

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

CITIZENSHIP, YOUTH AND EUROPE



EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP



PARTNERSHIP

COUNCIL OF EUROPE & EUROPEAN COMMISSION

TRAINING-YOUTH

WWW.TRAINING-YOUTH.NET

Under Construction

Citizenship, Youth and Europe



T-Kit

on

European Citizenship

Welcome to the T-Kit series

Some of you may have wondered: what does T-Kit mean? We can offer at least two answers. The first is as simple as the full version in English: "Training Kit". The second has more to do with the sound of the word that may easily recall "Ticket", one of the travelling documents we usually need to go on a journey. So, on the cover, the little figure called "Spiffy" holds a train ticket to go on a journey to discover new ideas. In our imagination, this T-Kit is a tool that each of us can use in our work. More specifically, we would like to address youth workers and trainers and offer them theoretical and practical tools to work with and use when training young people.

The T-Kit series has been the result of a one-year collective effort involving people from different cultural, professional and organisational backgrounds. Youth trainers, youth leaders in NGOs and professional writers have worked together in order to create high quality publications which would address the needs of the target group while recognising the diversity of approaches across Europe to each subject.

The T-Kits are a product of the Partnership Agreement on European Youth Worker Training run by the European Commission and the Council of Europe. Besides the T-Kits, the partnership between the two institutions has resulted in other areas of co-operation such as training courses, the magazine "Coyote" and a dynamic internet site.

To find out more about developments in the partnership (new publications, training course announcements, etc.) or to download the electronic version of the T-Kits, visit the Partnership web site: www.training-youth.net.

Council of Europe publishing
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex

ISBN 92-871-5228-4

© Council of Europe and European Commission, May 2003

This document does not necessarily express the official view of the European Commission or the Council of Europe, their member states or the organisations co-operating with the institutions.



**Coordination of the T-Kit series,
supervision of content and layout:**
Balázs Hidvéghi (*educational advisor*)

Secretariat
Dianna Osayande (*administration*)
Laetitia Pougary (*webmaster*)

Editor of this T-Kit:
Peter Merry

Authors of this T-Kit: (*see also last page*)
Miguel Angel García López,
Andreas Karsten,
Peter Merry,
Yael Ohana,
Alison Straker

Cover Page and Spiffy Character
The Big Family

Reproduction of material from
this publication is authorised
for non-commercial educational
purposes only, provided the source
is quoted.

Advisor:
Peter Wootsch



PARTNERSHIP
COUNCIL OF EUROPE & EUROPEAN COMMISSION
TRAINING-YOUTH

**Council of Europe
DG IV
Directorate of Youth and Sport**

European Youth Centre Strasbourg
30 Rue Pierre de Coubertin
F-67000 Strasbourg, France
Tel: +33-3-88 41 23 00 – Fax: +33-3-88 41 27 77

European Youth Centre Budapest
Zivatar ucta 1-3
H-1024 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: +36-1-212-4078 – Fax: +36-1-212-4076

**European Commission
DG Education and Culture
Unit D5: Youth Policy and Programmes**

Rue de la Loi, 200
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32-2-295 1100 – Fax: +32-2-299 4158



Contents

Contents	4
Foreword	5
Introduction	7
Citizenship in Europe	9
• Where do we come from? – A History of Europe and Citizenship	9
• The Return of the Citizen – Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship	19
• Possible Future Developments	27
Our Conceptual Framework – what we think	31
A Call to Action	43
Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship – who is doing what today?	45
Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship – how we think it should be done	55
Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples	67
Conclusion	91
Bibliography	93
Webography	99
About the Authors	103



Greetings, fellow citizen, and welcome to the T-Kit on European Citizenship. The theme of this publication is one which seems to be on many people's minds today – including yours, clearly.

The Council of Europe and the European Commission have made European Citizenship the Number One Priority in their Partnership Agreement on European Youth Worker Training. As institutions, they are aware of interest from their member states to do something about this topic. First on the topic of citizenship – how can we stimulate young people to engage more in society? Why does there seem to be so much disillusion and disinterest in traditional politics? – which is where our politicians feel it, of course. Secondly, the additional element of Europe – what meaning does this community have for people? Do they even perceive Europe as a community to which they belong?

Why do so few young people vote in the European elections? Is there a future to Europe? If the answer is “yes”, then today's young people are going to be the ones to shape it.

Disillusion and frustration with politics today is particularly noticeable amongst young people in Europe. Political leaders often appear to be missing vision and passion for the important things in life. Once elected to govern, political parties seem powerless to change anything fundamental in the face of the apparently inevitable process of globalisation.

Yet many young people have ideals, visions and passion. They express those in multiple ways as active citizens outside the formal democratic structures. Seeing the problems, they want things to change. However, our political leaders do not seem able to respond. And if people want to act, at what level should they engage? What impact can the local youth organisation have, when faced with the massive global issues that are beamed into our lives via TV and computer screens? As we become more aware of the global, we are challenged to make sense of it in the local.

Europe can provide a bridge here. As nation states are perceived as being less influential and less relevant in our globalised lives, Europe can provide a trans-national space for communication and action. Young people know there is a bigger world out there, and Europe can provide opportunities for exploring, learning and engaging.

There is also a more historical drive to the European project. Within living memory, neighbours all across Europe have been enemies at war, with young Europeans called up to kill other young Europeans. In more recent history, we have seen similar tales of sorrow and destruction unfolding in the East of our continent. Developing a European Citizenship is also about investing in the future, so that we and our children are not forced to look at our fellow young Europeans down the barrel of a gun.

This is a key time for Europe. The European Union is committed to a programme of enlargement, welcoming new member states in the coming years. Times of change like these always bring both opportunities and threats. Opportunities for easier travel and human contact between young people from all over Europe, for experiencing life in different cultures and societies, for widening our horizons and developing our ability to deal with the difference and complexity that we will encounter. Threats will come from the increased diversity that we meet, both on a surface level in terms of our ways of doing things, and on a deeper cultural level. Alongside that, is the challenge that integration into a bigger political block brings to nation states.

Education for European Citizenship will have to engage with these issues. An important element of this will be to ensure that attitudes based on respect underpin the development of a European identity, to safeguard against it becoming a mere extension of exclusive nationalism. Europe should be the forum where shared values can be acted upon, within Europe and with regard to those outside – wherever we should see the boundaries.



This T-Kit aims to help people who are working with young people in Europe to develop activities on the theme of European Citizenship. These could be people who use European Citizenship as an approach in youth work, and / or carry out activities about European Citizenship. So it should be useable for international groups, as well as single nationality groups.

As a team writing this publication, we have a number of expectations. We hope that you find the T-Kit open and provocative. We have deliberately not provided a recipe book – this is improvisation cuisine – in order to stimulate more thinking and questions, to create curiosity and a desire to learn more and try things out. We hope it provides a framework for you to orientate yourself in this work, and that you are able to use the insight in your own reality.

This T-Kit does not come to life until you make it happen. So enjoy the read, then go out and use what you have learned. And don't stop thinking, using and learning. As with everything in this world, it is under construction...

Your T-Kit team

*Miguel Angel García López,
Andreas Karsten,
Peter Merry,
Yael Ohana,
Alison Straker*



So what is there to discover in this T-Kit? There are two main elements – firstly, an exploration of the concept and practice of European Citizenship itself, and then of education for European Citizenship, both in theory and in practice. And all of this linked back into youth work in Europe.

To start with, we try to provide a coherent background picture to inform any work done in the area of European Citizenship. This includes:

- an overview of the historical development of citizenship in Europe, from the Greeks through to the Enlightenment, including some explanation of key concepts, including the Nation State and Human Rights, and a time-line of the development of citizenship in Europe since the 1940s;
- a critical look at contemporary approaches to the topic, exploring the tensions between citizenship seen as a status and citizenship more as identity and values, taking a look at post-modern approaches, and comparing how the European Union and Council of Europe see the topic;
- and a crystal-ball exploration of the future based on current trends – how might globalisation, environmental crises, new technologies, and the enlargement of the EU impact on the way European Citizenship develops?

We then outline our approach, which is based on a concept of European Citizenship that is dynamic, complex and integral. See below for more about this, as it also shapes the way we have devised and written this T-Kit.

Following this, we move to the educational side, with a look at contemporary approaches to education for European Citizenship – how different people and institutions attempt to engage the inhabitants of Europe – and we make a connection between those approaches and the approach that we have chosen to take, making explicit the connection between ideas and practice. The main schools of thought we dissect are the individualist and communitarian approaches, which represent complementary perspectives on the topic. Then we take an engaging look at how the European Union and Council of Europe are attempting education for European Citizenship.

Next, we come to the section on practice. We decided to present this in a way that is not usual for textbooks on practice. As all practice happens in context, we have not only given you an outline of the methods, the timing, materials and steps. Instead, we have told the story of practices in specific contexts, with some reflection on why they were successful on that occasion. There are a wide variety of stories, from all corners of Europe, on a wide diversity of topics connected to European Citizenship, and carried out by very different types of organisation.

To help you to decide whether a certain practice and the methods used are appropriate for you, and how you might adapt them, or develop your own project or activity, we have provided an Educational Framework, suggesting the kind of questions we think you should be asking yourself, and issues it could be helpful to consider. We base this on the idea of responsive practice, where the programme one develops is tailored specifically to meet the needs of the target group, and where its implementation is flexible enough to take into account any new needs as they emerge.

Please do read the background texts, and resist the temptation to jump straight to the sections on practice. The publication has been written as an integrated text, and it is important that the wider context is understood before thinking about methods.

Finally, we have a resources section at the back, with a bibliography, and web-links to further resources.




There are also some transversal elements to the T-Kit. At different points you will see Questions **in a box, marked by a question mark**, which are designed to stimulate your reflection in relation to the topic that is being discussed at that point. Sometimes when we are reading we enter a kind of trance state – these questions should help prevent that, and keep you thinking critically about what you are reading – a kind of Brechtian theatre technique in written form!

There are also a number of Training Activities **symbolised by an “under construction” sign**, – these are ideas that you could use during training courses or workshops to explore the topic that is being discussed – adapt them as appropriate. You could also use some of the Questions to stimulate reflection in groups that you work with. Remember – stay awake and aware as you read, or before you know it, you will be believing what we write!

Our Approach to the T-Kit

Before you set off on your journey through this T-Kit, we think it is important for you to know something about our approach to the topic and the publication. Dynamic, complex and integral are the three key terms of this approach. We believe in an approach to European Citizenship that embraces these concepts, and we have therefore produced this T-Kit in line with them.

What that means in practice is that we have tried to provide an overall picture of the development of European Citizenship and education in this area, without passing judgement on different concepts, but by showing how they fit into the bigger picture. The map we have used to locate and identify these different approaches is our conceptual framework. This can be summarised in the graphic below, which is developed in detail in the section Our Conceptual Framework.



These four quadrants, and the dynamics between them, make up our map. This also represents our values, in terms of how we believe education for European Citizenship should be approached – by addressing, in the whole, all of these areas. This does not mean that one project needs to address all of them, but it means that we should choose consciously which area we are going to work in, and be aware of which areas we are leaving out, if we choose to do so. Different people, at different times, need different approaches, and different areas to be addressed. With the help of this map, we feel it is easier to consciously choose where to focus.

So enjoy the exploration. Whether you choose to take the map with you, or leave it behind to have a look at later – bon voyage!



Where do we come from? A History of Europe and Citizenship

Let's start at the beginning – where has this concept of citizenship come from in Europe, and what shapes and forms has it taken over the centuries? This chapter cannot tell the whole story of citizenship, and neither that of Europe. What this chapter can do, hopefully, is to show you where some of our ideas and traditions and some of our intellectual heritage comes from. Clearly, such an attempt can only be subjective. We invite you on a small journey into the past: discover great ideas and famous thinkers, reflect upon their thoughts and beliefs and form your own opinion. Enjoy the trip!

Citizenship in the ancient world

The idea of citizenship is said to be born in the classical world of the Greeks and the Romans. When the time of kings had passed, the idea developed to involve at least some of the inhabitants in defining law and executing government – clearly the first roots of modern citizenship! But most of the tiny city-states of ancient Greece allowed only free resident men to participate in their civic life, which implies that citizens were in numbers actually a minority. Children, women, slaves and foreigners were not considered citizens. The Romans even used the citizen's status 'civitas' as a privilege which could be gained – and lost.

As you can see, citizenship didn't always mean to live in a democratic environment! Nevertheless, already at that time there were thinkers like the Greek philosopher Plato, who was convinced that democracy is no less than the most attractive form of civil society. He was even convinced that his "Republic" could only begin after a revolution. And how powerfully did history prove that he was right!

Another great philosopher was Aristotle. Many of his ideas, developed more than 2,300 years ago, still play an important role in our lives and in the way we think and act today. "The whole is greater than the sum of its parts" is a quote we often use, but hardly anyone knows that Aristotle coined this famous phrase. More important for our purpose is his conviction that communities exist because of human kind's impulse to be and live with others. Aristotle also wrote something which will still be true in another 2,300 years: He believed that well-organised education – in schools as well as outside formal institutions – creates societies in which citizens want more than to survive, namely to live together with a sense of social responsibility. Amazing, isn't it?

One facet of the ancient world you may have heard about before is the 'Agora', a public place and the centre of civic activity in ancient Athens. It was here that decisions by citizens were taken, where discussions were held and where exchanges took place. The 'Agora' was the heart of Athens' civil society, a society based on the community and the collective rather than the individual.

If you want to explore the ancient world a bit further, you can consult the following websites:

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ancient/asbook.html>

<http://ancienthistory.about.com/>

<http://plato.evansville.edu/public/burnet/>

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/GREECE/GREECE.HTM>

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/ROME/ROME.HTM>

<http://sophies-world.com/SophieText/aristotle.htm>

http://home.earthlink.net/~pdistan/howp_2.html

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Citizenship disappears – and returns

The notion of 'citizenship' and underlying concepts and philosophies had basically vanished from the continent during the medieval times of feudalism, when only few people were entitled to rule the great majority.

It was only during the 16th century and the Renaissance movement that citizens gradually re-appeared in Europe, especially in the Italian city-states, where citizenship was usually connected to certain conditions. In most of the cities, citizenship was limited to children of citizens. In Venice, to give you one example, you had to live as a non-citizen and pay taxes for 15 years in order to become a Venetian citizen.

But it was the 'Enlightenment' that finally brought the concept of citizenship powerfully back to Europe. Read on to find out more or hold on for a moment and discover the time of the Renaissance:

<http://www.historyguide.org/earlymod/lecture1c.html>

<http://www.oir.ucf.edu/wm/paint/glo/renaissance/>

<http://www.bartleby.com/65/ci/citystat.html>

<http://www.crs4.it/Ars/arshtml/arstitle.html>

The European Enlightenment

'The Enlightenment' was a very comprehensive European movement, embracing philosophy, art, literature, and music, as well as social, cultural, linguistic and political theory in the late 17th and 18th centuries. The Enlightenment was concerned to reach outside itself and see the world differently – which also included the role of citizens and the meaning of citizenship. One of its basic understandings is that nothing is given or pre-determined, but that the universe is fundamentally rational, which means it can be understood through the use of reason alone and it can be controlled. From this starting point and inspired by the Greek city-states, Jean-Jacques Rousseau developed the idea that all citizens should contribute to political decisions without thought for personal advantage.

The ideas of 'enlightened' philosophers had a great impact: The French Revolution identified itself with the ideas of the 'enlightenment', and they also influenced the constitution of the United States of America. And even today Rousseau's ideas haven't died. John F. Kennedy once said, almost a hundred years later: "Political action is the highest responsibility of a citizen", and many more quotes from a lot of famous people could be added. Just think how many people you can see talking about different ideas promoted and developed during the 'Enlightenment' every day on TV, or actually in your very neighbourhood, even during your daily work!

Unfortunately, this is not the place to get deeper into the ideas behind the 'Enlightenment', but here are a few exciting possibilities to read further about Rousseau and Voltaire, Hume and Smith and many other great philosophers and their stimulating thoughts:

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/ENLIGHT/ENLIGHT.HTM>

<http://mars.wnec.edu/~gempel/courses/wc2/lectures/enlightenment.html>

http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html

<http://europeanhistory.about.com/cs/enlightenment/>

http://home.earthlink.net/~pdistan/howp_7.html



The liberal understanding of citizenship

The basic idea behind the liberal understanding of citizenship is simply that there are certain basic rights every citizen has as long as they are loyal to their state (not to the regime in power at any given moment).

One of the first and most influential liberal thinkers was the English philosopher John Locke. According to him, the state exists for the sake of citizens and the protection of their rights and freedoms. Based on a social contract between the people and their government, citizens have the freedom to think, to believe, to express their beliefs, to organise themselves, to work, to buy and sell, and to choose their government freely as well as to change it (actually even to remove it by revolution).

Beyond these ideas connected to the liberty of individuals, some of the liberal thinkers were also concerned by questions regarding the collective and society as a whole. The Scottish philosopher John Stuart Mill argued for instance, that moral maturity is essential and is only possible if a citizen is involved in some kind of collective activity with other citizens or on their behalf. Liberty and freedom only make full sense by being connected to notions such as collective responsibility and equality, or, as Hobhouse expressed it: "Liberty without equality is a name of noble sound and squalid meaning" (1911, p. 38). This unalterable belief in the fundamental equality of all people is actually something that can be traced as far back as the Stoics, a philosophical movement founded in Athens around 300 B.C.

From these two closely related, but also clearly distinguishable positions, two schools of thought developed. They both share the same essential belief in the utmost significance of liberty and are usually referred to as liberal individualist (the former) and liberal communitarian or republican (the latter). As you can see, the adjective 'liberal' is related to much more than only the free market economy, a way in which the liberal movement is very often interpreted and limited to nowadays!

The roots of liberalism still play an important role in today's societies, as do the ideas of the period of the 'Enlightenment': Just think about the often-used argument that citizens are not born, but made. In other words: People have to grow up in democratic environments to become democratic citizens.

A few great resources to explore the ideas of the liberal movement further are:

<http://www.worldlib.org>

<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/l/locke.htm>

<http://www.turnleft.com/liberal.html>

<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/m/milljs.htm>

<http://www.lymec.org>

http://www.britannica.com/heritage/article?content_id=1374

Revolutions

Based on the entirely rational world-view promoted by the 'Enlightenment', a lot of ideas were developed on how society could be influenced and changed. Ideas for change lead to demands for change, and demands for change led to the revolutions we all know. Revolutions were seen as the most effective way to achieve political and social change.

The French Revolution was the first major social revolution, of far greater dimensions and – with its 'Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen' - of deeper significance than the American Revolution that had preceded it. Only the Russian Revolution of October 1917, which led to modern Communism, can rival in world importance what happened in France at the end of the 18th century.

The foundation of the modern republic, the strict separation of state and church, the root of the human rights movement, the birth of the famous revolutionary triad 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', the ignition spark for the first explicit feminist movements – so many things have been the direct or indirect result of these social revolutions that we can't name them all. But we can invite you to a tour exploring some of the ideas and impacts and, most importantly, the human beings who did all of this!

http://www.britannica.com/history/euro/1/2_2.html

<http://www.thehistorychannel.co.uk/classroom/gcse/rus2.htm>

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/REV/>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/education/modern/russia/russifla.htm>

<http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/browse/texts/>

<http://revolution.h-net.msu.edu/>

<http://www.pbs.org/ktca/liberty/>

<http://www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/revolution/>

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**



**Future
Developments**



**Our Conceptual
Framework**


**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

 Within which of the above-mentioned schools of thought would you most like to be a citizen? 

 Within which of the above-mentioned schools of thought would you most like to be a leader? 




For each school of thought above, make a human statue (Image Theatre), showing the relationship between citizens, the state, and other players in society. Bring them together and look for comparisons, differences and signs of development / progress.

(For more on Image Theatre, see http://www.engage.nu/interact/Working_Methods/interactivetheatre.htm)

Having introduced you to the main schools of thought, which inspired today's understanding of citizenship, and the main events that have led us to where we are today, we invite you to discover some other notions connected to citizenship and their origins. Please keep in mind that these notions are often closely related to different philosophical movements and historical events, and that we can't point out all of these links all the time. Moreover, these notions are, as is the whole chapter, subjectively chosen and described. We trust it will stimulate your thinking.

The Nation State

The concept of nation states has only existed for the past two hundred years, even though we quite often tend to believe the opposite, just because it's what we know. But actually history is not the history of nation states. One could even dare to ask whether the concept of the nation state is only transitory. Processes like globalisation, the strengthening of the European Union and immigration have forced the once-so-closed nation states to open up. How long is their chapter in history going to last after all?

 What do you think the nation state will look like in 20 years time? 

It is basically the modern history of Europe, which can be described as the history of nation states. Many European nations materialised as states as late as the 19th century. It was usually only after their formation that languages were homogenised, national educational systems were set up and elements of a shared national 'culture' appeared (such as flags, anthems and similar symbols).

In the end, nations can be constructed more or less by chance, and they can be de- and reconstructed as well. It is important to realise that, when a nation is constructed, some people are included and others not, and the question of inclusion almost never takes into account what the people feel they are. Looking carefully at the European integration process and the political debate about immigration, you can see exactly that happening: by defining who is part of the European Union and who is not, some people are included, others are excluded. Do you know anyone who feels European but is not a legal citizen of the European Union?

While all states clearly define who is part of their nation and who is not, and who is allowed to become part of their nation and who is not, there are distinct differences in the way they do so. In some countries the belonging to their nation is determined according to the 'jus sanguinis' (originally from Latin and means 'law of blood'). It simply means that a child takes their citizenship from their father or mother. In other countries the 'jus soli' rules (also Latin and means 'law of the soil'), meaning that citizenship is decided by the place of birth. These systems are antagonistic and regularly lead to dual nationalities or statelessness (the loss of any citizenship).

For many reasons, nation states are nowadays not, as they used to be, independent from each other in the strongest meaning of the word. On the contrary, the interdependence between nation states is growing faster and stronger day after day. Just think of the Euro, which in consequence binds twelve European nation states very closely together. But actually the Council of Europe represents the first post-war attempt to organise and strengthen this interdependence, an attempt whose success was visible during its 50th anniversary in 1999.

.../...



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**


**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

The European Union is another, more advanced, model for the regulation of mutual dependence between a number of nation states in Europe. The EU has come a long way from its modest early stages of economic co-operation to a matured union, which is somewhat close to a confederation and has further ambitions. Actually the EU manages, for the first time in the history of nation states, to extract national sovereignties to a supranational level and to create a dynamic balance between this new sovereignty and national interests. And it also helps to sensitise people to the fact that the nation state is not the only form of collective identity and that it does not have a higher dignity than other elements of one's identity.



Brainstorm a list of issues that you think are important for people in society today. In small groups, discuss whether you think those issues should best be dealt with at local, national or international level. Feedback from the discussions and compare answers. Open up a discussion about appropriate levels for decision-making ("subsidiarity"). Link to the role of the European Union.

The Euro was not the first ...


When the Euro was introduced on January 1, 2002, replacing twelve of the world's major currencies in one go, there was a lot to be read about the singleness of this event, the uniqueness of this moment and the outstanding achievement of twelve European countries.

But by going back more than a thousand years in European history, you will find out that there has been a truly European currency before. It was around 750 when Pepin the Short, King of the Franks, introduced the Silver Denier, a currency that remained Europe's standard for more than 500 years.

As is the history of nation states, the history of European currencies is amazingly brief. None of the Euro-states' currency was older than 200 years. The German Deutschmark had just turned 50 when it was replaced by the Euro. The life stories of most European currencies are surprisingly short, but very often people are convinced of the opposite. Were you?



How long has your country's currency existed in its present (or pre-Euro) form?



Set up a debate for and against the introduction of a single global currency

Human rights are older than you might think...

The concept of human rights can be traced back to the Stoics in ancient Greece as well as to other cultures outside Europe. The first time a written charter, containing some basic rights of men, was developed is believed to have been in England, where King John of England signed the 'Magna Carta Libertatum' in the 13th century.

During the Renaissance movement most of the thinkers drew on the ancient Greek belief that all men are equal, and in the following 17th and 18th centuries the idea of underlying natural rights evolved. But it was only during the 'Enlightenment' and the time of the revolutions at the end of the 19th century that human rights (as rights possessed by people simply as, and because they are, human beings) became part of the political agenda.

.../...



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

It was the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, which unforgettably expressed that 'all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.' Amazingly and sadly enough, the US constitution did not extend these rights to either slaves or women.

In 1788 the 'Declaration of the rights of man and of citizens' was adopted as a result of the French revolution, defining basic human rights similar to those outlined in the Declaration of Independence.

It was only in 1948, when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was unanimously adopted by the UN on December 10, that human rights were declared valid not only for men, but for every human being.



Do you believe that human rights should be applied universally, in the same way to every woman, man and child on this planet? Should people be forced to follow the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? How would you deal with people who violated any of these "Rights"?



Since then, a number of human rights standards have been adopted throughout the world. It is to the Council of Europe's merit that a European 'Convention for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms' exists, which protects any human being on the territory covered by the convention. The convention is complemented by a European Court of Human Rights, which persons affected by human rights' violations can appeal to.

There is a lot more to be said about human rights, enough to write a separate publication! Feel free to explore some of these remarkable resources to learn more about human rights and human rights education:

- <http://www.coe.int/hre>
- <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>
- <http://www.un.org/works/humanrights/humanrights1.html>
- <http://www.echr.coe.int/>
- <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/WhatYouWant.asp?NT=005>
- <http://www.unhchr.ch/>

Women

Women have made up half of the population since the very beginning of our existence, but nevertheless they were often ignored. We had to point out several times already, that noble and human ideas such as the existence and the protection of undeniable natural rights were in their beginnings often only applied to men, not to women. When you take your history books from school, how many women do you find in it?

It is not a secret that no country has achieved full equality between women and men – yet. But still it is a valid question to ask if there has basically been any woman influential in history at all. Think back to the chapter you have just read. Do you remember a female name?

It might be true that women have been less dominant throughout most of the history that we are aware of. But considering everyday life, the only thing we can surely claim is that women have been less influential in the writing of history and history books.

We have collected some powerful websites for you to discover more about the history of women and their present situation. Dive in!

- <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/>
- <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/>
- <http://www.lkwdpl.org/wihohio/figures.htm>
- <http://www.unifem.undp.org/>
- <http://www.un-instraw.org/>
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/gender/>
- <http://www.feminist.org/>

Having read the basics of citizenship history and explored just a few of the notions connected to citizenship you are just about to jump into the next chapter, where we will introduce you to more recent developments and debates around citizenship. But before that we thought it would be useful to offer you a short overview of Europe's history after the Second World War, which will help you to place the contemporary debates around (European) citizenship in its social context. So here you go!



September 19, 1946

In his famous speech at the University of Zurich Winston Churchill calls for “a kind of United States of Europe”. According to him, “a remedy [was needed] which, as if by miracle, would transform the whole scene and in a few years make all Europe as free and happy as Switzerland is today.”

April 16, 1948

The Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) is created to co-ordinate the implementation of the Marshall-Plan, a plan announced in 1947 to foster reconstruction and the economic revitalisation of Europe. Today the organisation is called the “Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)” and has 30 member countries sharing a commitment to democracy and the market economy.

www.oecd.org

May 7-11, 1948

Fostered by the International Co-ordination of Movements for the Unification of Europe Committee, the Europe Congress meets in The Hague, The Netherlands. It is chaired by Winston Churchill and attended by 800 delegates. Participants recommend that a European Deliberative Assembly and a European Special Council, in charge of preparing political and economic integration of European Countries, be created. They also propose the adoption of a Human Rights Charter and, to ensure the respect of such a charter, the creation of a Court of Justice.

April 4, 1949

The North Atlantic Treaty is signed in Washington DC by 12 states, creating a military alliance to defend each other, if necessary. Today the alliance has 19 members and is closely co-operating with Russia and by mid-2004 NATO is expected to have further enlarged to 26 members.

www.nato.int

May 5, 1949

The statutes of the Council of Europe are signed in London by 10 states aiming to protect human rights, pluralist democracy and the rule of law and to help consolidate democratic stability in Europe. It enters into force on August 5 the same year. The first session of the consultative assembly takes place in Strasbourg in the beginning of September, 1949.

www.coe.int

May 9, 1950

In a speech inspired by Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, proposes that France and Germany and any other European country wishing to join them pool their Coal and Steel resources («Schuman Declaration»). The Schuman plan is later subscribed to by six more states and approved by the Council of Europe’s Assembly.

April 18, 1951

The Six (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands) sign the Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the humble beginnings of today’s European Union (EU). In May 1952 they also sign the European Defence Community (EDC) Treaty.

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

November 4, 1950

The European Convention on Human Rights is signed by the Council of Europe member states in Rome. It enters into force on 3 September 1953 and defines a number of fundamental rights and freedoms. The Convention also establishes an international mechanism to ensure collective adherence to the convention by all parties signing it. One of the institutions created by the convention is the European Court of Human Rights, which was established in Strasbourg in 1959.

<http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/WhatYouWant.asp?NT=005>

March 25, 1957

The Six (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands) sign the 'Treaties of Rome' establishing the European Economic Area (EEA) as well as the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). The treaties enter into force on 1 January 1958 and represent a new quality of co-operation in the field of economics and politics between nation states in Europe.

July 20-21, 1959

Seven countries of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), namely Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, decide to establish the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). They considered free trade as a means to achieve growth and prosperity amongst themselves. In this respect EFTA was originally meant to be a counterbalance to the European Economic Area established a year before.

<http://www.efta.int/structure/main/index.html>

September 18, 1959

The European Court of Human Rights is established by the Council of Europe in Strasbourg under the European Convention on Human Rights, as the main instrument to ensure the enforcement of the obligations that the signing countries entered into.

<http://www.echr.coe.int>

August 13, 1961

Erection of the Berlin Wall.

October 18, 1961

The European Social Charter is signed by the Council of Europe member states in Rome. It enters into force on February 26, 1965. Protecting social and economic human rights, it is the natural counterpart to the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees civil and political human rights.

<http://www.humanrights.coe.int/csweb/GB/index.htm>

July 1, 1967

The executives of the three European Communities (EEA, EURATOM, and ECSC) are merged into one.

January 1, 1973

Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland join the European Communities.

January 1, 1981

Greece joins the European Communities as their 10th member state.



January 1, 1986

Spain and Portugal become members of the European Communities.

July 6, 1989

Mikhail Gorbachov addresses the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, proposing a new disarmament initiative. His proposal brings a new quality to the relations between East and West and, at the same time, underlines the importance of the Council of Europe as a force for a peaceful and stable European continent.

November 9, 1989

The Berlin Wall falls. With it, Soviet Communism ends and the USSR collapses. Vaclav Havel passionately called the events of 1989 'the return to Europe'; and that is what it was: A return to Europe, imposing new missions on all European and international organisations, be it the EU, the Council of Europe, NATO, the OECD or EFTA. Democratic stability could, for the first time since the end of the war, be pro-actively consolidated in all of Europe, now stretching from the Atlantic to the Russian border with Japan.

<http://www.historyguide.org/europe/lecture16.html>

February 7, 1992

The Treaty on the European Union, also known as the Maastricht Treaty, is signed in Maastricht. It enters into force on November 1, 1993 and establishes the European Union as a political union. It also introduces the Single European Market.

www.europa.eu.int

October 8-9, 1993

The first Council of Europe summit of heads of state and government in Vienna adopts a declaration confirming its pan-European vocation and setting new political priorities in protecting national minorities and combating all forms of racism, xenophobia and intolerance.

January 1, 1995

Austria, Finland and Sweden join the European Union.

February 28, 1996

The Russian Federation joins the Council of Europe and makes it a fully pan-European organisation.

January 25, 2001

Armenia and Azerbaijan join the Council of Europe, which then has 43 member states.

January 1, 2002

The Euro becomes the official currency in 12 member states of the European Union. Its introduction marks an unequalled quality of co-operation between nation states.

<http://europa.eu.int/euro/html/entry.html>

April 24, 2002

Bosnia & Herzegovina joins the Council of Europe as its 44th member country.



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**


**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

? ? What is the most important event that you remember in your lifetime that has influenced your role as a citizen? **? ?**



Parallel Citizenship Autobiographies – Each person draws a time-line of their life, and marks on it key events that have influenced their development as an active citizen. Compare and discuss.

Now you have it all – the story so far! You have read about the roots of the concept of citizenship and how it evolved through the centuries; you have explored some notions connected to citizenship, eye-openers helping to see current debates in a different light; you have recalled the post-war history of Europe. The time has come to go on and plunge into the more recent developments and discussions around European Citizenship. Read on and enjoy!



The Return of the Citizen Contemporary approaches to citizenship

Citizenship – a popular word

The T-Kit you are reading just now is only one proof of many that the somewhat fixed understanding of citizenship – the relationship between citizens and their state – has been expanding and that the notion of “citizenship” is experiencing a major increase in its visibility.

A good example of this, is the remarkable number of results that the internet-based search engine Google returns searching for “European Citizenship”: About 9,280! If you enter “citizenship” as a query, it comes up with more than 1,560,000 results (www.google.co.uk, March 10, 2002). All these websites are the direct or indirect result of conferences that have been organised, of publications that were printed, speeches which were given, research that was undertaken, books which were published, and discussions that were held, and in fact are still going on with amazing intensity.

When following some of these debates, reading some of the publications or looking at different websites about citizenship, the first thing most likely to strike you is how differently the term “citizenship” is used and understood. Rob Gilbert describes citizenship as “a broad, complex and contested term” (1996, p. 46).

Aiming to overcome the static understanding of citizenship as a legal status in relation to the nation state, most contemporary concepts of citizenship are closely linked with the notion of “civil society”. That is the reason why we think it is important to describe the undisputed core of both notions (citizen-state and civil society) and highlight common elements, before introducing some of the main approaches currently discussed.

Contemporary Citizenship – more than a status given by the state

“You get a passport, you can vote, you are entitled to the protection of the state.”

One way among many to describe how citizenship was understood until very recently: as the straightforward relationship between citizens and their state, clearly defining rights and responsibilities of both.

At the end of the 1960's and the beginning of the 1970's this understanding of citizenship started to be challenged, questioned and developed in different directions. The two following definitions illustrate this development and show that citizenship was opening up and starting to connect to topics like feelings, morality and senses of belonging:

“Citizenship is the practice of a moral code – a code that has concern for the interest of others – grounded in personal self-development and voluntary co-operation rather than the repressive compulsive power of state intervention.”

(Hayek, 1967)

“Citizenship is a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed. There are not universal principles that determine what those rights and duties shall be, but societies in which citizenship is a developing institution create an image of ideal citizenship ... Citizenship requires a direct sense of community membership based on loyalty to a civilisation which is a common possession. It is a loyalty of free men endowed with rights and protected by a common law.”

(Marshall, 1973)

During the 1990's, concepts of citizenship were taken even further, introducing the notion of ‘multi-dimensional citizenship’ and creating a direct link between citizenship and identity. In

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**


that way, they were trying to react to recent developments such as European integration, globalisation, migration and their political, social, economic, cultural and ecological consequences. Again, a selection of definitions from this period hopefully helps to give you an idea about these conceptual developments:

“Citizenship is the peaceful struggle through a public sphere which is dialogical.”
(Habermas, 1994)

“Citizenship is not just a certain status, defined by a set of rights and responsibilities. It is also an identity, an expression of one’s membership in a political community.”
(Kymlicka and Norman, 1995)

“Citizenship is a complex and multidimensional concept. It consists of legal, cultural, social and political elements and provides citizens with defined rights and obligations, a sense of identity, and social bonds.”
(Ichilov, 1998)

“Citizenship is the active membership and participation of individuals in society who are entitled to rights and responsibilities and who have the capacity to influence politics. Therefore citizenship has to be more than a political and juridical status; it also is a social role.”
(Cesar Birzea in June 2002 at the 2nd Pilot Course on European Citizenship, organised by the Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe)



Using some of the quotations in this section, run a Statement Activity. Someone reads out one of the quotations, and people move to different areas of the room depending on whether they agree or not with the statement. They are then asked to explain why they agree or not, and people can change position if they are convinced by someone else’s argument. It is important to debrief this exercise afterwards, to allow people to express how they felt during the activity (not to get into another debate about the topic, which can happen very easily!).

The collected definitions are neither exclusive nor exhaustive and should really just give you an idea of how broadly and diversely the term ‘citizenship’ was and still is being understood and how its understanding has changed and developed in recent times. Beyond that, the definitions help to make a few observations about similarities between the different concepts and understandings of citizenship.

? ?	<p>Which do you believe is more important (rank them 1 to 4)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having legal citizen’s rights (e.g. to vote) • Feeling a sense of connection to the communities you belong to • Believing for yourself in respect for all people • Having the practical skills and capacities to engage in politics and / or civil society 	? ?
-----	---	-----



Common Elements

One of the elements shared by all definitions of citizenship is the question of belonging to a community. Such a community can be defined through a variety of elements, e.g. a shared moral code, an identical set of rights and obligations, loyalty to a commonly possessed civilisation, a sense of identity.

In the geographical sense, community is usually defined at two main levels, differentiating between the local community, in which the person lives, and the state, to which the person belongs. These two levels are not exclusive, but depending on the concept and/or definitions, the accent may be more on one level than the other (Audigier, 2000, p. 17).

Another shared aspect is that citizenship always exists in public and democratic spaces, in which citizens have equal rights as well as responsibilities. These rights and obligations are being exercised and fulfilled whilst respecting the rights of other citizens and counting on them to fulfil their own responsibilities.

Different Concepts and Contexts

Beyond these shared essentials, quite a number of conceptual differences exist. Very often they are identifiable by the adjective used together with 'citizenship'. One example is the concept of 'democratic citizenship', as promoted by the Council of Europe. The adjective 'democratic' emphasises the belief that citizenship should be based on democratic principles and certain values, e.g. pluralism, respect for human dignity and the rule of law.

Apart from the above mentioned elements, which help to compare, analyse, structure and differentiate various conceptions of citizenship, there are quite some components which seem to be arbitrary unless looked at in the specific context for which a citizenship model was developed and in which it is used. The adjective 'European' is for instance used both as a reference to territory and as a reference to a certain identity, a sense of belonging and a set of cultural rights. Its exact meaning can only be understood in relation to its specific context, e.g. the political purpose, the institutional framework and/or the historical development of the idea.

Civil society – what is it about?

As we have shown, the understanding of citizenship has developed from a citizen-state relationship – in purely legal terms – to a concept embracing multi-dimensional relations between citizens and their state, citizens and their community and between citizens themselves. Nowadays 'citizenship' is much more than a legal construction and relates – amongst other things – to your very personal senses of belonging, for instance the sense of belonging to a community which you can shape and influence directly. A space to be or to become influential is civil society.

There have been numerous attempts to define "civil society". The expression is on everyone's lips, but not everyone means the same thing when using the term. While the term has already existed for a long time, its current popularity is a development of the past twenty years. During these last two decades we have seen and experienced what Forbrig (2000) describes as a "remarkable renaissance" of the term and the concept of civil society in all parts of Europe.

Introduced by the philosophers of the Scottish Enlightenment, such as Adam Smith and David Hume, civil society was in its original sense meant to be a characterisation of society as a whole, which did not necessarily imply democracy (Wimberley, 1999, p. 1).

A later understanding restricts civil society to social structures outside the state, or, in other words, it simplifies civil society as society minus the state.

A third, and probably nowadays the most common, conception perceives civil society as the sphere of non-governmental organisations and associations (especially of a voluntary nature). It is therefore very close to the so-called "third sector".

Most of the contemporary definitions and debates refer to the third point of view, the main debate being whether religion, economy and/or the family should be considered as a part of civil society or not (Bahmueller, 2000, p. 1).




**European Convention
on Human Rights**
(See p. 26)

A widely accepted sociological definition of civil society is the following:


“Civil society can be defined as a set or system of self-organised intermediary groups that:

- (1) are relatively independent of both public authorities and private units of production and reproduction, that is, of firms and families;
- (2) are capable of deliberating about and taking collective actions in defence or promotion of their interests or passions;
- (3) do not seek to replace either state agents or private (re)producers or to accept responsibility for governing the polity as a whole; and
- (4) agree to act within pre-established rules of a ‘civil’, i.e. mutually respectful, nature.”
(Schmitter, 1997, p. 240)

Independent of the concrete phrasing of the definition which a discussion may be based on, the vast majority of such debates start from the same basic assumption: Society is on the move. The concept of the nation state, once a hermetically closed construction, has become porous. What will become of it is still unknown, but it is certainly going to be something new (Lauritzen, 1998).



How do you see your role in civil society?
Which of the descriptions here does it best relate to?



The EU and the CoE and their approaches to citizenship

This T-Kit can not – and does not want to – describe everything that has been done on European Citizenship by the European Union and the Council of Europe. It can only highlight a few aspects which are of interest in this context.

One of these aspects is the fact that neither the founding text of the Council of Europe nor those of the Union contain the words ‘citizenship’ or ‘citizen’. Nowadays, both institutions put great emphasis on the concept of citizenship, be it called European, active and/or democratic.

The beginning of this chapter illustrated that the two institutions are not at all the only ones pursuing ‘the return of the citizen’. On the contrary, this push is coming from all sides. Is it because our democracies are endangered – as many people claim – confronted with decreasing participation in votes and elections and, actually, most forms of traditional engagement in society? Is it because active citizens and civil society have to replace the welfare state in order to maintain social cohesion? Or is it just another thought-reducing buzzword-campaign to keep NGOs busy?

Finding profound answers to these questions would go far beyond the scope of this publication. Opinions on these issues are as diverse as the readership of our T-Kit. We believe that there is more to the concept of ‘citizenship’ than an excited response to political disillusionment. Or to say it with the words of Professor François Audigier: “We should not consider the ‘return of the citizen’, the necessary appeal to a citizenship of initiative, proximity and responsibility, to be a happy result of the crisis of the state and of democratic political institutions.” (Audigier, 2000, p. 14)

An interesting difference between the two European institutions is that the citizenship of the European Union is clearly and strictly conditioned: Only someone who possesses the citizenship of one of its member states is an EU citizen as well. The **European Convention on Human Rights**, on the other hand, protects any human being staying within the area covered by the convention, independent of their nationality. Still, you will hear a lot of EU-politicians talking about ‘European Citizenship’, simply meaning the legal citizenship of a person living inside the European Union. Clearly, European Citizenship – at least in the context of this T-Kit – is more embracing than this limited and exclusive understanding.



Another distinction can be observed regarding the approach of the institutional programmes in the youth sector. The answers which the two institutions seek to provide to the question ‘We have made Europe, but how do we make Europeans?’ are quite distinct. While both believe in the worldly wisdom that people are born, but citizens are made, the European Union attempts to bring ‘Europe closer to its citizens’ through personal intercultural experiences, voluntary service and direct dialogue with young people (European Commission, 2001, p. 17), whereas the Council of Europe is relying much more on intercultural group experiences, intercultural learning in protected learning environments, working with multipliers and the creation of snowball effects.

Despite all their differences and the diversity of their approaches, both institutions share one essential conviction – at least in the youth field of their work. That is that European identity can only be defined by a set of commonly shared values, an approach calling for a consensus much more than enforcement. This belief is reflected in a variety of resolutions of the Council of Europe, a great number of policy documents of youth organisations and recently in European Union documents such as the Commission’s “White Paper on Youth”, in which Europe is referred to as “the champion of democratic values” (European Commission, 2001, p. 52). It is therefore only consistent that the two main European institutions, based on this shared conviction, have initiated a partnership to combine experience and strength for promoting the notion of a ‘European Citizenship’ – a co-operation which would make sense for all working areas but which is, for the time being, limited to the youth sector.

? ?

When did you last hear something from the EU or Council of Europe about European Citizenship?

What understanding of European Citizenship was behind their message?

? ?

Post-modernity
(See p. 25)

Recent developments

Society is undoubtedly changing and is influenced by a variety of factors, which are often associated with what many call **post-modernity**. This characterisation manifests itself in a variety of different trends and tendencies, such as

- the information revolution brought about by new information and communication technologies;
- a fundamental change in the production and the use of knowledge;
- a shifting sense of identity that puts less emphasis on common interests and shared values than before;
- a change in the nature of politics and how citizens participate in political processes.

All of these developments have a significant influence on citizenship (and education and training for citizenship). While their existence remains unquestioned, opinions about possible consequences vary substantially.

? ?

How do you think these developments will impact on citizenship?

? ?

Some argue that the notion of identity has to and is going to remain the essence of citizenship, but needs to be disconnected from the nation state and expanded to various geographical levels, from the local through to the global level (Gilbert, 1992, p. 58).



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Others believe that the ‘traditional’ concept of citizenship is about to disappear in post-modern society. They see a need for a new ground on which another form of citizenship could be developed (Gilbert, 1992, p. 59).

Another theory, while sharing a rather pessimistic evaluation of post-modern trends in society, argues that some of the “post-modern developments themselves offer new possibilities for citizenship” (Gilbert, 1992, p. 60).

The debate on the European level has followed the first point of view for a relatively long time – that identity is the essence of citizenship, from local to global. It is not only the institutions that have argued for a European Citizenship, with a European facet complementary to other elements. Civil society organisations state that “furthering European integration requires the substantiation of the concept of European Citizenship” (European Youth Forum, 2001, p. 1).

But while still agreeing with the belief that the notion of identity should be disconnected from the nation state and expanded, an increasing number of people also argue for a set of shared values as the underlying reference point rather than geographical regions only. Whoever shares these values is a European citizen, “and they can be so in Moscow or in Cairo, in Athens or in Castrop Rauxel.” (Lauritzen, 1998, p. 5).

According to the interpretation of the notion “citizenship”, there are different theories regarding its future developments:


- Is the nation state a concept of the past?
- Are citizens going to refer to a community of values rather than a nation state?
- Has the concept of citizenship any future at all?

Some possible answers to these questions will be introduced in the next chapter, once again not claiming to be complete or exclusive, but rather exemplifying the diversity of opinions and theories.



Post-modern Society

Here comes a quote from the book "A Primer on Postmodernism" by Dr. Grenz, hopefully helping you to understand what post-modern society means: "*Postmodernism* refers to the intellectual mood and cultural expressions that are becoming increasingly dominant in contemporary society. These expressions call into question the ideals, principles, and values that lay at the heart of the modern mind-set. *Postmodernity*, in turn, refers to the era in which we are living, the time when the post-modern outlook increasingly shapes our society. The adjective *post-modern*, then, refers to the mind-set and its products. These have been reflected in many of the traditional vehicles of cultural expression. Thus we have *post-modern* architecture, art and theatre. *Postmodernity* is the era in which *post-modern* ideas, attitudes, and values reign – when the mood of *postmodernism* is moulding culture. This is the era of the post-modern society."



Postmodernism – a definition based on text from www.counterbalance.org

A general and wide-ranging term which is applied to literature, art, philosophy, architecture, fiction, and cultural and literary criticism, among others. Postmodernism is largely a reaction to the assumed certainty of scientific, or objective, efforts to explain reality. In essence, postmodernism is highly skeptical of explanations which claim to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions, or races, and instead focuses on the relative truths of each person. In the postmodern understanding, interpretation is everything; reality only comes into being through our interpretations of what the world means to us individually. Postmodernism relies on concrete experience over abstract principles, believing always that the outcome of one's own experience will necessarily be fallible and relative, rather than certain and universal.

Postmodernism is «post» because it denies the existence of any ultimate principles, and it lacks the optimism of there being a scientific, philosophical, or religious truth which will explain everything for everybody – a characteristic of the so-called «modern» mind. The paradox of the postmodern position is that, in placing all principles under the scrutiny of its skepticism, even its own principles are not beyond questioning. It contradicts itself in the statement that there are no universal truths – except of course the universal truth of postmodernism.

A key thing to remember is that one of the identifying characteristics of Postmodernism is that there are a lot of different kinds of postmodernism, lots of different theories encompassed by the term «Postmodernism». Many people think it is not possible, or at least not safe, to rest with only one definition of Postmodernism, but there are certainly a few key elements. Diversity is one of them; much of multicultural theory has been included in what is considered to be Postmodernism, and emphasis in many areas seems to be on the voices of many rather than the chosen voices of the few. Often, Postmodern writers seem to define themselves in contrast to Modernism, that is to say: not about individual great minds working in isolation, producing «Great Works», not about the separation of high culture and low culture, not about there being one great universal truth out there which we are all working to find (maybe that's why there's no one great universal truth about what Postmodernism is), and therefore not about one particular version of the Universe.

The problem then comes in the extreme tendency to deconstruct everything, to make everything relative, and remove all sense of common values or moral human responsibility, so there can be no right or wrong, as it all depends on the social and cultural context. It then becomes difficult to condemn the atrocities of the previous century, or the more recent terrorist attacks. So what might post-Postmodernism look like?



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



European Convention on Human Rights

The «European Convention on Human Rights» sets forth a number of fundamental rights and freedoms (right to life, prohibition of torture, prohibition of slavery and forced labour, right to liberty and security, right to a fair trial, no punishment without law, right to respect for private and family life, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and association, right to marry, right to an effective remedy, prohibition of discrimination). More rights are granted by additional protocols to the Convention. Parties undertake to secure these rights and freedoms to everyone within their jurisdiction.

The Convention also establishes an international enforcement mechanism. To ensure the observance of the engagements undertaken by the Parties, the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg was set up. It deals with individual and inter-State petitions. At the request of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the Court may also give advisory opinions concerning the interpretation of the Conventions and their protocols.





Possible future developments - the future is not what it was, but...

After the journey through our history, and after seeing the changes in our collective understandings of citizenship, we will be looking at the most recent, and possible future, social changes and developments in relation to the notion of citizenship. This exercise might help us to anticipate some answers to the emerging tensions and challenges related to the notion of citizenship. At the same time it is important that we recognise the in-built limitations of doing so. As experience shows, the future is unpredictable.

The technological revolution, globalisation, migration, environmental degradation, the inversion of the demographic pyramid in industrial societies, the enlargement of the European Union, terrorist attacks and their consequences, are some of the most relevant socio-political developments that significantly influence the understanding and development of citizenship.

Each of these social developments is very complex, and there are multiple interactions and mutual implications among them. In the following paragraphs we will try to introduce very briefly the main tensions or open questions related to the notion of citizenship that these social changes raise.



What do you think are the most important changes happening in your society today?



A new relationship between the individual and the community/ies of reference

Until very recently, the communities of reference for individuals (communities which people relate to) were quite limited and clear: e.g. family, town, region, country, group of friends, work colleagues, religious group. Ways of participation were determined by the «rules» or habits of those communities that relate to, among others things, the sex, age, profession and socio-economic situation of the individuals. The possibilities for individuals to participate were therefore limited but at the same time clearly structured.

Nowadays, phenomena like globalisation, European integration, global environmental degradation, and technological possibilities invite us to think about larger and further communities of reference: e.g. Europe, the world. At the same time more traditional communities of reference are made less stable by the consequences of these changes, such as large-scale migration both within and between countries.

Individuals and citizens very often have the feeling that a lot of things happening in the world affect them. But at the same time they often have the feeling that the way this influences them is unclear and indirect.

In other words, the world seems to have become smaller from the point of view of information, the economy, environment and interdependence. Yet at the same time, the world seems to have become harder for individuals to influence. It seems that individuals can very easily be spectators of a lot of films but at the same time it is very hard for them to become actors in any, including their own.

“ The world seems to be getting smaller, yet harder to influence ”

While general trends have been confirmed through research (See for example *Life Chances and Livelihoods* (2000), U.N. Publications, Geneva), it is important to remember that there are also be many encouraging exceptions; committed individuals actively participating and having an influence in their communities.

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples



The challenge is to try to develop a new relationship, a closer one, a more balanced one, between the individual or citizen and the community/ies of reference; the basis of an active citizenship.

Slogans such as «think globally, act locally» and «reflective information leading to action» inspire the efforts of groups to bridge the existing distance between individuals and the participation mechanisms of our societies. Non-governmental organisations are using the intermediary space of civil society – between citizens and political structures – to promote participation and participative democracy. Different lobby groups try to represent the interests of groups of individuals in decision-making processes.

But it seems that all these initiatives together with others cannot completely fill the existing gap between the citizen and the decision-making bodies of our societies. The challenge is still there, it is still necessary to re-balance, taking more into account the individuals, and their relationship with their community/ies of reference.

Europe and the rest of the world

The most important present and future social developments (e.g. the technological revolution, globalisation, migration, environmental degradation) happen, or have consequences, at a world-wide level. Any development in European Citizenship in the future should therefore increasingly take into account the realities and aspirations of the rest of the world.

After «Europeanising» the world for centuries (through colonisation, the spread of political, social and cultural models, world and cold wars), it is now time to «globalise» Europe, to think of Europe in a wider, global perspective.

European Citizenship should not be developed as an island of rights and privileges. On the contrary, the privileged living conditions of Europeans – compared with those in other parts of the world – should facilitate the integration of world-wide aspirations such as peace, democracy, human rights and the promotion of ecologically sustainable development.

Europe, due to history and to its present position in the international community, has a specific role to play and a responsibility towards the rest of the world. Our historical links with many countries outside our own continent can help us to «understand the world»; something easier said than done. Our economic and political power should allow us to articulate efficient mechanisms to improve, for the common good, the living conditions and opportunities of non-Europeans.

Without falling into any new Euro-centrist position, the specific contribution of a renewed European Citizenship could consist of this understanding and of a commitment by Europeans to the whole of humanity. European Citizenship - understood as a citizenship from within Europe and committed to the world - should help us to achieve peaceful and democratic societies all around the world, which respect human rights, and live within the framework of ecologically sustainable development.

An ethical response

Scientists tell us that the world is so small and interdependent that a butterfly flapping its wings in the Amazon rainforest can generate a violent storm on the other side of the Earth. This principle is known as the «Butterfly Effect». Today we realise, perhaps more than ever, that most human activities have their own «Butterfly Effect» – for better or for worse. This realisation must drive our resolve to act for the better.

Without underestimating political, cultural or religious differences, recent social developments (e.g. communication technologies, economic globalisation, the European integration process, migrations) make us feel closer to each other all around the world.



At the same time, increasing mutual knowledge and information make us perceive more clearly than ever where the remaining borders of humanity lie. United Nations Agencies, for example, remind us, year after year, that today's real borders are between the powerful and powerless, the free and the fettered, the privileged and the humiliated. And far from disappearing, these borders are becoming ever more entrenched.

In the time that it takes you to read this paragraph, several children will be born somewhere in the world. Their mothers will hold them and feed them, comfort them and care for them – just as any mother would anywhere in the world. In these most basic acts of human nature, humanity knows no divisions. But most of these babies will begin their lives centuries away from the prosperity that one small part of humanity has achieved. They will live under conditions that many of us would consider inhuman. (Adapted from the Nobel Lecture 2001 by Kofi Annan)


Humanity grows closer through information and communication technologies, international integration processes and globalisation, and at the same time it becomes more and more fragmented due to the growing differences between those who are privileged and those who are humiliated. These co-existing, opposed and contradictory synergies of «unification» and «fragmentation» constitute a paradox and a big economic, social, political, cultural and educational challenge for humanity as a whole. This is a challenge that has to be overcome not only because the situation of our «global village» might become unmanageable in the future, but also because it questions our own human nature, our dignity as human beings and our ability to live together.

“ Humanity is growing closer, yet at the same time more fragmented ”

Overcoming this challenge requires a personal and collective response which could be, at first, an ethical one based on solidarity and mutual respect in order to be able to change the present situation. This ethical common ground of solidarity and mutual respect could be the basis of a renewed understanding of citizenship, and the connecting thread between the different economic, social, political, cultural, and educational measures to be taken, in order to transform the present situation. In the next chapter, we will outline how we translate this understanding into our way of looking at European Citizenship.



What do you believe should be the basic values to guide us through this time of change?



Envision how you believe your country (or Europe, or World) might look like in twenty years time. This can be done, for example, through drawing, painting, collage, Image Theatre. Share the visions, and discuss the implications for citizenship.

Our Conceptual Framework

What we think



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

Citizenship: A contested concept

Citizenship is a contested concept (i.e. there are many different understandings of the concept) because, as we have seen, traditions and approaches to citizenship vary across History and across Europe according to different countries, histories, societies, cultures and ideologies. All these different ideas about citizenship live together in a fruitful and at the same time troublesome tension with economic, social and political implications.

Within any of these different concepts, from the perspective of the individual, citizenship is an intrinsically contested concept because it implies a permanent interaction and negotiation between the personal needs, interests, values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours of each citizen and the communities in which they live and participate.




Figure 1 – The Citizen – Community Dynamic

These two interacting tensions – firstly between different concepts of citizenship and secondly between individual citizens and their community/ies - and the connection between these tensions, constitute the heart of our approach to citizenship and a precious richness which offers us a lot of learning opportunities in our educational work with young people.

This approach could not and does not try to be neutral. As a further step in the youth work developed over recent years by the European Commission and the Council of Europe, we will introduce two approaches – rather than models – with a clearly identifiable common thread: **citizenship as a dynamic, complex and integral concept.**

? ?

Reflect for a moment on the terms dynamic, complex and integral.
Can you see how they might go together?

? ?

Our conceptual framework (see graphic below) is made up of the individual and the collective dimensions of citizenship and its interior and exterior expressions. The individual dimension of citizenship tackles the personal values and perspectives – in its interior expression – and the individual behaviour, rights and responsibilities – in its exterior one. The collective dimension of citizenship covers the collective values, notions and conceptions – in its interior expression – and the cultural, social, political and economic structures – in its exterior one.

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples



Figure 2 – Citizenship Framework

Citizenship Conceptual framework		
	Interior	Exterior
Individual -citizen-	Personal values & perspectives	Individual behaviours, rights and responsibilities
Collective -community/ies-	Collective values notions and conceptions	Cultural, Social, Political and Economic Structures

Using two different approaches we will explore the complexity and dynamism of citizenship. The first approach - the four dimensions of citizenship - takes a sociological perspective and the second approach - senses of belonging - takes a personal one. Both approaches describe the individual-community interaction, crucial for any definition of citizenship. The first starts from the collective community and the second from the individual.

Those two approaches offer us two complementary views (sociological and person-centred) of the complexity and controversies surrounding citizenship. They are not just a compilation of different ideas, they are both expressions of a dynamic, complex and integral understanding of citizenship which also form our conceptual framework and the bases of the educational approaches and practices we propose in the following chapters.

The Four Dimensions: a social approach to citizenship. ¹


In the relationship between the individual and society we can distinguish four dimensions, which correlate with the four subsystems which one may recognise in a society, and which are essential for its existence: the political/legal dimension, the social dimension, the cultural dimension and the economic dimension.

? ?

As you read the descriptions of the Four Dimensions, ask yourself how developed you think each of the dimensions is in you.
How developed is your citizenship in each of the dimensions?

? ?

Figure 3 – The Four Dimensions of Citizenship



¹ These four dimensions of Citizenship were developed by Ruud Veldhuis, in “Education for Democratic Citizenship: Dimensions of Citizenship, Core Competencies, Variables and International Activities”, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1997, document DECS/CIT (97) 23.



The Political Dimension

The political dimension of citizenship refers to political rights and responsibilities vis à vis the political system. The development of this dimension should come through knowledge of the political system and the promotion of democratic attitudes and participatory skills.

The political dimension of citizenship can be promoted through awareness raising and education, for example: concepts of democracy, political structures and decision-making processes on a national and international / European level, voting systems, political parties, lobby groups, political participation and other forms of participation (e.g. demonstration, writing letters to the press), the history and basis of civil society, democratic values, human rights in Europe, consciousness of current political issues including European integration and international politics, international relations, international organisations and legislation, the role of the media, the judicial system, economics.

The Social Dimension

The social dimension of citizenship refers to the behaviour between individuals in a society and requires some measure of loyalty and solidarity. Social skills and the knowledge of social relations in society are necessary for the development of this dimension.

The social dimension of citizenship can be promoted by, for example: combating social isolation and social exclusion, safeguarding human rights, bringing together different groups in society (e.g. national minorities and ethnic groups), raising awareness of social issues (e.g. the situation of social and ethnic groups), working for equality of the sexes, working on the social consequences of the information society, compensating for differences in social security, welfare, literacy and health.

The Cultural Dimension

The cultural dimension of citizenship refers to the consciousness of a common cultural heritage. This cultural dimension should be developed through the knowledge of cultural heritage, and of history and basic skills (language competence, reading and writing).

The cultural dimension of citizenship can be fostered by, for example: promotion of intercultural experiences, preservation of the environment, working against racism and discrimination, knowledge of national, European and global cultural heritage and history, discussion of the role of information technology and the mass media.

The Economic Dimension

The economic dimension of citizenship refers to the relationship between an individual and the labour- and consumer- market. It implies the right to work and to a minimum subsistence level. Economic skills (for job-related and other economic activities) and vocational training play a key role in the fulfilment of this economic dimension.

The development of this economic dimension of citizenship can be achieved by, for example: improving vocational qualifications, integrating minority groups into the economic process (e.g. through positive discrimination), engaging with the challenges of globalisation using innovative methods and strategies, facing the challenges of European and global economic co-operation, studying the different European working situations and the aspects of employment / unemployment and their relationship to the social aspects of the global economy, becoming aware of the social consequences of changes in the world economy, protecting consumer rights.

Following this approach, citizenship could be compared to a chair. The four legs of the citizenship chair would be the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions. The integral development of citizenship would come through the balanced implementation of its four dimensions.

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**


**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**




Figure 4 – The Citizenship Chair



These four dimensions of citizenship are attained via socialisation processes which take place in an organised way at school, in families, civic organisations, political parties, and in a less organised way via associations, mass media, the neighbourhood and peer groups.

? ?	Which dimension(s) have projects which you have experienced been focused on?	? ?
------------	---	------------



Draw (or make!) your own Citizenship Chair, illustrating how developed you feel each of the dimensions is for you. You could also do this for your society, or as a group process for Europe, comparing different people's opinions.

European Citizenship

Following the logic of this model, the existence of a mature European society would imply a parallel European Citizenship with an economic, a social, a political and a cultural dimension.


However, Europe has not reached that stage yet. Do we talk about a common European Society? Certainly not in the same way as we do about a Portuguese or Polish Society. Apart from the growing diversity and complexity of social realities across the whole continent, the absence of developed economic, cultural, social and political systems at the European level still makes it very difficult to talk about a European Society or a European Citizenship.

European Citizenship is today something in between a tangible reality and a distant ideal - an ideal that could be reached by the full and balanced development of all dimensions of citizenship at European level. Such an understanding of European Citizenship would be based on the values of Democracy, Human Rights and Social Justice.

It is commonly acknowledged that in the building process of our continent, the political, and even more so the social and cultural, dimensions tend to be dominated by the economic one. According to this model the economic should be balanced by the other three dimensions. In this context, the idea of a «European Citizenship», due to the interdependence of the four dimensions which necessarily go with it, is in itself a critique of the imbalances and deficits of the European integration process so far. Equally, it can be a key model to help overcome them.



Figure 5 – The European Citizenship Chair




?? In what ways are you aware of an imbalance in the dimensions at European level? How does that imbalance impact on your life? ??

Relevance for youth work

This approach - the four dimensions of citizenship - describes and relates the exterior expressions of both the collective and individual dimensions of citizenship. In this approach the interior dimension of citizenship is considered as a consequence of the exterior one.

Figure 6 – The Four Dimensions in the Framework



In this approach, the community in which the individual lives is identified with society in general, as a whole, without distinguishing, at least to start with, between different communities, social groups or structures.

We could say that this approach is «society centred», since the description of the relationship between the individual and the society is done through four social sub-systems: the cultural, economic, political and social. This approach is a good tool for understanding how citizenship develops in modern democracies.

As already mentioned, associations and particularly youth organisations are significant spaces for the socialisation process through which individual citizens acquire the necessary competencies for the development of the four dimensions of citizenship. Youth organisations are spaces for learning, experiencing and promoting active citizenship. These four dimensions can provide some guidelines for educational, social and political youth work.



We can gain a comprehensive social understanding of citizenship through the four dimensions. This can be very useful for analysing the different areas where citizenship should take place, and the eventual deficits or imbalances among them.


If we look, for example, at a city or at a minority group, or at a certain age group, in the context of the economic, social, political and cultural dimensions of citizenship, we would be able to identify very quickly what, in each case, is hindering the development of an integral approach to citizenship. We could identify the areas where we could act to promote a more integral citizenship and then focus our actions. (The same kind of analysis could be done for processes like European integration or globalisation.)

This approach can then be used as a tool to guide, provide a framework for and set up priorities in youth work and youth policy at a local, national and European level.

? i

With a target group in mind,
identify how each of the dimensions might look for them.

? i



With your own peer group or target group in mind, analyse the four dimensions and make an initial list of the areas that you feel need to be worked on, to develop a more balanced capacity for citizenship.

The senses of belonging: a personal approach to citizenship

Another way of approaching the individual-community/ies interaction and the issue of citizenship is to look at it from the perspective of senses of belonging.

The identity of individuals is precisely what makes them different from any other person. The identity of each individual is shaped by many different belongings or senses of belonging to certain groups of people.

For example, you might belong to the group of Spanish people and to the group of people living in Germany and to the group of heterosexuals, and to the group of married men, and to the group of white people. These groups one belongs to are differently constituted; we might have decided to belong to some of them – e.g. married people - and we have no choice over others – e.g. our nationality.

Figure 7 – Senses of Belonging



All those senses of belonging, together with many others, shape our identity. If you could make a complete list of your senses of belonging, you would certainly be the only person in the world having all of them.




What senses of belonging do you recognise in yourself?
Which groups or communities do you feel a relationship to?




The more senses of belonging we recognise in ourselves, the more aware we become of the complexity of our identity. At the same time, each of these senses of belonging opens us up to a new group of people. The more senses of belonging we are aware of, the more able we are to relate to and interact with other people. In other words, identity - if it is considered in all its complexity - whilst distinguishing us from others, also implies openness to different individuals, other groups and our common humanity. However, this can only be the case if we do not reduce identity to solely a couple of senses of belonging.

Figure 8 – Multiple Senses of Belonging



This process of development involves a move away from ego-centrism and towards a more world-centric view of the world and approach to people, as our consciousness expands from an awareness of ourselves to one including those close to us to one embracing all humanity. Such a process is not always easy and sometimes provokes fears (e.g. losing one's national identity). It is important to remember that as a more world-centric consciousness emerges, it transcends and includes the earlier more ego-centric and ethno-centric ways of thinking – they do not disappear, they are simply framed within a more complex way of thinking, making their expression more healthy and constructive. (See Figure 9 – inspired by Wilber (2000))

Figure 9 – Developing Wider Senses of Belonging



The different senses of belonging of each individual do not have the same importance (e.g. you may rank your sense of belonging to a religious group higher than that of your nationality) .



The order of importance changes continually, and new belongings appear. But their different levels of importance should not imply that one cancels another out, even if they seem to be difficult to combine. For example, being of Spanish nationality and also a German inhabitant.

In terms of values, this complexity and diversity of individual identities indicates that it would be unrealistic to think about a citizenship consisting of a fixed and inflexible set of values for all the different situations that individuals are confronted with. On the other hand, an awareness of the complexity of individual identities should not imply falling into ethical relativism by changing radically and constantly our personal behaviour, attitude or set of values, depending on the situation.

Complexity and diversity of individual identities implies the articulation of a minimum common ethical ground based on the so-called ethic of «responsibility»; I have an ethical responsibility because my acts have an impact on the community/ies I belong to; I feel responsible towards them. A growing consciousness of senses of belonging would, therefore, imply a growing universalism in the ethical awareness of individuals. As we recognise more senses of belonging in ourselves, we come to see the complexity in others as well. Simplistic prejudice tends to diminish, as our perspectives broaden and our capacity for dealing with diversity and complexity increases. It is important to note that although the potential for this kind of development exists in every human being, it does not happen automatically. It depends very much on the life conditions which we have to deal with, as well as the conditions for change present in us and our environment.

This approach rooted in the senses of belonging embraces two important affirmations. Firstly, everybody is different, is influenced by different life conditions, has different values and needs, and, therefore, needs to be treated as their individual condition determines. At the same time, it acknowledges that different individuals are connected with different groups and in the end all people are connected by the very fact of their being human – equality of being. In the words of the Council of Europe campaign, “All Equal, All Different”. Within these affirmations, all of us are negotiating our agency as individuals and our communion with others.

“We are all negotiating our agency as individuals and our communion with others”

European Citizenship

Apart from nationalities, a lot of other adjectives have been used combined with citizenship: e.g. environmental citizenship, student citizenship, feminist citizenship. Too often those adjectives which emphasise a certain understanding of citizenship are only trying to promote a legitimate but exclusive sense of belonging in a specific group of individuals.

Should European be one more adjective of citizenship? Should “European Citizenship” be one more “kind of citizenship”?

? i

What is it that makes European Citizenship different from any other kind of citizenship, in your opinion?

? i

The identification of the individual with a continental reality which is already part of their life is probably desirable; the sense of belonging to Europe is important. This sense of belonging to Europe is necessary, with all the external symbols attached to it, but European Citizenship should not be reduced to it. European Citizenship, even considered from the point of view of the individuals, should be more than another sense of belonging to another «family» and the promotion of it.



Howard Williamson, a researcher and youth worker, underlines the importance of the local sense of belonging since, apart from being important in itself, it is the first and most immediate opportunity for practising citizenship (Bridges for Training event, 2001). An important step on the way to developing a more world-centric European Citizenship is therefore to develop citizenship on a more local level. This should not be forgotten – we cannot expect everyone to immediately embrace the whole of humanity.

From the perspective of the individual, European Citizenship should be the process and status which makes it reasonably possible to exercise our multiple and dynamic senses of belonging (including the local or the national one) even if sometimes it might be problematic to combine them. European Citizenship would mean then, for each European, to integrally live and develop their identity.

European Citizenship would be both a process and a status which ideally would allow individuals to be fully their own selves and at the same time to be an active part of their community/ies all around Europe. This, without renouncing any part of their identity or their senses of belonging, but deepening them.


? ? Do you agree with this statement? **? ?**

European Citizenship would be a basis for allowing and encouraging somebody to have and develop multiple senses of belonging e.g. French, Ukrainian or Irish; from an ethnic majority or minority; female or male; a worker, student or manager; a mother or father; *and* a Christian, Jew or Muslim, and so on.

Relevance for youth work

This approach - senses of belonging - describes and relates the interior expressions of the collective and individual dimensions of citizenship. In this approach the exterior dimension of citizenship is considered as a consequence of the interior one.

Figure 10 – Senses of Belonging in the Framework





The idea of senses of belonging has been used by sociologists and psychologists to analyse the identity and role of the individual in complex post-modern societies and to describe the so-called “poliedric” (with more than one face) identities. Private companies, for marketing purposes, promote a sense of belonging with their member or customer cards. Social classes, trade unions, political parties and youth organisations quite often say that the sense of belonging among their members is lacking.

As we see, the notion of “senses of belonging” is very much present and used in different sectors of society. At least for this reason it is useful to start to draw some conclusions about its relevance for our youth work in relation to the concept of citizenship.

This second approach to the issue of citizenship through the senses of belonging gives us a perspective about what happens, from the point of view of the individual, in the interaction between individual and community.

We could say that this approach is “person-centred”, since the description of the relation between the individual and the community is done through an individual notion: the senses of belonging.

Without going too much into detail at this point and without pretending to explain everything through this approach, we think that it can help to understand the identities, behaviours, tensions and even apparent «contradictions» of individuals, particularly of young people.

Youth work, at the end of the day, is a question of working for and with young people. To consider the senses of belonging of individuals can, as a first step, help us to understand others’ identity and the mechanisms of interaction of individuals living in complex and demanding societies.

This is especially relevant in some youth work fields such as minorities, discrimination, anti-racism, where the attention to and the consideration of the individual dimension is particularly important.


Citizenship as a dynamic, complex and integral concept ²

As we have seen in our historical overview, until recently the concept of citizenship has been more commonly understood in rather static and institutionally dominated terms: being a citizen was primarily a question of the legalities of entitlements and their political expression in democratic polities. The dimensions of identity and inclusion seemed to present few problems for the realisation of citizenship, in that European societies were understood to be essentially homogeneous in ethnic, cultural and linguistic terms – the presence of minorities notwithstanding. Internal difference and diversity may have been registered, but the dominance of majority ‘national’ ethnicity, culture and language remained largely unquestioned.

This is no longer so. Across Europe, the proportion of “denizens” (non-citizen residents) living in the different countries of Europe is bound to rise in the decades to come as a consequence of mobility between countries as well as inflows into Europe from outside. The assertion of the *right to difference* by minority groups – indigenous or otherwise – is now a well-established feature of European social and political life. This means that the concept of citizenship itself is shifting to a broader-based notion, in which legal and social rights and entitlements continue to provide an essential element, but in which negotiated and culturally-influenced understandings of citizenship are becoming more prominent.

Taking such a broad understanding of citizenship implies acknowledging an individual’s personal development, and a society’s interior development (e.g. their value systems and ways of thinking). An individual and society will engage differently with the four dimensions of citizenship - social, economic, cultural, political - depending on the way of thinking that is most influential for them at a certain time. Working with citizenship, therefore, also implies paying attention to both the personal development of the individuals, and the underlying group development in the society. An understanding of these states and dynamics enables one to work with the four dimensions in such a way as to be able to meet the needs of people in their specific context.

2. This section was developed partly in reference to «Learning for active citizenship: a significant challenge in building a Europe of knowledge» European Commission <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/citizen/citiz-en.html>



In national (or regional) groups, ask people to discuss and note down what they feel are the most influential values in their country or region. Note down what percentage of the population you think relates to each value. Compare the results of the different countries/regions, and discuss implications this might have for co-operation in Europe.


The concept of citizenship is, thereby, becoming more fluid and **dynamic**, in conformity with the nature of modern societies themselves. In this context, the practice of citizenship becomes a method for social inclusion, in the course of which people together create the experience of becoming the architects and actors of their own lives.

This implies that a more **integral** concept of citizenship is more appropriate to modern societies, which can incorporate legal, political and social elements as well as working critically with a foundation of diverse and overlapping values and identities.

Citizenship is a **complex** concept that enables the maintenance of a negotiated social integration that can adequately encompass all those who live in today's Europe and hence have a stake in its shape and future.

Looking back to the two approaches to citizenship previously described, we can see that the on-going development of all the four dimensions of citizenship and the changing and multiple senses of belonging of individuals are an expression of this dynamism, integrity, and complexity in the understanding of citizenship. Those two different and complementary approaches help us to connect the individual and collective dimension of citizenship and its interior and exterior expression.

Figure 11 – The Complete Conceptual Framework



Thinking about citizenship today involves, as in our conceptual framework, exploring the bridges and interactions between different and traditionally isolated approaches. It would be precisely there, in the connections and mutual influences of the different approaches, that we could probably find the richest keys to understand the complex and permanently changing nature of citizenship.

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**


**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



Using the framework above, make a map of your own citizenship.
The following questions go with different quadrants:

- What are your personal values? (Individual Interior)
 - How do you express your values?
What rights are important for you to claim?
- What responsibilities are important for you to take on?
(Individual Exterior)
 - What are your main senses of belonging?
What values do you share with those communities?
(Collective Interior)
- How do you engage with the cultural, social, political
and economic structures and systems of your communities?
(Collective Exterior)



Promoting a *complex* understanding of citizenship implies, especially nowadays, challenging simplistic answers (e.g. reducing citizenship to a list of rights and obligations towards the state), and providing space for everyone to be actors in their own plays, with their variety of needs, values and ways of thinking. Promoting a *dynamic* understanding of citizenship implies gently engaging people's resistance to the rapid changes in Society (e.g. the impact of technological changes or growing internationalisation processes). Promoting an *integral* understanding of citizenship implies putting back into its wider context every reductionism of reality (e.g. by considering the growing multiethnic and multicultural composition of our communities).

In other words, facing and promoting a complex, dynamic and integral understanding of citizenship implies engaging with the permanent challenge of constantly reconsidering the role and potential of individuals, as citizens in our changing societies.

A Call to Action



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

As we have seen through the previous chapters, European Citizenship is a highly contested concept. You might be wondering what relevance this concept has for working with young people. Why is it important for a youth worker or leader to know about European Citizenship or to use it in their everyday work with young people?

If we are true to our conceptual framework, then the answer to this question lies in the challenge of individual and collective responsibility. As we have seen, citizenship and European Citizenship, both refer to much more than just a static legal status or recognition of the individual as belonging to a particular state. Rather, they are understood as dynamic, complex and integral concepts.

In practice, European Citizenship can be seen as a process of becoming responsible for one's surroundings, for other individuals and for the society in which we live, in a wider and more inclusive perspective which goes beyond national and continental limits. That responsibility can take many shapes and forms. It is not a responsibility which one can or should be forced to accept, using moral persuasion, but one which the individual freely chooses to engage in. It is a voluntary commitment to the development of a society rooted in values of respect. It is also an ethical response to the civilisational problems facing human kind and to the solving of those problems within local contexts. It is also a kind of agency, a kind of power, a kind of empowerment.

As has been mentioned at several moments previously, many young people have desires, passions and a will to participate and act for the betterment of society as a whole. It may not be expressed through voting or in formal ways, but it is there. This is where our concept of citizenship and European Citizenship can come in. It can be seen as a channel for those desires, passions and wills. In so doing, the youth worker or youth leader reshapes the youth activity or organisation as a tool for social, political, cultural and even economic change.

In the next sections of this T-Kit, we challenge you to integrate this notion of citizenship and European Citizenship into your everyday work with young people. We challenge you to engage in the process of reshaping the practice of youth work as a provocation to the status quo, as socially and politically constructive and as empowering young people to become actors for change.

We attempt to provide an educational framework for this, although as you will soon realise, we tend towards asking more questions than providing answers. We hope, that in so doing, we can provide a constructive tool for youth workers and leaders to develop activities that help young people to act out their desires, their passions and their will to change the world in which we live for the better. We like to think of this attempt as a call to action.

**“ We hope to help you to help young people
to act out their desires, passions and will to change
the world we live in for the better ”**

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

A Call to Action

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship – Who is doing what today?



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

Having explored different ways of understanding European Citizenship, and how the concepts have unfolded over the years, we now move on to look at how we educate for European Citizenship. As in the earlier chapters, we first see what we can learn from the experience of past and present approaches, and then outline our suggestions for good practice.

Education for European Citizenship – A Few Words Of Warning!

As in all discussions about citizenship and European Citizenship, in academia or in practice, the debate on “education for citizenship” is influenced by political interests, conflicting concepts of the “good citizen” and opposing ideas of how best to educate people. According to Professor Bogdan Suchodolski, of the Polish Academy of Sciences, who is a survivor of the Holocaust, “I saw educated doctors give deadly injections to children, I saw educated lawyers in command, I lived in barracks built by educated architects and I saw educated students running the death camp” (quoted in Lauritzen, 2001). The good and just of this world are not the only ones who use citizenship education. Fascists also have a concept of what is a “good citizen” and educate for it.



How would you define a “good citizen”?



As you have already seen in this T-Kit, the notions of “citizenship” and “European Citizenship” are contentious, often controversial. A consensus on what they are, and should be, does not exist. As if things were not complicated enough for youth workers interested in this area, the concept of education for citizenship is just as unclear.

In most books, the discussions on this theme are largely “normative”, which means they discuss what “education for citizenship” *should* be, rather than how it is actually practised today and what its content *is at the moment*. In addition, the debate on “education for citizenship” is mostly dominated by theorists and practitioners of formal or in-school education. Their concerns are largely related to how to “teach” national citizenship in the first place.

It is only in some exceptional cases that European Citizenship (or, to be more precise, the European dimension in education for (national) citizenship) is actually referred to or explored. People refer relatively rarely to the fact, that non-formal educational contexts (such as the activities of youth organisations, and the educational programmes organised by youth workers), and informal educational situations (such as young peoples’ experiences of everyday life through music, peer-groups, culture and consumption) are also “sites of citizenship” (DECS/CIT (98) 38 rev.)³, where young people experience citizenship and learn how to practice it.



Where were you first encouraged to think about the terms and concepts Citizenship and European Citizenship?



This section of our T-Kit attempts to describe some of the educational concepts and practices used when dealing with citizenship issues. It takes as its starting point the two conceptions of citizenship education which are most commonly referred to as underlying programmes that aim to educate for citizenship in Europe. As a second step, we will attempt to summarise the commonly accepted objectives of this education, critically exploring the concepts and practices of citizenship which the literature proposes.

3. Term coined by the Council of Europe project on “education for democratic citizenship”. Sites of citizenship are defined as “...new, or innovative, forms of management of democratic life. The sites consist of any initiative (centre, institution, community, neighbourhood, town, city, region, etc) where there is an attempt to give definition to, and implement, the principles of modern democratic citizenship. The site is a practice, or a set of practices, which will illustrate the modern day meaning of citizenship and the structures which support it”.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



Thirdly, we will take a look at the whole issue of Europe in relation to citizenship education, and reflect on the European dimension in citizenship education programmes. Again, a critical eye will help us to understand better the existing practices in relation to the European dimension of education. Lastly, we will attempt to outline «Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship» consisting of some general reflections (based on the integral, dynamic and complex nature of European Citizenship that we propose in this T-Kit) and of some competencies that we feel are key contents of education for European Citizenship today.

Education for Citizenship – Common Driving Forces and Objectives

According to the literature which we consulted, there are two main and differing schools of thought about “education for citizenship”, which are inspired by two historically dominant conceptions of national citizenship in democratic societies. The first school of thought is known as “Communitarian” or “Civic Republican” and the second is known as “Individualist”. Both of these schools of thought have developed out of the larger philosophical movement known as “liberalism”.

Each of these schools has developed a concept of national citizenship, through which they define what they think a “good citizen” is, and on that basis they define how to educate these “good citizens”. As we will outline below, the two schools differ quite radically in what they understand by citizenship, the idea of the “good citizen” and the objectives and content of “education for citizenship”.

Communitarian or Civic Republican understandings of Education for Citizenship

Communitarians and Civic Republicans believe that citizenship involves “membership of a community entailing a juridical status which confers formal rights and obligations, such as equality under the law, the right to vote, paying taxes or otherwise contributing to the social and economic welfare of the community. The concern is over the extent to which these are safeguarded in law and government, and also over whether citizens practice these formally established rights and obligations...” (Gilbert, 1996). Community membership is the most important characteristic of this approach to citizenship. The members of the community must have some common values, interests and obligations in order to form a community. In this view, citizenship is seen as more than a status: it is an activity and it should be practised. Without practising your citizenship it is not possible to be a citizen. In fulfilling the tasks of citizenship, a person’s identity as a member of the community is maintained and sustained.

This approach to citizenship implies that education for citizenship should empower and support people to practice citizenship, by providing information, skills and resources so that they are capable of taking the opportunity and using the possibilities which are provided. However, it should also promote the obligations of citizenship, and encourage loyalty and obedience to the community’s shared values. So in this view, education for citizenship should “be concerned with ensuring that citizens can and do contribute to the practice of citizenship” (Gilbert, 1996).

According to Derek Heater (1990), citizenship education should help citizens to understand their role, which for him involves status, loyalty, duties and rights “not primarily in relation to another human being but in relation to an abstract concept, the state” (p.2). For Heater, citizenship is defined by two characteristics – “identity and virtue”, and these should be at the heart of the citizenship education project. Identity can be based on many different senses of belonging, such as ethnicity or gender, but citizenship is the identity of identities, and “helps to tame the divisive passions of other identities” (ibid. p.184). Virtues such as respect for procedural rules, and a sense of responsibility and loyalty towards the community are key to citizenship in Heater’s view.



Citizenship education, in this view, could have the following objectives:

- To familiarise individuals with the values of the community to which they belong and to which they owe their rights as citizens (today, this community is usually the nation state, and so the values of the community would be so-called “national values”);
- To develop a sense of common responsibility among citizens for the well-being and continual development of the community;
- To familiarise individuals with their roles and obligations, as well as their rights, under the terms of their citizenship;
- To provide individuals and groups with the instruments and capacities (e.g. skills, intellectual resources) to actively carry out their citizen’s obligations towards the rest of the community;
- To develop a sense of loyalty and obedience among individuals to the community which has granted citizenship.



To what extent do you agree with these objectives?



Individualist understandings of Education for Citizenship

Individualists believe that citizenship is a status that confers rights on individuals and sovereignty over their own lives. Hence, the function of the political sphere is to provide space for citizens to exercise their rights, and to protect them to do that. Citizens should be left to follow whatever collective or individual interests they consider appropriate, and political arrangements are made to allow for this. These arrangements, however, are largely utilitarian in nature. Hence, citizens have the right to participate politically, but it is up to them to choose how and when they do so within the limits of the political arrangements made to facilitate their participation (like welfare or special access for the disadvantaged). It is equally the right of the citizen to choose not to be active politically.

This idea of citizenship has one major advantage, which is that it does not propose one and only one definition of the “good life”. In this account, the guarantor of individual freedoms is the political system, and people are limited in the pursuit of their individual or collective interests only by being obliged to respect the autonomy of others and the institutional arrangements put in place to guarantee that freedom (Oldfield, 1990 in Gilbert, in Demaine and Entwistle, 1996).

This view of citizenship implies that education for citizenship should focus on the rules and procedures put in place for political and other forms of participation, so that people know how to participate. Developing citizens skills such as the ability to resolve conflicts without infringing on the rights of others, to express opposition to a particular course of action proposed by government, to defend one’s rights and maintain one’s individual autonomy are central to Individualist approaches to education.

However, such approaches do not concern themselves with “substantive rights or common values” (Gilbert, in Demaine and Entwistle, 1996) or with encouraging people to come up with alternative solutions or propositions to those they oppose. Citizens are to be educated to be able to participate if they want to and not to infringe upon the freedom of others.

So, citizenship education in this view could have the following objectives:

- To provide individuals with knowledge and skills that allow them to exercise their rights to the full, without infringing upon the autonomy of other individuals;



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**



**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

- To provide individuals with the capacity to express opposition to courses of action and political developments that they do not consider to be in their interest or in the interest of society as a whole;
- To provide individuals with the required confidence and competence to participate in the political sphere within the constraints imposed by the rules of political engagement put in place;
- To provide individuals with the means to defend their rights as citizens.


 To what extent do you agree with these objectives?
 

Problems and dilemmas

These differing objectives imply that the approaches in developing citizenship education curricula are likely to be different, and that the results and benefits brought by these curricula will be different. In terms of content, Communitarian approaches to education for citizenship differ from individualist approaches because they propose what the values binding the community together should be and Individualist approaches do not. Hence, Communitarian education for citizenship can encounter accusations of both moralism and paternalism. In addition, it suffers from the fact that today's society is marked by increasingly different value systems being present within one community – people believe different things and today express this openly.

The problem is that Communitarian approaches to education for citizenship propose one dominant set of values to which the community as a whole is supposed to subscribe. And they do this despite the fact that people are more and more aware of diversity within the society as a whole, as well as between and within individuals. Hence, Communitarian education for citizenship remains faced by the problem of how to define the criteria for membership of the community, whilst at the same time being aware of the potential for exclusion.

Individualist approaches to education for citizenship are also faced with a number of problems. They are weak in providing a sense of belonging or identification for the citizenship they propose, because they avoid any discussion of values and norms. In addition, they may alienate people by their specific attention to procedure and rules. And while they wish to develop the capacity for critical thinking and opposition by the individual, they do not advocate that individuals propose alternative courses of action.

These approaches share some problems in common. The first is that they are both so-called “protective models” (Hogan, in Kennedy et al, 1997). Both these approaches aim to provide citizens with possibilities and skills for participation, even for criticism. However, the actual extent to which citizens *can* participate has an effect on the kind of education for citizenship provided or proposed. In most contemporary democracies, opportunities for direct access to decision-making procedures, the heart of political participation, comes regularly but only rarely, in the form of elections.

In both approaches to education for citizenship, individuals are to be taught how to use the right and obligation to “participate”. This could be equated with teaching about elections and voting. They may, however, not be taught how to articulate their interests vis-à-vis political decision makers or to propose alternative solutions to the problems that concern them. In our contemporary systems of pluralist democracy, participation is considered good, but only to the extent that it does not undermine the foundations of the society and the political system. In other words, revolutionary activity is not considered in either of these approaches as an act of citizenship.

Secondly, both approaches remain quite distant from today's realities, in particular the realities of young people. In the case of communitarian approaches, they propose value systems which come close to being exclusive, that cannot live up to the diversity of contemporary society and life. In the case of individualist approaches, they propose no values whatsoever, except for the autonomy of the individual and, therefore, do not provide any means for young people to express their identifications in a positive and socially constructive manner. And the education that both propose remains largely focused on providing skills for negotiating participation in the public domain and formal politics.



These educational approaches do not sufficiently consider the potential other forms of identification of young people, and their desire for cultural expression. They, therefore, have difficulty taking into account the more alternative forms of political engagement of young people (e.g. cultural and identity politics, environmental protection or anti-racism, music and lifestyle movements) and as a result find it difficult to validate, prepare for and work with the civic potential of such forms of participation.

Thirdly, there is the problem of motivation. Both approaches have difficulty detailing how individuals can be and remain motivated to carry out the duties, and practice the rights of citizenship. In the case of communitarian approaches, education faces the challenge of developing the motivation of individuals to carry out their citizen's obligations. In the case of individual approaches, education faces the challenge of motivating individuals not to limit the autonomy or freedom of others in exercising their own rights as citizens.

Ironically, both schools of thought resort to arguments made by the other to provide answers to the motivation problem. Communitarians suggest individual self-interest.

For the individual the benefits of carrying out their citizen's obligations are larger than if they do not carry them out. Individualists suggest commitment to common values and community solidarity as the reason for individuals not to limit the freedom of others in the exercise of their rights. If we accept that there is a motivation problem for national citizenship, which is arguably easier to identify with for most people than some abstract notion of European or trans-national citizenship, then it follows that we also face a motivation problem when dealing with European Citizenship.



How can we motivate young people to practice European Citizenship?



The following table compares the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches as explained above in summary form:

Figure 12 – Table of Individualist and Communitarian Approaches to Education for Citizenship

	Advantage	Disadvantage
Individualist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community membership is technical rather than value based, so less likelihood of exclusion Citizenship as a status conferring rights, no obligation to perform duties in order to be considered a citizen Can work with diversity Allows for critical thinking and opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak in providing sense of identification due to "no values" approach Can alienate by focus on procedure and rules Does not provide for alternative ideas Protective model Far from realities of young people Motivation problem Problem of individual self interest
Communitarian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides values with which to identify Develops sense of responsibility and duty to the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes one over-riding set of values binding the community together – problems of paternalism, moralism and exclusivity How to define criteria for entry into the community Requires obedience and loyalty Protective model Far from realities of young people Motivation problem



Which elements of these approaches do you most identify with?





Debate about what the content of citizenship education should be is very lively. Both approaches face a common dilemma when trying to identify how best to educate citizens. The question on everyone's lips is: "should education for citizenship be a subject of its own or should it be a transversal educational priority and approach?" Much of the scholarly literature available on education for citizenship explores how citizenship education can be achieved through the existing curriculum of the average school, placing particular attention on the teaching of history (national, European and world), languages (native and foreign, modern and classical), cultural studies, area studies and geography, but also clearly marking out a role for social and political studies and even the natural sciences.

The aim of this approach is to incorporate the development of citizenship attitudes and core skills for the practice of citizenship into the existing school curriculum, without endangering the quality and standards of general education. The other approach, where citizenship is treated as a subject matter of its own, and is referred to under a variety of titles including Human Rights Education, Civic Education, Values Education, Education for Citizenship or Education for Democratic Citizenship, Personal Education, Social Education, as well as Environmental Education, views citizenship as a definable body of knowledge and skills for which educational institutions can offer a range of courses of study, both compulsory and optional.

No consensus has been reached on which of these two approaches is more effective in providing young people with the knowledge, skills and motivation to act as citizens and participate in the development of their polities and societies. And while this question is largely debated in the literature about formal education, there is plenty of evidence that this is also a debate of concern to non-formal educators and educational institutions.

**“ Should education for citizenship be a subject of its own
or should it be a transversal educational priority and approach? ”**

The European Dimension to Education for Citizenship

When speaking of the European dimension to Education for Citizenship it would be wise to remember that the language used in the scholarly literature in this regard is very clear. While we may wish for a more "European" approach to education (which can mean everything from an approach which is more cosmopolitan to more human rights centred), we are faced with the reality that the "European" remains only one, and only a young, dimension of education for citizenship in most national curricula, a dimension that is considered additional to national citizenship, if referred to at all.

The concern of educators to include a European dimension in citizenship education has developed from the reality of living in "Europe" (understood in most literature as living in the European Union). It is acknowledged that the community is a wide concept encompassing much more than the nation state, where regions find themselves defined across national boundaries and where individuals are becoming more and more aware of decisions made at European and world level as having a direct influence on their daily lives, whether that be in material terms or in terms of individual capacity to exercise certain rights, such as the freedom of movement.

The difficulty with this understanding is that citizens of the different nations of Europe also live in the world and are significantly affected by world events and developments (in particular all events related to the globalisation of markets and economies, as has been mentioned earlier). So far, it is difficult to say that "world citizenship" has a meaning for most people, despite the best efforts of organisations such as UNESCO and other UN agencies who wish to promote it. Hence, this understanding of European Citizenship more or less ignores the global dimension of citizenship and has the tendency to be largely Euro-centric.



The definitions current in different European Institutions have a bearing on what can be understood as European Citizenship and, therefore, education for it. In the European Union, European Citizenship has until very recently been exclusively defined in procedural terms: a status conferred on all those holding the citizenship of any member state of the EU, providing certain additional rights to such citizens – freedom of movement within EU territory, the possibility of directly electing Members of European Parliament and so on. In the Council of Europe, on the other hand, values such as human rights protection, pluralist democracy, democratic stability and security and social cohesion, as well as cultural diversity in a geographical Europe have been and remain the defining parameters of European Citizenship.

As has been discussed in more depth in “Contemporary Approaches to European Citizenship”, the difference between these two approaches, in both conceptual and theoretical terms, is very simple: in the EU definition, European Citizenship is a status conferred automatically on those who are already citizens of a member state of the EU and is accompanied by additional rights to those conferred by national citizenship. In the Council of Europe definition, European Citizenship is an attitude or behaviour one develops through adopting certain values (human rights, democratic security, social cohesion and the rule of law⁴) and their practice, regardless of one’s nationality or citizenship status. In theory, according to this latter definition, even those who are stateless can be European citizens. Of course, practice tells a different story, because without a relationship to a state and the civil and political rights that are conferred on individuals by that relationship, marginalisation is practically unavoidable. It is no surprise, therefore, that in their translation into educational programmes these two approaches differ considerably.



What have been your experiences of education for European Citizenship, if any?



European Union and Council of Europe Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

In terms of the content of national curricula, the European dimension of education for citizenship is full of conceptual difficulties. In the European Union, and in countries now in the process of accession to the EU, the European dimension of citizenship education is largely defined by teaching and training knowledge and skills that allow citizens and potential citizens of the EU to understand the institutional reality of the European Union, the rights conferred by EU citizenship (including the right to vote in European Parliament elections and, if resident in another member state of the EU, to participate in local or municipal elections) and the procedural functioning of the European Union institutions⁵.

In other countries, in particular in the many member states of the Council of Europe, that so far are not even considered potential candidates for EU accession, the concern is to find common points of interest among citizens of a wider Europe. In countries of the former Soviet Union and in South East Europe, “European Citizenship” is attractive but illusory, as it is bound up with perceptions of material well-being, freedom of movement and absence of war or violent conflict that the safe haven of the EU represents in the collective mind’s eye.

The approach of the Council of Europe also has its drawbacks, as no consensus exists in many of its member states as to the historical and cultural reasons binding them to so called “European values”. The advantage of the Council of Europe approach, however, is that in promoting a value based identity, understood in terms of a citizenship that is European, individuals and groups can freely promote those values without reference to status, ethnicity, geography or history. Educational programmes can also promote such values, and therefore, have the possibility to define themselves as “European”.

On the European level, the educational programmes of both the Council of Europe and the European Union (in particular in the youth field) have come much further in exploring the

4 For more information on the values and mission of the Council of Europe, please refer to its web site: www.coe.int

5 For more information on the European Union institutions and their mandates and roles, please consult the EU website: <http://europa.eu.int/>.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



“European Citizenship” maze and in developing practices reflecting the values based approach. In terms of curricula, both the EU and the Council of Europe have developed youth programmes that promote the values of a European Citizenship that is constructed as a choice and as a practice. The EU programmes that promote European Citizenship or use education for European Citizenship as an approach to work with young people are seen as complementary to national educational provision (both formal and non-formal) and are intended to promote a European Union that is closer to its citizens, one concerned with the betterment of the lives of all the people living within the territory of the Union, whether citizens of the Union or not. Hence, in the practice of European Citizenship, as promoted by such programmes, status is less of an issue. The continual enlargement of the youth and education programmes of the Union, to include accession countries and so-called “third countries” (countries that are neither members of the Union, nor accession countries, nor programme members) is further proof of good intentions. Some of the more prominent examples of such programmes in the EU are Socrates, Leonardo Da Vinci, Erasmus, and the Youth Programme (including the European Voluntary Service Programme)⁶.

**“ European Citizenship should be constructed
as a choice and as a practice ”**

In the Council of Europe, programmes which address education for European Citizenship are seen as standard setting test sites for the development of new and innovative approaches and practices which can eventually be adopted and adapted by national education and training institutions and youth policy actors. In the Council of Europe, European Citizenship, as defined above, is one of the main priority fields of action of the youth sector for the years 2003 to 2005. It is emerging out of a thirty year history of developing youth participation at all levels of society, and is motivated by the ongoing concern that participation and active citizenship among young people has to find explicit expression in youth policy at the European level. In the Council of Europe, the Education for Democratic Citizenship Project, the History Text Book Project, the Participation and Democratic Citizenship programme of the Directorate of Youth and Sport and the European Youth Worker Training Programme in partnership with the European Commission, are good examples⁷.

Education for European Citizenship in Practice

While a survey of the practices of the European dimension of citizenship education in the national curricula of all European countries is impossible to undertake in this publication, the European level programmes offer some significant food for thought, in particular for those who are interested in developing non-formal education activities for young people on European Citizenship or using European Citizenship as an approach⁸.

In terms of content, all the European level programmes mentioned above have a number of important features in common. Interestingly, despite their different starting points and philosophies, the European Union and the Council of Europe agree on a number of core values and competencies that education for European Citizenship should educate for. The following section will attempt to provide a description of the core features of education for European Citizenship, as expressed in the programmes of the two institutions.

6 For more information on EU programmes promoting European Citizenship, please refer to the following website: <http://europa.eu.int/>
7 For more information on Council of Europe programmes promoting European Citizenship, please refer to the following website: www.coe.int/youth and www.coe.int
8 For further information on the content of national education systems and the place of citizenship education within them please refer to the following website <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Databanks/Dossiers/mainfram.htm> which provides general information on the education systems of all UNESCO member states



For these two institutions the core competencies are grouped according to four interlinked dimensions of the practice of citizenship (Veldhuis, 1997)⁹:

Political and legal dimension

This dimension implies that education should address the knowledge, attitudes and competencies needed for individuals to exercise their rights, and carry out their duties in the context of the political and legal systems governing citizenship, whether national, international (i.e. Council of Europe) or supra-national (i.e. European Union). This implies that education for European Citizenship should be concerned with developing knowledge concerning political and legal systems (for example, civil and political rights, other human rights, civic obligations), skills for participation in those systems and constructively critical attitudes towards them, attitudes favourable towards democracy and its development through individual and collective action and competencies for active participation in the life of the public sphere, including the European public sphere.

Social dimension

This dimension implies that education for European Citizenship should address the ways in which social relations develop and are carried out between individuals and groups. Covered by this dimension are issues and values such as solidarity and mutual respect, valuing the contribution of all individuals to society, and having equal opportunity to contribute to the development of society. Social competencies such as negotiation skills, empathy, active tolerance and mutual support should be educated for.

Economic dimension

Although often little acknowledged, economics plays a determining role in the extent to which people can act as citizens. The “have-nots” of society are often the target of specialised programmes to develop their capacity to participate as active citizens. However, under this dimension, all citizens would be socialised to the development of the economic competence necessary to actively participate, including knowledge of how economics function, in particular knowledge of the growing global dimension of economic life, the role of consumption in the production of sites of citizenship and knowledge of the world of production and employment. In addition, it would educate citizens to understand and try to change the economic mechanisms that exclude others from full participation and by implication, active citizenship.

Cultural dimension

Under the cultural dimension would be placed all skills pertaining to the development and practice of the common values espoused under European Citizenship. It refers to high cultural aspects such as knowledge of European and world history, different cultures and peoples and languages. However, more importantly, it also refers to the interior side of European Citizenship, to varied but complementary senses of belonging within a common heritage and to values such as the universality of human rights, environmental protection, non-discrimination and respect for others.

While all of these dimensions of the European Citizenship education project as understood by its two main sources (Council of Europe and European Union), imply a strong cognitive, knowledge based approach, the *practice* of education for European Citizenship in the non-formal

⁹ These four dimensions of Citizenship were developed by Ruud Veldhuis, in “Education for Democratic Citizenship: Dimensions of Citizenship, Core Competencies, Variables and International Activities”, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1997, document DECS/CIT (97) 23. See also on pp. 32-34



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

educational contexts and programmes of these institutions has shown that there is more to this kind of education than just factual knowledge. The European Citizenship education coin has two sides, one relating to cognitive development and the other relating to the development of attitudes. There is even reason to believe that of the two sides of the European Citizenship education coin, the attitudinal side is the more important in addressing some of the difficulties of education for citizenship mentioned above, such as the motivation problem.

Having looked at how other people and institutions are approaching education for European Citizenship, the next chapter explores our ideas for how to go about it.



Which do you feel is more important – developing attitudes or knowledge?



Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship – How we think it should be done



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

Building on the foundations of the concepts of European Citizenship and education for European Citizenship already explored, the challenge that remains for this T-Kit is to offer some guidance on how all these ideas can be transformed into practical action¹⁰. In particular this section will focus upon how to develop an ethos and practice that support our conceptual framework. For, while techniques might be simple and relatively easily learned, the complexity lies in their application, which requires experience, thought and skill to be successful (Merry and Titley, 1999).

We provide an educational framework inspired by the main ideas developed in this T-Kit so far; our view of citizenship, its history and the current challenges it faces, our conceptual framework for citizenship and an exploration of Citizenship Education. This framework is not and does not pretend to be a closed model. It is an open attempt at gathering together the most relevant

- general considerations,
- key competencies
- and knowledge

needed by European citizens to function and actively participate. The details and further developments of the educational framework we offer have to come from the users of this T-Kit themselves, as you are the ones carrying out educational programmes and activities on Citizenship Education all over Europe. We do, however, try to provide some guidance that will help you along your way.

There are a couple of disclaimers that accompany what follows. The first relates to the educational context. Although much of the content of education for European Citizenship should be relevant across formal and non-formal educational divides, it is worth noting that the content of this T-Kit is specifically directed at the non-formal sector and, more precisely, out of school education with young adults. It will, we hope, be of particular relevance to those working in that sector. However, we hope too that it will inspire and be of practical use to formal or in-school educators.

Secondly, we ask you to keep in mind that any effective approach to the *content* of European Citizenship needs to be sensitive to the dynamic and transformational nature of the *concept* of European Citizenship itself. This implies leaving space for potential innovations in concept and practice, hence the general nature of our guidance. We resist, therefore, establishing a concrete model.

With this in mind we now go on to explore how to generate some practical action out of all these good ideas.

Making it happen: Doing Education for European Citizenship

The need for project or programme implementation to include *planning*, *doing* and *evaluating* will be familiar (see the T-Kit on Project Management for more information in this area). We will devote some time to exploring each of these areas. However, we don't want to present these elements simply as distinct steps to be followed one after the other. As you will read below, the kind of *responsive practice* that we promote encourages ongoing evaluation and planning as part of maintaining flexibility and responding to individuals, the context and new situations that arise. For this reason, our exploration of these three elements is set in the context of an integrated approach. This approach advocates an intelligent and responsive educational practice that recognises the need for continuous evaluation and revision of planning and action.

¹⁰ This section owes much to Straker, A. (2001) Pushing at the Limits: Reconstructing Cross-Cultural Exchange in Education. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



Building an Intelligent and Responsive Practice


As will already be clear, we are not offering a quick-fix or simple step-by-step recipe or guide for education for European Citizenship. We make no apologies for this. We respect your intelligence as practitioners and your capacity to put your own skills and experience to practice in a manner that fits the particular circumstances in which you find yourself. This approach is well illustrated by the words of a British cookery writer, Nigel Slater. He introduces his recipe-free cook book with the following instructions:

I want to encourage you to take in the spirit of the recipes that follow, but then to deviate according to your ingredients and your feelings, to understand that our ingredients and our hunger are variables that should not, cannot, be subjected to a set of formulas laid down in stone. I want you to break the rules. I want you to follow your own appetite. (2000, p. 50)

However, we do want to point out that is not the same as saying that none of us has anything new to learn! We do believe that

- all of us can learn from the experience of others,
- more abstract discussion and thought can challenge us to think and adapt our ways of doing things.

The first will be addressed by the practical examples that follow, and what we hope to do in this section is to raise some questions and issues that will address the second, and enable you to further develop your own approach to practice.



Give a small group of people a number of ingredients and a target group of people to cook for. Have them prepare food for the target group. Debrief the metaphor (after eating!), linking to learning about how to design an educational activity or process for a certain target group.

In essence what we are proposing is that as a facilitator of education for European Citizenship, you may be given ideas about which elements might unite in a successful combination, or which tools can help work towards a desired outcome, and what might lead to disaster, but that it is equally important that at every stage of your work you apply your own intelligence, skills and personality, and reflect upon the particularities of any given situation. There is no replacement for the sensitive and intelligent practitioner.

In addition to this, while rational thought, understanding, and direction appear necessary prerequisites to success, a positive outcome also depends on that which is not so easily quantifiable – instinct, taste, feeling.

I believe a recipe should be treated as a living thing, something allowed to breathe, to change its nature to suit our ingredients, our mood and our desires. (ibid.)

This should not be perceived as a problem but as the very essence of good practice. We should not be fooled by the ease of following apparently simple pre-determined step-by-step routes, the effect of which can be to crush innovation and inspiration and to depersonalise involvement. Rather, we advocate a very personal approach that draws upon the skills and personal qualities of the facilitator and places them firmly in the specific work context. By context we refer to something much more particular and complex than sweeping cultural definitions.

Of course it is vitally important to recognise a broad social context and to conduct oneself and any activities accordingly. However, we argue that it is equally important to reflect on the details of the micro-context. In practice this means not just considering what country the project is taking place in or the religion of the participants, but such details as the personal skills and characteristics of the individuals in the group, or how somebody reacted to a situation five



minutes ago, or the limitations of the room in which your project is based. A method we would advocate is to be present in a situation, to continually assess it and to work with what seem to be the best techniques within that particular context, at that particular time and to the desired end. Also, let's not forget that much depends on the skill, talent, taste, and personality of the person – probably you – who is coordinating all of this.



Is this the way you work already? If not, what do you feel are some of the challenges of this approach, and how might you be able to try it out?



Evaluating, doing and planning a project

As we have already suggested, it is difficult to draw a clear distinction between evaluation and educational practice, for *a responsive working practice is itself an evaluative process*. This is both through the ongoing reflective process that accompanies action and brings about continual adjustment and modification, and the more conscious, retrospective analysis of action (Leitch and Day, 2000). Evaluation, therefore, is not to be regarded as something to be tacked on to the end of the project – a mild irritation suffered for the sake of pleasing funders. We consider it a very important process that should be ongoing from conception to completion of any project or programme of work. For this reason, we choose evaluation to head our discussion of implementation.

Evaluation: What? How? and Why?

Evaluation can be seen as the most complex and challenging aspect of any programme. To be of a high quality, it must be implemented with the skill and sensitivity of the programme itself, and it must take account of the conventions of social research (e.g. maintaining confidentiality if requested, allowing people to choose to participate, using techniques that minimise bias) and address the, perhaps diverse, concerns of the facilitators, participants, and funders of a project. Additionally, if the evaluation process is not to undermine the desired aims of the project under evaluation, then it must actively support them.

Evaluation can be seen to operate on three levels: *outcome, impact, and process* (United States Department of Education, 2000). An outcome evaluation explores the immediate, direct outcomes of a programme on its participants. Impact evaluations, on the other hand, identify more long-term outcomes of a programme as well as unanticipated effects. The last, process evaluation, focuses upon techniques and their implementation. Ideally, in our view, evaluation of a project should be a balance between the three.



In evaluation you have done, have you put more emphasis on outcome, impact or process? How could you get a better balance next time?



Perhaps due to the pressures upon project organisers to prove the value of their work to external bodies (particularly those from which they seek funding) there is a tendency for disproportionate attention to be afforded to outcome evaluation. This is encouraged by evaluation guidance such as that given by Woolf (1999), which states that evaluation can only be effective if SMART objectives are set for a project. SMART objectives are those that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and achievable within a Timescale.

This approach can be very appealing for its neatness and simplicity, and indeed evaluation by SMART objectives does have its place and value. However, we feel that an evaluation process defined purely around measurable objectives cannot always do justice to the richness of outcomes, and the long-term impact education for European Citizenship can have. Every European Citizenship project will have different outcomes and will depend upon different processes for its success.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



Also, it is likely that unpredicted outcomes, and certainly unpredicted processes, will arise over the course of a project. The fact that some outcomes cannot easily be evaluated, and certainly cannot be quantified, should not diminish their importance. We consider it imperative that educational aims are not reduced to those that can be measured, for the sake of being able to prove what has been achieved. An evaluation based only on preconceived notions of outcomes, thus, is unlikely to do full justice to any project.

“ Is SMART so smart, after all? ”

We propose that *evaluation, as an element of practice, should be a responsive process, implemented in a manner suited to the particular project, and according to the particular skill, taste and understanding of the person conducting it.* Evaluation must also be founded in ethical practice and should reflect the aims being sought in its implementation. Perhaps even more important than the need for evaluation to address immediate and long-term outcomes, is the need for ongoing evaluation of processes and outcomes to inform responsive educational practice.

**“ Evaluation, should be a responsive process,
implemented in a manner suited to the particular project,
and according to the particular skill,
taste and understanding of the person conducting it. ”**

The fact that unanticipated results might be significant and that outcomes are complex and not always predictable or measurable, does not save us from the need to set goals and think about what we want to achieve from the earliest stages of planning. Equally, the fact that step by step processes cannot guarantee success does not remove the need to consider what approach you might adopt. In particular it will be important to work out your values and ideas – the ethos or philosophy of your approach, if you like.



Think of a time when you have had outcomes of a project
that you could not / did not predict in advance.



In the text that follows we explore broad considerations that we believe should be taken into account at every stage of the implementation of your project. In order to help you to relate this to your own work and practice, what follows on from that is a series of practical examples or ‘citizenship scenarios’ that explore particular projects and how their organisers combined ideas and aspirations with the reality of getting things done.

Thinking and Doing: Generating Action

Intercultural education is not a closed programme that may be repeated without continuous modifications. On the contrary, not only is the range of possible intercultural activities very wide, but we also have to question continuously what we are doing and why. It is impossible to buy a magic formula which can guarantee us success. (Council of Europe, 2000)

Before going on to look at the principles and ideas that we believe are important to build your educational practice around, we remind you once more why we take the approach we do. We hope that this will help you bear with us in the challenge of developing your own practice!

There are several reasons why we are (as it may appear) choosing to make your work difficult by refusing to tell you how to do it in simple steps – sadism is not one of them! First and foremost,



we feel that it is important to remember that there are many and varied ways of achieving high quality education for European Citizenship – what happens with one group of people working with one facilitator on one day will never be exactly repeated. Success, too, depends on much more than meeting a pre-defined set of criteria and this is why we focus on the deeper ideas of how to approach education for European Citizenship rather than dictating how to do it.

To achieve a (satisfyingly simple) set of step by step criteria for how to run a workshop or make a project happen, it is tempting to dissect a successful project and then repeat back its components as a set of criteria for success. However, as we were reminded in the history section, Aristotle tells us that *the whole is greater than the sum of its parts*, and there is little sense in such an exercise. For example, the fact that a performance created with an international group is performed in all the languages spoken by members of that group might well be indicative of an inclusive working practice. In contrast, to prescribe use of all those languages as an essential aspect of inclusive practice is plainly ridiculous. Equally, making use of all the languages would not automatically be inclusive. So much depends on how and why things are done.

In essence, what might be a consequence of a high quality project will not necessarily be a causal factor of another good project. That, however, is not to say that it does not matter how you approach and plan projects. Instead, it is to argue, as Pettigrew (1986) does, that practice should be driven by a broader theoretical basis, one that goes beyond a listing of conditions.



To what extent can you relate to the approach taken here?



It is with this in mind that we set out some general considerations for education for European Citizenship.

General considerations for European Citizenship Education

A life long process

The dynamic nature of our concept of citizenship calls for any educational approach to European Citizenship to be an ongoing and life long process, capable of engaging with the new challenges arising from the continual transformation of societies and individuals.

The complexity and integrity of citizenship that we referred to earlier, implies that the simple transmission of knowledge is not enough for the effective development of citizenship in modern European societies.



How can you equip people with the skills for ongoing, life-long learning?



Diverse and thoughtfully selected contents

In terms of contents, learning for citizenship could include for example computer training - as a key skill and competence that young people need for effective economic and social participation under conditions of technological modernisation and economic globalisation. It could also include training on Intercultural Communication, as a key social competence for living in culturally, ethnically and linguistically plural societies. In both cases, in terms of an educational approach, learning for (European) citizenship has to involve the affective, cognitive and pragmatic level of learners, in order to achieve their full development as individuals so they can play a fully active part as citizens in society.



In this line, a curriculum for Citizenship Education could include a large diversity of subjects. Citizenship Education does not have to be exclusively on the "subject of citizenship". As was mentioned in the Four Dimensions model of citizenship, the development of citizenship can



come through the awareness raising and knowledge about a variety of subjects such as human rights in Europe, literacy and health, cultural heritage and history, ecological aspects of the global economy.

In non-formal education, while choosing the contents for each programme on Citizenship Education, there are always a lot of criteria to consider. One of the first could be to look at the different subjects covered by formal education and other educational actors in order to find the complementarity in terms of content and approaches. In a certain socio-economic context, for example, computer training is largely covered by the formal education system and in some others it is something that youth organisations have to promote in order to guarantee the access of young people to new technologies.

The aims of each educational programme and the specific training needs of learners would be the two most important criteria for an adequate choice of contents for European Citizenship Education. Education for European Citizenship would be, in each case, an autonomous subject dealing with a clearly identified list of contents (curriculum) according to the aims of the educational programme and the specific training needs of learners.

 Think back to the last activity you organised, and reflect on how you selected the contents. How could you improve the way you select content next time? 

Transversality

When schools, educational institutions or organisations do such an exercise and come up with a certain Citizenship Education Curriculum, there is the tendency to think “We found it! Finally! This is Citizenship Education!”. But being realistic it would be more adequate to say: “Here, now, according to our aims and to the identified training needs, our offer for Citizenship Education consists of...”. In other words, the autonomous nature of Education for Citizenship shouldn’t play against its transversality.

Education for Citizenship as a transversal educational priority is the only reasonable response to the diversity of individuals, groups and communities – reflected for example in our Conceptual Framework “Senses of Belonging”. The diversity and the transversality that it implies are even clearer considering Education for Citizenship at European level. Its transversal nature facilitates the dynamism and cross-fertilisation with other educational priorities such as Intercultural Learning, Human Rights Education and Participation.

At the same time, this transversality cannot be a superficial facade trying to cover every theme without deeply touching any of them. Apart from the already mentioned importance of a well-reflected selection of contents, the promotion of some clearly identified competencies (described below) should be an integral part of the objectives of education for European Citizenship programmes.

 How could you integrate some of these concepts for education for European Citizenship into activities you have already planned? 

“Learning” oriented

It would be very difficult to imagine that any “teaching” (the transmission of a previously elaborated knowledge) could cover the complexity and integrity of citizenship. It may be suitable for transmitting certain facts, but in the development of attitudes, it would not be adequate. In addition to this, through teaching on citizenship, individuals would acquire theoretical knowledge likely to be quite unconnected with their reality, with minimal significant contribution to their integral development as citizens.

For citizenship education, what is essential is the «learning», (the process of active discovery of new knowledge and the development of attitudes and competencies) through experience and not the «teaching». Learning for citizenship comprises the development of democratic values



and attitudes on the affective level, but also the acquisition of knowledge and competencies on the cognitive level. Both are best gained through practice and experience – on the practical level.



Why do you think we are asking you all these questions?



Learners as active participants

For a Citizenship Education based in knowledge, attitudes and skills it is necessary to place learners at the centre of education and training methods and processes. This is not at all a new idea, but in practice, the established framing of pedagogical practices in most formal contexts and in some non-formal ones has privileged teaching (and teachers) rather than learning (and learners).

Learners should become active participants in the own learning process, which they learn to co-manage and negotiate together with their trainer-guides and with their co-learners; by developing awareness, having responsibilities and taking decisions.

The significance of this educational approach to citizenship is self-evident. If the content of what should be learned, i.e. «become an active part of society», stands in contradiction to the way in which it is being learned, i.e. “without being an active part of your learning process”, the educational process becomes very ambiguous, due to the lack of coherence between the content and the educational approach.

In relation to European Citizenship, we might conclude that European citizens are not produced through informing people that they should be European citizens. The development of European Citizenship takes place through experience, through providing individuals with experiences that enable them to reconstruct the framework of their thoughts and actions. And the learning process that can achieve this takes place on both conscious and unconscious levels.



Does the way you train or work with young people reflect and complement the topic you are working on?



An Integrated Practice

There is a long-standing view that the learning process and the ethos of the learning situation must embody those values being promoted (see for example Allport, 1954; Fogelman, 1996). What we are in favour of is an approach that Albala-Bertrand (1997) terms *systematic wholeness*. Within the context of school-based education for citizenship, he writes that this implies all curriculum areas as well as the teaching style and organization of the school reflect the values of citizenship. The same principle can be applied more widely.

It is important that every element of the work is sympathetic to the skills and values being promoted. For example, the manner in which group work is approached dictates the nature of the learning outcomes. The mere fact of working in a group does not necessarily result in collaborative group work. (Kaye, 1995) The educational process appears equally important as the aims. Vink (1999) feels that this is particularly so in the non-formal sector, given its less pressured learning environment.



How can you make your work and the environment you work in, better reflect the skills and values you are promoting?



Participatory pedagogies

Therefore, democratic and participatory pedagogies are very important: their value as self-managed tools for personal and collective development constitute the very essence of what is to be learned and practised in Citizenship Education. For this reason it is very important to use the whole potential of participatory pedagogies and not only use them as irrelevant exercises without any meaning for individuals. Such a reductionism of participatory pedagogies can be as inadequate as the use of authoritarian ones (where methods are just tools at the service of the unilateral or one-sided transmission of knowledge).

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples



In both cases (authoritarian pedagogies or misuse of participatory ones), by imposition or by superficiality, there is a lack of real interaction between the learner and what is to be learned and between the learner and the trainer. But if participatory pedagogies are used with all their potential, this interaction is provoked and expected. This “object of learning - learner” interaction is the heart of participatory pedagogies and it could be their most significant contribution to Citizenship Education.

This interaction comprises, among others, the following steps: exploration of the interest and initial knowledge of learners, self-managed learning, critical questioning of what is being learned, application of what is learned to the learners environment and further exploration. We would like to emphasise the need for participatory pedagogies to be carefully articulated in structured learning opportunities and educational programmes.


The implementation of participatory pedagogies in educational programmes is one of the most important characteristics of non-formal education. For this reason the rich educational experience of institutions and youth NGO's in training (e.g. running different educational programmes, covering the cognitive, affective and practical dimension of individuals, developing and innovating participatory methods) is of particular value for Citizenship Education. We will present some good examples of that rich experience in the next section.

For the moment, and having addressed some of the more general aspects of *how* to approach education for citizenship, we would like to turn to the *content* of education for European Citizenship, and to look at some of the key skills and attitudes we feel that citizens in a modern and plural European society need, and by implication that education for European Citizenship should educate for.

Key Competencies for European Citizenship Today ¹¹

We believe that there are three interrelated spheres making up the competence needed by citizens to actively participate in European society, and that should be addressed by education for European Citizenship. First, education for European Citizenship should provide **KNOWLEDGE** about relevant themes such as democracy, rights and freedoms, the World, Europe, current affairs and politics. Second, education for European Citizenship should provide **SKILLS** such as competence for active participation or intercultural communication skills. Lastly, education for European Citizenship should work on **ATTITUDES**, such as attitudes to democracy or difference, and should attempt to assist young people to develop their attitudes in line with their values. All of these spheres have political, social, cultural and economic dimensions and necessarily have to be treated on a number of levels and from a variety of perspectives.

Figure 13 – Key competences for Education for European Citizenship



¹¹ This section has been developed with reference to a number of texts, combining elements of all: International Project “What Education for What Citizenship” – What Citizenship (<http://www3.itu.int/ibe-cityed/inoeng90.html>); Curriculum and Quality Development Group “Pilot Course on European Citizenship – Curriculum Principles” (Partnership Programme between the European Union and the Council of Europe on European Youth Worker Training); Gordon H. Bell “Educating European Citizens – Citizenship Values and the European Dimension”, David Fulton Publishers, London, 1995; “Jump into Education for Democratic Citizenship!”, Council of Europe Education for Democratic Citizenship Project, 1997 – 2000.




However, **VALUES** should inform the identification of the **AIMS** and be the “centre of gravity”, the permanent reference of education for European Citizenship where all dimensions and spheres find their sense and balance. Indeed education for European Citizenship should also provide young people with the opportunity to explore their values, identity and senses of belonging to the community or communities of their choice and should assist young people in becoming active protagonists, both in defence and promotion of their values.

As has already been mentioned, the identification of the concrete objectives of European Citizenship programmes should stem from the learning needs of the learners.

Even if the interaction between all the elements mentioned above is not necessarily linear and in practice, as we will see, their relationship becomes more complex, the following matrix could be used as a tool for the articulation of educational programmes for European Citizenship.

The entry point into an educational process can be different for each programme and even for each learner. In that sense, the matrix can be read in multiple directions without necessarily starting from the values and finishing with the attitudes. This matrix is just an attempt to show, all together, the different elements to consider and the relationships between them in the design of Educational Programmes for European Citizenship. You do not need to include everything! Use it as a guide, map, or initial starting point, but not as an ultimate check-list.



Design a curriculum, Training Course or activity on European Citizenship. Outline which qualities of European Citizenship you are focusing on, and justify your choice.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



Figure 14 – European Citizenship Education Matrix

Values	Aims	Learning Needs	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
Equality of all human beings	To assist young people in exploring their value orientations, personal identity and senses of belonging to the community or communities of their choice	Identifying one's values and understanding where they come from Understanding one's senses of belonging and identifications with a / many communities	Human Rights (universality, rights, legal mechanisms to protect human rights, role of individuals in creating a culture of human rights and human rights protection) Environment (awareness of our interdependence with the environment, how to protect it in one's everyday life) Global concerns (e.g. development, poverty) Cultural Diversity (awareness of cultural diversity, pluralism of opinions and interests) Democracy (Awareness of how democratic regimes function and the norms that regulate their operation (legal framework and operating mechanisms))	Empowerment and Participation (motivating and enabling others, letting go of control) Community Development (working with communities to help them develop more sustainable and peaceful environments in which to live) Nonviolent transformation of social and political conflicts (nonviolent approaches to conflict transformation, team work and co-operation, problem solving, active listening and communication)	Tolerant of ambiguity Empathic Distanced from social roles Respectful of (cultural and social) difference Showing solidarity Trusting and honest Open
Human Rights					
Solidarity	To assist young people in becoming active protagonists (in defence and in promotion) of their values	Understanding where one's values intersect those of other individuals, the communities to which one belongs and society as a whole Ability to articulate one's values without causing oppression of others			
Pluralism (e.g. cultural, social, political)					
Environmental responsibility					
Active respect for self and others					
Sustainable Human development					
Interdependence					



Values	Aims	Learning Needs	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
Democracy	To develop the civic, political and social awareness and competence of young citizens in Europe to participate actively in the development of the local, regional, national and European society	Ability to navigate and negotiate civic, political and social life in one's immediate environment and to see one's role in that of the State, Europe and the world	<p>Human Rights Rights and freedoms of citizens (main declarations, conventions, and legal instruments governing these rights and freedoms)</p> <p>Civil Society (awareness of the role of civil society and the importance of active participation)</p> <p>Globalisation (what is it, how does it function, what effect does it have on the lives of citizens, the role of Europe in the world)</p> <p>Current Affairs (what is going on in the news in Europe and the world, what do people with different opinions say about current affairs)</p> <p>European and national political landscape (descriptive, and theoretical politics, social change in different countries and Europe)</p> <p>Peace and Conflict (What is conflict, where does it come from, how does it escalate, its relationship to power, etc)</p> <p>Knowledge about Europe (e.g. different cultures and religions, different political systems, Europe and its history, European law and economics)</p>	<p>Representation (self-organisation, lobbying, presentation skills, political and social autonomy)</p> <p>Change-management (empowerment of persons and groups, analytical skills, critical and argumentative thinking, evaluation, assertiveness, problem-solving, democratic leadership, team work and co-operation)</p> <p>Global communication (New information technologies, foreign languages, intercultural competence).</p>	<p>Respectful of the environment</p> <p>Understanding and responsive to different needs</p> <p>Responsible for own actions and their consequences</p> <p>Passionate and determined</p> <p>Favourable towards democracy, active participation, social change</p>
Respect for the rule of law					
Nonviolence and Peace					
Freedom					

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

Having explored so much of what we feel should shape your approach to education for European Citizenship it is now time to relate these ideas to some practical realities.

The following pages contain examples taken from real experiences of European Citizenship Education in action. The aim of this section is to further help you as practitioners think about what kind of activities you might organise, what kind of approach to your work you might take and what techniques you might use. Through the presentation of a series of *scenarios* we provide information, examples and exploration with the aim of stimulating thought and helping you to develop and enhance your own intelligent practice.

We have collected information from different people working on diverse projects across Europe. Some of the projects were set up consciously to work on the issue of European Citizenship Education; others have an alternative focus but embrace issues or approaches that make equally valid contributions to this field. We have deliberately not categorised the projects into different types. We want to encourage you to read all of the contributions as we feel sure you will find something of relevance in each of them.

However, we have tried to illustrate the diversity of activities that come under the European Citizenship Education umbrella. We have drawn upon projects that work, for example: with individuals; with big groups; on different issues; with the arts; with sports; in a small locality; internationally; and with a huge diversity of people in terms of age, ability, and social, religious or cultural background. These varied projects are managed by equally varied organisations, whether local, national or international, governmental or non-governmental, big or small, run by paid staff or volunteers.

European Citizenship Education, it is clear, can be carried out in many different ways with many different people and in many different contexts, both directly and indirectly tackled, and in formal or non-formal educational settings. There are many further means of carrying out education for European Citizenship and the examples we have chosen are illustrative rather than exhaustive. For example, as you will see in our resources section, there are a large number of very successful projects based around electronic communication. What we hope is that through demonstrating how ideas have been applied in a variety of contexts, you will be inspired to adapt and apply what you have learnt from this T-Kit to meet your own needs.

We hope that the following explanation will help you to navigate your way through these examples. We have not offered straight-forward descriptions of activities; instead we focus on key ideas or actions for illustrative effect. We have tried, however, to present these in a framework that shows the wider picture of the project and the local context. Each scenario appears under a heading of the project title. Where appropriate the name and contact details for the organisation are also given, as well as a brief description of its field of work.

Within the context of the particular project and the place in which it happens, we undertake a more detailed exploration of one or two key aspects or components of the project. The project organisers explain how and why they did what they did, linking their action into the more theoretical content of the T-Kit, raising questions and exposing issues for further contemplation. Each scenario concludes by drawing together Issues for Exploration that relate to the particular example, raising questions that might be kept in mind when planning, doing or evaluating European Citizenship Education. The aim of this is to help you, the practitioner, to find your own way to a responsive and intelligent practice that embraces a notion of European Citizenship as integral, complex and dynamic. The resources section at the end of the T-Kit will offer sources of further exercises and techniques.



As you read these examples, analyse a few of them, using the conceptual framework quadrants, and the key competencies, outlined in the earlier sections. Which area(s) and competencies does an activity focus on?
What can you learn from their experience?



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship


Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples



Break into small groups. Each group takes one of the following examples, and analyses it using the conceptual framework quadrants and the key competencies. Reflect also on the extent to which the activity was an example of responsive practice (and did that make a difference?).

Public Discussions and Networking	<i>Association of Disabled Students (ADS)</i>
The Association of Disabled Students, based in Belgrade, exists to support young people with disabilities and to campaign for their rights.	Dimitrija Marinkovića 5 11 000 Beograd Yugoslavia Tel: +381 11 496 409 Fax: +381 11 497 409 Email: office@asdsyu.org Contact: Vladimir Čuk

In the period between March and June 2001 the Association of Disabled Students cooperated with several local organisations to hold a series of public discussions in six cities in Serbia. The key aim was to provide young people with disabilities with an opportunity to express their attitudes and problems in public, and to find potential solutions within the local community. Additionally, the organisers hoped to compare the situation in different local environments in Serbia as regards disability.

In the current social and political context of Serbia much of the challenge of this project was in establishing an infrastructure from which to develop future campaigns and action and in finding an appropriate means of introducing the concept of citizenship.

With recent political changes and the collapse of the war-time government, it has been revealed to what extent the seriousness of the situation for disabled people had been hidden for a decade. However, local governments, due to accumulated problems, the financial situation and inadequate information, are not yet making any significant steps to improve the position of disabled people.

In every area there are organizations of disabled people, founded and categorised according to medical disability. Although there are formal and informal bodies that co-ordinate the activities of all these organisations on a local level, such co-operation is in most cases only spoken. Further, contact with other NGOs is very rare and in most cases non-productive. This is partly a consequence of the previous government's attitude, previous dependence of disabled people on the state, and the lack of any history of the non-governmental sector in general.

The term European Citizenship in Serbia can be viewed through the lens of human rights. Even though the political system has recently been changed and the situation started improving, certain problematic areas of everyday life have hardly been touched by the changes. That's particularly so where the rights of people with disabilities are concerned – physical and structural barriers, vague legal regulations, the small percentage of employment, insufficient conditions for quality education and last, but not least, the strong impact of prejudices in society about people with disabilities. The size and range of the problems people with disabilities face daily, as well as the basic nature of their unfulfilled basic human needs in Serbia, leaves no room whatsoever for comparison with other European countries. This also means it is almost impossible to tackle these issues directly and explicitly. Therefore, the European Citizenship idea, in the sense of working for the achievement of basic standards in respecting human rights of persons with disabilities and finding ways of solving their problems, has been introduced into this programme almost "underhandedly".



The above context meant a very particular approach was required, which in a way introduced the concept of citizenship through the back door.

One of the main reasons for ignoring the needs and rights of people with disabilities is very poor communication and co-operation between organisations working with this target group. This project represents an initial step towards establishing unity and overcoming differences among these organisations. Once partners were found from local NGOs and interested individuals, it became possible to exert greater pressure on local authorities to commit themselves to solving local problems and establishing (pre)conditions for respecting the rights and needs of people with disabilities, and in accordance with European standards in this field.

Public discussions were organised in Beograd, Nis and Novi Sad first, these being the largest cities in Serbia, covering the central part of Serbia, the south and Vojvodina (the North). After that the public discussions were also organised in smaller cities – Krusevac, Kragujevac and Subotica, also with their geographic position and the particularities of the situation in mind (e.g. economy, refugees, multinational composition of society, standard of living).

After choosing the local environments in which the programme was to be carried out, the ADS team searched for local partners that could help organise public discussions and support the very idea of the project. The steps in each of the local communities were mainly the same:

- Establishing communication with local organisations dealing with the problems of people with disabilities, or otherwise interested in co-operation.
- Field work and meetings with representatives of local organisations, the media, local authorities and interested individuals, in order to provide every possible kind of support to organising local public discussions.
- Defining the participants of the public discussion from the local community and profiling the main subject of the discussion.
- A few weeks after the initial meetings, the discussions were organised in co-operation with local partners.
- Through meetings and during the discussions themselves, the bases for co-operation between local organisations were set and the most pressing local problems concerning people with disabilities were defined, as well as possible steps towards their solution.
- A few weeks after the discussions, the ADS team visited each city included in this project once more, and intensified the effects of the projects through meetings.
- Following this project, ADS organized a few actions in the different local environments in order to intensify co-operation and help the local organisations. In four cities there were psychology workshops with diverse groups (participants had different disabilities or no disability), and all the cities were included in the recently completed media campaign.

It appears the public discussions project will show long term effects, as indicated by the recent founding of ADS branch in Kragujevac. ADS will now focus their activities beyond Belgrade, so that the idea of the Association and their way of operating may spread. That would also enable the organisation of projects on a national level with more impact than has been possible so far.

Issues to explore

- How to combine needs analysis of students with disabilities and (re-)establishing communication between this marginalised group and the society/community they live in
- Co-operating with local partners and organisations rather than imposing something from the outside
- Dealing ostensibly with one issue but tackling wider/deeper citizenship issues through doing so
- Long term process planning action and pursuing follow-up
- Working at the appropriate pace and level and going step by step towards bigger goals

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

An approach to citizenship

Beavers Arts is an arts and education charity based in North Staffordshire, England. It exists to sustain, develop, and enrich the lives of individuals, groups and communities through activities that contribute to cultural democracy. To this end, a lot of projects are undertaken with diverse groups of people in many locations. Current projects focus particularly on asylum seekers and refugees, and young people at risk of social exclusion. For example, projects share practical transferable skills; explore community and personal history; create community events and celebrations; make books, exhibitions and videos. Above all, they use group work, training projects, music, photography, words, murals, banners, reminiscence and cultural exchange and much more, to work for tolerance, communication and co-operation between people. Walking through windows, an international youth exchange project was run in collaboration with Italian partners, L'Arvicola.

Beavers Arts

16-19 Barracks Square
Barracks Road
Newcastle under Lyme
Staffordshire ST5 1LG
England

Tel: + 44 (0)1782 717 326
Fax: + 44 (0)1782 717 190
Email: beaversarts@aol.com

Contact: Gill Gill

At the core of Beavers Arts' work is their understanding of what being a citizen means:

Our approach to citizenship has little to say about nationality or patriotism, nor even about being European; instead it works through a process that starts with the individual, draws out the nature of commitment, and seeks to build of it something substantial enough to redefine the place where individuals draw their personal boundaries. The end we have in mind, for our work, is the same old idea of creating citizens of the world; keeping this end in mind, we come to the beginning – the boundaries around the self that each of us creates.

Rather than seeing citizenship as a set of conditions, rules or obligations, we believe that it is more important to ask how people see themselves and the nature of their relationship with others around them – including those with whom they have no actual contact. Positive actions, inclusive thinking and good citizenship are likely to stem from a sense of self-worth combined with an open, trusting and flexible approach to others.

Each of us defines the limits within which we perceive our own interests to lie; for the most damaged and defeated individuals, it's not always possible to draw such a boundary at all. For people with little trust in others, the boundary may include just "me and my partner" or "me and my family" – or just "me". Beyond this, things can get tricky, boundaries fluid, identities negotiable. Some young people (and adults, for that matter) extend their boundaries to a locality, a gang, to sub-groups that can be opaque to the outsider; or to a city, or a region; an ethnic or racial or religious identity; or to a nation, with or without statehood.

Wherever the line is drawn, people extend a degree of commitment to those *within* their personal boundary. As a minimum they will treat those *within* the boundary more favourably than outsiders. At the extreme, far too many are willing to deride, attack or even kill those outside their self-defined frontier or to die for the group within which they locate themselves.

For us, the task is firstly to build upon people's inherent ability to think positively about, and act charitably towards, those falling *within their own boundaries* and secondly to encourage individuals to extend their horizons – to look beyond the self, or the family, or their cluster of friends, to consider including others *within* rather than outside their personal boundaries – a more or less endless process, as new groups arise for our consideration and to challenge us.

Symbolically our task is simple enough though far-reaching to replace "I" with "we", to constantly push back the hypothetical border between "we" and "them". Theoretically such a process is well supported by both Islamic and Christian theologies, as well as by some political traditions – though in practice, religious and political allegiances may build barriers rather than eliminate them. The way we work with people from varied backgrounds and with different belief systems is essentially to pull simultaneously in two directions – firstly to reinforce the self through a process of creative self-expression, and secondly (simultaneously) to build trust in others through interaction with actual individuals.

What we actually do, you may be reassured to know, is rather more prosaic – drumming, games, collaborative working, eating, talking, walking. Just doing, though, is not all. The alchemy that turns the earthy stuff of *doing* to the glittering goal of changed reality is achieved by paying attention – what Buddhists might call mindfulness. And acting on what we observe. There is no plan, no guide, just taking note . . .



A little less conversation, a little more action...

Below we discuss an exercise that we make frequent use of. We call it 'entering the space'. Here, it is explored in the context of the first session of a fortnight's, performance-based international exchange project – 'Walking through windows'. The group was particularly diverse in every respect and also included some quite vulnerable and under-confident young people.

We wanted to start to introduce the idea of eye contact, of being able to look at other people. And that's about both increasing your confidence and making you look confident as a performer, which are two separate things. But as well as that it's to do with drawing strength from the group. It's a thing we do lots of – looking at the people within your group.

The exercise begins from the familiar, democratic starting point - the circle. Each member of the group is then given the opportunity to step into the circle and *be present* (enter the performance space), pause, look every member of the group in the eye, and then say their own name before resuming their neutral position in the circle. In the course of the activity, everybody thus assumes the roles of both actor and audience.

On this occasion we deliberately chose to let people go in their own time, rather than going round the circle, as we would normally do it. I actually looked round and went "oh, I can't ask them to do this". You just need to be so aware of the feeling of the group at the moment, and ready to adapt your plans.

We have quite a few exercises that work around similar principles as this one. An important aspect of such exercises is developing a sense of inclusion. This is embedded in the way we work around the circle; particularly how you regard other people – your look upon the audience and accepting their look on you, is very important.

We are not for one minute trying to suggest that by gathering a group of people in a circle and by taking them through a simple exercise that they will suddenly regard each other in a new and respectful light. However, we do believe that within a context of a project that builds upon processes and skills from one day to the next and that generates a trusting and relaxed atmosphere, such exercises enable significant changes to start to take place.

A final word of warning – the mechanics of this exercise are deceptively simple, but the process of its implementation was sensitive to many complex and ever changing factors unique to this particular session. Working with the same group in the same room, the next day even, would not be the same.

Issues to Explore

- The how not the what
- Working with people where they are at
- Democratic working practices
- Building skills
- Responding to the group
- Simple techniques – big ideas
- Exploration and self-development

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

**Malta Comes
(South and North Europe Meet)**

Euromeet was founded in 2001 by a group of interested previous youth exchange participants. It is an NGO and receives no statutory funding, but does have the part-time support of a local authority youth worker. Based in Husum, Sweden, its aim is to expose young people in the region to the potential of international exchange through making Husum an international meeting point. The organisation currently has 30 members who are busy planning exchanges, building contacts, participating in courses and raising European awareness through outreach work.

Euromeet

Address: Euromeet, Billsta 1308A
S-894 91 Sjölevad

Tel: + 46 660 26 51 22,
+ 46 70 671 28 90

Fax: + 46 660 26 51 22

E-mail: Euromeet@yahoo.se or
bensod@hotmail.com

Contact: Bengt Söderlind

This project, the most recent of Euromeet's three exchanges, brought almost 40 young people from Sweden and Malta together. The aim was to compare differences and similarities between young people who come from the northern and southern extremes of the continent and to raise awareness on the richness and power of cultural diversity. The theme was young people and their leisure time.

Both groups started the project at home, planning different discussion themes like school, youth organisations, leisure time, and so on. We made a rough programme that everybody looked at and helped us to develop. Then when the Maltese group arrived we practically spent all the time together with them. The first evening we had a cultural evening, where we showed typical food, music, and so on from our region in Sweden. The Maltese youngsters had also brought things from Malta with them. We had an intercultural evening where we shared a lot of things. That was a way of starting to see that a lot of things seem quite different in the beginning. During the rest of the programme we mixed a lot of activities, visiting different special places in the municipality and discussions. One special thing we did was to invite people staying in the Swedish municipality during the summer but who come from Malta. The Maltese group did not know about it, so one day when we were sitting and eating, a boy suddenly came and started to talk Maltese with them. That was one way of showing that Europe can be smaller than we believe.

In this way of working your group learns a lot first about another country, but also more about their own country. Preparation and guided discussion help to develop this, and learn about Europe and its organisations.

Outcomes – First our group saw a lot of things around our area with "new eyes". You come to appreciate more of what you usually take for granted. Both groups found out that in practice there are really no differences between Swedish and Maltese youth, and that they are quite the same in their interests. They started then to want to meet more youth from other countries. Many in the group "grew" a lot during the exchange. They had to face something new and unknown, but they also realised that you can do more than you ever believed in yourselves. Many life-long friendships were formed.

I have been working as a youth leader since 1978. This work involves a lot of helping youth with low self-confidence. So the task is to guide, find ways to help them increase their self respect. I can tell you that during all these years I have never met such a good tool for this as intercultural learning and meetings.

Although the main aim of the project was to develop European Citizenship and interculturality, the organiser found that there were very significant outcomes in terms of individuals' personal development, too. He explores this below.

In Euromeet groups you always have a mixture of youth with different skills and abilities. Some may be good at writing, some at talking, some at planning or finding good solutions, and so on. So, for example, even if you are not so "good at English" there is still plenty that you can contribute to the group and the work – we make sure of it.

When we start a new exchange we have the whole group (or sometimes a smaller planning group at the start) involved from the very beginning. They see the whole process through from planning and decision making (and the accompanying discussions) to the real exchange/meeting and on to the evaluation and future talk.



We have had youth that come at the beginning feeling very unsure, with their heads bent down. Then, after the project, you can see how they have literally raised their heads as if to say “I really did this”.

All of the following factors together are important in achieving this: to be a part of a group; to have a mission within the group – a sense of purpose; to feel that you belong and are useful; to be supported to do something new and maybe also a little scary and then afterwards to see that you really could!

Before our first exchange with Malta I had what the group told me was a crazy idea – that we should have an English course. They told me that English was their poorest subject at school. I then told them “You have to talk and make yourselves understood, not think of spelling and grammar”. The scary thing was to go to a country where one of the languages is English. However, when we arrived and listened to how the Maltese people talked the young people became more sure of themselves. One of the boys liked it so much that after some days he just spoke English. He even sat down in cafes talking with the locals. We could see after this that he “grew” a lot, and he even came back and finished at school. The interesting part was also to listen to our group that refused to talk English together at home. In Malta they started to talk more and more with each other.

Another development is that after our exchanges and the related work, we decided to go around to other youth to tell them about this and the possibilities of youth exchanges. Then the participants trained more to talk in front of others – another scary thing for them. I can see that they now are more confident as a result of this. They are also more interested in taking responsibility – so many of them are now working voluntarily at our Youth Centre. And because of these positive outcomes, they talk positively about this kind of educational experience and we have more and more young people interested.

Issues to Explore

- Active participation – decision making and involvement in processes
- What makes a project on European Citizenship intercultural?
- Working with people’s strengths
- Finding a way for everybody to make their contribution and for it to be valued
- Challenging and stretching people – but not too much
- Building on success

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

**Integrating Minority Groups through youth
participation in developing a civil society**

**Local Democracy
Agency, Sisak**

The Local Democracy Agency (LDA) is an international NGO that aims to support local authorities and citizens in regions affected by war to promote local democracy, through: networking and knowledge sharing; rehabilitation of public services; promoting economic activity, youth participation, gender equality, and freedom of information and expression. There are ten associated LDAs in the former Yugoslavia working to build a pluralist multi-cultural society.

S. i A. Radi_a 2a
44000 Sisak
Croatia
Tel: +385 44 521 227
Fax: +385 44 521 231
Email: ldesk-si@sk.tel.hr
<http://www.lda-sisak.hr>
<http://www.ldaonline.org>

A key project in the Sisak-Moslavina county of Croatia focuses on developing a civil society by the integration of minority groups through youth participation.

Contact:
Tatjana Puškarić

In 1998 the project was launched with the task of creating a network for understanding, communication and confidence building for young people from different ethnic minorities from five towns at war just a couple of years earlier; and to do so in one year, starting from nothing. The project established five youth groups (one in each area) each reflecting the diversity of ethnic and social groups. The groups were connected by a Youth Focal Point in Sisak but also worked independently. Activities included the publication of a joint newsletter, training, summer camps, cultural events and international partnership.

To the organisers, the possibility of meeting the objectives, given the local circumstances, felt like science fiction. Just getting going was a major challenge...

We wanted to gather young people from different ethnic communities spread across five small cities (that were at war, just a couple of years before) and create with them a network for better understanding, communication and confidence building. We wanted it from them and we really believed that young people can make a much needed new bridge between divided communities.

When the project started all this looked like a science-fiction movie. After many official presentations and more negotiations with officials we finally got access to our desired group. We gathered young people from schools, and started with a group without previous youth work experiences (since at that time and in those places there was no such thing for them) and with a lack of practical skills. So, our very first steps were workshops, training and many, many meetings, phone calls, day talks, night talks...travels and walks around. After a couple of months, we established our co-operation and communication system. Each local youth group delegated its own representative who became a leader. Thus, communication finally became more effective and less expensive...instead of talking with 20 people from one town, we just had to call one.

Now, our group, fully aware of their role and mission, started to organise workshops, debates, solidarity actions, summer camps, training courses, exhibitions, concerts...it wasn't easy to follow the floods of ideas, but nobody wanted to give up on anything proposed. In order to reach a wide audience, we opened a small Info point where young people had the opportunity to use free Internet, to read new "European" literature, European newspapers and finally, to be informed about each of our activities or about those organised and implemented by their peers in other European countries. That's the place where one of the projects greatest successes – the newsletter – appeared. Edited together with a common sense and spirit, the newsletter "Tockica" (small point) soon became a tool for communication, freedom of expression, exchange of ideas as well as making the whole project more visible.

The more we worked, the more was done by the youth groups, and less by us – seniors! We were really a team where everybody respected the ideas of others (not that we completely agreed all the time!, but the respect and trust really worked).



So how did this happen?

The first steps in the early stage were taken with the aim of getting closer to our «targets» and to establish good communication and confidence. We didn't want to start with tough issues (such as ethnic tolerance, minority rights, confidence building) although we wanted to reach them at some point! We really wanted to reach them in a more subtle way, by showing how tough issues and their alternatives function in practice. Instead of immediately launching our desired high level objectives, we started with a questionnaire that covered all possible areas of youth's interests and needs. And it turned out in the results that youth, regardless of their social and ethnic background, showed interest in the same things (this was not a surprise for us, but it was a very good argument for further activities). Regardless of all the invented differences between them, they all wanted education about sexuality and drug use and misuse, and more music and fun. And we told them how similar they are. And we organised the same activities for all of them – activities they wanted to have. This really started to tickle their curiosity and to develop a sense of commonality. For the first time, contrary to what adults so often told them, they started to realise how they are not so different. While this was going on, we made good use of the newspapers and the radio to publicise every activity. Almost every day something was published that supported and gave importance to issues we were dealing with. Through the support of the media, we managed to create a common «invisible» space even before our groups actually met each other.

At this point, the mayors also realised the serious nature of our work, and they gave us free space for our activities. That was really something new. To return this big favour, we did our best and managed to find sponsors who gave computers. Having this important tool, our «dislocated» groups could prepare their own material, posters and leaflets to gather their peers. At that stage, we as facilitators did little more than simple logistical tasks like delivering paper and glue. Everything else was done by the youth themselves. I wouldn't say they were all the same, some were lazy, some were very silent, some were very loud, hard and stubborn. But, it was very important not to change their individuality and their identity since they were forced to change it so many times before due to the war and its consequences. They told me how many times they were betrayed and here I was extremely careful.

After four years and a lot of hard work much has changed. There are now established youth leaders in the region, running activities and courses, working with others in the daily struggle for building a fairer and more tolerant society.

Issues for Exploration

- Focusing on the group whilst projecting out
- Recognising surroundings
- Time and patience
- Gradual transfer of responsibility
- Following the interests of participants
- Varied approaches
- Tackling issues on every level – mayors and participants
- The importance of a common project
- “Tickling their curiosity”

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

**Promoting real youth initiatives
from the local to European level.**

***Luciole – Manifeste ARA
local network***

Luciole is a not-for-profit organisation working under the umbrella of Manifeste ARA, in Brittany, France. The work of Luciole is based on giving all individuals, particularly young people, the chance to play an active role in their lives and their surroundings.

Le Bois Grignon
56220 Malansac
France
Tel: + 33 297 43 41 32

Luciole strives towards these goals by working to:

Email: luciole.ara@magos.com or:
michtolacarvane@yahoo.fr

- sustain projects and local actors connected to youth and youth workers through such support as advice and action-training
- participate in research/action in non formal education and intercultural learning

www.chez.com/manifesteara/luciole

Contact: Denis Morel

This youth initiative, which began in 1999, has seen a growing group of committed young people develop a project idea and see it through to its realisation; first on a local level and then across Europe. The project, Michto la Caravane, is now working with partners in France, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Italy and Portugal to actively engage individuals in their local communities.

The project began with four young people (19-21yrs) who formed a link with the Manifeste ARA Network. Although at that stage they could not formalize any concrete ideas, it was easy to feel their need to act, to do something, and in a way, "to build their place"... So I began working with them to focus their ideas, beginning this process by exploring their own self-recognition and discovering their own competencies and skills. The second step was to push them to define what they could do with all those competencies.

The project Michto la Caravane was born. In summer 2000 the group crossed Brittany working with local people, using street-based art and educational activities, to act, to do something together...

A few months of extensive planning preceded this activity - visiting the different places to try and involve local initiatives in the project, and training in working methods, project management and social relations.

From this the will to continue grew and grew and in 2001, me still working with them, they decided to promote their values in a larger setting – Europe. After 5 months and a lot of effort in preparing dossiers and fundraising at all levels (from local to European), they gained the support they needed to make a start. So far, this has involved meeting partners from the different countries to prepare on a local level before the arrival of Michto la Caravane. This is essential to achieve the aim of their presence being a platform of initiatives rather than just a show. Michto is just a pretext to develop social relations at a local level, to promote the self-organisation of local communities. The tour begins this summer.

The work of Luciole very firmly adheres to the belief that learners should be active participants, and their learning experiences linked closely to the reality of the situation in which they are operating. Below, Denis describes a bit more how he worked with this group of young people and why he chose to do so.

As I said, it is not "classical training" about Citizenship or European Citizenship Education. It is more action training. This project is one example of our way of working - to train directly in reality, in the territory, using the ideas of the people involved. Our main aim, therefore, is to work on the social utility of the individuals, particularly young people, to work on their active participation in their environment (thinking that they can consider their environment as their village, their region, their country, Europe, the world...)

So when I started to work with this group, it was planned to be at local level first as an experiment, but with a view to a possible European perspective.

Through this action training approach, we worked on all dimensions of project management, administrative skills, Intercultural Learning, and to develop their competencies and social attitudes. This involved working with them as individuals and as a group, in an informal way.



They started first to develop their project at local level. This supports our process of empowering young people, giving them the desire to participate actively in the place where they live and to promote their own values – how they see social relations between people, sharing their conception of life, promoting and arguing for it. It is totally a process of citizenship Education!

You can organise abstract teaching for youth workers on this topic, but it is still in a way artificial if it is not related with the reality of the young people that they work with. And when you enter this reality, then you enter into a new dimension of time! You cannot speak of one week of training, because you have a lot of different aspects to work on in order to build confidence to empower, and finally to let them fly completely alone! Such work needs regular contact over months.

But one thing is sure: We cannot speak about the Citizenship of young people if we try to merely involve them in a project of the youth worker or the trainer! This means that it needs time and patience. On the plus side, as you train young people, volunteers, you are also training other people – the local social actors who are in contact with them, the other volunteers and members of those organisations. This approach of action training touches a lot of people!

Outcomes

I consider that if you give people the chance to taste this kind of work, to achieve something both for themselves and their communities and on their own initiative, then they want it again and again. This is what happened after 2000 with Michto. In France there are now (summer 2002) 50 young adults (from 18 to 30 years old) who are several months into this process, and who will shortly follow the caravan.

Issues for exploration

- Enabling a responsive and personal practice
- Matching process with intended learning outcomes
- Working with, not imposing on
- Natural progression - flexibility
- Allowing time for progress
- Many small steps can go a long way

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

**Integrated Europe? –
A youth perspective**

***OBESSU (Organizing Bureau of
European School Student Unions)***

OBESSU is a European platform for national school student organisations. It was founded in 1975 in Dublin and currently has 24 members in 20 countries as well as contact and observer organisations in a further 10 countries. OBESSU does representative work for school students and organises seminars for its members to exchange experiences and develop common policies for (school) education on a European level. The following project was conducted in collaboration with two partners: The German foundation “Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES)” and the federal school student organisation “Bundeschülerinnenvertretung BSV”.

Westermarkt 2 5th floor
1016 DK Amsterdam
The Netherlands
Tel +31.20.6234713
Fax +31.20.6255814
obessu@obessu.org
www.obessu.org

Contact: Sinziana Radu

A seminar on migration and schooling took place in Berlin for one week in July 2001.

In total 30 participants aged between 16 and 24 took part in the seminar. For us it was important to have people both from EU member states and people coming from other European countries. The discussions we had about migration aimed at seeing the different problems related to migration in the EU and Non-EU countries in comparison. Furthermore it was essential that all the participants had a background in a school student organisation.

The aim of the international workshop was to see what the tendencies concerning migration in Europe currently are and the effects of migration on school education and the learning process. We discussed European integration as a process; if it is something we as school students want to see happening and if yes, how and what it should look like. We aimed to find out what role school students and their organisations play in the integration process. We aimed to find out what is behind expressions such as “the European idea”, “European culture” and “fortress Europe” and what they mean to us. We questioned what we mean when we say European culture or identity? Is it a geographical term? Is it an historical idea? Where does it come from? How can we identify what we have in common? How does Europe relate to young people?

Furthermore we looked at how migration affected Berlin (where the meeting was held) and at racism and xenophobia as phenomena often linked to migration in school and in politics. For us migration is related to citizenship because as an immigrant you often do not have the same rights as a citizen of one country. Nevertheless you have to follow the same laws, pay the same taxes and adapt in quite some ways to your country of residence. But migration does not only change the life of the migrant, it can also change for those who are his/her future classmates, who have the chance to learn from people with a different background in their class.

We used participatory methods such as plenary debates, working groups, theatre workshops, inputs from and discussions with experts, as well as exchanging experience between participants who reported on the situation and work done in their own countries. The experts were chosen not only according to their professional insight but also because of their way of presenting and involving participants. The working groups were different for each of the sections of the programme and always chaired and reported by one of the participants. For some of the working groups the team did not prepare the exact topic beforehand – they waited for the results of the first discussions and let the participants decide about the actual topic they wanted discuss.



The emphasis of OBESSU's work is on promoting active participation and the practice of European Citizenship.

OBESSU sees its work in general as aiming to make school students active European citizens. At each seminar we point out the special value of European co-operation on this issue. We explain the European institutions and the most relevant documents of the European Commission and the Council of Europe. And with our daily work we try to influence these institutions and give school students on European level a voice.

Nearly all our work is based on the idea that through active participation in school you will become an active citizen – and this is what we want students to become, or better, we want students to be capable of being active and hope to be able to stimulate them enough to be active. Active participation is not only an enriching way of designing a programme for a conference and often better for the learning process of the individual – but it is part of the idea of the active participation of a citizen in society. Part of the methodology is that the participants feel that their participation is wanted, useful and needed. One of the main points also is that it rather depends on methods than on the content if one is active and that for a project which deals with this topic it is crucial to choose participatory methods.

Of course citizenship does not only imply knowing the European Institutions and their way of decision making – on the contrary: for us democracy at school is vital for the development of democratic citizenship. Democracy cannot be taught in theory: it must be exercised from an early age on. As young people are not allowed to vote in real (national, regional or local) elections they need to learn about their rights at school. Usually school is the first state institution they meet in their lives and if they learn that there their input is wanted, that their participation is welcome, they continue to participate actively later on in society. Therefore, OBESSU helps to build school student structures where they do not yet exist and supports its members in their fight for school students' rights, and democracy at school.

Concerning European Citizenship OBESSU and its members demand that every school student has the possibility to go abroad (for a long or short term exchange) at least once in their school time. Through an exchange and learning foreign languages a European feeling of belonging and identity can be created. We want Europe to be a mainstreamed part of all subjects related to society, history, philosophy, etc. We try through the work with our members and their members to show that there is more to Europe than the European Institutions, a common currency within the EU member states and a common market in the EU. Europe is something which is present in many aspects of life and plays an important role for our future.

Issues for exploration

- Democracy cannot be taught – it needs to be learned/practised
- What kind of learning environment does it take to be able to “learn Democracy”?
- How to select participants – what factors do you need to consider?
- Working within structures that already exist
- Balancing knowledge and understanding with action and the development of ideas and opinions

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Football Summer School

Open Fun Football Schools

The Open Fun Football Schools began work in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in 2000. Supported by the Danish Football Association, the aim of the football schools is to use fun participation in sport as a means of crossing ethnic and social barriers and working towards better and more democratic understanding in society. Since its foundation in 1998 in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the organisation has expanded to work in Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo. The organisation operates on several levels, working with children, young people, teachers and youth workers through a variety of activities. To date over 40,000 people have participated in activities or training.

<http://www.openfunfootballschoools.org.mk/>

http://www.play-the-game.org/speeches/culture/football_schools.html

<http://www.uefa.com/uefa/News/Kind=524288/newsId=11058.html>

Football summer schools are an important aspect of the work of the organisation. However they are just one element of a more comprehensive programme that works to overcome societal tensions within the very particular context of post-war inter-ethnic relations in the region. The organisers explore below how their strategy aims to address the local situation.

The context in which the open fun football schools operate is not often conducive to collaboration. For example, few schools or educational institutions offer a cross-ethnic approach. Likewise, many institutions, from political parties to sports clubs, are divided along ethnic lines. Many young people in the region grow up not knowing the people that they live alongside; a situation that will foster many future problems if opportunities to engage across ethnic divisions are not provided.

Challenging the barriers and obstacles of this context is central to the work of the Open Fun Football Schools. We see our whole programme in the following way:

- as a tool for bringing teachers, leaders, trainers and children from different ethnic and social backgrounds to play together, thereby bridging present divisions and promoting social cohesion;
- as a project promoting democratic pedagogical principles, which gives children an experience of fellowship, co-operation, mutual understanding and the basic principles of sport for all;
- as capacity building for hundreds of qualified teachers from elementary schools and trainers from football clubs participating in our project.

In the 2001 season, the activities of the Open Fun Football Schools were implemented according to a regional strategy aimed at facilitating both cross-boundary collaboration (between nations) and cross-entity collaboration (between population groups – with usually antagonistic relations - within a country). For this reason, it was important that all 10 seminars for instructors, leaders and trainers involved a balanced number of participants from Bosnia Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, and were located evenly in all the countries involved. Similarly all our 45 Open Fun Football Schools in 2001 were organised in accordance with our “twin-city approach” where football clubs, leaders and trainers from a minimum of two municipalities from different population groups (between which relations tend to be antagonistic) jointly organise an Open Fun Football School.

In this context we find it important to emphasise that we succeeded in implementing 4 regional seminars for instructors, leaders and trainers in Macedonia with participants from all the above countries as well as 14 Open Fun Football Schools in the middle of the war/crisis. All schools were organised in accordance with our social and multi-ethnic principles, even though it was not always easy to recruit a sufficient number of Macedonian and Albanian children for the same activities. Our twin-city approach was adapted perfectly in Bosnia Herzegovina and Montenegro.



Football summer schools are week long programmes involving 8-14 year old children. Open involvement of children, regardless of ethnicity, social background or ability, and a focus on fun, is designed to challenge societal divisions.

Kids play on the same team regardless of gender, talent or any other difference. The key idea is that participation should be fun for everybody. The games and exercises are designed with a focus on enabling people to succeed again and again. Throughout the week the participants get to live football. However, it is not about developing and harvesting talented players, but about providing a rich and rewarding experience. Using ball games and 'playsport' the football schools aim to move people, physically and psychologically, across the numerous and invisible frontlines that still divide the country.

Through such sporting activity the aim is to bring together people from different groups of the population between whom relationships are antagonistic, and to work with them to create a space in which they can meet, discuss, and share enjoyment. In turn the aim is that this will stimulate processes of confidence building and the integration of refugees and minorities.

Issues for exploration

- How to bring groups of people or individuals together who usually do not communicate
- How do you plan to overcome the barriers between them?
- Working on several levels simultaneously
- Choosing participants
- Creating commonality where difference is over-bearing
- Using fun as a serious learning tool
- Tackling issues maybe not cognitively at first
- How to generate an atmosphere of non-competitiveness and equality

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Philosophical Studies

***The Centre for Knowledge
Science and Society***

The Centre promotes pragmatic and scholarly studies of knowledge-human interfaces; the relation between humans and things. It is a grouping of academics representing research interests across the University's faculties. Apart from an active research programme, the Centre is the home of the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Philosophy degree programmes in Philosophical Studies of Knowledge and Human Interests. Through innovative, project-based teaching and learning, students are encouraged to actively engage with and make sense of the world around them – society, its socio-historical foundations, its institutions and structures.

University of Newcastle
Herschel Building
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU
England

Tel: +44 191 222 7302
Fax: +44 191 222 7361
<http://www.phil.ncl.ac.uk/>

Contact: Professor Milan Jaros

Hannah Perkins, an undergraduate student, used her final year project to explore notions of truth and knowledge and their relationship to time. She applied her conceptual understanding to the field of education, asking such questions as 'how can a teacher present truth?', 'how can young people be taught to think?', and 'why do we educate people at all?'. Hannah's learning processes and their outcomes illustrate the ethos of citizenship education embedded in the Centre for Knowledge Science and Society's teaching and research.

Through the process of working on her project Hannah developed both her opinions and her way of thinking. She discusses below how the course structure and learning processes helped her to do so.

When I was at school I never questioned things much. This course has changed that. Now I can look into things like texts so much more and see things that I just wouldn't have thought of before.

This course is great for helping you find a place where you want to be. It must be one of the freest courses ever – in every respect. You can do whatever you want and go into something, look into what interests you. Doing such a big piece of work, you have to do something that really interests you. This is what really helped me recognise that I would like to go into teaching. The course offers you the freedom to be something you want to be. Some people find it hard, but you can really take advantage of it. Having one-to-one discussions about my work was really inspiring and it was great that my tutor was able to pick up on what might interest me and help me to focus. It was pretty daunting at the start, but I think last year's project prepared me for this.

I am much more focussed now – I went through so many ideas and considerations. Also, I have to be one of the most organised people I know. I just had to be with having such big projects and deadlines months ahead. Another thing, that a lot of my friends tell me, is that I have a very rational mind now – that I am able to see the other side to things and think clearly. It's something that's come out of me on this course. I think those are all good qualities to have and they will help me teach.

The main issues that I wanted to address in my project were: Is it possible to have a timeless knowledge? And, therefore, how can a teacher present the truth (when it will not be considered the truth in the future)? To these concerns, I applied concepts taken from contemporary thinkers such as Michel Foucault relating to the change of knowledge over time. This led me to such questions as – why do we educate people? I asked myself, is it in order that they can be autonomous and do original things? Or is it as a means of social control?

I have a pessimistic opinion in some ways. But I think if I've got these questions in my head it may help to make me a modern teacher. I think children should know how to question and to think critically.



The philosophical studies degree programme uses project methods as a means of active participation to enable students to accept responsibility for themselves and their learning process, and to develop further skills for active citizenship.

Our degree programme in Philosophical Studies is above all about how to think – how to turn the volumes of information that we are confronted with everyday into selective order, and to establish a rational basis for personal identity. This is implemented by exploring some of the most spectacular achievements of the human mind. Such knowledge is not studied in the isolation of academic disciplines, but in terms of cultural practices. This approach, combined with a strong project component, aims to develop students' ability to separate knowledge from opinion in real life contexts, and their capacity to communicate with others.

Throughout the three years of their studies students are gradually given greater freedom and responsibility. By their final year they work on a large scale project that enables them to integrate their conceptual understandings with their beliefs and a real life situation or context. This is a key capacity needed for active citizenship. The active nature of a learning process based around individual projects develops the capacity for self-direction and self-management. While the course as a whole develops common skills such as the capacity to think clearly and rationally, to process information, and to make connections, project work inspires an originality and inventiveness that enables students to work beyond the restrictions of any tutor's understandings or opinions. Likewise the knowledge of power and institutional structures gained throughout the taught elements of the course is enhanced and personalised through its application in project work.

Project work enables tutors to focus on individuals and their specific needs and interests, and to respond to them and the context in which they are working. Such a way of working allows flexibility, not only in the topics of study but in the working styles used. Importantly, although much of the work is carried out on an individual level, students are encouraged to present their ideas to others informally in seminar groups and by way of formal presentation, thus developing their ability to communicate their understandings.

Issues for exploration

- How can you facilitate 'questioning' in formal and non-formal learning environments?
- How can you encourage young people to question their environment and the information they receive?
- Gradually building responsibility
- Flexible working practices and responding to the individuals concerned
- Giving people the confidence to accept responsibility and make decisions
- Expression and development of ideas
- How can you help people to connect what they are doing to the bigger picture?
- Balancing information or knowledge with capacities and skills
- Developing values based on knowledge and thought

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

European Exchange Club

Francas + Nancy

Francas + Nancy is a youth and community education association based in a less privileged area of Nancy. It offers leisure activities and educational support. It is part of a substantial national organisation and in Nancy is supported by 7 staff and a dozen or so committed volunteers. The exchange club collaborated with Rencontres Franco-Roumaines, a small voluntary organisation that exists to promote cooperation between France and Romania, and a series of schools in Galati, Romania.

11, rue Laurent Bonnevey
54 100 Nancy
France

Tel: +33 3 83 96 15 80
Fax: +33 3 83 98 69 14

The European Exchange Club grew from the development of exchange projects and collaboration that began in 1997. Three exchanges have taken place to date, supported by a wide variety of activities to involve the local communities in Nancy and Galati. These projects have also provided opportunities for training *animateurs. The aim of the work has been to generate opportunities for disadvantaged young people to engage with cultural activities and to be introduced to a European dimension.**

If education for European Citizenship has appeared explicitly at particular instants within the activities of the European Exchange Club, it is evident in a far more continual manner in the aims and practice of the organisation, even where it is not a specified objective.

As the project unfolded it developed in many directions not conceived of at the outset. The best way to understand this is to explore the process by which it happened.

The idea for the collaboration came from an informal discussion between two individuals. This occurred at a moment when Francas + Nancy was looking to develop their intercultural work and a School in Galati had an established French club keen for further opportunity to develop knowledge of French language and culture. Correspondence between the young people began. The idea for an exchange arose from the growing desire of the young people to meet their correspondents.

It was the constraints imposed by the possibility of gaining funding that determined the first leg of the exchange would take place in Romania. However, it was still possible to plan a reciprocal visit for the following year.

Planning for the first visit involved education about each other's countries – their history, culture and social realities. In France this turned out to be as much to overcome the misgivings of families towards sending their children to a country more or less confused with Yugoslavia and therefore the war, as it was to inform them. Following this visit, which involved time with host families, and with their exchange partners in the countryside and at the coast, the French youth prepared an exhibition and a reflective diary of their experiences. This was the point at which the European Exchange Club was created with the aim of carrying out future exchange and education projects to actively develop European Citizenship. The future direction of the organisation was based upon the experiences gained from the first exchange visit.

To meet the interests of the French group and ultimately to meet the demands of the project funders the 1999 exchange followed a clear theme and had much more structured activities. Working with experienced professionals, the young people had the opportunity to learn a wide variety of media techniques and put these into practice throughout an exciting period in which they worked in both countries and travelled together between France and Romania. A lot of effort was made to link these projects to the local communities. This was helped by family hosting for part of the duration of each project and, in Nancy by a media presentation and exhibition that followed the exchange visits. In the Romanian community the complementary programme for training workers, engaged 120 children and young people in activities run jointly by French and Romanian volunteers over the course of a month. Despite very limited funding, this project drew from local resources - what the participants and their families could themselves provide – and engaged them actively in social debates.

The exchanges themselves tackled issues of European Citizenship from a number of angles:

- Learning about European and national institutions
- Active participation of young people in their journey of discovery through use of the media
- The presentation of their discoveries to their own communities
- The involvement of their environment in the preparation and the realisation of the project
- Geographical awareness of Europe brought about by land travel

* "animateur" in French refers to a specific profession; it means people who work with children or young people to organise free-time and/or educational activities, including such things as sport or arts and crafts. In English animateur is most often translated as "youth worker".



Things are not always what they seem...

The exchange programme, despite its overall success, has had to overcome significant barriers. This has led to bringing collaboration with one organisation to an end. Underlying the problems, which we go on to explore below, is the difference of opinion over the motivation for the exchange activity and therefore its aims. Exploring this can offer some insight into important factors not to lose sight of in the effort to make projects happen.

On the part of Francas + Nancy, an important aim of the exchange was to keep participation open, and for selection not to be based upon financial means. Also, the active involvement of young people in developing an educational focus to the exchange was central to their citizenship-based approach. For one of the Romanian partners, such aims were lost in the eagerness to have an opportunity for travel to western Europe – a tendency enhanced by the socio-political situation and the difficulty Romanians have had in travelling in recent years. The aims of Francas + Nancy were thus accepted more as conditions that would make travel possible, rather than as embodying core values. This led to controversy over the selection of participants and the approach to the work, and ultimately undermined the success of the partnership.

In 2000, Francas + Nancy had to face an organisational restructuring, which ended in 2002. During this period it organised an interactive exhibition about the Euro and Europe, in partnership with several NGOs, institutions and young people of the area. This allowed the organisation to continue on the way of opening the area to Europe. In autumn 2002, the European Exchange Club restarted its activities and drew its new perspectives.

Issues for exploration

- Is your idea supported by a need or interest among the participant group? Is it more than a personal interest?
- Allowing things to develop according to the interests of participants can increase chances of success. Think about how low key activities might work to enable the introduction of bigger and more complex projects.
- Think about what might constrain the development of your project. How much of an impact will these external factors have? Are you able to hang on to what is important in your project? If not, is it worth continuing?
- How can you assess what is required and work with people from the place they are at rather than the place you would like them to be at?
- Think about how you can ensure your project is able to develop according to what is learned and the needs and interests of the participants.
- Choosing project partners – do they share your aims and ethos? Does this matter?

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



Youth Empowerment Project

“Sunflower” – Centre For Grassroots Relief Work is a Croatian non-governmental, not-for-profit, organisation founded in 1992 as an emergency response to the psycho-social needs of communities affected by war. “Sunflower” has programmes in 6 regions of Croatia connected to the following cities – Zagreb, Varazdin, Pula, Knin, Topusko and Petrinja.

“Sunflower” is committed to the implementation of democracy building, citizen participation and empowerment, community development, voluntarism and altruism, shared responsibility, equal opportunities and the involvement for all regardless of gender, religious or national differences. It strives towards these goals through a variety of social projects of which the youth empowerment project is one.

Sucokret – Centar za humanitarni rad

Avenija Dubrovnik 10
10 000 Zagreb
Croatia

Tel: +385 1 6556 425
Fax: +385 1 6551 715
Email: Zagreb@suncokret.hr
<http://www.suncokret.hr>

Contact: Vesna Kajis

Four experienced youth workers attracted 60 young people, aged 16 – 23, mostly high school and university students, to participate in 9 months of non-formal education during the year 2001. The aim was to develop a team of dynamic and informed young citizens who, together, would become active youth/peer leaders, who would share their knowledge and experience with other young people. The objectives were: to learn about issues of global interdependence, to develop leadership skills and self-confidence, to design and implement social actions and projects that involve young people actively in their communities and in democratic processes.

Building a civil society

Objectives of the activity:

- to have the participants explore the necessary components for a civil society
- to have the participants think about obstacles to creating a civil society

Activity:

Participants are divided into groups of 4 to 6 people. In the first phase of the activity, each group is given thirty minutes to create their ideal community, based upon what the group decides constitutes a “civil society”. After the group has discussed what they want in their community, they must draw a blueprint of what it would look like. The group should discuss aspects such as: environment, population criteria, system of government, structure of the community, services, and other. These concepts should be reflected on their blueprint.

Following this exercise each group presents their “community” to the whole group.

The next stage allows for a more in-depth exploration and discussion of what the groups have begun to uncover. The facilitator(s) should work with the whole group in considering issues such as those below.

On the process of the activity: How was it to do this activity? What was the process of designing the community like? Was it democratic? Why or why not? Were there any conflicts or disagreements on how the society should be structured? How were they solved? Did anyone take on a leadership role?

On the nature of the communities created: Who will be responsible for maintaining order, fairness, and equality in the community? Who does the decision-making? Did the communities have anything in common?

On the relationship with the participants’ personal experiences: Is this community similar to or different from your community? If so, how? If not, why not?

On a more conceptual level: What prevents a civil society from developing? What are the components? What ingredients are necessary for civil society?



The presentation of this activity comes with a warning! In the words of the facilitator, "I'm afraid that this exercise is just a small piece of a one year process of non-formal education for voluntary work and civil society involvement and its meaning is not very deep." Below we explore how and why this exercise was used by this group, looking closely at the work context.

This activity made up one small element of training for a group that met weekly and was participating in a training curriculum of 20 workshops, focusing on communication, peer leadership, facilitator's role, creative techniques, collaborative problem-solving, human rights, civic participation, social action design. This extensive training was then the foundation upon which the young people designed and conducted research to identify issues of concern in their communities and implemented social actions and micro-projects.

This exercise, like all of the activities, was experiential and interactive, using joint experiences, reflection and discussion as a tool for learning and sharing.

Again, in the words of the facilitator: "I find it useful as an introduction to start thinking about young people's role in civil society and civil sector development. We use this exercise:

- When dealing with young people who do not see any space for their active role in society because they take youth marginalisation as fact;
- When we want to confront young people with their passive role in society;
- When we want to raise self-awareness about their potential for making changes;
- When we want to motivate and empower them to start acting and planning social actions."

The most valuable, long term result was that 15 young people, participants of this project, felt confident enough to take on active roles as peer leaders. Together with 4 experienced staff they started 8 new groups in 5 different cities, sharing their acquired knowledge and experience in new 9-month projects. This was a crucial moment that has helped "Sunflower" to spread this kind of project to three new locations in 2002, using the "snow ball effect" with young people educating themselves to become active citizens in a developing civil society.

Issues for Exploration

- Time investment – realistic time planning
- The investment in the individual to achieve a multiplying snowball effect
- How can the same activity be implemented successfully with different people? How can workers prepare themselves to achieve this?
- What opportunities can you provide for young people to take forward their newly acquired skills/knowledge and put them into practice
- Keep momentum going at the end of one phase of the project
- Do the activities you are planning form part of a structured whole that has some purpose and then develop in a particular direction, so they are not just a random collection?
- Are your activities open-ended enough to develop to meet the needs and interests of the group?

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Step Toward Tolerance

The Youth Centre Izgrev is based in Sofia. It is run by a core team of five volunteers, with the support of a further thirty youth volunteers who were involved in former activities. The centre's main activities are based in schools, where the volunteers run educational programmes on such issues as drug misuse, Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD) and HIV/AIDS prevention.

Youth Centre Izgrev (YCI)

Sofia, 1164, h.c Lozenetz, str.Kiril Vidinski
2 app.35, Bulgaria

Malina Edreva - malina_edreva@abv.bg

Elena Milanova - lenilaf@abv.bg

Gergana Berova - berovs81@yahoo.com

Daniela Furnadhieva - danielaf@dir.bg

This drugs and HIV/AIDS education programme ran for three months in 2001/2002. Its main objective was to reduce the risk behaviour of the 15-18 year old participants with regard to drug taking and sexually transmitted diseases, and to challenge prejudice. Equally important was the ambition to train the 30 young people who participated as peer educators and to assist them in more wide-reaching programmes of work.

The initial motivational meeting and training was held at a local hotel because of the free and relaxed atmosphere it provided. It was particularly important to create a relaxed atmosphere as the project brought together a diverse group of young people, with different motivations, from five schools, and of differing ages. We began the project by finding out the knowledge and interests of our participants. This helped us to judge how to present our activities and at what level. The team adjusted their plans to suit the group. At the first meeting with all participants, we presented YCI, the idea, the purpose and the expectations we had of the "Step Toward Tolerance" project. Following some motivating games and a brief "tour de table" all 30 participants were divided into five mixed work groups. Every group chose a team co-ordinator to represent the group during the project. A talk about HIV/AIDS, touching upon factual and emotional aspects in a global context, formed the basis of a lively discussion within the groups.

Following this meeting, there were weekly gatherings with the team co-ordinators. Each session combined the presentation of information, discussion and social activity. We focused on many topics such as: how to explore a youth community; how to assess community needs; and how to write a project proposal. Each team provided different approaches – questionnaires, characteristics, printed materials, games – helping the co-ordinators to develop the work systematically. As a result they took their own initiatives and everybody prepared a draft for a future project. Our feeling was that the co-ordinators matured during this time.

The level of participant activity was also very pleasing. During the period of the meetings they had their own initiative to develop the work and to involve a larger audience, not only in their classes, but in their schools and the entire local community. Also, some external events happened during the project. The students took part very actively in the ANTI-AIDS coalition activities on 1st of December. Together with the Red Cross they distributed information in night clubs and on streets.

The project continued with the part most looked forward to – the participant training. For this the Centre relied on the help of experienced facilitators. They attracted the attention of the participants with games, music, discussions and moving talks. The training included talks about health promotion and education, in general. However, the participants were most interested in the topic of drugs, so we concentrated our efforts on this. After this the subject of STDs and risk behaviour was explored. The students heard many examples from real life. We had a separate talk specifically on HIV/AIDS followed by an interesting simulation of situations. The young people were engaged on both factual and emotional levels.

One of the goals was to attract the young people to become volunteers of Youth Centre Izgrev and we achieved this goal with great success!



An important aspect of this programme was developing a peer education programme. One of the organisers explores in more detail how and why peer education was integrated into the Step Towards Tolerance programme.

Peer education is not a new method for Bulgaria. I think it is a key way of educating young people and involving them in voluntary work, because it both increases their awareness of social problems and encourages them to be more active. However, educating young peer leaders is not a simple process. There are many factors to be considered, such as the economic situation of the country, the different mentalities of the individuals involved, their age (teenage years are the most sensitive in human life and are the best for peer educators), their backgrounds (including such things as religion and education from the family). I mean that when you stand up in front of a class of thirty students, you have to consider that they are totally different from each other, and at the same time you have to somehow develop unity among them. I think this is a challenge which was difficult for me personally.

The project we conducted with 21 difficult high-school pupils from Sofia is an example of training good peer leaders.

This experience reminded me that when teaching students to be good peer-leaders it is important to consider the following things that you may need to do or be ready for:

- have a mixed team of young people with different experiences
- be open-minded towards students
- speak freely and show your own emotional connection with the issues concerned
- help them understand that everybody is unique as a person, and every person has an opinion that is very important to the group as a whole
- use different kinds of methods that draw on their creativity and allow free expression, such as games, poetry, and drawing
- create a relaxed and friendly atmosphere
- continually motivate and encourage the group
- be ready for different questions, which often are very confusing
- accept that maybe no more than one or two will be ready to continue their actions after your efforts
- be ready to continue your work with these interested people, including them in different projects and meetings, giving them information
- understand that the way in which you act with them will shape how they will behave themselves, what their values are, and how in the future they will begin their own work with others

Finally, don't forget that young peer leaders could give to you many new ideas which are important when you write a project proposal or prepare other material.

Issues for Exploration

- What do you consider important when planning a peer education programme?
- How might you balance skill knowledge and attitude development?
- Why are you doing what you are doing?
- Can you be flexible and responsive?
- How can you support others to develop their ideas into practical action?
- What kind of working atmosphere do you want to generate and how might you go about this?
- Working with people as individuals
- Establishing the needs and interests of the group

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Conclusion



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

So you've made it to the end. Congratulations, and welcome! It is of course only the end of the beginning – as the real work starts now: putting it into practice. With what we now know of the past, with the insight we have into potential futures, and with the points of reference we have gained from the various theories and practice of others – what is it that we feel called to do?

We hope you have arrived here stimulated, with ideas buzzing and plans emerging. As is often the case in this work, you may have as many questions as answers – and as many a trainer will tell you, that's a good thing! What it is essential to remember, is that we should always be faced with some questions. If we are not, we stop learning – and that would be tragic!

Rather than this being a disempowering thought (how on earth am I expected to do my work well if I don't have all the answers?!), it urges us to start now. If there can be no final answer to life, the universe and everything (or even to European Citizenship), then there is no point in waiting for it. We had better dive into the uncertainties of life with energy and joy, accepting that whatever happens as a result, happens, and there is no point in regretting it. At the same moment, and in the same breath, we must take responsibility for acting now on anything we are not satisfied with.

A key element to this work is the coherence between what we are communicating and the way in which we communicate it. If we are trying to encourage participation, respect and creativity, with these as essential content parts of our educational programmes, we must reflect those in the methods we choose to use, and most importantly in our own personal approach to the people we are working with. Being an educator for European Citizenship is as much about developing our own selves, as it is about facilitating others, learning new methods, and convincing funders that our projects are worth their money.

As we hope you have realised now, education for European Citizenship is not a value-free agenda. In fact, it gives us the opportunity to connect to some fundamental human values such as respect, creativity and love – and to give them form in the playground of European youth work. It is work which future generations will be thankful for. It is work which should help to secure a continent that is peaceful, just, ecologically sustainable, and a supportive partner to peoples and communities from other parts of our planet. It is work we can be proud of.

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Conclusion

Bibliography



T-Kit
on
European Citizenship

-
- Albala-Bertrand, L.** (1997). *Five main criteria to approach citizenship education*. http://www.itu.ch/ibe-cited/approach_criteria.html
- Allport, G. W.** (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Annot, Madeleine and Dillabough, Joanne (eds)**, (2000). *Challenging democracy: international perspectives on gender, education and citizenship*, Routledge, London.
- Audigier, F.** (2000): *Basic concepts and core competencies for education for democratic citizenship*. Strasbourg, Council for cultural co-operation.
- Baglin Jones, E and Jones, N**, (1992). *Education for Citizenship : ideas and perspectives for cross-curricular study*, Kogan Page, London.
- Bahmueller, C.** (2000): *Civil society and democracy reconsidered*. In: Bahmueller and Patrick: *Principles and practices for education of democratic citizenship*. Center for Civic Education, Calabasas.
- Baily, Richard (ed)**, (2000). *Teaching Values and Citizenship Across the Curriculum*, Kogan Page, Stylus Publishers, London.
- Beck, John**, (1998). *Morality and citizenship in education*, Cassel, London.
- Bell, Gordon**, (1995). *Educating European Citizens – Citizenship Values and the European Dimension*, David Fulton Publishers, London.
- Burbeles, Nicholas C, and Torres, Carlos Alberto (eds.)**, (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York and London.
- Callan, Eamonn**, (1997). *Creating citizens: political education and liberal democracy*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Chambers, D. and Pullan, B. eds** (1992): *Venice: A Documentary History, 1450-1630*. Cambridge, Blackwell.
- Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC)**, (2000). *Education for democratic citizenship project, Jump into democratic citizenship*, poster prepared by Mark Taylor, Strasbourg.
- Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC)**, (2001). *Education for democratic citizenship project, Education for democratic citizenship: methods, practices and strategies: final report*, Strasbourg.
- Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC)**, (2000). *project on Education for Democratic Citizenship: Basic concepts and core competencies for education for democratic citizenship*, report prepared by Francois Audigier, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe** (2000). *Pause for thought*. <http://www.ecri.coe.int/en/05/03/03/e05030323.htm>
- Craft, Maurice**, (1982). *Education for diversity: the challenge of cultural pluralism*, University of Nottingham, School of Education, Nottingham.
- Craft, Maurice**, (1984). *Education and cultural pluralism*, London, Falmer.
- Curriculum and Quality Development Group** (2000). *in the framework of the Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission Training-Youth, Pilot Course on European Citizenship – Curriculum Principles*, Strasbourg.

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples

Bibliography



Demaine, Jack and Entwistle, Harold, (1996). *Beyond communitarianism: citizenship, politics and education*, MacMillan, Basingstoke.

Duerr, Karlheinz, (2000). *Strategies for learning democratic citizenship*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

Edwards, L (ed), (1994). *Education for democratic citizenship in Europe: new challenges for secondary education*, Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger.

European Commission, (1997). *Accomplishing Europe through education and training*, Office for official publications of the European communities, Luxembourg.

European Commission, *Learning for Active Citizenship*, accessed on <http://europa.eu.int/comm/citizen/citiz-en.html/>, 27.02.02.

European Commission, *Lifelong Learning: Making A European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*, accessed on <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/life/index.html/>, 27.05.02

European Commission (2001): *White Paper: A new impetus for European youth*. Brussels.

European Youth Forum (2001): *Strategies and key objectives for a youth policy in the European Union*. Brussels.

Fennes, H, and K, Hapgood, (1997). *Intercultural learning in the classroom : crossing borders*, Cassel, London.

Ferry, Jean Marc, (1999). European studies for democratic citizenship, *A democratic culture that is plural and yet one: education and democratic citizenship in the context of a multiplicity of historical and cultural perceptions*.

Fogelman, K. (1996). Education for citizenship and the National Curriculum. *Beyond communitarianism: citizenship, politics and education*. **J. Demaine and H. Entwistle**. London, Macmillan.

Forbrig, J. (2000): Post-communist civil society: A suggestion for a theoretical framework. *The Masaryk Journal*, Vol. 3, Issue 1.

Furlong, Andy and Guidikova, Irena (eds.), (2001). *Transitions of youth citizenship in Europe: culture, subculture and identity*, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.

Gay, P. (2002): *Liberalism*. Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopaedia.

Gilbert, R. (1996): Identity, culture and environment: Education for citizenship for the 21st century. In: Demaine J. and Entwistle H.: *Beyond communitarianism: Citizenship, politics and education*. London, Macmillan.

Gilbert, R. (1992): Citizenship, education and postmodernity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 13, No. 1.

Gioliotto, P (ed), (1993). *Enseigner l'éducation civique à l'école*, Hachette éducation, Paris.

Guidikova, Irena, *La mondialisation de la culture de participation*, dans Agora débats jeunesse, n°. 19, l'Harmattan, 1^{er} trimestre 2000.

Grenz, S. (1996): *A Primer on Postmodernism*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Gross, P. and Levitt, N. (1994): *Higher Superstition. The academic left and its quarrels with science*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press.



Guarasci, Richard and Cornwell, Grant H. (1997). *Democratic Education in an age of difference – Redefining citizenship in higher education*, Jossey Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Gundara, Jagdish and Jacobs, Sidney (eds), (2000). *Intercultural Europe: diversity and social policy*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Habermas, J. (1994): *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Oxford, Polity Press.

Hale, J. (1977): *Renaissance Europe: Individual and Society 1480-1520*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Harpes, Jean – Paul, (1999). *The conditions for the creation of a European democratic culture – summary of five reports prepared by experts for the CC – HER*, Strasbourg.

Hayek, F. (1967): *Studies in philosophy, politics and economics*. London, Routledge.

Heater, D. (1990): *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. London, Longman.

Helve, Helen and Wallace, Claire, (2001). *Youth, Citizenship and Empowerment*, Ashgate Publishing, Hampshire.

Hobhouse, L. T. (1911): *Liberalism*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Hopken, W. (1994): *History, democratic values and tolerance in Europe: the experience of countries in democratic transition*. Sofia, Council of Europe Symposium.

Ichilov, O. (1998): *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world*. London, The Woburg Press.

International Project What Education for What Citizenship?, (May 2002). *Five main criteria to approach citizenship education*, accessed on <http://www3.itu.int/ibe-citied/inoeng90.html>.

Jeffs, Tony, *Informal education – conversation, democracy and learning*, 2nd edition, Routledge, London, 1998.

Jeffs, Tony, (1999). *Learning beyond the classroom – education for a changing world*, 2nd edition, Education Now Publishing Co-operative, Ticknal.

Kaye, A. (1995). Computer supported collaborative learning. *Information technology and society*.
N. Heap, R. Thomas, G. Einon, R. Mason and H. Mackay. London, SAGE.

Kennedy, Kerry J (ed.), (1997). *Citizenship, education and the modern state*, Falmer, London.

Kymlicka, W. and Norman W. (1995): Return to the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. In: Besner, R. ed.: *Theorizing Citizenship*. New York, State University of New York Press.

Lagree, Jean – Charles, *Introduction – Les jeunes dans la société multiculturelle*, in *Agora débats jeunesse*, n°. 22, l'Harmattan, 4^e trimestre 2000.

Larsen, Magdalena (ed.), (2000). *Speak Out! On European Citizenship*, Institute for Citizenship Education, London, (see also www.citizen.org.uk/speakout/).

Lauritzen, P. (1998): *Auf dem Weg in die europäische Bürgergesellschaft: Herausforderungen für die politische Bildung*. Budapest/Bonn, IKAB.

A History of Europe and Citizenship

Contemporary Approaches to Citizenship

Future Developments

Our Conceptual Framework

Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

Our Educational Approach to European Citizenship

Citizenship Scenarios – Project Examples

Bibliography



Leitch, R. and C. Day (2000). Action research and reflective practice: towards a holistic view. *Educational Action Research* 8(1): 179-193.

Lynch, James, *Education for citizenship in a multicultural society*, (1991). Cassell, London and New York.

Maalouf, A. (1998) *Les identités meurtrières*, Éditions Grasset & Fasquelle, Paris.

Marshall, T. (1973): *Class, citizenship and social development*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Merry, P. and G. Titley (1999). *Training methodologies: to know and transform Theatre of the Oppressed and youth*. <http://www.coe.fr/youth/english/Coyote/issue1/theatre.htm>

Microsoft (registered trademark) Encarta (registered trademark) Online Encyclopedia, History of Education, accessed on <http://encarta.msn.com/>, 2001.

Morin, E. (1987). *Penser l'Europe*, Éditions Gallimard, Paris.

Mougniotte, A. (1994). *Eduquer à la démocratie*, Ed. du Cerf, Paris.

Nie, Norman H et al, (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

NZZ-Folio (2001): *Europa. Schwieriger Weg zur Einheit*. Zürich, Verlag NZZ-Folio.

Osler, Audrey, (2000). *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity and equality*, Trentham, Stoke on Trent.

Osler, Audrey, (August 1997). *The contribution of community action programmes in the field of education, training and youth to the development of citizenship with a European dimension: final synthesis report*, University of Birmingham.

Osler, Audrey, Rathenow, Hanns-Fred and Starkey, Hugh, (1995). *Teaching for citizenship in Europe*, Trentham Books, Stoke on Trent.

Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission Training-Youth, *European Citizenship in Youth Work – A training course for youth workers and youth leaders on European Citizenship education in youth work*, report of the Pilot Training Course, EYCB, 21 October to 1 November, 2001, prepared by Arjen Bos (Engage! InterAct).

Pearce, Nick and Hallgarten, Joe, (2000). *Tomorrow's citizens: critical debates in citizenship and education*, IPPR, London.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1986). The intergroup contact hypothesis reconsidered. *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters*. **M. Hewstone and R. Brown**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Ravitch, Diane and Viteritti, Joseph P, (2001). *Making good citizens: education and civil society*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Ross, Alistair (ed.), (1999). *Young citizens in Europe*, CiCe, School of Education, University of North London.

Rubenstein, David and Stoneman, Colin (eds.), (1973). *Education for democracy*, 2nd edition, Penguin, Harmondsworth (Middlesex).



Ryba, R. (1995). *Developing a European dimension in the curriculum educating European citizens: citizenship values and the European dimension*, David Fulton Publishers, London.

Smith, Mark K. *Communitarianism*, accessed on www.infed.org/biblio/communitarianism.htm, January 2001.

Smith, Mark K. *Education for Democracy*, accessed on www.infed.org/biblio/d-dem.htm, 2001.

Schmitter, P. (1997): Civil Society East and West. In: Diamond, L. et al eds: *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Scurati, C. (1995). From inter-cultural education to teacher preparation: an Italian view in a multi-cultural perspective. *Educating European citizens: citizenship values and the European dimension*. G. H. Bell. London, David Fulton Publishers.

Slater, N. (2000). Hands that do dishes. *The Observer Magazine*. 22nd October 2000: 50-55.

Spiegel Special (2002): *Experiment Europa. Ein Kontinent macht Geschichte*. Hamburg, Spiegel Verlag.

Straker, A. (2001) *Pushing at the Limits: Reconstructing Cross-Cultural Exchange in Education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Talbot, M. (1995). *Active citizenship : training for equal opportunity to participate*, Network Educational Press, Stafford.

Taylor, M. (2001): *Jump into Education for Democratic Citizenship*, Strasbourg.

Turner, David and Barker, Patricia, (2000). *Activities for teaching citizenship in Secondary schools*, Kogan Page, London.

Turner, David and Barker, Patricia, (2000). *Developing citizenship in Secondary schools*, Kogan Page, London.

Ullmann, W. (1967): The Rebirth of the Citizen on the Eve of the Renaissance Period. In: Lewis, A. ed: *Aspects of the Renaissance*. Austin, University of Texas Press.

United Nations Publications (2000). *Life Chances and Livelihoods* (2000), Geneva.

United States of America Department of Education (2000). *Evaluation primers (1-5)*. <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/primer1.html>

Vink, C. (1999). *Giving credit: certification and assessment of non-formal education*. <http://www.coe.fr/youth/english/Coyote/issue1/credit.htm>

Webber, Stephen and Liikanen, Ilkka, (2001). *Education and civic culture in post-communist countries*, Palgrave, Basingstone, Hampshire and New York.

Wilber, K. (2000). *A Theory of Everything*, Dublin, Gateway.

Wimberley, J. (1999): *Civil society and the reformation of higher education in central and eastern Europe: Perspectives from the Council of Europe*. Strasbourg.

Woolf, F. (1999). *Partnerships for learning: a guide to evaluating arts education projects*. London, Regional Arts Boards and the Arts Council of England.

Youth in Action, No. 65 *Education for citizenship*, Autumn 1998, pp.2 – 3

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Bibliography



Websites Accessed by Section

A History of European Citizenship

<http://www.globalfindata.com/frameset.php3?location=/gh/index.html>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.euromaths.jyu.fi/money1.html>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.labyrinth.net.au/~saul/history/money.html>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.universalrights.net/main/histof.htm>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/rightsof.htm>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.lkwdpl.org/wihohio/figures.htm>. Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ancient/asbook.html> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://ancienthistory.about.com/> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://plato.evansville.edu/public/burnet/> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/GREECE/GREECE.HTM> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/ROME/ROME.HTM> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://sophies-world.com/SophieText/aristotle.htm> Accessed on June 3, 2002.

http://home.earthlink.net/~pdistan/howp_2.html Accessed on June 3, 2002.

<http://www.historyguide.org/earlymod/lecture1c.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.oir.ucf.edu/wm/paint/glo/renaissance/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.bartleby.com/65/ci/citystat.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.crs4.it/Ars/arshtml/arstitle.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/ENLIGHT/ENLIGHT.HTM> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://mars.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/wc2/lectures/enlightenment.html> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://europeanhistory.about.com/cs/enlightenment/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

http://home.earthlink.net/~pdistan/howp_7.html Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.worldlib.org> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.turnleft.com/liberal.html> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.lymec.org> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

Webography



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/l/locke.htm> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/m/milljs.htm> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

http://www.britannica.com/heritage/article?content_id=1374 Accessed on July 2, 2002.

http://www.britannica.com/history/euro/1/2_2.html Accessed on May 27, 2002.

**Future
Developments**

<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/REV/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/browse/texts/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

<http://www.thehistorychannel.co.uk/classroom/gcse/rus2.htm> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/education/modern/russia/russifla.htm> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://www.pbs.org/ktca/liberty/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

<http://www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/revolution/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://revolution.h-net.msu.edu/> Accessed on May 27, 2002.

<http://eycb.coe.int/eycbwwwroot/hre/index.asp> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

<http://www.un.org/works/humanrights/humanrights1.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.unhchr.ch/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

<http://www.echr.coe.int/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/WhatYouWant.asp?NT=005> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

Webography

<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.lkwdpl.org/wihohio/figures.htm> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.unifem.undp.org/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.un-instraw.org/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/gender/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.feminist.org/> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://www.historyguide.org/europe/lecture16.html> Accessed on July 2, 2002.

<http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Summaries/Html/005.htm> Accessed May 25, 2002.

<http://www.counterbalance.org/gengloss/postm-body.html> Accessed on June 13, 2002.

<http://csf.colorado.edu/forums/femisa/feb96/0042.html> Accessed on June 13, 2002.



Contemporary Approaches to Education for European Citizenship

<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Databanks/Dossiers/mainfram.htm> (accessed 05.07.02)

Electronic resources for further information

http://www.eun.org/eun.org2/eun/subdesc_my europe.cfm?sub_id=130&language=en

This site offers you activities, a selection of open projects and resources on peace, international cooperation, the environment and democracy.

<http://www.politeia.net/>

The network for citizenship and democracy in Europe is a virtual organization of more than 1500 persons and institutions that are active in the field of citizenship and political education and wishing to cooperate at European level.

<http://www.citizensconnection.net/home-page/about-us.vdf>

CitizensConnection.net is the biggest website in the UK for active citizens – packed with advice for people who want to make a change.

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/connect/uk-002.html>

Township offers the opportunity for creative educational work and debate around the issue of citizenship, creativity, change and the sustainability of our towns. It will encourage the exchange of ideas and new initiatives, through a series of workshops, a resource pack for use by teachers and community workers and a Website.

<http://www.curriculum.edu.au/democracy/>

An Australian site produced for the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/education/schools/getinvolved/>

BBC education site – stories of active participation. Don't just sit there, get involved!

<http://oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/teachers/globciti/globciti.htm>

Oxfam's powerful site, on international citizenship. Developed in partnership with teachers and other educationalists this curriculum builds on existing good practice and recommends the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to which we believe young people are entitled to enable them to develop as Global Citizens

<http://www.europe4you.net/index.htm>

Site promoting participation in Europe.

<http://www.globalschoolhouse.com/>

The American site Global SchoolNet is a leader in collaborative learning. We continue to provide online opportunities for teachers to collaborate, communicate, and celebrate shared learning experiences.

<http://homepages.ed.ac.uk/calarks/arks/materials.html>

Electronic educational resource packs

A History of Europe
and Citizenship

Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship

Future
Developments

Our Conceptual
Framework

Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship

Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship

Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples

Webography



**A History of Europe
and Citizenship**

<http://www.britishcouncil.org.uk/education/resource/europe/ercinfo10.htm>

The European Resource Centres for Schools and Colleges (ERCs) have been set up to provide information for the education sector. There are a number of websites that can provide useful information to teachers and students of geography: general citizenship; democracy; diversity and identity; human rights; equal opportunities; challenging racism; media; law; citizens rights; working and employment; consumer rights; the EU and the world; environment; school linking. There are also a number of other websites that may be of interest to students and teachers that can be accessed from the links index.

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Citizenship**

**Future
Developments**

<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/sitemap.htm>

A wide-ranging internationally focused educational resource

**Our Conceptual
Framework**

<http://www.infed.org/>

The encyclopedia of informal education

Explore key thinkers, theories and themes in informal education and lifelong learning.

**Contemporary
Approaches
to Education
for European
Citizenship**

<http://www.csv.org.uk/>

A UK charity committed to enabling people to actively participate in their communities through volunteering, training and education

**Our Educational
Approach
to European
Citizenship**

<http://www.citizen.org.uk/>

Tackling apathy, stimulating debate, promoting awareness, supporting education, encouraging active citizenship. The Institute for Citizenship is an independent charitable trust. Our aim is to promote informed, active citizenship and greater participation in democracy and society through a combination of community projects, research, education and discussion and debate.

**Citizenship
Scenarios –
Project Examples**

<http://www.citizen21.org.uk/>

An online citizenship resource for educators

Webography

<http://www.training-youth.net/tkits.htm>

All the T-Kits on-line

http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/index_en.html

European Commission's website on education

<http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/>

The United Nations Global Teaching and Learning Project



About the Authors

Miguel Angel García López is a “part time free lance trainer”. Originally Spanish, living in Germany and working all around Europe since 1998 for European institutions, NGO’s and private companies. He also works as resource person for the Sociology Faculty of the University of Osnabrück and collaborates with some Spanish publications. “Make a team” is his motto because he believes that we need to work more and better in teams.

rmbercia@aol.com

Andreas Karsten lives in Germany and works as a freelance trainer and consultant for national and international NGOs, foundations, political parties and companies. He also works as a part-time journalist and is the junior partner in a tutoring company. Andreas does not only profit from “life-long learning”, he also believes in it and is presently dealing with the complex art of networked thinking.

lolo@devilarts.de

Peter Merry is a human ecologist. He is a partner in Engage! InterAct, and works with change and development processes in a variety of contexts. In all his work, he aims to integrate the development of Self, Relationships and Systems, in the evolutionary context of our current global reality. Surface manifestations include intercultural learning, conflict transformation, group dynamics, organisational development, global governance and sustainability. The same deep dynamics are to be found beneath the surface of them all.

peter@engage.nu

Yael Ohana is presently working as an educational advisor at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg. Her main responsibilities include preparing and implementing training programmes for youth leaders and youth workers functioning at European level. One of her areas of specialisation has been the training of minority youth leaders for the development of more participation and citizenship opportunities among their youth constituencies. One of her main interests is the development of new curricula for training and non-formal education with young adults.

yael.ohana@coe.int

Alison Straker is an educationalist actively seeking to develop the dialogue between theory and practice. Through action research, her doctoral thesis united her long-standing interest and experience in cross-cultural education and youth work with wider theoretical concerns in the fields of education, communication and contemporary society.

alistraker@hotmail.com

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

CITIZENSHIP, YOUTH AND EUROPE



IN 1998, THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION DECIDED TO TAKE COMMON ACTION IN THE FIELD OF EUROPEAN YOUTH WORKER TRAINING, AND THEREFORE INITIATED A PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT. THE AIM OF THE AGREEMENT, WHICH IS LAID DOWN IN SEVERAL COVENANTS, IS "TO PROMOTE ACTIVE EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP AND CIVIL SOCIETY BY GIVING IMPETUS TO THE TRAINING OF YOUTH LEADERS AND YOUTH WORKERS WORKING WITHIN A EUROPEAN DIMENSION".

THE CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE TWO INSTITUTIONS COVERS A WIDE SPECTRUM OF ACTIVITIES AND PUBLICATIONS, AS WELL AS DEVELOPING TOOLS FOR FURTHER NETWORKING.

THREE MAIN COMPONENTS GOVERN THE PARTNERSHIP: A TRAINING OFFER (LONG TERM TRAINING FOR TRAINERS AND TRAINING ON EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP), PUBLICATIONS (BOTH PAPER AND ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF TRAINING MATERIALS AND MAGAZINE) AND NETWORKING TOOLS (TRAINERS POOL AND EXCHANGE POSSIBILITIES). THE ULTIMATE GOAL IS TO RAISE STANDARDS IN YOUTH WORKER TRAINING AT A EUROPEAN LEVEL AND DEFINE QUALITY CRITERIA FOR SUCH TRAINING.

