

**Participation Now!**  
**Citizenship Education and Democracy in Times of Change**

21 - 24 November 2012  
Córdoba, Spain

**Critical Summary**

**by Benjamin Barber**  
Political Theorist (USA)

It is a difficult task in light of the great diversity and richness of our week of meetings to try to summarise or pull together common themes from our conference. There are so very many of us, and as we each listen to one another, we filter what we hear through our own concerns, backgrounds, and commitments. So, please don't take this as anything but one particular take on our debates. Perhaps you can use it as an excuse to do your own critical thinking, to reach some of your own conclusions and your own recommendations, using my remarks this morning as one possible benchmark. I suspect the organisers are hoping that everybody will, in their own way, do this both on their own but also with one another. After all, as the organisers said this morning, the richest and most productive part of our meetings is not when you are out there and some of us are up here but when we are together at lunch tables or over coffee talking with one another, dialoguing about the workshops and the focus groups. So, think of this as one side of a multi-sided dialogue where I have a rather long opening statement and then we continue a conversation right through until next year in the Hague.

I was fortunate to be at the conference last year in Poland and as the 20 percent of you (about one out of five from this year's group) who were there will remember, because we were in Warsaw, there was a focus on what we might call East/West relations, at least within the European context. Western Europe/ Eastern Europe relations were key, and though we talked about "new democracies", they were the newer democracies in the East that were our subject not the Arab Awakening. The debate took place, as it did this year, in a situation of some urgency and crisis because the fiscal crisis was already well underway. The European recession was a dominant force, the debate over austerity well underway. As a result, our Polish conference was anything but a complacent meeting, a gathering in which participants simply said, "Let's talk about civic education and making nice little citizens out of young people." This year, as we all know, in place of that East/ West focus, what we have seen all week is a North/ South focus. European and Mediterranean Europe, with an awareness of North Africa and the Middle East. We again confront a context of crisis, urgency – the urgency of new "new democracies" in the making, the urgency of the Arab Awakening (we have learned this is a better phrase than the patronizing "Arab Spring").

This awakening is quite different than what we might call the European Awakening, because the European Awakening and the East European Awakening came out of the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the beneficiaries were countries that were technically part of Middle Europe for four centuries. Whereas, here we are seeing now is an awakening of a part of the world in which democracy and citizenship and civic education have been rare aspirations. What we face is a world of new aspirations, new hopes, new struggles that take a form quite different than those associated with Eastern Europe.

Let me to start by congratulating the organisers, because it was a brave and courageous act for them to reach out in this fashion. We opened the conference up to people deeply engaged in the struggle for democracy, a struggle for citizenship, but under conditions quite different than those of Europe. In reaching out to the Arab Awakening, the organizers in a certain sense can be said to have knowingly blown up the conference. That is to say they took us out of our comfort zone, without knowing where we might end up. The comfort zone for this group has been Europe and the old conditions of old democracies and the struggles of new European democracies; questions like "how do you sustain democracy where it has existed for centuries?" and "how do you keep citizens engaged in older democracies in the face of corruption and the taint of money?" Such questions are tough, but familiar and thus comfortable. Even the urgent issues such as the costs of capitalism, the impact of monopoly corporations, the role of big money, the deprivations of austerity – these too are questions in our comfort zone. But in reaching across the Mediterranean we welcomed in a new set of urgent issues quite different than the ones we're used to. I call that courageous. For the old issues of democracy, education, civil society and citizen education change their stripes when we look out across the Mediterranean and put them in the context of that distinctive history and political reality.

The temptation was perhaps to say: "Well let's invite some Egyptians and Tunisians and give them a lesson in civic education." But we have learned that our guests have as much to teach us. Their presence has raised this core question: What happens when two different parts of the world, closely linked historically (as Claus Leggewie said) by the Mediterranean, are thrown together again by new revolutions in the name of democracy? What can they teach us? What can we teach them? The Mediterranean connection is ancient (see Braudel) and important to both Europe and Africa. But the connection has frayed in recent centuries, eroded by colonialism and neo-colonial capitalism. What has remained has not been a very productive relationship. In the new era where neo-colonialism seems dominant, some ever allude to the ways in which the Enlightenment has become a tool of domination. Does that give our conference with its focus on Enlightenment values of civic liberty, citizenship and democracy, a shadowed neo-colonial aspect? We hope not, we trust not, but the very question can makes us anxious.

There are, for example only a few of us who are native English speakers, yet English – not German or Spanish or Arabic – is (for practical reasons, to be sure) the official language of the meeting. Yet the most interesting question I heard was posed in Arabic a couple of days ago here and translated for us. We might want to think in the future about facilitating the speaking of other languages is English. English is everybody's Second Language – ironically the new 'lingua franca' of the modern world. I note there are few of our Spanish colleagues here, though we are meeting in Cordoba. It surely would have helped to have Spanish as an official language. (I recognize there are costs in translators, but it may be worth paying those costs).

Let me return to our theme: democratization in the old and new worlds, Europe and the Mediterranean and put the contrast in a temporal frame. An earlier speaker noted that looking at democracy in Egypt and democracy in Western Europe now was to undergo a kind of a time shift. A change in where we are in the food chain. Democracy is kind of late in the food chain and up at the top in the West; but in the Southern Mediterranean and North Africa it is just getting underway. What we really have is not so much fundamental distinctions but different moments in the stages of democracy. We need to place this moments in historical time. One of the poignant aspects of Western Europe is that we inhabit old democracies, some would say tired democracies, some might even say conflicted democracies. Democracies in which the fundamental problem is how to retain the attention of citizens, the trust of citizens, the engagement of citizens at a moment in history when they are cynical, angry, alienated, privatised – simply not paying very much attention. And when they do pay attention, feeling very angry.

Contrast this with a part of the world in which democracy is young; and an atmosphere of hope flourishes, despite the costs of the struggle; where people are looking forward not to sustaining or regaining democracy but getting and securing freedom, making it happen. There is no more exciting time in the life of any culture than when its aspirations to freedom – often quite ancient – are first realized in practice. Think of the French Revolution in Western Europe – a revolution that failed in many ways but in that moment, aroused all Europe. So many writers and intellectuals talking about what it meant to be young and alive at that crucial moment, for those who ancestors had watched five hundred years of history unfold, an unchanging ancient regime dominating the political landscape.

The Arab Awakening is very much a moment like this. High expectations, high costs, and a sense of being part of a special moment in history, that, I think, for a lot of people in that part of the world despite the high cost, despite the struggle, the vicissitudes, the uncertainty, to be alive. Even for those of us who have watched from afar, what a revelation to hear the news of President Morsi's diktat, to hear the protests of Egyptians among us. We stopped our program mid-course, listened to the decree, and heard the impassioned response. What an extraordinary moment; yet one that will present challenging questions for research, for democratic practice, for civic education. Proving again that revolution is only a starting place for a democratic journey, and nothing can be taken for granted. The current moment in Cairo, with the revolution in danger, must be explored in terms of democratic development and the stages through which it passes, not necessarily identical from one culture to another. Whether this crisis will have special inflections, different intonations, in Egypt today than it did in France say a hundred years ago we needed to determine.

Is it fair to say that what we are really looking at is a pre-democratic Egypt just entering the phase of democracy, and a post-democratic Europe in which we are struggling with the problems of having been democratic for a long time? (If not necessarily that successfully!) Is it a question of ancient freedom, where liberty is old and comfortable and for some people perhaps less important compared to new young freedom, yet to be tasted? Or is this to patronize Egypt and be too complacent about Western Europe? In the United States, nearly half the population doesn't vote even in presidential elections while people are dying in North Africa for that same right to vote. Think of that difference. A vote where we have to convince people to go out and take the freedom that sits right before them and those who can pay for the lives with the struggle to get that freedom. I have sometime thought the best form of civic education in the West would simply be to tell young people they no longer have the right to vote, no longer have the right to speak; suggest though it may be a right, it must be fought for.

The difference is really crucial and has a real impact. Think of the difference between the term used in Spain, "indignados" (the indignant ones angry over rights abuses), and terms such as rebels or insurgents, people whose job, before they can even think about democracy or citizenship, is to overthrow a powerful tyranny. What a fundamental difference that is and how it changes what we understand by citizenship: "indignados" in a post-democratic setting and the insurgents, the revolutionaries, in a pre-democratic setting. It is particularly complicated because as our opening speaker said, to overthrow a tyranny is not the same thing as to establish a democracy. That is perhaps the biggest lesson to be learned by our friends in Libya and Egypt and Tunisia and Bahrain and Yemen – getting rid of a dictator doesn't create democracy. Rather, it often leads to chaos, instability and uncertainty. It does not automatically produce democracy. In fact, historically the overthrow of tyranny has more often yielded not democracy but renewed tyranny. The French Revolution issued in Napoleon and the restoration of the monarchy. The Russian Revolution issued in Bolshevism; Kerensky, the moderates, the reformers, were liquidated and the extremists – the Bolsheviks – prevailed. The Iranian Revolution, aimed at overthrowing the Shah (something many citizens sought) resulted in the rule of the Mullahs.

So revolution, inspiring as it is by itself, is no more than a preliminary condition for an ongoing struggle for democracy which revolution itself cannot establish. Revolutions do not establish democracy, they end tyranny. What happens afterwards depends on what people do after the revolution. Our friends in Egypt have initiated the struggle, done the hard work of overthrowing a military dictatorship. Now comes the even harder part: forging a gradual path to democracy. The Libyans learned that with a little help from the West they could put an end to a 42-year-old Libyan dictatorship. Yet for the last two years they have been struggling with how to convert that victory into a meaningful success for democracy. To date, because the rule of militias, the absence of a rule of law, religious rivalries, the burning of Sufi mosques, the inability of an inspiring central government to actually enforce governance because it has no tools to do so, have together made Libya a great deal less democratic than those who overthrew Gaddafi hoped. Shooting a tyrant in the head is one thing: establishing a civil society, an integral nation and the rule of law is another.

The question is what steps follow revolution? What does it mean to establish democracy? Indeed, an even more fundamental question, "What is democracy?" What is the end state we are seeking? What does it mean to be democratic? This points directly to one of the key debates we have had this week. Is democracy just one set of principles, one singular form of government everywhere and in every epoch the same? One set of universal principles that we can all simply adopt and apply throughout the world? Or does democracy refer to a single solution to which there are many paths? Many varieties? Different approaches for different times and places? Is democracy culturally particular to this or that time and place or is there a kind of a universal recipe?

Can we take the French Declaration of the Rights of Men and Citizens; the UN Declaration of Human Rights, the American Declaration of Independence; and apply them across the board? Adopt them on paper, and that makes you a democracy? Some of our colleagues this week embraced the universal conception of democracy as one singular solution, everywhere the same. Others argued that it must be regarded as very different from place to place depending on where it is, the stage of development of the emerging nation. This is clearly one of the fundamental questions we must keep asking.

I am a dialectician which means when you say, "Is it A or B?" I tend to say, "Actually it is both" – and they are related! Now that may seem evasive and in a way it is, because it allows you to, be on both sides at once. Our friends this morning were suggesting we hear the other side, the opposite view, a dialectical approach too. What we need to do is be not just embrace our own side or listen tolerantly to the other side, but somehow deals with the tension that comes when we actually are on both sides of the question.

On the question of democracy as a universal and democracy as a particular facet of a stage of development in particular cultures, I think we have a right to be on both sides of the issue. For democracy in its essential features is something universal. The same everywhere – just as human beings, despite race, religion and language, are part of a single species with a single set of desires and aspirations. Democracy in its essential form, which I think you can find hidden in every distinctive expression of it, is always about power and how we relate to power. One way, the traditional way, is for some to exercise it over others. One man, a tyrant, a monarch a group of men (an oligarchy) rule. Or we share power, which is the democratic solution. That makes equality an essential part of the equation.

Democracy is about sharing power, but there are many different ways to share it, and thus many paths to democracy. We can legitimise power through a social contract. We can make it real through participation and engagement. We can make it accountable and transparent, not exercising it but keeping an eye on those that do – various forms of representative government. Under representative government, we do not govern ourselves but choose the people who govern us. Each of these reflects a way of sharing power and assures that no man has the right, privilege or power to exercise jurisdiction over others without their permission. Sharing power is then the singular essential feature of democracy. But having said that we can also say that the way to get there, the processes and institutions

and constitutions by which that goal can be achieved, are various and multiple. There are many different roads to achieving and manifesting democratic principles. Let me remind my friends who believe democracy is a single, universal idea, everywhere the same, that the paths to achieving it are different in Europe, in the East, in the Mediterranean. We are talking about a plural institution with many manifestations.

Just a couple of examples: England has followed a system of Common Law, unwritten law. The continent has followed Roman law, written law. Yet both reflect democratic legal systems. Similarly, in England and America courtroom justice is a question of an adversarial process between the prosecution and the defence. It is a battle for truth between two sides, and justice is the outcome. The French, being Cartesians, offer an objective Cartesian approach; three judges arrive at the "truth" through common inquiry, doing research and thinking things through together. Justice is not the result of a battle, it is a result of a form of research and inquiry, which produces justice, both do but there are different ways of doing it. One based on adversarial procedure, the other on scientific investigation of the "truth". There are Western systems that emphasise the collectivist character of rights – no, not the Soviet Union, but Switzerland. In Switzerland, rights revolve around "Gemeindfreiheit" – the freedom of the commune. The communal spirit (Kantönlicheist) trumps the individual. In America we talk about individual rights, my rights. Both approaches to rights are valid, both are democratic but they're evidently quite different from one another.

Other differences within Western democratic regimes include parliamentary government versus presidential government, unitary government versus federal government. Some governments have strong central power and some (as in the U.S.), weak government through the separation of powers. With this much differentiation even within the Western system, there is no reason for peoples elsewhere in the world not to seek their own path, their own institutions, their own way of doing democracy.

The lack of perspective affects countries seeking democracy such as Afghanistan. There, the U.S. has tried to impose its own form of democracy with little awareness of local traditions. In truth, the most democratic institution in Afghanistan is the Loya Jirga, the National Council of Tribes, which brings the rival tribes we see as contestants for power together and allows them from time-to-time to find consensus through communal discourse. The Loya Jirga is an atypical but democratic institution, if not one that can reproduce around the world.

Democracy is an experimental system and every culture is a laboratory. Consequently, what Egypt is doing right now, what Libya is doing, what Yemen is doing, is experimenting with democracy. Trying to make certain fundamental principles of self-government and popular sovereignty work, but in the context of their own history, their own times, their own cultural situation, their own national make-up. A country that is tribal like Libya is going to have a very different and probably much less centralised form of democracy than say Egypt where there is a strong sense of nationality.

As an experimental process, democracy requires a great deal of patience – more than impatient insurgents seeking freedom now are likely to want to tolerate both in Egypt and Tunisia, Morocco and Libya. After all, we face urgent problems that we want to fix right away. People who have waited generations for liberty don't want to be told to be patient. Yet patience is the democratic virtue. The greatest and most forgotten virtue of democracy is patience. How hard it is, however, to tell a people who have been oppressed for a long time, "Be patient", it is going to take a while more. Overthrowing the tyrant, jailing or shooting the dictator, will not make you free. It will take much more work, much more time.

Think of the history of the West: the United Kingdom began its long journey over 800 years ago with Magna Carta, and still faces democratic issues today. Switzerland's journey began 700 years ago, with William Tell and the original three inner cantons – the Urkantonen. But they didn't give women the vote till 1971, 650 years into their history. In the United States, the republican journey began 250 years ago; but our first 80 years unfolded

under slavery, and it took a bloody civil war to overcome it. Yet Brits and Americans today look at Egypt or Yemen or Iraq and remark: "Well, if you're a pessimist, you will probably think it will take at least two years to achieve democracy! If you are an optimist, you will think it shouldn't be more than six months."

This naïveté can create expectations among emerging democracies that the process they are involved in is easy and quick. And if it takes too long, there is something wrong with you. A slow and difficult process can be mistaken for failure. Someone said at a panel this week that it's OK to make mistakes. I would go further, I would say democracy is the right of people to make their own mistakes, as against dictatorship, which is about other people making mistakes and imposing their mistakes on you without your permission.

New democrats need to accept making mistakes, take responsibility for them and acknowledge them. And cure them. And work with patience. The leaders in Tahrir Square need to say to their comrades, "We know you have engaged in a mighty struggle, but it may be that only your children or your grandchildren will have the full reward of your struggle." How hard it is to speak this way to those who have waited a lifetime and risked their lives for freedom? Yet they must understand that only patience allows a rising people to develop civic institutions in the deliberate way that is more than just writing a constitution or establishing a multi-party system. One of our friends reports there are 77 new Egyptian political parties today. Well, it is easy to establish a party, just declare, "I am a party. We and my friends, we are a party."

But creating citizens takes much longer. All of us who work in citizen education know that freedom is something we are born with a right to but not a competence for. Citizenship is something to be acquired, learned. Alexis de Tocqueville talks about what he calls "the apprenticeship of liberty." Becoming free in a responsible manner is an apprenticeship. It is about school, but also about civic education, about civic experience. There's no question that the revolutionary experience, the experience at Tahrir Square of Tripoli or Benghazi, is an educational experience, training in citizenship. Feeling responsibility. Using power discretely but effectively. Yet it is also the case that you can't learn all the lessons of citizenship during a revolution because you might also learn lessons about impatience, about violence and retribution. These are hardly the lessons of citizenship that we want to teach.

When we turn back to OUR subject, civic education, and think about it in the context of the issues I have been looking at here, it is evident that we need to think about it contextually. As with democracy, we need to recognize different civic strategies may be needed in different times and places, different stage of development. What works in Berlin may not work in Tunis; what works in Malaga may fail in Cairo. The wisdom we have heard over the last days is drawn from many places, and reflects my view that civic education, like democracy, has to be adapted to the particular circumstances of particular emerging societies. How we teach citizen education here in Western and Eastern Europe may require some modification in the newer democracies still struggling for their freedom, still trying to establish the civic foundation for democracy. Citizenship and citizen education are long-term projects; Revolution is an instant project. Anybody with a gun and an ideal can help overthrow tyranny in the time it takes to pull the trigger on a gun a turn a revolutionary phrase. Think of what happened with Gaddafi.

But to create citizens takes much longer. Angry idealists, rebels, insurgents, people who have been abused but know nothing of citizenship, can end tyranny; but only citizens can institute and sustain democracy. Think of what happened AFTER Gaddafi (tribal breakdown, militia anarchy, a failure of civic unity). Without citizen education, such failures are inevitable. When it comes to citizen education we are involved in a long-term not a short-term project and we are likely to run up against the "democratic" impulse to solve things quick. "Let's have elections now, let's write a constitution today, let's institute multi-party government right away." In Brecht's play *Mother Courage*, an enraged young soldier is preparing to kill a cruel sergeant when his comrade tells him: "Don't shoot! If you murder the

Sergeant there will just be another Sergeant. Yours is a 'short anger,' and of no use. Short anger changes nothing. You need a long anger, one capable of changing the system."

Democratic revolution is sometimes like that: short anger; it removes the tyrant but leaves tyranny in place. Civic education demands a long anger, a willingness to work and wait until fundamental changes are underway. If you are a rebel, be more than just a rebel. Be an indignado, but don't be defined just by indignation. Cultivate a long anger. Draw yourself a long horizon. Far enough down the road to allow for fundamental changes.

A second crucial point about civic education and the need to adapt it to the new circumstances of the Arab Awakening is to insist democracy is not simply about responsibility and rights, being engaged and being committed, being a civic volunteer. These are facets of democracy's softer face. But it also has a hard face: it is about power. Young people's interest in citizenship grows by leaps and bounds when they are persuaded that engagement in politics is about sharing power, having power, using power. Many young people study economics because they think that is where the power is (and that IS where it often is today!). Or they study law because they think power is in the legal system, the police and judicial systems. But power remains at the centre. Voting is about controlling our deputies: that's power. Several weeks ago in the American elections despite the expenditure of billions of dollars by the Republican Party and the Tea Party – the Party of Reaction – the right wing found themselves defeated by the power of the vote. They not only lost the presidency, they lost eight of the nine Senate contests they contested because money failed to buy voters. We talk sometimes cynically about the influence of money on politics – a corrupting influence to be sure – but the fact is you can't buy democracy outright. You have to buy voters and if voters refuse to be bought money, fail to corrupt. In the U.S., we saw not just the defeat of a reactionary party. We saw the defeat of big money; several billion dollars wasted trying to undermine democracy and remove the President Obama from office. Politics is still about power and in a democracy, voting is the arbiter of the political. If young people understand this, they are more likely to engage in the work of citizenship.

The third point we have focused on this week is the role of interdependence and cooperation in liberation politics. In the Mediterranean, it became apparent that people couldn't win freedom in one country at a time. A hundred years ago, Leon Trotsky insisted there could be 'no socialist revolution in one country at a time.' It is everywhere or nowhere. It is true for democracy – it is not possible one country at a time. Democracy works effectively only when it can cross borders. Citizens within borders can't be free unless citizens across borders are free. The NGO Citizens Without Borders (citoyens sans frontieres) is important because it symbolizes the need for working globally on civic issues. To me the biggest omission in the Arab Awakening today is the lack of direct interaction, cooperation and interdependence between the struggles in Libya, in Egypt, in Yemen, in Bahrain and Syria. Those struggles have to be united and they must in turn be linked to the struggles of the "indignados" in Greece and here in Spain. That is what Marx had in mind with his famous cry: 'Workers of the World Unite'.

He understood that workers would never secure their rights one country at a time. Today, in an uneven world, Unions cannot protect jobs in one country when they can flee to another. If children are exploited in one market, how can others that do not exploit them compete? Until workers are protected everywhere they will be protected nowhere: the same is true of citizens. Interdependence is a fundamental reality of our modern world. Which precipitates a dilemma: we inhabit eighteenth century political institutions where independence is the mantra, yet we're up against twenty-first century challenges that are consistently interdependent – without 21st century global democratic institutions to respond. This suggests that teaching interdependence has to be a part of civic education – whether in Western and Eastern Europe or North Africa and the Middle East or elsewhere in the world.

The fourth challenge we face today in teaching citizenship in a democracy is how to encompass and address religion. This is one of those uncomfortable subjects we'd rather address. And when we do we have a tendency to want to talk only about the beautiful

ecumenical aspirations of the children of Abraham, of this multi-religious history here in Cordoba where Christianity and Judaism and Islam coexisted peacefully – where they live together in a single house, as they did historically, and where they share an Old Testament together which tells the story of the prophets that belong to all three faiths. Yet we know well that despite that dream, despite the aspirations of Cordoba (which we encountered in a film this week), did not really survive a time of comity and ecumenical peace that lasted only a century after which the Crusades destroyed it.

While every religion has its ecumenical aspect, it also has its zealots. I am frustrated when I hear only about fundamentalist Islam and Salafism, not because those aren't real threats to tolerance and stability, but because fundamentalists can be found in every religion – Judaism, Hinduism and Christianity alike. In the United States, we do suffer from fundamentalism in the form of certain varieties of Evangelical faith. It too aspires to a Christian kind of Puritan Sharia – religious laws that trump civic laws. In Massachusetts you can't buy alcohol on Sunday. That's Sharia. In Salt Lake City, the Mormon Church imposed a code of behaviour at odds with the secular. That too is Sharia, though we don't call it that. The attack on gay rights comes out of a religious instinct that insists there is only one kind of family, only one kind of love that is legitimate. Christian Sharia?

My intention here is not to vilify religion. Religion is a core element in human civilization. Somebody said early in the week in a workshop that they thought religion was just fine – as long as it was just some one's opinion. But of course religion isn't just about personal opinions, about preferences. The statement "I believe in Jesus Christ as the son of God" is not like the statement "I believe green is my favourite colour." "I love Spanish ham" is a different kind of declaration that "I love Allah". Religion is not about subjective taste but about communal conviction. Religion always brings with it a commitment to universal values and imperatives. The Ten Commandments do not allow me to say "I prefer not to kill" or "I will not covet my neighbour's wife this afternoon." They take the form of imperatives: "Thou shall not kill!" Such imperatives have societal consequences that can put them in conflict the law. If you live in a society with capital punishment, you live in a society's that defies the commandment "Thou shall not kill" and if you are serious about religion, that is a serious problem. Because religious commandments are communal and rival the pronouncements of positive and secular law. There is a fundamental tension between the religious and the secular and it cannot be glossed by pretending religion is just personal. In earlier times this led to wars of religion and the state, and to doctrines like that of the "Two Swords" where church and state were deemed to have their own discrete realms. Yet for the individual, which to obey? "Render unto God, the things that are God's, and to Man those that belong to men." But which belong to whom!? Conflict is inevitable. There is always going to be a productive and necessary tension between religion with its laws and the state with its laws, and there will always be tension about how to accommodate the two.

There's no simple solution. In the United States, we have ordained a constitutional separation of church and state. Yet conflict persists: can the Ten Commandments be posted in a courtroom? Can a Christmas crèche be built in a public park? Ironically, the United States is one of the most religious countries in the world, so what the constitution separates in theory doesn't remain separated in practice. For the same reasons, one can't pretend the mosque has no part in civil society, that it is a "private" space. It intrudes on civic and public space, and properly so. So of course, in Islamic cultures, there will be a tension between the laws of the state and the laws of Islam, the laws of Sharia; that is the reality, sometimes productive, sometimes not, that we must live with. Religion and the secular state are everywhere rivals for our conscience. The state has to assure that religion doesn't impose itself on non-believers. But prudent states also acknowledge that religion provides social glue and moral guidelines that can help hold together society and maintain ethical standards.

Alexis de Tocqueville, a 19th Century advocate of bottom-up democracy, argued convincingly that the more free societies are, the more they need religion to hold them together. Traditional societies have ample social cohesion as a result of nationality, ethnicity,

language and history. They do not need religion for social bonding (though they usually have it). Multicultural societies liberated from their past do require some basis for social cohesion, and religion (or "civil religion") is often the answer.

So it is not just in Egypt and Morocco and other places in the Islamic world that must confront the influence of religion, which brings with it both virtues and vices. One has to determine out how to incorporate it wisely and prudently into a coherent society that is free and democratic but also responds to the need for common values that help hold it together. Without common values it is very hard for democracy to function. If there is no fundamental agreement on anything then every quarrel over say hospital expenditures or marriage becomes a fundamental quarrel that is very difficult to resolve.

We must then come to terms with religion, something hard for civic educators in secular societies to do. The aim is not to teach religion but to teach what it means for democracy to accommodate religion, whether we're looking at Catholic Ireland or the Progressive Catholicism of Latin America or American Protestantism and or Hinduism in India or Islam around the Mediterranean. Tolerance and pluralism are obviously end goals, but to achieve them in a mono-cultural religious setting is not so simple. Negotiating religious principles around say abortion or gay marriage is not the same as negotiating a business contract. I embrace the ecumenical values of Cordoba, yet I also know that they are very, very difficult to put into practice and sustain. They weren't sustained historically here in Cordoba. They are not always sustained in more secular countries like the United States. They have never been fully sustained anywhere.

I want to say two final words, the first about a human faculty central to culture and art, to religion and also to democracy. When we teach citizenship we need to teach imagination. Imagination is the magic human faculty rooted listening to and responding to others, looking across difference to find commonality. To teach citizenship is to teach listening and teaching listening means teaching imagination. A democratic citizen sees in others divided by race, religion, history and interests, a being like her – with common interests and common purposes. To do that requires imagination. The arts and arts education are similarly rooted in imagination. For me, the arts belong in a civic curriculum. Thinking about what that means can be a powerful too in imagining a new curriculum. Our friend from Cairo who works with puppets already demonstrated as much!

My second 'final word' is about civic education and subversion. Yes, I said subversion. For civic education, and education itself, is always about and must be about subversion. Civic education is about teaching how to think critically, to pose hard questions, to understand why understanding "heresies" can help create tolerant citizens. I heard a good many things this week – I'm sure you did too – that I really disagree with, that I would label "wrong" or "false" or "misguided." Heresies in my own hierarchy of beliefs. It is my obligation, especially when I feel that way, to listen harder, not to reject 'alien views' out of hand. Somebody said earlier in the week that Occupy Wall Street failed, failed everywhere. I couldn't disagree more. The more reason to listen, to pay attention to the argument. Someone else declared, 'protest can be a form of anarchism'. Really? That can't be right, can it? Or can it? 'Participation may be a form of manipulation', somebody else said. That is heresy to a strong democrat like me, so I better listen comprehend what is being said. And then there is that trope we hear often from critics of the West, that the Enlightenment was actually a form of oppression and colonialism. That goes against our instincts, a good reason to take it seriously. Somebody even said in a small session that Egyptian President Morsi's executive decree roundly condemned by most of us was not all bad. It was an Egyptian colleague who said it. We might want to dismiss him as a Salafist, but he isn't, and he had a worthy argument – if not one we might finally agree with. Sometimes the heresies, the seemingly 'ridiculous' statements, teach us more than they complacent truths that are clichés.



★ NETWORKING EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Where then have our days of lively discussion brought us? To question democracy as a universal? To problematize civic education? Maybe. Yet listen to my favourite Democratic Statesman in America, Thomas Jefferson. Because all the tough questions we have raised suggest that civic education is hard, democracy is harder, freedom the hardest of all. But when democracy was not working, as it should, Jefferson said, "If you think people lack the discretion (the education) to exercise power prudently, the remedy is not to take away their power but to inform their discretion." Civic education is about informing the citizenry's discretion. At the end of our post-democratic era a lot of cynics think democracy is done, we have to find something an alternative. But Jefferson would have told us "inform the discretion of citizens". After all, again Jefferson's words, "the remedy for the defects of democracy is more democracy".

