Networking European Citizenship Education (NECE)

Report 4

Expert Workshop: *Models of European Citizenship Education*

Saarbrücken, November 5th – 7th, 2005

Dr. Viola B. Georgi

for ***Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung***

November 2005

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: European Citizenship (Education)

> "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." Will Kymlicka, 1995

European citizenship was first defined as such in Article 17 of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and reaffirmed in the European Constitution in 2005. Citizenship of the Union complements national citizenship and entitles citizens to the following rights:

- the right to move and reside freely
- the right to vote and to stand as candidate in European and local elections
- the right to diplomatic and consular protection
- the right to petition the European parliament
- the right to refer matters to the Ombudsman
- the right to write to the institutions in one of the Union's European languages
- the right of access to documents of the Union

The *Treaty of Amsterdam* (1997) introduced European Citizenship as a priority objective.[1] Whereas critics interpret the treaty as an attempt to create an artificial and supranational identity – a *homo europeus* – and thereby suspect the imposing of cultural uniformity at the expense of national sentiment, the authors of the treaty argue that the basic idea was to nurture the consciousness of a common European legacy, i.e. the common traditions of democracy, pluralism and equality. European Citizenship, they argue, should not be conceptualised as a substitute to national citizenship but rather as **a way to transcend national confinements** by belonging to a larger entity, called the European Union.

Although at different paces, European societies have undergone and are undergoing profound changes in the fabric of their population and in the way their institutions are transformed. Considering such changes, concepts of national citizenship have to become more open and flexible. In the light of these changes **models of (European) citizenship have to be rethought**. It seems that we have to develop a broader concept of citizenship that con-

[1] Working towards the objective of European Citizenship we can find some interesting research such as *Education and Active Citizenship in the European Union* by Audrey Osler (1997). She examined action programmes, such as *Socrates*, *Youth for Europe III*, *Leonardo da Vinci*, with regard to their contribution to developing citizenship with a European dimension.

centrates on the idea of 'community' which embraces the local, national, regional, and international contexts that individuals move in simultaneously.

European citizenship, in this sense, should not only be seen as legal status, a set of rights and duties, European citizens hold, but it should also be understood as an important dimension of forming **transnational community** as well as identity. Here the question of a shared "European identity" comes into play. How do we identify the European dimension of citizenship? How can membership and belonging to the European community be expressed in terms that are equivalent to traditional ideas of national citizenship? What is necessary to give such a concept the power of establishing social cohesion similar to national categories?

The European Union today is a dense and complex network of institutional, social and political relationships. European citizens are at the heart of these networks and their active involvement is essential in order to ensure a democratic and balanced development of the European Union. The challenge of European Citizenship is dual as it involves a more active participation of individuals in the decision making process and a tightening of social bonds and solidarities between them.

However, currently the **European Union is facing a paradox**: despite the successes and the achievements of the European Union since its creation, European Citizens seem to have developed a rather *distanced relationship* towards the European institutions. They also seem to have difficulties *to identify* with the process of European enlargement and integration as the recent rejection of the European constitution by democratic verdicts in France and the Netherlands illustrates. Looking further back in the history of the EU, the rather low level of participation in the elections for the European Parliament underlines the **difficult relationship between the citizens and the EU.** The challenge is to bring the European Union and its institutions closer to the citizens of the member states through promoting Europe's achievements and improving citizens' participation in creating a EU that is based on mutual understanding, shared values (such as democracy and human rights), freedom, fairness, solidarity, and tolerance.

European institutions have to become more transparent for their citizens.[2] Citizenship education in this context is not only crucial for dealing

[2] The *European Commission* just recently adopted the proposal of a new programme called "Citizens for Europe" (2007-2013). The programme shall help to bridge the gap between citizens and the European Union. It shall provide the Union with instruments to promote active European citizenship, put citizens in the centre and offers them the opportunity to fully assume their responsibility as European citizens. It shall respond to the need to improve citizens' participation in the construction of Europe by encouraging co-operation between citizens and their organisations from different countries in order to meet, act together, and develop their own ideas in a European environment which goes beyond a national vision, respecting diversity (European Commission, 2005).

with the described lack of acceptance, participation and identification, but also has an important role to play in the preparation and formation of European citizens.

2. Conference Report

Education has to make the idea of Europe more tangible for its citizens. A recent comparative study including six European countries documents that European citizenship is a rather neglected dimension in mostly nationally confined curricula of civic and democracy education (Wallace, 2004). In short, a new kind of citizenship requires a new kind of citizenship education. Key questions of the workshop **Models of European Citizenship** were: What defines a "good European citizens"? What subjects and values distinguish a European model of citizenship from others? What meaning and influence do models have on citizenship education in Europe? The workshop followed three goals:

(1) examining and comparing national and European models of citizenship
(2) comparing national models of citizenship on the basis of best practice
(3) developing criteria for a model of European citizenship (education)

The workshop was organized and conducted in a cooperation of the *German Federal Agency of Civic Education,* the *State Agency for Civic Education Saarland* and the *Representation of the European Commission* in Bonn. The workshop was opened with short welcome speeches by Jo Leinen[3] (*Member of European Parliament*) and Barbara Gessler (*Representation of the European Commission*[4]). Discussants from different subject areas and professional backgrounds (research, education, project coordinators etc.) from eight European countries (Latvia, Estonia, Germany, UK, Italy, France, Sweden, Austria) participated in the discussion.

The fist panel **"Comparing National Models of Citizenship Education"** consisted of two presentations that looked at the British and the Estonian case. **Prof. Dr. Audrey Osler** (Director of the *Centre for Citizenship and Human Rights Education*[5] and research professor at the *University of Leeds*, UK) titled her paper **"Education for Democratic Citizenship in England: theoretical models and student experiences"**

[3] See: www.**joleinen**.de/www/html/content/ english/documents/pdf/CVLeinenEN.pdf
[4] See: europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/press_ communication/repscontact_en.htm
[5] See: www.education.leeds.ac.uk

Osler started her presentation with an overview on the key documents of citizenship education in England. She mentioned the so called *Crick Report* from 1998,[6] the document "Play your Part: Post-16 citizenship guidance" (2004) as well as two other decisive documents, called "Citizenship and Language Skills for New Citizens" and "Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society: the Government's Strategy to Increase Race Equality and Community Cohesion" published in 2004 and 2005.

In the document "**Play your Part: Post-16 citizenship guidance**"[7] Citizenship education, Osler explained, is considered a life-long learning process based on activity and research that aims at encouraging participation. In addition it is considered to be a chance to learn about Europe. Osler stressed that the document addresses the UK's international relations with Europe and the EU, which according to her illustrates that Europe does not get a "whole hearted endorsement" in the British school curriculum until today. Osler then elaborated on the report "**Citizenship and Language Skills for New Citizens**" which, Osler argued, reacted to the fact that the UK has introduced a test for new citizens, in which these have to answer questions on citizenship (understanding society and civic institutions) and prove their command of English. Apart from practical studies of British institutions, multicultural society, law employment, information sources and addressing everyday needs of immigrants, the idea, according to Osler, also was to create an official ceremony that shall increase pride in becoming a citizen. The report, Osler said, discusses equality, social cohesion, belonging, civic participation and also makes a move towards a shared European agenda. However, she stressed, that education for European citizenship is neither strong nor explicit in England.

Looking at teaching European Citizenship, Osler stressed, that in the 1990s significant progress had been made, through academic research[8] that was also absorbed by European institutions such as *the Council of Europe,*

---

[6] The so called **Crick-Report** is the final report on education for citizenship and teaching democracy in schools 1998 composed by the *Advisory Group of Citizenship Education.* Even though it operates with rather traditional definitions of citizenship and nation-state and hence does not enfold European citizenship, the Report according to Osler, acknowledges the 'European context' in terms of knowledge, skills and values. It mentions the origins and the history of the EU, the European political institutions as well as the Monetary Union. It does refer to human rights as key concept. And: it gives schools freedom to design specific curriculum according to needs. The full report is available under http://www.qca.org.uk/6123.html.

[7] For details see: http://www.qca.org.uk/post16index.html

[8] For instance: Osler *et al*.: *Teaching for Citizenship in Europe* (1996) and Holden and Clough (1998) *Children as Citizens*; Sayer (1995); Davies and Sobisch (1997) *Developing European Citizens*. In that context it seems important to mention a study for the European Commission that proposes a set of guidelines for evaluating transnational projects for their contribution to citizenship education by Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey, 1999.

the *European Commission*, the *Association for Teacher Education in Europe* and the *European Educational Research Association*.

If we want to understand European Citizenship, Osler argued, it is necessary to take a look at the current work being done in this field. Osler considered the following **documents** as crucial to the process of **defining the dimensions of European citizenship.**

- *Council of Europe* (2002): Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on **Education for Democratic Citizenship**[9]
- *Council of Europe* (2003): Committee of Ministers of Education Declaration by the European Ministers of Education on **Intercultural Education in the New European Context.**.[10]
- *European Union* (2004): Education and Citizenship: Report on the Broader Role of Education and its Cultural Aspects.[11]

Osler then turned to her own research on citizenship, preparing the ground with some general assumptions. She talked about the phenomenon of "shifting identities" and the fact that globalisation and migration bring about multiple loyalties of individuals and groups. This reality, Osler argued, calls into question the idea of citizenship as having a unique focus of loyalty to a particular nation state. Education for *national* citizenship, according to Osler, therefore often fails to engage with the actual experiences of learners, who, in a globalised world are likely to have shifting and multiple cultural identities and a sense of belonging that is not expressed first and foremost in terms of the nation. In that context Osler criticised, what she called a deficit model of citizenship education, that is characterized by compensatory programmes that consider the learners as apathetic, inactive and ignorant. This was particularly true for programmes addressing learners from ethnic minorities, said Osler. She argued in favour of an education for citizenship that builds on previous experience and learning in communities.

She then introduced a **research** project that investigates **sites of citizenship learning**, aiming at taking influence on formal education programmes. She made a survey of 10 to 18 year olds from four schools asking about their perceptions of identity and community. The framing questions were: How does citizenship education respond to diversity? To what extend does it address the formal and informal barriers to citizenship

[9] See full document at www.bmbwk.gv.at/medienpool/12943/edcempf_200212_en.pdf
[10] See: www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/Standing_Conferences/e.21stsessionathens2003.asp
[11] See: europa.eu.int/abc/doc/off/rg/en/2004/pt0414.htm

faced by children and young adults? In order to answer these questions Osler conducted interviews with young people that aimed at exploring the following issues: "Young people's identity and place," "Young people's identity and mobility," "Self-definition of young people in the light of hybridity, culture and religion" and "Young people in their community."

On the basis of her empirical study, Osler concluded, that **citizenship learning of young people** takes place at many different sites and public spaces such as parks, schools, shopping centres, community centres and libraries. Citizenship learning according to Osler's study, happens in every day life such as visits to hospitals, housing and social security offices or dealing with police and immigration officers. According to Osler, young people experience **citizenship as a practice**. Her interviewees, Osler concluded, had developed a sense of belonging and responsibility that was expressed by:

- a strong identification with local neighbourhood and city
- cosmopolitan perspectives
- a recognition of our common humanity
- a sense of solidarity with others
- the ability to make connections

Osler in accordance with her research is in favour of a model of **cosmopolitan citizenship** that challenges the notion that the nation state is the only locus for democracy and that the state alone has the power to guarantee the rights of its citizens. In that context she also scrutinized the relationship between cosmopolitan democracy and identities and found that there were many overlapping communities of fate as well as transnational and diasporic communities. Therefore Osler summarized: (1) human rights are the basis for new forms of local/national/European/ international democracy and (2) cosmopolitan citizenship includes national and European citizenship.

Looking at the **dimensions of European citizenship**, Osler mentioned, that young people have local, national and international perspectives and can articulate their multiple and dynamic identities. This reality, she argued, is seldom recognized in educational programmes. Osler concluded that education for cosmopolitan citizenship builds on experience. It addresses peace, human rights, democracy and development and equips learners with the knowledge, skills and attitudes that enable them to make a difference. Moreover, according to Osler, the cosmopolitan approach is clearly orientated towards the future, preparing citizens to play an active

role in shaping the world, at all levels, from the local to the national, the European and the global."[12]

The next presentation on "**Citizenship Education in Estonia**" was given by **Prof. Dr. Sulev Valdemaa** (*UNESCO Chair in Civic and Multicultural Education Studies, University of Tallin*[13])

Valdemaa outlined some of the major challenges of civic education in the light of the present day Estonian society that has 1,4 million inhabitants (66% native Estonians, 33% Russian speakers). Civic education according to Valdemaa has to address (a) the cultural/ethnic dividedness of the population, (b) the raising gap between the wealthy and the poor people, (c) the role of Estonia as a European democracy.

The Estonian case of civic education, as Valdemaa explained, was special, because civic education in Estonia only came into being after the collapse of the Soviet regime in 1989. Valdemaa divided the development of civic education in Estonia into three stages:

(1) Educational transition (1989 – 1996)

The first stage, Valdemaa described as a stage of re-orientation and transition characterized by attempts to synchronize societal change and education. Valdemaa said that concepts of civil society are unknown. Civics is an optional subject to be studied but there is no training of civic teachers yet.

(2) Introducing of the National Curriculum (1996 – 2001)

The second stage Valdemaa characterized as the phases of establishing of democracy and civil society. He said that the national curriculum reflects the new democratic Estonian society. Civics, taught with a knowledge focus, he explained, was turned into a mandatory subject and in-service-training for teachers.

(3) Curricular modernization (2002)

The third stage Valdemaa outlined as the completion of the societal transformation process. Civil society in Estonia, Valdemaa stated, is large, developed and maybe even influential (There are about 20.000 NGOs in Estonia). The civics syllabus as well as the teacher training therefore, according to Valdemaa, were redesigned in order to put greater emphasis on a skill and value-oriented approach. The development of civics in Estonia, as Valdemaa pointed out, had been strongly supported by the *Soros Foundation*[14] and some NGOs cooperating with different US and European

[12] Audrey Osler: (Ed.): *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity.* Trentham 2005. Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (Eds.): *Citizenship and Language Learning: international perspectives*. Trentham 2005. Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey: *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education.* Open University Press 2005.

[13] See: portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2960&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=-580.html

[14] The Open Society Institute and Soros Foundation Network is a US-based private operating and grantmaking foundation that aims to promote open societies by shaping government policy and

donors. Also, he stressed, a national examination in civics for graduating was introduced.

Concluding Valdemaa mentioned that civics in Estonia was still rather textbook-centered. He said that there was no institution responsible for developing teaching and learning methods in civics. That is why private publishers determine the content following a set of national guidelines, and autonomous universities and NGOs decide about teachers' pre service and in-service training.

The **discussion of both presentations** (Osler and Valdemaa) brought up the following aspects. Raveaud Maroussia elaborated on her own research work that compares the dimensions of **citizenship in France and Britain.** She argued that the main difference was the function attributed to the public and the private sphere in both countries. Maroussia said that Osler's model representing an anglo-saxon perspective, was very inclusive. In Osler's model, she said, being a good citizens is being a good person with moral obligations towards the communities they belong to. In contrast to this understanding of citizenship, the French model made a very strict distinction between the private and the public. French schools represent the public sphere. Family, the community, religion or ethnic affiliations are seen as part of the private sphere and are therefore completely excluded from school. Participation in France, she concluded, was therefore based on the formal citizen status, not on any other form of belonging. Falk Pingel asked whether it was at all possible to develop a common model of citizenship given that there are so many ideas, approaches and methods on citizenship education in Europe. Elvire Fabry argued that there could be a European sense of citizenship based on human rights. However, she said that the key questions in that context was, whether people can develop a sense of community and **solidarity with an unknown fellow citizen** of a greater European entity. Barbara Gessler said that she felt that Europeans cannot immediately embrace a concept of cosmopolitan citizenship without having strengthened a sense of belonging to Europe previously. Giovanni Moro remarked that there is a **lack of discourse on European citizenship.** He stated that European citizenship has a concrete basis: rules, institutions, rights and duties as well as elements of belonging (expressed for instance by programmes of the European Commission). He therefore pleaded for exploring the dimensions of European citizenship previous to going cosmopolitan. European citizenship, he argued, should be the first step on the way towards cosmopolitan citizenship. Moro also emphasized the importance of citizens' organizations in creating European citizenship.

supporting education, media. See: www.soros.org

Osler responded that France and the UK have to reflect their traditional model of citizenship against the background of Europeanisation and globalization.

Cosmopolitan citizenship, she argued, is not to be seen in contrast or competition to European citizenship. However focusing on European Citizenship, she felt, nourished a sense of **European superiority** and would not take into account the fact that Europe has drawn people from all parts of the world. She added that all citizens living in the 46 member states of the Council of Europe are protected by European laws. Pingel underlined that statement of Osler, pointing at the importance of the European Conventions. Sigrid Steininger stressed that European citizenship should not be defined as an exclusive term, because **Europe is not equivalent with the EU**. Gessler said that developing European citizenship means including future enlargement. She pointed to Turkey as a potential new member that will bring about cosmopolitan notions of citizenship. Valdemaa said that in Estonia, young people are not yet educated to identify with Europe. Ingmar Svenson said that young people in Sweden were well informed about Europe, but missed opportunities to play an own role in its creation. He pointed out that young Swedes had created their own political platform through networking a lot through the internet. Susanne Talmon said that the problem is that citizenship education is promoted by national actors rather than European actors that may help to create a **European public sphere.** Aija Tuna said that European citizenship for her was about educating responsible national and European citizens as well citizens of the world. She added that in Latvia **European diversity** needs to be experienced in order to be appreciated. Latvian citizens, according to Tuna, have to realize, that European citizenship is not about loosing an identity but gaining one in addition to the national identity.

The next presentation given by Dr. Falk Pingel (Director of the *Georg Eckhard Institute for International Schoolbook Research*[15] in Braunschweig, Germany) dealt with **the representation of Europe in schoolbooks**. Pingel asked if there was anything particular about civic education in Europe? He also asked if European values are to be considered universal or just European? And finally he asked why it is so difficult to agree on shared values in Europe?

In most European countries, he argued, civics or citizenship education are not a discipline or a subject. Instead, he said, citizenship education is considered a cross curricular issue which can be integrated into other subjects such as history and geography. The problem with this is, as Pingel

[15] For more information on the institute see: www.gei.de

stressed, that citizenship is taught as history or geography but not as citizenship. He therefore strongly supported the introduction of citizenship as a proper subject in school, which also entails that teachers have to be trained in order to teach the new subject. However, he added that even when citizenship education was implemented into the national curriculum it would often just cover a national perspective, neglecting the European dimension. European citizenship, Pingel emphasized is a new approach that has not yet been practiced widely in European educational institutions.

From a structural perspective, he argued, there is no mandate for European institutions (e.g. the Council of Europe, EU) to take influence on the development of the general curricula and textbooks used in the member states. Pingel said that this made common approaches and standardization difficult.

He also pointed out that civics looks back at a tradition of 30 to 40 years of educational practice in this field in some countries (Western Europe), whereas it was a new concept in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. The latter regions according to Pingel were very skeptical about civic education because they associated their experience of political indoctrination (in the previous totalitarian systems) with civics.

Nevertheless, he stressed, that Eastern and South Eastern Europe urgently need to adapt to Western European standards because these, according to Pingel, are a precondition for becoming a member of the EU, where civics is mandatory. Pingel elaborated on the case of Bosnia-Herzegowina where CIVITAS[16] contributed decisively to establishing and implementing civics. Pingel then gave a couple of examples from European schoolbooks that illustrated the images and visions of Europe in different European countries. Showing different maps of Europe, he explained that talking about Europe always means to talk about borders. The histories of borders in Europe, he stressed, are rich, brutal and painful. In spite of that, Pingel argued, that border concepts and the revision of borders are crucial for conceptualizing a common European heritage that builds the fundament for European integration.

Pingel showed a survey from the Eurobarometer[17] that asked about the identification of the citizens with Europe. Only 10% identified foremost with Europe. 40 % identified with the nation state and 60% identified with both: their national background and Europe. Pingel concludes that Europeaness is considerd an additional value rather than an identity on its own right. Pingel also quoted a French study that states that from a psychological perspective, young people cannot relate to Europe because it would be too

[16] For information on the CIVITAS programmes see www.civitas.org
[17] For more statistic information on this issue see: www.gesis.org/en/data_service/**eurobarometer**/

abstract. Looking at a study in the UK, he underlined, that British students preferred national history to European studies.

Pingel summarized that we are currently moving between regionalization and globalization ("glocalisation"). There are different stages of development all over Europe that are expressed by diversity. In the past, he argued, diversity in Europe has lead to conflicts. Today, he said, one of the biggest challenges is to negotiate and respect the different ways to interpret history in Europe.

In her presentation Elvire Fabry[18] (Deputy chairwomen of the *Fondation pour l'innovation Politique*[19]*,* Paris) addressed the question **"What is a good European citizen?"** Fabry doubted that there is something like a "good European citizen," as she argued, that there are no reliable criteria to define a "good European citizen." Respecting the law and paying taxes she said cannot be applied as criteria in a European context. Looking at the indicator of participation in European elections (which is very low), Fabry concluded, that there is still a lot of work to do educating "good European citizens." She therefore asked how European citizenship can be reinforced. Fabry explained that a "horizontal" notion of European citizenship has emerged before the Maastricht Treaty based on a set of (economic) rights. She stressed that the problem was to add a "vertical" dimension of European citizenship to the juridical ("horizontal") concept. Adding such a **vertical dimension to citizenship**, according to Fabry, is only possible if the lack of civic European practice is to be overcome by more citizen participation and influence taking on European governance and policies. Fabry emphasized that creating European citizenship is therefore strongly related to building European democracy. She made the point that the conceptualisation of European citizenship confronts us with the paradox to operate with terms that are taken from a national frame of reference, but aim at transcending the mental borders of the nation state. She stressed that the question of European citizenship was not about fostering a new sense of belonging, but rather to make different levels of belonging, allegiance and solidarity compatible.

Looking back at the history of the European Union and the political visions of politicians such as Monnet and Schuman, Fabry stated that there is no device to a concept of European citizenship. She argued that the debate on European citizenship is rather recent and strongly connected to the fact that "the allegiance of Europeans started to be a strategic goal that

[18] Elvire Fabry is the author of the book *Qui a peur de la citoyennete europeenne? La democratie a l'heure de la constitution*, Paris 2005.
[19] See: www.fondapol.org/

would have impact on European governance". Fabry desribed how in the 1980s Europeans, due to an economical crisis, started to demand more accountability and transparency. Europe, as Fabry agued, was no longer a question of diplomacy but democracy. In the 1990s, Fabry said, European institutions underwent a crisis of legitimacy, amplified by a distancing of the citizens from the political representation at the European level. According to Fabry's analysis, one major reason for this was the absence of a "final political design of Europe." The lack of such a final vision and the lack of consultation of the citizens in the enlargement process brought about feelings of insecurity.

Fabry made the point that the EU had overcome the point of simple institutional cooperation. She argued that the EU needs a strong and vital civil society wanting to play a role in creating the democratic Europe of the future.

Fabry then turned to **models of European citizenship**. She warned that due to historical developments, specific political traditions of citizenship have emerged in different European countries that have to be taken into account. Fabry went even further arguing that due to the different, partly even contradictory concepts of citizenship traditions, "there is no consensual definition of citizenship that could be transferred to the European level." Therefore she considered it not surprising that European citizenship was not promoted by the national governments and hence there was little awareness about this citizenship status among the citizens.

Fabry distinguished between the Athenian democracy and the Roman Empire. She classified the Athenian democracy as participative democracy, giving citizens an active role. In contrast she marked the Roman Empire as a juridical democracy that limited citizenship to a set of rights and liberties.

Fabry also briefly referred to the difference in citizenship traditions in Germany, France and the UK, that is resulting from different understandings of the relationship between the public and the private sphere. Fabry stressed that the challenge on a European level was not to harmonize those different models, but to identify common trends beyond that differences emerging at a transnational level.

Fabry said that in the aftermath of Maastricht it had not been achieved to create a sense of belonging to the European community. Analyzing the rights guaranteed in the Maastricht Treaty, she made the point that **European citizenship** could be considered **a "citizenship for transnational migrants."**

She argued that the voting legislation in the EU had a great innovative potential, because it separates political participation from (national) identity. However, Fabry commented, the absence of real European parties

and European electoral programs hindered the formation of public European interest.

The studies on the **European consciousness** of the citizens of the EU are, according to Fabry, to be interpreted twofold: On the one hand recent opinion polls (SOFRES, 2005) illustrate that only about a quarter of the citizens in the EU felt they had a **common history and a common cultural heritage.** On the other hand recent polls focusing on shared values (Euro-RSCG, 2005) document a certain convergence on essential values such as solidarity, market economy and protection of environment. However, Fabry argued, that even though the *European Charter of Fundamental Rights*[20] that is reflected in the *European Constitution*[21]succeeded in establishing common ground, nourishing a kind of "constitutional patriotism," this is not sufficient to mobilize a sense of belonging. In her conclusion Fabry therefore asked herself, how European citizenship can be enforced.

Fabry suggested firstly that the right of initiative of the European Commission could be build up in order to generate more participation of the citizens. Using new communication technologies, millions of citizens could easily be activated to create a strong debate in Europe beyond the agenda of the political leaders. Secondly she suggested to create such a European public sphere. She outlined four preconditions for establishing a European public space:

- National media have to report more on European questions and at the same time European media have to be built up
- European themes and discussions have to be made concrete for the citizens (De-institutionalisation)
- European leaders are needed in politics and civil society
- European political parties have to be formed in order to overcome the national frameworks of reference

Fabry presented some examples (media work, citizen panels and consultations) from the work of French NGOs active in the field. The **discussion** of Fabry's presentation concentrated on the following aspects. Moro stressed that European citizenship is to be considered an ongoing process. He criticised the distrust towards citizens on the side of the EU institutions, which caused alienation and a lack of participation. Moro talked about a **missed occasion for creating a European Demos**. He therefore pleaded for the invention of **new forms of appreciating citizen's participation in Europe** and the need to strengthen citizen organisations in general. Moro, however,

[20] See: www.europarl.eu.int/**charter**/pdf/text_en.pdf
[21] For a summary of the constitution see
http://europa.eu.int/constitution/download/oth180604_3_en.pdf

also stressed the important function of the media building a European public sphere. Moro made clear, that Europe is in need of a public arena, defined by the interests of the citizens rather than by the bureaucracy of Brussels. Gessler asked how European actors and powerful citizenship organisations could be created and what role citizenship education played in that context. She added that one strategy towards creating a European public sphere might be to **make national debates more European**. She added that she also thinks that the role of the media is crucial, mentioning the problematic role media in France played (pejorative reporting on Europe) previous to the referendum on the European constitution. Fabry quoted a study that showed, the more informed citizens were about the EU, the more they voted in favour of the constitution. In this context she also made clear that the perception that European identity is contradictory to national identity has to be fought. Fabry asked: Why is a "European coming out" risky for national politicians? Who are the strong European leaders today? Who is carrying the European public interest? What is the political project of Europe? Steininger emphasized the necessity to **establish links between the decision takers and the citizens as a basis for building trust** between the political elites and the citizens.

3. Results of Working Groups and Recommendations

The following **list of suggestions for follow up workshops** comprises ideas of the workshop participants developed in group work as well as some other recommendations that are based on my analysis of the questions raised in the workshop.

- Workshop for European researchers that work in the field of comparative citizenship (education) studies. The idea is to provide a platform for joint European comparative research.

- Workshop for European researchers that brings together researchers interested in developing a joint research project on the intercultural/multicultural dimensions of citizenship education. A comparative research project on identity, belonging and citizenship in Europe that puts particular emphasis on diversity does not yet exist.

- Workshop on the role of the media in and for Europe. The workshop should examine the deficits and chances of the (national) media, not only conveying European issues but also making them relevant to the citizens. By doing so, media could (a) contribute to establishing a European public space and (b) foster a sense of European citizenship. This workshop should address media experts as well as media researchers and representatives of NGOs and foundations dealing with media and EU-institutions that focus on communication (*European Commission* etc.)

- Workshop on the documents and recommendations of the *Council of Europe* with respect to *Education for Democratic Citizenship* and *Intercultural Education*

- Workshop that analyses and explores central European documents (Conventions, treaties etc.) with the objective to develop common ground

- Workshop on citizenship (education) terminology in Europe. The idea is to work on a multilingual glossary that explains terms and backgrounds of their usage in different national contexts. The workshop could be called: Spelling Citizenship in Europe.

- Workshop on teacher training in citizenship education in Europe

- Workshop on teaching material used in citizenship education in Europe
- Workshop on teaching methods of citizenship education in Europe
- Workshop on implementation strategies of citizenship education in Europe