

Networking European Citizenship Education (NECE)

Report 6

**Expert Workshop: *Citizenship Education within the Context of
Migration and Minorities***

Kreisau, November 18th – 20th, 2005

Dr. Viola B. Georgi

for *Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung*

November 2005

Table of Contents

	page
1 Conference Report	3
2 Results of Working Groups	21

1. Conference Report

As a consequence of historical and current migration flows deriving from European integration and globalisation processes, mobility and migration have become important features of describing modern European societies. European societies today have to deal with the meeting of different world views, cultural traditions, languages, religious beliefs as well as notions of human existence.

Since the inception of European unification, Europeans have increasingly become mobile. There are different reasons for this mobility, among them employment, education, and partnership. In addition to European national and cultural heterogeneity, globalisation as well as the history of labour migration and colonialism brought about cultural encounters and conflicts that go beyond traditional European cultural parameters. Due to such changes, Europe has long been composed of multicultural societies – although many societies only slowly become aware of this fact. Immigrants from within and outside the European Union have established themselves and have added new features and perspectives to European societies. Another dimension of diversity is the situation of (national) minorities, in particular in the post communist European societies. Awareness of this dimension increased only after 1989.

The year 2005 marks not only the 60th anniversary of the end of the World War II that caused many migration flows all over Europe, but also marks half a century of post-war labour migration. From the mid fifties on, for example, the German government signed treaties with countries like Italy, Spain and Greece, later on with Portugal, Turkey, Morocco and former Yugoslavia in order to recruit so called guest workers to temporarily fill the lack of labourers in the booming German industry at the time.

In the early 70ies it became clear that many of the so called guest workers had become immigrants. Families were fetched; children were born in the host countries, own businesses, and an ethnic infrastructure were established. The receiving European societies had to recognize the immigration that had taken place and develop strategies of integration for the newcomers and their children with regard to education, social services, work and political participation. Taking into account the outlined developments, the workshop “Citizenship Education within the Context of European Migration” addressed the following questions: How can we provide migrants and their children with real access to education, culture and politics? Keeping the backdrop of European migration history in mind, in what ways can European citizenship further developed? What could a

model of multicultural citizenship in Europe look like? What is the role of the major religions with regard to integration?

The workshop took place at the historical location of “Kreisau”¹ - Krzyzowa - (Poland) and was carried out as a co-operation of the *German Federal Agency for Civic Education* (bpb) and the *Polish Krzyzowa Foundation for Mutual Understanding in Europe*. The workshop was officially opened by Ronald Hirschfeld (bpb) and Annemarie Franke (Krzyzowa Foundation for Mutual Understanding in Europe). Discussants from different subject areas and professional backgrounds (research, education, project co-ordinators etc.) from seven European countries (Poland, Rumania, Portugal, The Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Hungary) participated in the discussion.

¹ For more information see www.kryzowa.org.pl

The first presentation was given by **Michael Stanzer** (*Civic Education, Hungary*).² Stanzer chose a very broad approach to the question, **how “civic education” can include the subject of the history of migration**. He started his presentation with criticising the European situation of citizenship education pointing out the difficulties of finding a common language. This difficulty of identifying shared concepts, as Stanzer argued, resulted in a lack of definition and hence also a lack of standardisation of civic education in Europe. He asked, how Europeans should ever be expected to be able to negotiate content, teaching aims and standards if they are not able to get to a consensus on the umbrella term civic education.

Stanzer then elaborated on more **general theories on learning**, taking into account findings from cognition science, linguistics, genetics and human brain research. He argued that sustainable change in society can only be achieved if the parameters of teaching and learning are changed. Stanzer stressed that conventional, purely knowledge based strategies of learning – that he considered widely spread in European schools – do not correspond with brain compatible learning strategies (cerebral possibilities which are made available by age, gender etc.). He made the general point that schools, practising conventional teaching and learning strategies (frontal teaching, learning facts by hard etc.) failed to involve the learners and therefore had no effect on the development of social skills, empathy and emotional intelligence. Stanzer therefore pleaded for a stronger emphasis to be given to learning social and emotional competences as well as developing emotional intelligence and empathy. Stanzer argued, that these learning processes, basic to democracy, should **start at a very early age** (kindergarten, primary school), even though he considered life long learning as important (“learning to be” and “learning biography”).

Switching to the issue of migration, Stanzer argued for a holistic analysis that from his perspective needed to include findings from natural sciences (such as “logotherapy” of Victor Frankl or “the dynamics of imprinting” of Konrad Lorenz) rather than relying on sociological theories only. Only if such approaches were considered, Stanzer stressed, the framework for a contemporary and modern civic education could be developed.

The motivation for mobility and migration, Stanzer argued, originated in the evolution of mankind that had brought about different peoples and cultures. In spite of this variety, Stanzer stressed, that biologists have proven that there is no such thing as human races. Stanzer asked, whether this fact – **the obsolescence of the term race** – would be adequately taken into account in European schoolbooks today.

² For more information see: www.civic-edu.net

With respect to the integration policies in Europe, Stanzer criticized the lack of a master plan of integration. Such a plan from his perspective would have to address three groups: (1) The native population, (2) migrants of the third generation and (3) recent immigrants. He mentioned three interesting European projects that could meet the demands with regard to “learning for living”: *Integration@school*, *Grenzenlos* and the *Europaschule Budapest*.

In general Stanzer pleaded for an “**implicit civic education model**” which should consist of cognitive learning, supervision, coaching, social political and fiscal measures and social enlightenment. Stanzer therefore composed the following list of criteria for a good civic education: (1) Civic education must focus on the individual, (2) Civic education has to be inclusive to all learners, (3) Civic education must start in an early age and (4) Civic education must promote and concentrate on social competences. The **discussion** of the presentation was **very controversial**. The rather emotional exchange on Stanzer’s paper polarized between those who welcomed biologist theories on learning and those who strongly criticised and questioned their scientific legitimisation as explaining social phenomena such as xenophobia.

In the next presentation “**Learning From History**”, **Annegret Ehmann and Angnieska Debska** from the *Polish Karta Foundation* introduced the internet project *Learning from History – Online*.³

Ehmann began her presentation with a **review of civic education in Germany** making the point that civic education in Germany had developed as a reaction to the Nazi crimes. Civic education, as Ehmann stressed, was at the time strongly influenced by the allies (“re-education”) that hoped education would support the process of denazification and democratisation of the population. With the beginning of the Cold War, Ehmann explained, separate political cultures developed in the two post-war German states - the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR).

Ehmann emphasized that after 1945 many Germans realized the need of a broad democratisation initiative because studies documented a lack of identification with democratic structures and attitudes among substantial sections of the German society. Ehmann emphasised that in order to “secure and broaden democratic and European ideas in the German people,” the Federal Office for Homeland Matters (that in 1963 was turned into the *Fed-*

³ German Version: www.lernen-aus-der-geschichte.de; English Version: www.learning-from-history.de; Spanish Version: www.aprender-de-la-historia.de; Polish Version: www.uczyc-sie-z-historii.pl.

eral Agency for Civic Education) was founded in 1953 in the West German capital Bonn as a national educational agency.

Ehmann explained that **in both German states, civic education went different ways** based on their very different interpretation of democracy: Whereas in the FRG democracy was understood as repudiating totalitarianism, national socialism as well as communism, the GDR, in contrast, defined itself as a new state, whose legitimacy derived from anti-fascist resistance. Equality in the GDR, according to Ehmann, was to be accomplished through education for conformity, and individual needs were subordinated to the norms of the "true socialist society." These **differences in political socialisation**, Ehmann claimed, could be traced, even 15 years after the peaceful revolution in the GDR, the fall of the Berlin Wall in the autumn of 1989, and the unification of the two German post-war states on October 3, 1990. She underlined that the cultural, political, and mental unification was an ongoing project.

Ehmann then elaborated on the *Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany* that grants the sixteen states (Länder) jurisdiction over education. Therefore, she explained, Germany has sixteen different education laws and also sixteen different curricula for historical-political education, among others, in the subjects of history, social studies, civics, and political science. Ehmann, however, underlined that in spite of decentralized educational policy there is an exchange on standards for civic education among the "Länder".⁴

Ehmann elaborated on the role of the Nazi era and the Holocaust in Civic Education. She stated that the memory of the Nazi dictatorship – of which the Holocaust was an integral part – have been shaping German politics to this day. Ehmann pointed out that learning about the Nazi period and the Holocaust is compulsory in all types of schools in Germany and at all levels of education. She mentioned however that the international debate did not sufficiently take into account this fact. Therefore a major goal of the project www.lernen-aus-der-geschichte.de according to Ehmann is to allow teachers and educators in Europe and around the world to enter into dialogue with German colleagues.

⁴ In this context she quoted a paragraph from the Berlin school law from the early 1980s that had been agreed on by all sixteen states (Länder): "The goal must be the education of individuals, capable of standing resolutely against Nazi ideology and all other violent political belief systems. They must also be able to build a state and society based on democracy, peace, freedom, and human dignity. Individuals must be aware of their responsibilities toward society, and their behaviour must recognize the basic equality of rights for all human beings, respect every honest conviction, and understand the necessity for progressive social conditions as well as peaceful understanding among nations."

In 2000 the first multifaceted product, 10.000 bi-lingual (English-German) CD-ROMs accompanied by a booklet were published and distributed free of cost to a broad international educational audience, Ehmann explained. The CD-ROM, she said, presents 50 projects from primary and secondary schools, classes of disabled students, vocational training and commercial schools as well as from memorial sites and youth clubs and therefore provided a unique insight into best practices in Germany. Moreover, she stressed, that the projects chosen illustrate a great variety of methodological and interdisciplinary approaches combining history, art and literature, social studies, law and ethics. The projects, Ehmann said, consist of the teacher's lesson, didactic material, historical photos, documents, and student products. In addition the CD contains extensive supplementary materials such as maps, a glossary of historical terms, comprehensive bibliographies, addresses of memorials and thematically related institutions in Germany.

In February 2001 a complimentary German-English website with about 100 new projects and additional information about current events, exhibitions, conferences, new media or publications as well as radio and TV broadcasts was launched, augmented by a Spanish and Polish version in 2002 and 2003, Ehmann explained. Since 2001, she said, the number of website users grew from a few thousand to more than half a million users per month. In spite of this success, she made the point, that the project struggles with raising funds to keep up a multilingual version.

In 2004, as Agnieszka Debska explained, the *KARTA Foundation*⁵ launched a similar but **independent website editorial for school projects in Poland** called *Learning from History War: Occupations, Resistance, Genocide, Displacement*. Debska and Ehmann stressed that they want to build up a close German-Polish cooperation in order to promote school partnerships, facilitate youth encounters, excursions to memorials and bi-national teacher training.

Debska outlined some of the activities of KARTA such as the collecting of personal records of individuals that have witnessed specific historical events connected to WW II, archiving documents of 20th century social history of Poland and the conducting of a historical research competition called *History at Hand* for pupils in secondary schools. The latter programme according to Debska, looks back to a nine year history of success in which about 10.000 young people explored local histories. Debska in

⁵ KARTA is a non-governmental organisation dealing with the contemporary history of Poland and Central Eastern Europe. For more information see www.KARTA.pl

that context mentioned that the competition was part of the international EUSTORY⁶ network.

She also elaborated on the **differences between the German and the Polish website *Learning-from-history***. She said that even though they had copied the overall structure, they made some changes that reflected the Polish experience and the Polish educational practice. For instance, Debska explained, that from the Polish perspective WWII represents the encounter of two totalitarian systems that lead to crimes against humanity, namely National socialism and communism. That, according to Debska, is why the Polish website integrated all aspects of Russian and German occupations of Poland from 1939 to the immediate post war period. By doing so, she said, in particular projects that dealt with “ethnic relations under totalitarian systems” are to be considered in the light of contemporary relations between Poland and its neighbours as well as with regard to interethnic relations within Poland. Migration, as Debska outlined, here is mainly understood as forced migration and displacement caused by shifting borders as a consequence of World War II. By reflecting on these migration movements, she stressed, the awareness of the multicultural heritage of Poland could be rebuilt.

The **discussion** picked up practical questions on the design and implementation of the project. Guilherme asked why the website was not expanded to more international partners. Dekker asked whether there was a partner from the Netherlands and offered cooperation identifying a suitable partner. Ehmann answered that the project would welcome more partners if the funding was not so difficult. Hirschfeld stressed the necessity for a long term funding of such projects.

Moreover, the issue of responsibility versus guilt feelings were discussed in the light of the different generations dealing with the history of National Socialism. Also it was mentioned that the collective memories of migrants have to be related to the experience of National Socialism.

Manuela Guilherme (*Professor at the Centro de Estudos Sociais Universidade de Coimbra*) introduced the **European Research Project**

⁶ The EUSTORY Network’s main aim is to encourage young people to undertake an independent and critical examination of the past through participating in history competitions. At the moment 18 non-governmental organisations are members of the network. They are active in **Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Russia, Scotland, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Switzerland, the Ukraine and Wales**. By closely co-operating with each other in EUSTORY as well as with well known experts of history and history education, the organisations want to strengthen a multiperspective approach towards history, foster a new historical awareness, and make especially young people, listen to each other and to diverse, sometimes contradicting voices. For more information see www.eustory.de

INTERACT – Intercultural active citizenship⁷. She explained, that the research carried out in the context of Interact, by four European universities⁸ seeks to contribute to contemporary discussions of how to deal with the social and political changes resulting from European integration, enlargement and globalisation with a particular comparative view on the impact of these developments in Portugal, Spain, Denmark and England. The final product(s) according to Guilherme will contain guidelines and recommendations on the significance of the intercultural element of citizenship education to be used in educational practice (i.e. teacher training). Guilherme presented a set of guiding research questions that the partner institutions work with. Among others she mentioned the following key questions:

- What are the main guidelines for dealing with Citizenship and Human Rights Education offered by transnational and national official documents?
- How do transnational and national institutional actors/ policy makers understand the above mentioned guidelines?
- How do current national teacher education and development programmes and postgraduate courses approach and implement intercultural education within the scope of Citizenship and Human Rights Education?
- How do teachers perceive their own role as citizens of a multicultural society?
- How do teachers perceive their role as cultural workers and ‘transformative intellectuals’ within the scope of Citizenship and Human Rights Education particularly when focusing on Intercultural Education?

On the basis of these questions, Guilherme mentioned three major **objectives**:

- (a) to find out about the teachers' experiences, interests and opinions as citizens and as educators with regard to their and their students' intercultural civic participation and education

⁷ www.ces.uc.pt/interact

⁸ Department of Educational Anthropology, Danmarks Paedagogiske Universitet (Denmark), Centre for Social Studies, Universidade de Coimbra, (Portugal), Departamento de la Lengua e de la Literatura, Universidad de Valladolid, (Spain), Centre for Citizenship and Human Rights Education, University of Leeds & Institute of Education, University of London, UK

- (b) to compare/contrast these findings with the objectives and activities recommended by universal, European and national official documents on Citizenship and Human Rights Education aimed to foster Intercultural education

- (c) to identify the main needs for teacher education programmes in this area.

With regard to the applied **methodology of the research project** Guilherme outlined four strategies:

- (a) **Theoretical analysis:** review of relevant and updated literature on identity, and citizenship, human rights and intercultural education.
- (b) **Normative analysis:** close examination and comparative/contrastive analysis of the intercultural dimension in official documents aimed to regulate Citizenship Education at the European and national levels.
- (c) **Quantitative analysis:** statistical analysis of a questionnaire distributed amongst teachers of basic and secondary school level that are involved with Citizenship Education at disciplinary or interdisciplinary level.
- (d) **Qualitative analysis:** based on ethnographic research including individual interviews and focus-group interviews with some policy-makers and of a greater sample of teachers and student teachers.

After an introduction to the project design, Guilherme illustrated first research results on the document analysis, showing quotes from European documents that lay the basis for the discussion on intercultural education in Europe. She gave examples that showed a shifting of focus from a broadly understood Democracy Education to the integration of Human Rights Education, the discovery of Multicultural Education and the move to Intercultural Education.⁹

Guilherme also presented relevant paragraphs from documents analysed from the *Council of Europe* and the *European Commission*. As a result she clearly sees a **shift from assimilationist approaches, to models of integration** as well as shifts in favor of more participation. The recognition

⁹ **Example:** It is recommended that the conceptual research on intercultural education be re-launched (with a view to adapting terminology and clearly defining the content and context of intercultural education), Standing Conference of Ministers of Education, Athens, 2003.

of the intercultural element of Citizenship Education according to Guilherme is more recent and mostly attached to specific subjects such as language education, history, civics/citizenship and geography, even though intercultural education should be considered trans-/ inter-disciplinary.

From a **comparative perspective** Guilherme highlighted the following aspects, distinguishing between **Denmark, the UK, Portugal and Spain**:

- (1) In Denmark Intercultural Education is embedded in an international context and deals with communication and interpersonal relationships (the self versus the other). The perspective on intercultural learning corresponds with a more anthropological view that concentrates on norms, values and attitudes.
- (2) In England Citizenship Education is a proper subject that follows a political/democratic goal
- (3) In Portugal Citizenship Education is considered crosscurricular
- (4) In Spain the intercultural is part of a European framework which is about the acknowledgement of diversity, ethics, interculturality and solidarity. In general the Spanish approach seems more cognitive-oriented, based on the development of values, but not action-oriented.

The **discussion** concentrated on the following points: Hirschfeld wondered whether the presented results concerning the multicultural perception of Europe had changed in the lights of terrorist attacks in the US and Europe. He brought attention to the current German debate on multiculturalism that he considered a backlash. Guilherme answered that at least from the perspective of document analysis this was not the case.

Franke stated that she believed that there was a big gap between the analyzed declarations and documents and the perception of these issues by the citizens in Europe. Franke felt, that most European citizens are not prepared for dealing with diversity yet.

Stanowski elaborated on the Polish situation, giving the example that many teachers in Polish schools have another ethnic background (for instance: Ukrainian English teachers). The fact that members of minorities take over such official functions in majority schools according to Stanowski changes the general perception on these minorities. Arani took up this point underlining how important it is to employ teachers with a non-German background in German schools, where the percentage of migrant pupils was very high. An ethnic mixture of teachers, she argued, would send out a positive signal to the minorities as well as to the majority. Hirschfeld

commented that he observes the development of so called “parallel societies” in Germany. Most schools in Germany today, he said, fail to convey and practice a set of shared values. Arani reacted stressing that using the term “parallel society” would not serve the purpose of integration but rather undermine it.

Rus said that the remaining question for him is the question of how the official documents are interpreted by the societal actors. Guilherme responded that the expected final results of *Interact* based on qualitative interviews with these actors (teachers and students) will provide an answer to this question.

Lisette Dekker from *the Institute for Public and Politics* (IPP) in the **Netherlands** presented the activities of the IPP with regard to **promoting and facilitating active citizenship**. Dekker stressed that the IPP in particular focuses on **underrepresented groups** such as women, young people and migrants. The latter group, according to Dekker, is relevant because their participation is crucial for their integration.

Today about 10 % of the population of the Netherlands is of foreign decent.¹⁰ Looking at the migration flows in the Netherlands Dekker distinguished **four phases of immigration**: The first took place after World War II and brought Dutch people from Indonesia (former colony) to the Netherlands. In the 1960-70’s “guest workers” from Turkey, Morocco, Yugoslavia and southern European countries (Italy, Spain, Greece) were recruited by the Dutch government to fill the lack of labourers. In the 1970-80’s immigrants from Surinam and the Dutch Antilles came in greater numbers. And in the 1990’s many refugees (mainly from Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Yugoslavia) found a place to live in the Netherlands.

The striking thing about immigration policy in the Netherlands, as Dekker described, is that **non-western migrants and their (grand) children even if they have the Dutch nationality are continued to be seen as migrants**. There is even a special policy addressing the ‘allochtonen’ with regard to education, work, housing and integration in general.

Dekker also elaborated on European Citizenship as guaranteed in the Treaty of Maastricht¹¹ (1992). In addition to rights and duties, Dekker argued, citizenship was also about sharing a sense of identity and belonging to a community.

¹⁰ About 358.000 immigrants are from Turkey, 315.000 from Morocco, 328.000 from Surinam, 130.000 from Dutch Antilles (still part of Holland) and 600.000 others.

¹¹ See elaboration on the Treaty of Maastricht in the NECE-Report on „Models of European Citizenship” (Saarbrücken 2005)

Dekker made the point that **migrants in Europe** have a rather complicated relation to citizenship. First of all they are objects to different regulations in EU countries. Sometimes they apply for citizenship and have to wait for many years to get it. In some countries they are allowed to keep a dual citizenship, in others they have to give up the citizenship of the country of their origin. Dekker then sketched some of the formal pillars of EU citizenship such as laws and regulations, a common currency, freedom of movement and protection.

The IPP examined the political participation of migrants on the local level and came up with the following results: In 1994: 73 migrants were members of the council; in 1998: 150 migrants were members of the council; in 2002: 204 migrants were members of the council. Dekker concluded that about **2 % of all local councilors in the Netherlands today have an immigrant background.**

She also showed some interesting results with regard to **voting behavior**. In the local election in Amsterdam 2002, there were 30% Turkish voters, 22 % Marroccans and 26 % from Surinam. About 48% had voted for predominantly left parties such as Labour or the Greens. Dekker also gave examples of participation with regard to the national and European level. In 2005, 15 Members of Parliament in the **Dutch parliament** (consisting of 150 MPs) have an immigrant background. From 27 Dutch Members of the **European parliament**, one has an immigrant background, Dekker quoted the research results of her institute.

Dekker then explained the different areas in which the IPP is **promoting the active participation of migrants**. She mentioned the following areas in particular: Project work, public debates, conferences, meetings, research, publications, mainstreaming, human resource management and networking. She gave an example from the city of Amsterdam, where the IPP coordinated a four-year project on the participation of migrants offering courses on political participation, participation in boards, debates in the city, newsletters, a helpdesk (support for individuals and groups of migrants)

Dekker introduced the most recent project taken up by the IPP on behalf of the Ministry of Integration with focus on the **participation in the local elections 2006**. The IPP, Dekker explained, organizes trainings aiming at an increase of participation in four Dutch cities. The modules are designed to cover the following aspects of political participation: (1) Orientation on politics (to go and vote), (2) participation in politics (to become a member of a political party) and (3) participation in local governments (to become candidate on the list).

In addition to **stimulating migrants to become politically active, to vote and to stand for candidate** by running specific courses, the IPP, as Dekker stressed, does **research** on the outcome of elections, on the experiences of councilors that are published and backed up with recommendations geared towards mainstreaming. Regarding human resource management, Dekker emphasized how important it is to have migrant professionals in “mainstream organizations”. Moreover, Dekker made the point that networking with migrants organizations is the key to success.

On a European level IPP offers an exchange of information, experiences and models like the *Informatie en Servicepunt Participatie Migranten* (ISP) that promotes active citizenship for immigrants.

Hans von Amersfoort (*Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands*) titled his presentation “**Seeking the Balance Between Unity and Diversity – Education and Second Generation Immigrants**”. Amersfoort reviewed the historical emergence of the nation state in the 19th century. It was the nation state that brought about the development of a welfare system, he explained. The Western welfare states, Amersfoort argued, had to succeed in integrating territory and population. This integration was based on political rights, civil rights and social rights, that sometimes have a tenuous relationship. Amersfoort considered the main challenge defining the nation with regard to the fact that the welfare state includes only a limited number of people – namely the citizens. Education, he explained, had always played a crucial role in the making of a nation, because it had to diminish diversity (e.g. different regional cultures, histories, languages, dialects etc.) in order to create unity.

Amersfoort described the more recent migration flows, labour migration in particular, as a source of more diversity in Europe. The issue most relevant to him was not diversity as such but the question of **how this “new” diversity is to be reconciled with the character of the Western welfare states**. He elaborated on this question looking at the different generations of immigrants. The first generation, Amersfoort described, as less problematic in terms of integration, arguing that this generation of immigrants usually due to their limited language ability, restricted educational background and citizenship status, does only partially participate in the host society. For the so-called second generation – Amersfoort warned – such a situation of being excluded from participation is not longer acceptable. Also from the perspective of the welfare state, he stressed, this is a problem because the welfare state cannot afford the emergence of an ethnic underclass.

Amersfoort then introduced **three models of integrating immigrants** into national states:

(1) The first model “**Neglect Diversity**”– Amersfoort called it the French model – tends to neglect, deny and ignore diversity for the sake of becoming or being a citizen. This approach goes hand in hand with the separation of the public and the private sphere. With this model, Amersfoort said, France has absorbed millions of immigrants and does so until today. He however questioned, whether that model of neither acknowledging nor recognizing ethnicity is to be considered successful in the light of the recent riots of youngsters from the French suburbs (many of them with immigrant background).

(2) The second model, Amersfoort called it “**Ethnic Diversity as a Channel,**” was practiced in the Netherlands. Amersfoort argued that the Dutch model dates back to the rising of the Dutch state and the necessity to incorporate the Roman Catholics. The Dutch state decided to allow religious and ethnic groups a relative autonomy with respect to education. Religious groups were allowed to set up their own schools but under the control of the Dutch state. The idea was to subsidise and strengthen immigrant communities that would have a bridge function for the host society. By subsidising ethnic communities in the Netherlands, Amersfoort stated, ethnic leadership was created. As a consequence there is a broad landscape of immigrant associations active in the Netherlands today. However, Amersfoort critically remarked, that ethnic diversity was also deepened by this subsidiary principle. In particular the first generation of immigrants would use the ethnic community to withdraw and foster the more conservative and traditional elements of their culture. The participatory aspirations of the second and third generation could however not be satisfied with such associations.

(3) Amersfoort suggested a third model which he called “**The Ethnic-neutral Replacement Categories Approach**”. He argued that it might be reasonable to not address ethnic groups explicitly but rather implicitly through addressing certain problems. For instance Amersfoort said that we should look at schools that struggle with language problems rather than at schools with a high number of immigrants. We should rather focus on community approaches than dividing community projects along the ethnic lines. Amersfoort concluded that a combination of model two and three would probably be the most promising integration strategy in the light of the present situation of immigrants in many European societies.

The presentation provoked a **discussion** about the prerequisites of becoming a citizen and the **relationship between nationality and citizenship**. Stanowski stressed that due to the *res publica* citizens in Poland

are shareholders of the political sphere. Citizenship and nationality – Stanowski argued – were separated in Poland. Stanowski stressed that one can be a fully fledged citizen without having to give up one's nationality in Poland. Rus clarified that there are different and even contradictory understandings of nationality and citizenship in Eastern and Western Europe: In Eastern Europe nationality has the same meaning as ethnicity in Western Europe, whereas citizenship in Eastern Europe is considered equivalent to what is considered nationality in Western Europe. Rus himself added a model based on identity and communication with which he illustrated the four phenomena that may derive from immigration politics: segregation, integration, marginalization and assimilation. Guilherme pointed out that participation in terms of citizenship is more than just a representative form of participating in democracy. Active citizenship, she argued, goes beyond representative democracy and the nation state. Active citizenship according to her evolves on the basis of participatory democracy that aims at engagement in civil society. Moreover Guilherme emphasized the necessity to address the potential of ethnic groups rather than their deficits. Frölich critically remarked that immigrants themselves would feel “othered” and “labeled” by terms like multiculturalism. She asked, how much common ground was needed to promote shared values while at the same time living diversity in Europe?

The next presentation was given by **Callin Rus**, the director of the **Intercultural Institute of Timisoara**¹² in Rumania that has been set up in 1992, with the support of the local authorities in Timisoara and of the *Council of Europe*. Rus explained that the **location of Timisoara** was chosen because the area had a rich intercultural tradition. About 18 national minorities among them Hungarians, Roma, religious minorities as well as immigrants and refugees are at home in the region of Timisoara.

Moreover, Timisoara, as Rus stressed, had a symbolic significance because it was in Timisoara where the Rumanian anti-communist revolution in December 1989 was initiated. Rus briefly outlined the main **activities of the institute**. Apart from **intercultural education** and education for **democratic citizenship** (EDC, *Council of Europe*) both realized within international and European relations (for example CIVITAS¹³ or EYCE¹⁴), the institute **supports Roma** communities. Rus explained that the situation of the Roma minority in Rumania was difficult because of a complex mixture of problems having to do with cultural identity, the socio-economic

¹² For more information see: www.intercultural.ro

¹³ For information on the CIVITAS programmes see www.civitas.org

¹⁴ EYCE stands for *European Year of Citizenship through Education*. For more information see *Council of Europe* www.coe.int

gap, prejudices and discrimination. These problems are tackled by his institute by offering education and teacher training, a specific support for young Roma encouraging civic participation and local development based on democratic principles.

Rus made the point that migration as dealt with in a Western European context was a new area of activity for his institution.¹⁵ Due to globalisation and the European mobility, Rus stated, Rumania will also become a country of destination for immigrants. For the time being he said it is a new phenomenon for the Rumanian society. Rus hopes that the work done in intercultural education will support future **integration of immigrants in Rumania**. The challenge he sees is whether the experience with national minorities can be applied to other minorities as well. According to Rus, his institute has taken some important steps towards framing integration. The institute promotes a common conceptual framework of learning from experiences and it has developed projects and activities of training and awareness raising. Moreover, the *Intercultural Institute of Timisoara* is active in national and European networking and actively participates in a European Network for the promotion of immigrants' integration in rural areas: RURAL-IN.¹⁶

Rus presented the **internet forum www.interculturaleducation** that is designed to **build learning communities across European borders**. The programme as Rus explained, consists of a twelve week course that school classes may take, facilitated by their teachers. The web course gives students from Belgium, Scotland and Rumania the opportunity to interact on issues relevant to them in group based projects. The website, as Rus showed, offers a public space for students such as a cafeteria, a museum, a library and an exhibition hall to be filled with their ideas and issues.

The discussion focused on the question of access to the internet as a prerequisite to participate in such a project and the question of the feed back the project has received. Rus responded that at present there are 10 classes in Rumania and 10 classes in Canada and the US that make use of the internet-tool. Rus concluded with the perspective to hopefully attract more European schoolclasses.

The last presentation of the workshop was given by **Aliyeh Yegane Arani from the Muslim Academy in Germany**¹⁷. Arani introduced the draft for a

¹⁵ For details on projects see www.intercultural.ro/migrant

¹⁶ See www.rural-in.org

¹⁷ The Muslim Academy is a new forum for Muslims in Germany that was founded in 2004. The Academy aims at fostering dialogue on a variety of issues among Muslims with different background but also among Muslims and other denominational groups in Germany. For more

new project of the Muslim Academy that aims at **establishing a television programme organized and designed by young Muslims** in Berlin.

Arani introduced her project with some general remarks on the situation of Muslims in Germany and Europe. She critically commented the pejorative media representation of Muslim communities that had a negative impact on integration. Arani explained that being confronted with negative images of their community, Muslims tended to react with disappointment and hostility. Most of them according to Arani, lacked the motivation and/or the capability to actively oppose and confront these stereotypes. A television programme made by young Muslims, Arani said, may be a way to promote a different public representation of Muslims. She outlined the main pillars of the *Muslim Youth TV* to be broadcasted once a month in Berlin:

- Local project to be expanded to other cities when successful
- Target group: 15 young Muslims with different national, ethnic and religious backgrounds
- Content: news, reports, interviews on issues chosen by the young Muslims themselves (politics, culture, music)
- Broadcasting partner: *Open Channel Berlin* that functions as a citizen TV (reaching 1,6 million households) providing citizens with a public space to be filled by themselves.
- The team of young Muslims gets professional media/journalistic training
- Programme shall be broadcasted in German language
- Opening professional perspectives for young Muslims

Arani said that the possibility of self-representation through a TV-programme was a great chance for young Muslims to make their plural voices heard. Furthermore the project would bring about **empowerment for young Muslims**. She further made the point that the project would encourage those participating not only to acquire media skills but also to develop social and political competences while doing reports (research issues, discuss them, take responsibility and bring together different view points).

The **reaction to the project** was overall very positive and supporting, because most participants found the concept very convincing and promising. Some of the following questions were brought up in the discussion: Hirschfeld asked about the independence of such a programme given the fact that there are Muslim actors that strive for more influence in particular on young people. It was asked whether hate crimes could be expected as a reaction to the programme. Arani, answered, that she is not

information see www.muslimische-akademie.de

afraid and that such issues have to be confronted when they really become an issue.

Rus was interested in the relationship between the Muslim Academy and the other religious academies in Germany. Arani stressed the good cooperation. Rus added that the *Intercultural Institute Timisoara* also successfully supported radio and TV for young Roma. Guilherme commented on a Portuguese programme that screened biographies and stories of immigrants.

2. Results of Working Groups

Three international working groups were built and were asked to discuss the following questions:

- Can citizenship education be considered a means of integration?
- What follow up would be most suitable to the workshop?
- What contributions could the individuals and institutions make to further develop the issues discussed in the workshop?

Group 1 concluded that civic education cannot manage integration, because it is only a means developing and promoting participation for young people in general. They argued that integration politics are more important than education. Education according to the group cannot solve migration problems such as access to social services, education and the labour market. The group criticized short term politics in the area of migration and demanded long term strategies for European immigration policy.

Group 2 concluded that effective citizenship education has to consider the needs of specific target groups. Important for successful citizenship education according to the group are two factors (a) providing room for empowerment and (b) social learning.

Group 3 concluded that citizenship education should not concentrate on values, knowledge and attitudes but should also provide experiences of participation. It was argued that young people have to become stakeholders of the educational process, otherwise the content and the methods of citizenship education get into a conflict. The group underlined the necessity to make participation a lived experience. In addition the group reflected on the relationship between majority and minority emphasizing how important it is to prepare both to live in a multicultural society. In this context the American citizenship model was mentioned as good practice because American citizens may keep and foster their cultural heritage without losing their American identity (hyphenated identity, symbolic identity). Citizenship education it was recommended, should work towards such an open model that reconciles national citizenship and different cultural heritage.

3. Feedback of Participants

- All participants said that they could contribute to further developing the theme of the workshop with scientific work, expertise, studies and research (question 3 see above).
- Most participants enjoyed the European exchange and networking opportunity, the encounter with different personalities, perspectives and approaches
- Participants appreciated the information on projects and research from other countries
- Some participants missed a common thematic start such as an overview on the history of migration in Europe and the role of civic education in that context
- Some participants were irritated by the fact that the *Federal Agency for Civic Education* did not bring in their experiences and projects on citizenship education and migration
- Two participants found it difficult to relate to practical issues as they felt more at home in academia
- Some participants criticised that there was little time for discussing issues due to a very dense programme
- Some participants stressed that working in small international groups for a longer period would have enhanced the discussion and the producing of results (recommendations)
- It was remarked that there was a discrepancy between the theme outlined in the invitation to the workshop and the themes of the presentations given
- Some participants were confused because they had a couple of versions of the programme as it was changed until the last minute
- Some of the speakers said that they were uncertain about what was expected by them
- It was remarked that the workshop did not look at the majority as a target group for citizenship education with an intercultural dimension

Follow Up Ideas of Participants

- Workshop on the political participation of immigrants in different EU-member states
- Workshop that analyses “bad practice” (disappointments/difficulties) of educational work with migrants
- Workshop that helps setting up common projects

- Workshop focusing on migration and citizenship education in one country, but commented by experts from different European countries
- Workshop on European identities
- Workshop on the integration of immigrants
- Building up a pool for “best practice” as a pool of European ideas and a basis for networking
- Open the discussion to other representatives that deal with migration (Institutions, immigrants association leaders, cultural and political institutions)
- Seminar in which the leaders of minority/ migrant communities are participating
- Exchange about the situation of migrants in different parts of Europe: All participants can learn about different approaches in different historical and geographical situation