



Strasbourg, 26 June 2000

DGIV/EDU/CIT (2000) 23

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION (CDCC)

**PROJECT "EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC
CITIZENSHIP"**

Basic Concepts and core
competencies for education
for democratic citizenship

Prof. François Audigier
University of Geneva, Switzerland

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe nor that of the Secretariat.

All correspondence concerning this report or the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Directorate General IV Council of Europe F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex.

In 1997, the Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) project was set up with the aim to find out which values and skills individuals require in order to become participating citizens, how they can acquire these skills and how they can learn to pass them on to others.

A Project Group composed of education ministries representatives, specialists, international institutions and NGOs active in the field of education for democratic citizenship was set up at the beginning of the project. The project activities grounded in theory as well as in practical everyday life, have been divided between three sub-groups. They worked on

A – concepts / definitions :

Aims: to work out a framework of concepts for education for democratic citizenship together with the appropriate terminology and to identify the basic skills required for democratic practices in European societies.

B – pilot projects / sites od citizenship:

Aims: to identify, learn from, compare, appraise and encourage the development of citizenship sites (innovative and empowering initiatives in which citizens participate actively in society, especially at the local level). Partnerships between the different actors involved in education for citizenship (e.g. schools, parents, the media, businesses, local authorities, adult education establishments) are identified and supported.

C – training and support systems :

Aims: to identify different methods and ways of learning, teaching and training, to build up a network of multipliers, adult educators, teacher trainers in education for democratic citizenship, to exchange information and experience in the field of EDC and to create fora for reflection and discussion.

The many activities carried out between 1997 and 2000 resulted, *inter alia*, in the project's synthesis report and three complementary studies presented at the project's final conference (Strasbourg, 14-16 September 2000).

In addition to the present report, these are :

- Education for democratic citizenship : a Lifelong Learning Perspective, by César Birzúa, the synthesis report of the overall EDC project
- Sites of citizenship: Empowerment, participation and partnerships by Liam Carey and Keith Forrester
- Strategies for learning democratic citizenship by KH Duerr, V. Spajic-Vrkas and I. Ferreira Martins.

Further information on the EDC project's activities, studies, reports and publications can be found on the project's internet website: <http://culture.coe.int/citizenship>

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	7
1. THE GROWING CONCERN WITH CITIZENSHIP ISSUES	8
1.1 Some hypotheses and interpretations	8
1.2 Limits, paradoxes and precautions	10
2. CONTEXT, CONTEXTS	11
3. CITIZEN, CITIZENSHIP: HARD CORE, VARIATIONS AND CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES	15
3.1 Hard core	16
3.2 Conceptual variations and challenges	19
4. CORE COMPETENCES	21
4.1 First classification	21
4.2 Second classification	23
5. PRACTICES	24
5.1 Target groups and fields of intervention: all individuals, all institutions	25
5.2 "Sites of citizenship"	25
5.3 Practices in the school environment	26
5.4 Lifelong learning and other areas	28
5.5 Convergent approaches, similar difficulties	29
6. SOME RISKS AND DANGERS	30

The aim of this study is to explore the basic concepts and core competences of education for democratic citizenship (EDC). It takes up and complements an initial consolidated report disseminated under reference DECS/CIT (98) 35. It is based mainly on recent work carried out under the aegis of the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport in the “Education for Democratic Citizenship” (EDC) project¹. It is complemented by past and present activities carried out in this Directorate and by other Directorates. The results of these activities are to be found in the following reports²:

- Towards a democratic citizenship, 1994-1995, by Ettore Gelpi
- Summary and conclusions of the final conference of the project on "Democracy, human rights, minorities: educational and cultural aspects", by Etienne Grosjean
- Report of the consultation meeting on EDC by César Birzea
- Introductory document, by Ruud Veldhuis, and report, by Marino Ostini, of the seminar “EDC: basic concepts and core competences”
- Policing and human rights: a matter of good practice" Conférence, 10-12 December 1997.
- A work book for practice oriented teaching: human rights and the police, 1998
- Remembrance and citizenship: from places to projects, Delphi Seminar, 25-27 September 1998
- Democratic Participation in Education and Training, Lillehammer Seminar, 22-24 October 1998
- Violence in schools : awareness-raising, prevention, penalties, Brussels Symposium, 26-28 November 1998
- Youth Cultures, Lifestyles and Citizenship, Budapest Seminar, 8-13 December 1998, completed by the study ‘Culture de jeunesse et modernisation: un monde en devenir’
- Collection of EDC Project group Members' reports, 17-19 February 1999
- The challenges of science education, Education Committee Forum , Strasbourg 30 March 1999
- Linguistic diversity for democratic citizenship in Europe, Innsbruck Conference, 10-12 May 1999
- European Studies for democratic citizenship, preliminary reports, 1999
- Market-oriented society, democracy, citizenship and solidarity: an area of confrontation? Parliamentarians-NGOs Conference, Strasbourg, 31 May-1 June 1999.
- List of Decisions of Sub Group A from EDC Project, 31 May-1 June 1999
- Seminar on Empowerment and Responsibility: from Principle to Practice, Delphi, October 1999
- Brainstorming and study on “Education for Democratic Citizenship and Social Cohesion”, 15 and 16 November 1999
- Conference on Education for Democratic Citizenship: Methods, Practices and Strategies, Warsaw, 4-8 December 1999.

¹ The entire project is presented on the Internet: <http://culture.coe.fr/postsummit/citizenship>

² We have opted not to cite each author in order to keep the text a reasonable length. It goes without saying that the ideas expressed here have their origin in these different reports, which are themselves already consolidated presentations of numerous studies carried out in different contexts with actors coming from all Council of Europe member States.

INTRODUCTION

In just a few decades the word "citizenship" has become one of the most frequently used in discussions of communal life in society. It provides guidance for our response to what is sometimes referred to as the crisis in the social fabric and in social cohesion. The citizenship concept is used in particular to attempt to stabilise and redirect certain practices involving schools and, more generally, education and training. However, we must get beyond the vague reassuring consensus reflected in the constant use of these broad formulations to get to grips with the heated debates surrounding citizenship. A term with such an intense historical and social significance cannot be used lightly; it must not be reduced to a series of vague entreaties aimed at pacifying problem neighbourhoods or restoring some order to unruly schools. Respect for the law and a sense of responsibility, which are prerequisites for any democratic society, cannot be reduced to passive obedience to an inherently fair and stable social order. The collapse of the European communist regimes and the apparent consensus on democratic citizenship have not spirited away the debates, divergences, or indeed conflicts between and among different States, groups and individuals.

These differences do not only stem from different cultural and social traditions destined in the near future to merge into an obscure hypothetical global citizenship; they also reflect different ways of appraising today's world, of constantly reassessing our past(s) and mapping out our expectations, our future(s). It is slightly ironic to trumpet forth the concepts of freedom and responsibility, appeal for individual initiative and acclaim diversity as an invaluable asset to our societies, while at the same time flanking these declarations with talk of the unquestioned, immutable requirements or constraints of global developments. **The freedom of the citizen, or at least a certain traditional form thereof, is a freedom of association and discussion in a public environment theoretically governed by equality among all individuals.**

Naturally, most recent studies agree that our societies have radically changed, and with them the theoretical conceptions and practical implementations of citizenship. The content of this concept is expanding and growing with the diversification of modes of presence in the world and of relations with others. Allegiance and affiliation are becoming multiple and mobile. The State, particularly the Nation-State, is no longer referred to as the ultimate or most legitimate repository of power: ultimate in providing the model for co-existence in a world divided up into clearly delimited territories, and legitimate in representing the common weal of all citizens.

Reflection on the concepts of education for democratic citizenship is an integral part of the action: reflection gives meaning to the action, and vice-versa. Reflection and action do not stand in any hierarchical relationship to one another, whether through a "bias relation" or within two separate spheres. Action is always underpinned by a conception on the part of the actors, and reflection always feeds on this action and takes on meaning with reference to experience. Experience can only take on meaning with thought and the words used to express, guide and nourish this thought. The type of thought here is dialectical, even though, for reasons of editorial convenience, some texts concentrate more on experience and therefore on global existential diversity while others, like the present document, step back somewhat from concrete experience. The challenge is to weld together a myriad experiences, viewpoints and imaginations that are lived and expressed in the various cultural and social universes. This study of concepts must therefore be seen in relation firstly with the Council of Europe's reports and other publications, and secondly with the texts finalising the

Education for Democratic Citizenship project. All these texts have fuelled and inspired this study. Above and beyond the wide variety of inputs we should also remember the shared references, the "inalienable bedrock" of human rights and democratic political institutions.

This study begins with an outline of its own social context up. I first of all examine a number of aspects of the growing interest in citizenship and describe the limits of the study, which are in part dictated by the various possible definitions of the citizen as a person. The second section draws on various Council studies to develop discussion of citizenship. It concentrates on young people since education is primarily a matter for youth, and also the public authorities, using the example of the police. It finally more generally examines the relationship between State, civil society and market, a highly topical issue. This presentation of aspects of the general context is followed by an explanation of the citizenship concept based on a model which defines a vital "hard core" without which the very idea of citizenship would consist of mere woolly affirmations, and a series of extensions that are still being discussed and processed. This approach brings out several "conceptual challenges". I then go on to present two possible classifications of core competences, aimed at eliciting activities, combining them into a larger whole, giving them a broader sense and encouraging their coherency. This will enable us to highlight what is and is not covered by any one activity, with a view to securing other activities to complement it. The last section describes various practical means of implementing Education for Democratic Citizenship, concluding with a reaffirmation of the problematic and dynamic nature of citizenship. It is vital to continue theoretical and practical reflection on a subject in constant metamorphosis. We can only hope that the issue of democratic citizenship will always be a topical one, and that we shall never wash our hands of it.

1. THE GROWING CONCERN WITH CITIZENSHIP ISSUES

1.1. Some hypotheses and interpretations

This study, which builds on work carried out over the past few years, does not take account of everything that has been done on and around the subject of citizenship education since the inception of the Council of Europe. That would necessitate additional studies, which would certainly be very worthwhile. For example, a historical study would doubtless show that the affirmation and extension of the term "citizenship" are recent developments.

The European Convention on Human Rights, for example, the founding text of the Council of Europe, does not include the terms 'citizen' or 'citizenship'. The only expression that makes reference to it is contained in Article 4 which deals with 'forced or compulsory labour' to exclude from this category 'any work or service which forms part of normal civic obligations'. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is no more prolix; the term 'citizenship' is not used here either, though we do find the term 'nationality', used to assert that this is a right. Belonging to a political community is in the first place to belong to and pledge allegiance to a State, the legal framework which defines the conditions of this belonging, qualified as nationality. Citizenship is linked to nationality, the latter conferring on the former the rights associated with it. This term 'nationality' covers various meanings and, what is more, applies to very varied situations. Thus, the international texts employ the terms 'person', sometimes 'individual', 'man' (in the sense of 'human being', not the male of the species), but not the term 'citizen'.

An equally relevant study might deal with the changing use of terminology as a sign of changes in concerns and concepts. Over and beyond the different vocabulary and approaches adopted by various education systems, our focus has shifted, for example, from “civic instruction” to “civic education”, and now to “education for citizenship”, or indeed in some states “education for citizenships”. This development reflects two types of change: firstly, the transition from an approach in which the main priority in teaching was knowledge - particularly about local, regional or national political institutions - to an approach that emphasises individual experience and the search for practices designed to promote attitudes and behaviour showing due regard for human rights and democratic citizenship; the second change is a considerable extension of this field in terms of both content – given that no aspect of community life is irrelevant to citizenship - and the institutions and places concerned, given that the call for citizenship education goes far beyond the school environment to which it has traditionally been confined. **Thus, citizens defined in relation to the political authority to which they belong appear to be giving way to citizens seen as people living in society with other people, in a multiplicity of situations and circumstances.**

Let us venture an explanation for these developments. Terms such as “person”, “individual” and “man”, whose presence in the international texts has already been pointed out, affirm the primacy of individual rights over collective rights, particularly those of states ; they protect the person against any risk of abuse of power, whatever its origin may be; in accordance with the current conception of human rights in Europe, they place the individual at the pinnacle of society and imply that the particular rights established in each State must be subject to the principles of these internationally defined human rights. **Society is made by and for men.** The relatively recent (re)emergence of the term ‘citizen’ would thus be a way of going back to the question of ‘living together’, a question which had more or less been forgotten in democratic States for some decades, but is now arising very acutely again under the pressure of various factors: exclusion of a growing proportion of the population, extension of the globalisation of economies and cultures, the latter disseminated through the international media, calling into question of the political references of the past two centuries in Europe, such as the Nation-State, and the more recent social dimension of Welfare State, risks of ethnic fragmentation and the growth of exclusive specificities, challenges to the basic values of our societies, the phenomena of racism and xenophobia, etc. Some writers have contended that the concept of work has become inseparable from that of social cohesion, which would mean that exclusion from the world of work is one of the main causes of the threat to social cohesion. Developments on the labour market and in public policies tend to show that neither the market nor public intervention is sufficient to fully restore such cohesion. This effort necessitates active intervention by all citizens, particularly through voluntary associations, although this does not obviate the need for the public institutions. For instance, voluntary social operators could never afford the safety nets which various States have introduced in the form of minimum incomes. It is a case of ensuring co-operation rather than replacing one agency with another. The affirmation of democratic citizenship is intended to be “a response to the far-reaching changes taking place in our societies and the shortcomings of our political, economic, social and cultural structures” (Raymond Weber).

We have thus passed from a conception of citizenship that placed the emphasis on feelings of belonging and where the corresponding education accompanied the transmission of this feeling by a very strong emphasis on obedience to the collective rules, to a more individualistic and more instrumental conception of citizenship, a

citizenship that gives pride of place to the individual and his rights and relegates to the background the affirmation of collective and partial, in the geographic and cultural sense, identities embodied by States. Identity and belonging are changing and are being expressed in new contexts and with other meanings that we have to understand and master. Life is increasingly strongly reflecting the force of the imagination, the emotions and the affective in the construction and expression of these individual and collective identities.

1.2. Limits, paradoxes and precautions

Before returning to certain aspects of this context, we need to state the limits, paradoxes and precautions of this study. Citizenship and education for citizenship are radically changing fields which affect all aspects of life in society. The field is thus impossible to delimit precisely and, apart from his own subjectivity, the author can always be suspected of forgetting or betraying something. The sources used for this study, even though they come only from the Council in material terms, reproduce in their own way the diversity of the approaches, definitions and points of view that are expressed in and act on the European continent. While certain convergencies appear when reading them, there are also many differences and even oppositions. This is normal and desirable in any democratic area. I shall therefore try to highlight the shared strongpoints but also the divergencies and the disagreements, as so many invitations to pursue the debates and the studies.

Another limit is concerned with what is expected of education for citizenship and the words used to talk of it. The risk here is of swamping citizenship in a vision as idyllic as it is normative, to constantly make reference to it for any social activity or commitment, without always being clear about what this reference requires. It is therefore necessary to take a certain amount of care with the words used for talking about citizenship, the changes in it and citizen actions, such as ‘participation’, ‘responsibility’, ‘multiple citizenship’, ‘plural identity’, ‘rich in its diversity’, ‘informal education’ etc., without forgetting the generalisations contained in the categories we use to speak of the world and of people: ‘youth’, ‘cultures’, ‘civil society’, ‘the crisis of the nation-state’ and that of the welfare state, etc. These words are essential to us for thinking and acting, but we should be suspicious of their apparent self-evidence, of the simplifications they can lead to, the role they can play as thought-reducing slogans. The author is obviously neither immune to such usage nor outside the present debates. It is therefore necessary to constantly bear in mind that the words are not the things, that this study and all the texts on which it is based are intellectual constructs which try to make intelligible, each in its own way, a shifting and diverse reality, constantly being reinvented by actors and individuals in infinitely varied contexts. In the precise situations in which each finds himself, in schools and other places where education for citizenship is present, whether as an explicit project or a more discreet intention, it is possible to do only limited and modest things. The pragmatic dimensions, attention to reality and to people, are essential conditions for success. This modesty is itself the guarantee of the success of these actions and of their contribution to the affirmation, development and deepening of democratic citizenship.

Lastly, this text is a conceptual synthesis which endeavours to tie together everything that is democratic citizenship as it is conceived today and what concerns the educational practices in their teeming multiplicity, practices which also give rise to conceptual reflection. The different concepts, whose presence and importance are stressed in these pages, do not function in isolation, but in networked fashion, calling one another up, giving one another

meaning, constituting, according to the relationships established, models for thinking of reality and action. It is obvious that in view of the polysemia of the concepts advanced in this study, there are several of these models. Wherever possible, we shall try to explain certain aspects of these models. These attempts remain on the periphery of much more delicate questions concerning the conceptions that each of us has of human beings and of life in society, of what makes different people act, of the importance attached to tradition, to the heritage or to new things, of the way in which we view the collective destiny and the future of our societies.

Thus, for example, the relationship between the citizens and the public political institutions in the European democratic area is thought of as lying between two poles. The one makes the citizen the absolute sovereign, a member of a local community which delegates to the higher authorities only matters that it cannot deal with or settle itself; the other defines the citizen first of all as the member of a national political community whose institutions are the guarantors of the rights and freedoms that this citizen enjoys. In the first case the central power is always a potential threat to individual freedoms; in the second case this power is the very condition for freedoms, it being understood that, at all levels and in both cases, this power is the emanation of free and equal citizens, and those that exercise it are under the control of these same citizens. This difference of conception is never absolute and various intermediate positions between these two poles are found, depending on the country.

2. CONTEXT, CONTEXTS

All the Council's work, whether it is directly or indirectly concerned with EDC, stresses the importance of context. The context is either the environment in which somebody lives or an object whose transformation is necessary to affirm the principles connected with human rights. In this second sense, it is then a matter of modifying the context, or more exactly the contexts, to better permit each to exercise his rights. This is the case, for example, with the free movement of persons and goods, including cultural goods and ideas, of the openness of the media to cultural diversity, not one of the media for each person or for each group, but rather all media open to others, to the cultural productions of others; this openness also raises the question of the access of each to the media, which are for the most part very tightly controlled, etc. This is also the case with everything that calls for modifications of context, such as the development of marginalisation and economic and social exclusion.

The concern about social cohesion is central to all contextual analyses. The vocabulary underlying this concern frequently conjures up negative and pessimistic view of our societies: fragmentation, insecurity, corruption, instability, Mafia infiltration, discrimination, increasing inequality, individualism and "looking after number one", violent competition, etc. These highly polysemous terms which we have used as examples cover a wide variety of realities. These ambiguous terms are used to describe situations that some see as problematic and others as positive; for instance, fragmentation is also diversity, competition means initiative, and instability can also be motion. Without minimising the problems and human suffering that often accompanies the process thus designated, such an accumulation can be unduly alarmist, and we should be wary of scare-mongering. There is a risk of imposing a vision of a world divided into winners and losers, insiders and outsiders; in this scenario losers/outsideers have only themselves to blame for their situation because of their inability to accept the constraints of this changing world and show the requisite initiative. It is essential

to analyse the causes and precise configurations of these processes, which vary according to the places, societies and cultures in which those concerned live.

The very idea of context covers realities that can be analysed in different ways. For example, we can distinguish different levels:

- State contexts, with their traditions, their cultures, their institutions, their laws, etc. These States are areas and frameworks within which the citizens discuss, argue, confront their conceptions of citizenship, power, education, living together, etc. Studying and promoting EDC in Europe and beyond means being open to the differences of contexts between States as well as to the differences within each of them, thus getting away from the reflexes and stereotypes that make people attribute certain characters and certain conceptions to all of the citizens of a given State, whereas in our democratic areas we actually share many references, concerns and debates;
- local contexts, considering that the term 'local' may apply to areas of very varied sizes and configurations, from the neighbourhood or village to the region, contexts determined by administrative boundaries or other criteria, local contexts in which the citizens act very closely to their point of social and territorial integration;
- more general contexts connected with the phenomenon of globalisation and concern the processes and trends which include both local and State realities.

This distinction between different contexts according to territory needs to be complemented by thinking in terms of networks. In today's world many economic, social and cultural phenomena exist and develop as networks, ie in accordance with systems of relations which ignore borders, particularly political and administrative ones.

In the framework of this report we cannot take up all of the Council of Europe studies which discuss these contexts and try at the same time to establish the relations between them, bring out their specific characteristics, identify their dynamic and anticipate their future trends. We shall limit ourselves to discussing three of the themes studied as being particularly exemplary of the importance of context both for reflection and for the practice of EDC.

Youth cultures and lifestyles have been the subject of in-depth study. The traditional forms of political and social participation, as ways of fitting into society and establishing relations with others, have been abandoned in favour of groupings based on "sub-cultures" the prefix 'sub' meaning a specific category within a whole that is known as 'youth culture', not a value judgement. Some commentators interpret these sub-cultures as ways of opposing the dominant culture and creating, through lifestyles where clothing, music and leisure activities play the principal or even only role in the method of constructing an identity and as socialisation process. These methods function outside the traditional institutions of the family and the school. Many researchers analyse these sub-cultures as instruments of adaptation to social change. The feeling of living in a constantly changing world accentuates a sort of permanent 'zapping'. In many manifestations, the important thing is above all to participate in the event that is taking place here and now, an event that itself exists only through and with this participation. While some commentators stress the capacity of these youth sub-cultures to call into question the control of the commercial culture industries, others put the accent on the preponderant weight and recuperative power of these industries. The interpretation of these

movements with respect to citizenship is particularly delicate. While the creative and identifying aspect, creating flexible and mobile identities, is undeniable, the primordial, or even only, importance attached to the present, to the satisfaction felt in this present, prevents any taking into consideration of the questions that our societies are asking and which require the lasting involvement of all the citizens. When a more directly political expression does appear, it is focused on a single issue and considers the problems in a very fragmentary fashion. The social order and its possible calling into question are certainly not the main concern of these sub-cultures.

The studies on **the police and human rights** are emblematic of the actions necessary for the holders of any public authority of any kind. Mainly carried out in the Human Rights sector of the Council of Europe, these studies stress the importance, in any democratic society, of a quality police force, made up of people who are fully aware of human rights, the guarantee against any risk of corruption. The police service is a public service, a service for the citizens and for all people; its job is to protect. It is not for the police to punish offenders, but the judicial system. Protecting also means upholding the freedoms of each so that the civil society can be a place for initiatives and for all to accept their responsibilities. This requirement is particularly topical in the countries that have recently set up democratic political institutions. The behaviour and attitudes of the police are all the more important in that they constitute the most visible manifestation of the public powers. As with all the other areas of work it has opened, the Council of Europe is a place for exchange and dialogue on this theme, where different officials, actors and researchers describe their experiences in developing a democratic police force. As with many areas of social study, the analyses converge to affirm the crucial role played by training, whether basic training or in-service training. This is concerned just as much with work on police attitudes and behaviours towards other people as work on the rights of the police within the police institutions themselves. Violations of human rights are to be found in police treatment of other people and also in the way they treat one another. These studies on the police also show that human rights and democratic citizenship are placed under the responsibility of institutions, especially public institutions, and not only under that of individuals.

The third theme we discuss is much more all-embracing. It concerns the well-known relationship between **the state, civil society and the market**, which is also referred to as **Market society, democracy, citizenship and solidarity**. Are they all fully compatible? The answer is obviously extremely complex and would go far beyond the scope of this consolidated report. Views on this matter diverge, or indeed are diametrically opposed. Some people see civil society as the main forum for initiative and freedom, with the State a subsidiary body which, while necessary, should have minimum scope for action: justice, police, army and diplomacy are the only fields in which it needs to intervene. The "common good", insofar as this idea has any meaning, is a natural result of the expression of the specific interests of actors enjoying maximum freedom. The opposite extreme is a configuration that concentrates on the importance of a powerful public authority guaranteeing the "common good", which is in turn constructed and debated in the egalitarian decision-making environment defined by democratic citizenship. These two extremes are seldom met with in such a clear-cut form, and our democratic societies generally occupy various intermediate positions. However, the difficulties facing States, particularly Welfare States, and current transformations are making the former conception increasingly attractive. Its advocates interpret the crisis of social cohesion as a failure on the part of the Welfare State, and propose according maximum scope to civil society, which is defined as "market society".

The supporters of the latter conception see this crisis as the result of changes which are either uncontrolled or at least are potential causes of exclusion and social rifts. This debate must continue, because it is challenging our understanding and analysis of current difficulties and therefore our definition of the appropriate action, including education for democratic citizenship.

Whatever the future of these discussions, if we combine the aforementioned terms in as natural a manner as possible, the terms, or rather the realities they cover, are not so solidly anchored as it appears. For example, the income gap is increasing, with the richest, both persons and States, getting richer and the poorest getting poorer. The big multinational and transnational enterprises and economic institutions are considerably more powerful than the great majority of States; the latest UNDP report shows that the wealth of the world's 200 richest people exceeds the combined incomes of a group of States with 41% of the world population (2.3 billion people). Some speakers at the Parliamentarians-NGOs Conference pointed out that government action, especially in Europe, has for some years been directed mainly in favour of greater integration of national economies into world trade, leading to the surrender of sovereignty, not to infra- or supra-national democratic institutions, but to the benefit of these enterprises and institutions, which are not at all democratic. There is a strong tendency towards a crisis of disillusionment with politics and the calling into question of the powers of States, especially their welfare State dimension, and hence to expect civil society to introduce the initiatives necessary for the maintenance and development of social links. It is somewhat paradoxical to express concern about insufficient democracy and, at the same time, to accept the dismantling and demotion of democratic political institutions for the benefit of a (more or less coherent) movement of social initiatives whose legitimacy is affirmed by the simple fact of existing. Democratic political forms have to evolve and change, but we should not consider the 'return' of the citizen, the necessary appeal to a citizenship of initiative, proximity and responsibility, to be a happy result of the crisis of the State and of democratic political institutions. There is no reason why the market, i.e. the people and institutions who dominate it, should decide in favour of the common good. Is the market one of the places, or the place, for the production of the common good? Is economic efficiency, according to the principles of a highly deregulated free market economy, one way, or the way, to access a common good, both its definition and its achievement? The question of the common good is one of a political nature which calls for a discussion between all the citizens and which requires institutions that guarantee the respect of the principles of democracy and human rights, in particular equality and freedom. Thus, civil society cannot exist in democratic fashion without democratic public institutions, i.e. institutions controlled by all the citizens, institutions that guarantee the fundamental freedoms and equality of access for all to public goods, whether it is a matter of rights such as education or health care, or justice. Conversely, it is also the responsibility of civil society to promote and organise the democratic debate, to identify and discuss the great and small societal issues for which the citizens are responsible. Lastly, one final topic for discussion is justice, in the ethical rather than the institutional sense. This issue is resurfacing under a wide range of research projects in the philosophical and political science fields. It incorporates a specific approach to the question of the meaning of communal life, coexistence, and the necessary aim of any society. We shall return to this matter later on when dealing with responsibilities.

3. CITIZEN, CITIZENSHIP: HARD CORE VARIATIONS AND CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES

In what follows, we set out the hard core of the concepts of citizen and citizenship, as well as the variations and interrogations to which this hard core is subject. In view of the rapid changes taking place in our societies and hence the ways in which citizenship is conceived and experienced, it is essential to reaffirm what constitutes the essentials of a conception of citizenship in a democratic society. This should permit us to avoid calling ‘citizen’ any initiative, behaviour or attitude so long as it takes others into consideration. All societies have produced and implemented rules of collective life, methods of resolving conflicts, ways of being with others, others within the same society and others outside it, those who do not belong. What is special about the reference to democratic citizenship? What does this reference imply for individuals and institutions, whatever they may be? A word or reference that dissolves into something vague and fuzzy is no longer any use to help thinking or guide action, but simply serves to bring about a sort of soft consensus that each can go along with because nobody has put anything vital into it.

Like all the terms used in speaking of social and political life, ‘citizenship’ is far from having a stable and generally accepted meaning. It is increasingly being acknowledged that it is a multiform concept³. This obviously has important consequences for the core competences of EDC. This situation is perfectly normal and legitimate. Even if they endeavour not to be in contradiction with the principles commonly accepted for defining a democratic society, our political and social institutions fit into diverse traditions and take many forms. What is more, the meanings of the term ‘citizenship’ are open to the new experiences that life constantly leads us to invent, to the new forms that citizenship and democratic political life will take in the future; it is therefore normal or even desirable that all this should change. The words used in each language bear witness to this diversity. They are the instruments with which each person, each culture, through usage, constructs and expresses his or its conception of political and social life, freedom, and relations with others. This makes any attempt at synthetic construction particularly difficult, because any such attempt will always be suspected of reducing the diversity of experiences and way of thinking, and hence even of threatening standardisation, a real or imagined threat very present in much discourse speeches and in many individual and collective imaginations. Here we constantly find ourselves between the affirmation of collective identities which are based on the diverse political conceptions which have developed in the context of States which are today recognised at international level, and the search for common elements for building a democratic Europe, a European space of freedom, equality and solidarity. This European space has many dimensions and complex aspects which are obviously not limited only to the political universe, even if the examination of the legal and political conditions for the exercise of freedoms and the protection of rights is always required.

A quick glance at five different language dictionaries⁴ is very pertinent here. It highlights the nuances, and even the differences, which are present in the base texts of this study, which were drafted by authors from several States, and hence several different political and legal cultures. Each of these authors expresses himself within his own cultural framework, even if

³ Mr Ernst Joutte, sous-ministre adjoint aux relations civiques du Québec, speaks of a “polysemous and contested concept”. Seminar "Basic concepts and core competences", 1997 document DECS/CIT (98) 7 addendum

⁴ The choice of these five languages was determined by the ability of the author of this study to understand the meaning of the definitions contained in the corresponding dictionaries.

he takes into account as far as possible the multiplicity of points of view expressed in Council of Europe working meetings⁵.

English: **citizen** ... **1** person who lives in a town, not in the country : *the --s of Paris*. **2** person who has full rights in a State, either by birth or by gaining such rights : *immigrants who have become --s of the United States*. Cf *British subject* ; -- of the world, cosmopolitan person. --**ship** ... being a -- ; rights and duties of a --.

German: **Bürger** (...) *Bewohner einer Stadt od. eines Staates (Staats--)* ; *Angehöriger des 3. Standes, des besitzenden Bürgertums, der Bourgeoisie* ; *Zivilist* ; *ein -- des Vereinigten Staaten* ; *akademischer -- Angehöriger einer Hochschule* ; *ein angesehener -- unserer Stadt [zu Burg]*

Bürgerlichkeit (...) *Angehöriger des Bürgertums, Nichtadliger*

Spanish: **ciudadanía**. ① Cualidad de ciudadano de cierto sitio. ② Derechos de ciudadano de cierto país. (V. “NACIONALIDAD, NATURALEZA”). ③ “Civismo”. Comportamiento propio de un buen ciudadano : ‘Hay que votar por ciudadanía’.

ciudadano, -a (adj. y n.). ① *Natural o vecino de cierta ciudad*. ② Se aplica a las personas de una ciudad antigua o de un estado moderno con los derechos y deberes que ello implica ; a causa de esos deberes y derechos, la palabra lleva en si o recibe mediante adjetivos una valoración moral y un contenido afectivo : ‘No es buen ciudadano el que no respeta las leyes. Se siente ciudadano del mundo’. (V. : “NATURAL, SÚBDITO. ➤PATRICIO, *quirite*, *republicano*. ➤ CIVISMO, VALOR cívico. ➤ NACIONALIZARSE, NATURALIZARSE. ➤ LIBRE. ➤ CONCIUDADANO”). ③ *Antiguamente, habitante de la ciudad, de *clase intermedia entre la de “caballero” y la de “artesano”*. ④ “*Hombre bueno*”. *Hombre perteneciente al estado llano*.

Italian : **Cittadinanza**, s.f. 1. l'insieme degli abitanti di una città ; *la cittadinanza è invitata alle celebrazioni dantesche*. 2. appartenenza del singolo a una società organizzata a Stato ; cittadinanza originaria ; cittadinanza acquisita / Piccola cittadinanza, priva del godimento dei diritti politici e dell'obbligo del servizio militare / Doppia cittadinanza, appartenenza di un singolo, in qualità di cittadino a due stati.

Français : **Citoyen, enne** ... (XVI^e, “concitoyen” ; ... de *cit*). ♦1^o *Vx ou plaisant*. Habitant d'une ville ... ♦2^o (Fin XVII^e). *Antiq.* Celui qui appartient à une cité (2^o), est habilité à jouir, sur son territoire, du droit de cité ... ♦3^o (XVIII^e). *Mod.* Individu considéré comme personne civique, particulièrement National d'un pays qui vit en république ... ♦4^o (XVII^e ; de 1^o). *Citoyen du monde*, qui met l'intérêt de l'humanité au-dessus du nationalisme **Citoyenneté** : ... Qualité de citoyen. *La citoyenneté française*.

3.1. The hard core

Despite the differences within each definition and between languages, there are some common anchoring points which thus provide a sound base for pursuing our exploration of citizenship. It is always a matter of belonging to a community, which entrains politics and rights, notably political rights. In this sense, the citizen is always a co-citizen, somebody who

⁵ This is a delicate matter, too. While each expresses himself in the context of the culture to which he belongs, this culture is by no means homogenous or closed. In every European State there are debates, often quite heated, calling the conceptions of social and political life into question. Lastly, nobody 'represents' a culture, no culture is represented by a person.

lives with others. This community is defined essentially at two levels: on the one hand the local level, the city, often in the urban sense, in which the person lives, to which he belongs, and on the other hand the State, connected to being a national⁶ which confers the full rights accorded to the members of this State. This belonging always refers to a level of political organisation, a level of authority, and to rights; in other words, citizen and citizenship always involve the delimitation of a territory and a group, a territory where the rights are applicable, a group as all the persons entitled to these rights; they are thus anchored in the first place on the political and the legal. Lastly, depending on the tradition, the accent may be more on the local as the first level of belonging and a space sufficiently limited for it to be easier for the person to be active and participate, or on the national-State level as the main level where the law is decided and where collective public identity is constructed. In no State is one level or the other exclusive; it is more a matter of priority being accorded to one or the other, a choice which has consequences for the conceptions of EDC.

This reminder may appear paradoxical at a time when political power, in particular that of States, is being called into question by the development of large multi-State economic entities and large multi-, trans-, and even supra-national enterprises. Paradoxical too, at a time when claims for particular rights are multiplying and when the possibilities for extending measures aimed at recognising and protecting the particular rights of persons and groups are being debated.

This reminder is still incomplete. It should be added that citizen and citizenship exist in democratic spaces, i.e. spaces where persons have equal rights and dignity, where the law is made by the people for the people. Legal and political equality, together with the principle of non-discrimination, combine with the pursuit of the maximum extension of freedoms. **The citizen is a person who has rights and duties in a democratic society.** The first right is that of establishing the law; the first duty is that of respecting the law, i.e. exercising his freedom, developing his initiatives, organising his relations with others within the framework defined by the law. Democratic citizenship thus implies the autonomy of the individual as the primary value, with all the risks that this entails for the powers that be; furthermore, much discourse and the corresponding actions try to achieve a sort of moderation of this freedom-autonomy by appealing to the sense of responsibility and knowledge of the legal and even moral obligations implied by living together and respecting the other person, other groups.

Thus, the core competences associated with democratic citizenship are those called for by the construction of a free and autonomous person, aware of his rights and duties in a society where the power to establish the law, i.e. the rules of community life which define the framework in which the freedom of each is exercised, and where the appointment and control of the people who exercise this power are under the supervision of all the citizens.

We will all recognise here the first principle of human rights - "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" - and its consequences in a democratic society that is intrinsically tied to it. At all levels, public authority is the emanation of the citizens, for the

⁶ State, nation, nation state... these concepts call for an analysis which goes beyond the scope of this study. Thus the nation is associated with different conceptions not only of the social or the political contract but also of culture and cultures, language and languages, the possibility to belong etc.. Furthermore it would be necessary to place in a historical context the idea of the nation state and the specific forms it has taken in different European states, in order to examine it as a historical construction, created at a specific moment in a specific context and which does not prejudice other political forms which will appear in the future.

benefit of the citizens, controlled by the citizens. Access to communal goods - such as schooling, health care and even work - is theoretically subject to rules of equality. The political crisis in our democracies is thus a crisis in the pursuit of equality in the face of trends towards fragmentation and the growing power of major economic forces. Lastly, it should be noted that rights are above all freedoms, capacities to act rather than imposed constraints that are received passively.

The emphasis on the “hard core” of citizenship does not eclipse the other - economic, social and cultural - aspects of citizenship. It is a long time since citizenship was confined to the political sphere, and even longer to the mere act of voting; the statement and existence of economic and social rights have been debated for some time in connection with human rights. Without wishing to restate the construct suggested by Marshall, it is important to affirm the complementary nature of civil and political rights and economic and social rights. It is vital to ensure minimum material conditions for survival and access to certain “essential” goods if the political rights and freedoms guaranteed to all are not to come to nought; conversely, the definition of economic and social rights and of the conditions of access to them can only emerge from a democratic debate underpinned by civil and political rights. Far from being opposed, these two categories of rights sustain each other. These economic and social rights clearly have a legal dimension. We shall address the question of cultural rights at a later stage, since these are controversial and have not yet been precisely defined. We shall address the question of cultural rights at a later stage, since they have not yet been secured, never mind stabilised, and are still surrounded by controversy.

Against this background, EDC is the education and training project in which there are the most tensions, ambivalences and even contradictions. Its aim is neither technical nor professional. It concerns the individual and his relations with others, the construction of personal and collective identities, the conditions of living together. It thus has to deal with the individual and the social, the particular and the universal, the already there, insertion in an historical and cultural continuity, and the invention of the future, the construction of a future world, the acceptance of a pre-existing reality and the development of a critical approach.

All citizens of democratic States are both clients and providers of education for democratic citizenship

This approach defines the main aim of EDC. At this stage, we distinguish between:

- the political and legal definition of democratic citizenship connected with the status granted to all those who belong by right to a public community; while citizenship is based on this belonging, it should not be forgotten that foreigners are also entitled to very many rights, including most economic and social rights;
- the competences desired or expected, required or dreamed of, so that the way of considering this status and living the rights and duties associated with it permit its maintenance and its development towards ever more freedom, equality and democracy.

3.2. Conceptual variations and challenges

In addition to the core concepts mainly connected with the political and legal dimension of democratic citizenship and human rights — equality, freedom, dignity, right, law, power, and a few others — it is necessary to attribute a special place to some relatively new approaches and fields which are both rich and controversial.

In the first place, we need to consider all the adjectives that people use with the term citizenship. Far from being examples of linguistic preciousness, these adjectives indicate more or less precise and shared meanings. The first of them is of course ‘democratic’. For the Council of Europe, this adjective emphasises the fact that it is a citizenship based on the principles and values of pluralism, the primacy of law, respect of human dignity and cultural diversity as enrichment. Other adjectives such as ‘pluralist’, ‘open’, ‘experienced’, etc., express the refusal to be restricted to a single, rigid concept and sound like rallying cry to multiply the reasoned attempts to construct the meaning of a democratic citizenship and constantly invent the new forms that it takes.

Thus the concepts of participation, democracy or participatory citizenship seem to be increasingly recognised as being vital for the future of our living together. It is a matter of ensuring that each can take his place in society and contribute to its development at whatever level it may be, beyond the political act of voting. It is a matter of each being able to have control over his living environment. The reduction of obstacles to participation, in particular socio-economic obstacles, is an integral part of any strategy aimed at strengthening democratic citizenship.

Second for EDC comes everything connected with education and training institutions. To draw up an inventory, even very incomplete, would be too long for this paper. However, if EDC is to be a constant concern of all the citizens and of all the institutions in a democratic society, the fact remains that it has, or should have, an explicit and priority presence in education and training institutions, and especially in schools. **Cooperation, participation, dialogue and respect are so many words which designate attitudes expected of all the people in a school**, in particular the adults, attitudes that should inspire activities in schools and the general atmosphere of school life.

Thirdly, a new field has been developing in recent years concerning the question of cultural rights, which we associate here with that of identities. Many authors today stress the importance of considering the identity of the individual as being mobile and pluralist, of guaranteeing the freedom to belong to this or that group, or to several groups, the freedom not to belong and the freedom to change. One essential component of the individual’s identity is obviously the cultural component, with in the first place the language and all that this implies; it immediately raises the question of membership of groups, communities, peoples (these words are very emotionally charged), which construct the identity of each individual, in particular those in which a person grows up, which are as much a here and now as a heritage. Cultural rights are thus thought of as a new generation of human rights, after civil rights, political rights and economic and social rights. While there is fairly broad agreement on the importance of these cultural rights, and on what justifies them, such as the respect of the diversity of cultures and the affirmation of the richness of exchanges and cross-fertilisation, their actual taking into account in the political constructs of different States is more delicate.

Thinking and decisions oscillate between the necessary construction of a common public space where the citizens share sufficient references to be able to discuss, live together and construct their future and a whole collection of hoped-for or feared consequences connected with the very strong affirmation of differences and particularities. While the multicultural reality of our societies is broadly accepted, the political and legal treatment of this reality, i.e. the definition of rights, those of the persons entitled to them, and even more those of the groups responsible for them, not forgetting the territorial dimension of the definition of the latter, are still being, and must continue to be, discussed and constructed.⁷ Openness to others is one core competence of citizenship (see below); we add to it, after many others, the reality and value of cross-fertilisation, the need to make room for the historical and critical dimension, which makes it possible to historicise cultures, i.e. to bring out their instability, their lines of force, the continuity of exchanges and evolutions, the very frequent invention of traditions. We do not know what tomorrow's cultures will be, but they will certainly not be what they are today or what they were yesterday.

The question of the cultural dimension of citizenship arises more generally. One fundamental aim of education for democratic citizenship is the reinforcement of the culture of democracy. Similarly, although the sense of belonging is clearly diminishing in terms of shared values, identity, history heritage and memory, it is also inextricably linked to a projection into the future, an ability to develop a collective project.

d. In tandem with the idea of a collective project involving a relationship with Others, ie a capacity for initiative and recognition of Others, a great deal of emphasis is currently being placed on the concept of responsibilities. A response to the individualisation and fragmentation of our societies, pursuit of social cohesion and of new moral bases for living together? This notion certainly needs to be studied further, without calling into question the principles of human rights and without making it the instrument of a new social conformity. For example, the emphasis on responsibility at local level must not cause us to neglect other, more distant forms of responsibility, the repercussions of local decisions in other places and the impact on local situations of decisions taken elsewhere. Analysis of responsibility will benefit from being based on the practice of education for democratic citizenship.

The word "responsibilities" opens at least two lines of inquiry, that of the law, with the idea of legal responsibility, and the broader area of an ability to recognise Others and a duty to respond to their freedom as persons holding rights. This latter approach differs from and complements the former. It differs because it advocates identifying the idea of a complementary path of responsibility⁸ for each individual, and it is complementary because it does not deny the importance of society and interpersonal relations. This obviates any split between the public institutions on the one hand, with relations based on the slightly "politically incorrect" concept of obedience, and on the other the community at large, civil society uninfluenced by any institution, approved by the public who would see it as the archetypal environment for freedom. Such freedom is not that of any individual with naked power outside society, who would consider society as a limit to power. Freedom is an ongoing process of construction within the relationship between the individual and others, the world and him/herself. The institutions are not obstacles but the requisite human,

⁷ See "Cultural rights at the Council of Europe, 1949-1997", document DECS/SE/DHRM (97) 5.

⁸ See Seminar on Empowerment and Responsibility: from Principle to Practice, Delphi (Greece), October 1999, Document CDCC/Delphes (99) 4.

prescriptive and axiological frames for action. Responsibilities are bound up with the ideas of freedom and power, which gives the "path" concept its full meaning.

4. CORE COMPETENCES

Here were open a virtually unlimited field of experience and attitudes, of knowledge and behaviours. Several authors express reserves as to the possibility and above all the value of drawing up a list. They stress the formal and highly unrealistic nature of such an effort. The resulting list would always be provisional, which would not in itself be very serious, but more importantly it would be but a string of generalisations and commonplaces known to all, giving the impression that it is necessary to learn all of the competences cited through education. This infinite extension would have the perverse effect of discrediting such a list and the values, principles and objectives it contained. How to avoid a long litany of competences whose sum is supposed to define personal and social human perfection while everyday life would take care to invalidate it (almost) constantly? These authors prefer to devote their efforts to the study of the conditions for this education. Other authors on the contrary think it necessary to try to put a little order in such a vast field: for them, it is precisely the infinitely extensible and constantly shifting nature of citizenship competences that means an effort should be made to clarify and classify them.

These two approaches are not antagonistic. Constructs that list and classify competences cannot take the place of action and intervention, but they can be useful in that they bring a little clarity into this always open universe. They provide a theoretical framework which can be used to define, orient, incite and analyse activities. Several classifications have been proposed on various occasions by different authors as so many ways of outlining EDC. We would stress that these constructs are intended to help us, so let us take them as such and try to improve them through constantly comparing them with reality.

4.1 The first classification

The first classification comprises three broad categories of competences: cognitive competences, affective competences and those connected with the choice of values, those connected with action. Let us clarify the content of each of these categories a little:

- **cognitive competences.** We can separate these into four families:

- **competences of a legal and political nature**, i.e. knowledge concerning the rules of collective life and the democratic conditions of their establishment, knowledge concerning the powers in a democratic society, at all levels of political life; in other words, knowledge about democratic public institutions and the rules governing freedom and action, necessitating a realisation that these institutions and freedoms are the responsibility of all citizens. Legal competences are thus “weapons” with which citizens can defend their freedoms, protect individuals and challenge abuses of power by those in authority;
- **knowledge of the present world**, knowledge which implies, like that above, a historical dimension and a cultural dimension. The fact is that in order to be able to take part in the public debate and make a valid decision on the choices offered in a democratic society, it is necessary to know what is being talked about, to have some knowledge of the subjects

under discussion. In view of the multiplication of the fields of theoretical and practical knowledge, no individual could have total competence; this raises painful problems of choice in the field of education. These difficulties are aggravated by the provisional nature of a great deal of this knowledge and the need to train people to accept its mobility and welcome new ideas. The capacity for critical analysis of the society is essential here. Such knowledge of today's world also includes anticipatory capacities, i.e. the ability to see problems and solutions in the long term and avoid superficial short-term analyses. We know, but sometimes seem to forget, that many decisions taken today will have an impact tomorrow, whether they concern restoring balance within a formerly natural habitat which has now become completely "man-made", handing down sufficient energy or food resources to future generations, or addressing the long-term effects of investment in nuclear power or genetic manipulations, to take just a few examples;

- **competences of a procedural nature**, which we hope are transferable and hence usable in a variety of situations. In addition to various general intellectual capacities, for analysis and synthesis for example, we would stress two capacities of particular relevance for democratic citizenship: the ability to argue, which is related to debate and the ability to reflect, i.e. the capacity to re-examine actions and arguments in the light of the principles and values of human rights, to reflect on the direction and limits of possible action, on conflicts of values and of interests, etc.;
- **knowledge of the principles and values of human rights and democratic citizenship.** These principles and values derive in the first place from a reasoned construct, but at a deeper level they call for a conception of the human being based on the freedom and equal dignity of each individual.

This last family brings us directly to the second field of competences:

- **ethical competences and value choices.** Individuals construct themselves and their relationships with others in accordance with certain values. This ever-present ethical dimension encompasses affective and emotional aspects. Some people believe that acceptance of the values of human rights and democracy should only be the result of a rational construct, whereas others believe that it is not sufficient to decree acceptance in order to obtain it. Affective and emotional aspects are always present whenever one considers oneself as an individual in relation to others and to the world. EDC also calls for work on these aspects. Citizenship cannot be reduced to a catalogue of rights and duties, but entails membership of a group or groups, bringing identities into play in a very profound way. It consequently requires an ethical shift that includes a personal and collective emotional dimension.

Numerous as they may be, the values involved, for which construction work and reflection are necessary, are centred on **freedom, equality and solidarity**. They imply the recognition and respect of oneself and of others, the ability to listen, reflection on the place of violence in society and how to control it the resolution of conflicts. They demand the positive acceptance of differences and diversity, they require placing confidence in the other. In this connection it is necessary to go beyond a very narrow conception of tolerance, the need for which is so often proclaimed. The fact is that tolerance is not limited to the acceptance of difference, an acceptance which is sometimes indifference; it requires recognising one's own limits and considering the other as being the trustee, in the same way as oneself, of part of humanity; each individual needs others to construct

himself as a human subject; this reference to values is extremely important in order to prevent instrumentalisation of the law;

- **capacities for action**, sometimes known as **social competences**. Knowledge, attitudes and values, take on meaning in everyday personal and social life; they are embodied in capacities for action, in social competences, and help give sense to the presence of each to others and to the world. It is a matter of improving people's ability to take initiative and to accept responsibilities in society. Once again, it is impossible to compile an exhaustive list; let us nevertheless look at some of these frequently mentioned capacities:
 - the **capacity to live with others**, to **cooperate**, to construct and implement joint projects, to take on responsibilities. More broadly, this capacity contributes to interculturalism, particularly the need for people to learn several languages. Languages are regarded here not just as tools for communicating with other individuals but above all as openings to other modes of thought and ways of understanding, to other cultures. Interculturalism is not confined to the linguistic dimension, but involves all aspects of cultures, including history.
 - the **capacity to resolve conflicts in accordance with the principles of democratic law**, in particular the two fundamental principles of calling upon a third person not involved in the conflict, and of open debate to hear the parties in dispute and try to arrive at the truth, conflicts can be resolved through mediation aimed at producing an agreement between the parties, or according to judicial principles, where the decision is taken by a third party on the basis of laws and regulations enacted prior to the conflict in question,
 - the **capacity to take part in public debate**, to argue and choose in a real-life situation.

We could have presented these competences in the form of a triangle, with the three angles 'cognitive', 'affective and values' and 'social' in order to show the links visually. No category is exclusive of the others and in each situation these three categories are interdependent; they are three dimensions of the presence of each to the world and to others. Thus for example, the peaceful resolution of conflicts implies knowledge on the democratic principles that organise this resolution, a personal attitude which involves controlling one's own violence and accepting not to take the law into one's own hands, and the capacity for action in connection with the debate. The majority of the competences thus classified also refer to the two other fields. For example, argumentation and debate call for a knowledge on the subject under discussion, the capacity to listen to the other and acknowledgement of his point of view, as well as the application of these capacities in the precise situation in which the people find themselves. There is no effective citizenship other than that exercised in and by the actions of the individual; conversely, knowledge of and reflection on his acts and their social and personal, practical and ethical significance are just as important. According to the training and education criteria, the accent should be on the weakest dimension. Another advantage of this type of construct is that it constitutes an instrument which is an aid to the evaluation and reorientation of practices.

4.2. The second classification

A second classification has been proposed, by Ruud Veldhuis in particular, which distinguishes four dimensions of citizenship, dimensions which are based on an analysis of life in society. These dimensions are: political and legal, social, cultural and economic. As with the first classification, these dimensions are not ends in themselves, but are intended as

aids for the classification and clarification of the competences for an EDC. For some the four dimensions are equal; for others, the political and legal constitute a transversal dimension, questions of power and law running through the other three dimensions, economic, social and cultural.

At the risk of repeating some of the information given in the first classification, let us outline the content and purposes of each of these dimensions:

- the **political and legal dimension** covers rights and duties with respect to the political system and the law. It requires knowledge concerning the law and the political system, democratic attitudes and the capacity to participate, to exercise responsibilities at all levels of public life;
- the **social dimension** covers relations between individuals and requires knowledge of what these relations are based on and how they function in society. Social competences are paramount here. This dimension is connected to others, in particular the following one, through the weight of values such as solidarity;
- the **economic dimension** concerns the world of production and consumption of goods and services. It opens directly on labour and the way it is organised, on the fruits of labour and their distribution. It requires economic competences, i.e. knowledge on how the economic world functions, including the world of work;
- the **cultural dimension** refers to collective representations and imaginations and to shared values. It implies, like the others and sometimes more than them, historical competence, recognition of a common heritage with its varied components, a mobile heritage, a heritage to exchange with others. Culture is also connected with the capacities which form the basis of our schools in Europe, reading and writing, the capacity to move about in one linguistic universe and to acquire another. These last capacities are necessary conditions for all EDC.

Although they differ in presentation, both these classifications stress the importance of constructing a critical social consciousness, that is to say a consciousness of belonging to the world, a "fellow-citizenship" which involves the citizen shouldering his/her responsibilities on a day-to-day basis, but also necessitates a broader dimension beyond any immediate and local concerns. Such a social, but also historical and geographical, consciousness involves developing a capacity for stepping back from oneself, as well as establishing a public forum for debate.

5. PRACTICES

EDC is not simply a theoretical construct, but above all a daily invitation, ie an invitation to exercise one's freedoms within the framework set by democratic laws and human rights, and to take action to strengthen these rights and freedoms for all human beings. However, let us remember that nothing would be more absurd than to oppose theory and practice, reflection and action. To live is to think and to act; to think and to act is to live. Experience is conceptual: action always brings us into contact with the circumstances and context in which it takes place, and with the actor's perceptions of the world and human relations. Council of Europe activities, particularly those undertaken as part of the EDC project, consequently attempt to combine these two facets of this education.

The question of the relationship between theory and practice is by no means a rhetorical one. We have inherited approaches to this relationship in education that oscillate between two poles, neither of which is satisfactory on its own: one, favouring the teaching of content and knowledge about human rights and democratic citizenship, is based on reason, which is assumed to generate behaviour in keeping with this knowledge; the other holds that experience alone can give rise to a profound awareness of the need to act in accordance with human rights and democratic citizenship, and that the strength of this need will then generate appropriate behaviour.

5.1. Public targeted and fields of intervention: all individuals, all institutions

EDC is aimed at all individuals, regardless of their or their role in society. It can in no case be reserved to those who are marginalised or threatened with exclusion. Admittedly a knowledge of their rights is essential for these people if they are to be able to escape from the relegation process, but a knowledge of rights and duties is also necessary for those who are called upon to exercise power at any level of society, and especially those who hold a share of public authority. EDC cannot be a means for those in a position of authority to impose a kind of social acceptance on others. The greatest civic responsibility, if such a classification is relevant here, is that of persons who have more power and responsibility in society.

EDC consequently goes far beyond the school environment in which it was first applied. It asserts itself as a need that is felt throughout people's lives and in the various spheres of their existence. "Sites of citizenship" - a key feature of the EDC project - illustrate the importance of this new approach. We shall present them first, before going on to look at schools and other possible sites for action to promote democratic citizenship.

5.2. Citizenship sites

Citizenship sites are new, or innovative, forms of management of democratic life. The sites consist of any initiative (centre, institution, community, neighbourhood, town, city, region, etc) where there is an attempt to give definition to, and implement the principles of, modern democratic citizenship. The site is a practice, or set of practices, which will illustrate the modern day meaning of citizenship and the structures which support it." Such is the definition of this concept, which is specific to the "Education for Democratic Citizenship" project, as set out in the 1998 activity report⁸. This makes them a further means of implementing education for democratic citizenship as compared with the traditional approaches, which are mainly centred on existing institutions such as schools. They are suitable for work with young people who feel uncomfortable with or are underachieving at school, and within a lifelong learning perspective.

These sites, and the way in which they are defined, studied and used, clearly reflect the new thrust of EDC. For example, they cover a wide range of projects, encourage partnerships and thus involve many different players, explore different forms of participation, combat exclusion and so forth; they are based on values and democratic processes, which they aim to promote and consolidate. At these sites, development of EDC competences is combined with action to build upon them and strengthen them. The sites are therefore able to encompass a range of activities - co-ordination with local projects, setting up intercultural communication

⁸See document DECS/CIT (98) 38 rev.

committees to mediate between different communities, teaching young people from poorer districts about their rights and responsibilities, projects to reconcile communities divided by war, bringing about a democratic climate in schools, etc.⁹ Wherever they take place, these activities provide opportunities for expression and negotiation, identify training needs, and emphasise the need for the authorities to adopt an open, responsive attitude. One of the more promising avenues for constructing a European democratic environment involves establishing dialogue between all these sites by means of the new technologies. Such dialogue would help bring the individuals concerned out of their often narrow, restrictive environments in order to exchange experiences and prompt new initiatives.

5.3. Practices in the school environment

Schools are currently under heavy fire. This is no place to analyse the highly contradictory arguments advanced or the equally contradictory imperatives increasingly foisted upon schools. For instance, how can we ensure a minimum level of equality in access to knowledge and acquisition of skills when schools classify, stream and exclude people at the very request of society? How can we prevent the recognition of cultural diversity and different types of intelligence and ways of learning from resulting in withdrawal into distinctive identities and intensification of inequalities? We should perhaps just bear in mind that where education for democratic citizenship is concerned, schools fall down wherever society falls down, and are very often the only stable institutions that cater for the whole of one particular age group and strive to combat the threats to social cohesion. But here again the School cannot on its own restore social cohesion and transmit values since it is itself part of a world where this cohesion is collapsing or metamorphosing, and where these values are under attack every day from physical and mental violence and the force of a type of financial competition which ignores even the very concept of solidarity. This violence and competition is transmitted day in, day out by the media.

Above and beyond the judgments passed on schools and the changes they are undergoing, they are still vital institutions where education for democratic citizenship is concerned. At school one has to consider the three types of competence identified in the first classification: cognitive competences, ethical competences and action-related competences. There are three different ways of catering for them: school life, ie all aspects of school as a living, social environment with its collective rules, interpersonal conflicts, times and opportunities for co-operation, etc; the lessons themselves, which are the school's *raison d'être*; and the times, places and opportunities for spontaneous initiatives by the pupils outside the actual teaching activities. However EDC is incorporated into schools, it should be recalled that EDC has to closely associate the construction of knowledge, practice and action with critical reflection on each of them in order to work on the principles and values which underlie this education and explain them. If the school is to educate people to democratic citizenship, it must constantly ensure that the ways in which it operates are not contrary to human rights. It is not a matter of turning the school into a permanent forum, but rather of introducing structures, as has been done in a number of places, for dialogue, exchange, regulation and participation. We would stress on the one hand the need to make room for times when the pupils are in position to take initiatives and exercise responsibilities, and on the other hand the importance of developing ways of running the school which permit all, young and adult, to see their rights respected. These are the same fundamental orientations which form the basis for sites of citizenship

⁹See document DECS/EDU/CIT (99) 40.

School education is based on teaching and training content arranged in what are usually called disciplines or subjects. From the standpoint of behaviours and relations between individuals, all these subjects are concerned because the situations of teaching and training bring together individuals whose actions have to respect the principles of human rights. Here again it is impossible to stress too much the competences of listening, dialogue, participation and responsibility.

As regards content, the four dimensions, political and legal, social, economic and cultural are obviously in the first rank. This gives a privileged place to all the social science disciplines, which, in studying past and present societies, construct ways of understanding social, economic, political and cultural life, ways which include a historical dimension and a territorial dimension and which are in relation with human values and conceptions.

While the social sciences have an obvious place, other subjects are sound supports for EDC. This has been demonstrated in a number of studies. This is the case with modern languages and artistic education, everything that concerns creation and cultural exchanges. To learn a language is also to learn a culture, another way of categorising and qualifying the world, of expressing and thus of constructing one's thoughts and emotions. To develop artistic education is to learn other languages than the spoken language for explaining the world and one's relation to it, it is to encounter the works of others. This considerably enlarges the precise sites of initiatives and activities to construct the competences required by democratic citizenship. The sciences also make a vital contribution, firstly in terms of content, since the world we live in is increasingly influenced by science and technology, and secondly in terms of methods and intellectual - particularly critical - training, through the inculcation of a desire for truth, the pursuit of rational argument and accurate language and an appeal to the imagination.

To this brief list of traditional teaching subjects offered in secondary schools, and in some cases in primary schools, we should add the new technologies which, in all the diversity of their physical forms, their potentialities and their uses, also have their place in EDC. Understanding and mastering them also leads to new competences for which there must be education and training.

Whatever their subject-matter and content, all recent studies emphasise the independence of pupils or learners in applying active methods calling for initiative, discovery, a spirit of inquiry, responsibility and rigorously structured and considered experimentation.

Lastly, schools are running head-on into phenomena which, until recently, were largely outside their day-to-day experience - phenomena now grouped together under the general heading of "violence". Studies of violence in schools over the past ten years discourage hasty generalisations. Once again, it is important to assess the range of situations and the variety of acts covered by the term "violence". It is absolutely essential to take account of this diversity so as to avoid imposing misguided schemes and taking measures or decisions that will only make the problem worse. Although schools cannot do everything, although they alone cannot remedy social ills and although they are themselves pervaded by the conflicts and contradictions of our societies, they have a vital contribution to make to dealing with - and resolving - the problems of violence. As in other contexts, and almost archetypically, all studies of violence agree that efforts to address it must focus closely on individual situations and that they necessitate steadfast commitment from adults, co-operation among them, regular and patient dialogue with pupils and young people, the setting up of communication facilities and the use of conflict resolution methods based either on mediation or - in more

serious cases - on the justice system. Such action always draws on the principles and values of human rights. For example, conflict resolution involves calling in a third party and adversarial debate. All this means that adults must adopt responsible attitudes and behaviour; we cannot demand more responsibility from young people and then act as though such situations were unimportant. Lastly, particular consideration must be given to the victims. The law punishes, protects and compensates; more precisely, it requires those in positions of authority and responsibility to ensure that infringements and offences are punished, that victims are compensated and placated and that people are protected from acts of violence and all other violations of their rights.

A final aspect of schooling relates to education about rights. While in most states young people generally acquire their full rights on reaching their majority (normally set at 18), this does not mean that they are without rights below that age. They should therefore be taught about these rights and their significance. The aim is not to train lawyers, but to produce citizens who are aware of their rights and responsibilities and are therefore able to act in society in accordance with those rights. Young people do not move suddenly from a state of total dependence on their parents or guardians to a state of total freedom when they come of age. The rights of minors vary from state to state, but minors everywhere are subject to certain specific obligations, and their freedoms increase gradually with age. Like other areas of EDC, this is not a theoretical approach, but an induction into a day-to-day citizenship that focuses on everyday life, while attempting to provide scope for explaining the principles and values on which it is based. This concern for education about rights is not immediately evident in specific studies, particularly in relation to a given site of citizenship, but it is often present and underpins many reports.

5.4. Lifelong education and other areas

Another field of EDC is lifelong education or training. There is unanimity on this point. It is today inconceivable to consider that a person's education is completed once he has left school or university. School education is a right that is recognised in all democratic States and the implementation of this right results in the development of ad hoc institutions; the same should apply in the case of lifelong education. This calls for comprehensive economic and educational policies. This education cannot be reduced to a technical or vocational aspect only; it has to embrace what concerns the individual, the worker and the citizen. Whether it is intended to maintain the high skill level of some or to facilitate the reinsertion of excluded categories, the citizenship dimension is always present.

Among the target publics for this lifelong training, a particular place must be found for those who are responsible for education and training, whether in schools or some other institutional framework. All too often the public authorities fail to draw the appropriate conclusions from assertions concerning education and training for democratic citizenship, or the training of trainers. The emphasis placed on trainers derives from the concern to reach as many individuals and groups as possible, and from the associated need for "intermediaries" specially trained for this work.

Lifelong EDC occurs in a very wide range of places. Workplaces and firms are among the most important ones. Although it is true that firms do not set out to train citizens, like any other social institution they have a duty to operate in accordance with human rights, whether individual or collectively expressed rights. Firms too are therefore sites for training in citizenship.

Lastly, we shall refer once again to the need to take account of individuals and institutions which, in one way or another, have or will have authority over others. Efforts to introduce training in democratic citizenship into higher education establishments and the media, or into public institutions such as the police force or the justice system, are therefore both necessary and desirable. Once again, it is important to listen, to take account of projects launched by civil society and to see public authority as a service to citizens.

5.5. Convergent approaches, similar difficulties

All of these practices and experiences, all of these places and sites, reveal comparable needs. Everywhere the emphasis is on the importance of dialogue, listening and taking account of what other people say, so as to empower their ideas and thus those expressing them. A spirit of initiative, participation and responsibility is universally advocated, calling for action and practices that require personal commitment and time. This is where EDC as a process can best be observed. Partnerships and co-operation are always necessary, between individuals, between associations, NGOs and other groups, and between associations and local and other authorities. It is in such dialogue, initiatives and partnerships that relationships with others are experienced and constructed. Lastly, in situations with a more explicit training goal, emphasis is placed on case studies as examples to be resolved and a means of giving tangible form to the principles and values of democratic citizenship.

The situation is far from utopian, however. EDC is encountering numerous difficulties. These difficulties generally derive from various factors and situations that we have briefly presented in their context. The problem is sometimes that the socio-economic conditions are not right; exclusion from the main forms of integration into society, particularly work, makes it difficult to learn rights and responsibilities. Beliefs and common sense are sometimes obstacles to democratic citizenship; people do not trust a method of conflict resolution that observes democratic principles, whereas force, or even private revenge, remains a more accepted solution; others do not see why they should observe democratic principles when the rules of competition mean that the strongest win and therefore the weakest lose, when cheats are all too often winners and only artificial havens are left for those who do not have access to tax havens. Still others stress the limits of participatory, open practices in schools; even when this aim is not called into question, there is a great deal of resistance to it from both adults and young people. Among the former, teachers have often had little training in this area and hide behind syllabus and curriculum constraints, school authorities are loath to relinquish any of their power and the presence of parents is seen as problematic and sometimes even as contrary to the direction pursued; pupils, on the other hand, lack the confidence to become involved, find pupil committee meetings boring and often feel that little attention is paid to their views.

Other difficulties also stem from the different situations in different states, depending on their history. Many studies distinguish between former communist states and other countries, because the former underwent a long totalitarian period that isolated them from democratic institutions. This distinction should be handled with care. Firstly, these states do not share the same history, since some of them had known democracy before the second world war and had others little or no such experience. Secondly, some of the other countries were also subjected to long periods of dictatorship. Lastly, the more established democratic states are being overtaken by the breakdown of social and political bonds, giving rise to comparable

challenges and problems that we must all face and resolve, drawing on the principles and values of democratic citizenship and human rights.

6. SOME RISKS AND DANGERS

After setting out their thoughts on the concepts and their classifications of competences, and analysing the importance of EDC, the range of practices involved and the various ways in which it is introduced in schools and elsewhere, several authors warn against certain risks and dangers. Before we bring this study to a close, and in order to stress once again the importance of EDC and the specific problems and tensions associated with it, we shall list the most common risks and dangers, including some that have already been mentioned:

- the extension *ad infinitum* of the competences aimed at by EDC and of the fields concerned. At the extreme, since the citizen is an informed and responsible person, capable of taking part in public debate and making choices, nothing of what is human should be unfamiliar to him, nothing of what is experienced in society should be foreign to democratic citizenship. The risk is real, and we see many situations where, in the name of this extension, EDC is paradoxically reduced to the teaching of collective behaviours that conform to our cultural habits. This aspect of education is often very important, but EDC has to deal in one way or another with questions of power and the law, otherwise it is neither democratic nor citizenly;
- the bureaucratisation of training and education institutions and the failure of teachers and trainers to share their power. The question arises already in the schools, and is even more acute in adult education: what pupils or trainees have to say must be taken seriously. Their view is, on the face of it, authentic and has to be listened to and considered as such, even if at the same time it is the subject, focus or support of the training and education activity;
- the limitation of EDC to difficult situations. We have criticised a frequent tendency to take an interest in EDC only for persons in danger of exclusion or in difficult social and economic circumstances. If we forget the hard core of citizenship and the competences it requires there is a risk of its being reduced to a vague morality of behaviour, which, whatever the quality of the teachers or trainers, would become an enterprise of normalisation of bodies and minds. This hard core requires paying just as much attention to the education and training of those who are more in a position to exercise social responsibilities or hold a share of public authority? Advancing the ideas of responsibility and participation involves accepting a major risk, namely that of power-sharing. There is too much talk of the risk that empowering people "on the periphery" will amount to giving them rights without duties, as if we were afraid that these "marginals" will demand rights over which those in power prefer to retain their control;
- the reduction of EDC to the local, to the groups encountered in everyday life. Work in this direction is very useful and local integration is often a necessary condition for the construction of an identity. But in a world which is very open, with free movement of goods, and in particular cultural goods and information, other references are very present and need to be considered, perhaps in connection with the local, perhaps not. Lastly, it must not be forgotten that while certain persons are in difficulty locally and the fight against their exclusion requires local reintegration, others think immediately on the

continental and global scale. Thinking on these levels is also a competence necessary for understanding and exercising one's rights as a citizen;

- the ambiguity of words and their reduction to what suits us at a given moment. We have endeavoured to analyse as often as possible the concepts and the competences of EDC through calling them into question and testing them. None of these concepts and none of these competences can be enclosed within strict, closed, stable and unique limits and meanings. Thus each has to be constantly reconsidered both from the theoretical standpoint and with reference to the context in which it is used and the situation concerned. The word 'tolerance' is a good example here;
- the slippage of the political towards the cultural. The present phenomena of globalisation and crisis in our democratic political institutions are leading some people to seek in culture the affirmation of new rights capable of recognising other public entities than those which have hitherto dominated the democratic political universe. Market economy, democracy and democratic states, cultural diversity, collective identity and free movement of persons (to some extent), ideas (under the control of a few powerful companies), goods (increasingly), so many concepts and realities which have not yet finished being interrogated, both for their own sake and even more for the relations they have.

SUSPENSION POINTS

Human rights, culture and democratic culture do not spread like influenza! It is not natural, innate, to consider human beings to be equal or to state that all should participate in the establishment of the law, that the freedom is humanity's first good and openness to others a special condition for its existence. All this needs to be taught and by this very fact requires the commitment of citizens, educators and trainers. Whatever their convictions, their actions will not count for much if the society and the authorities, be they public or private, do not support them by more than words, which would be exacerbated if they acted in a manner incompatible with human rights and democracy. EDC can only be meaningful if there is a genuine correspondence with the rest of society.

So nothing can be taken for granted, and the needs are great. It is important always to bear in mind the theoretical and practical contribution made by the concept of democratic citizenship. Some keywords used frequently in this study, echoing their presence in the Council texts on which it is based, illustrate the need for such a frame of reference: freedom, equality, participation, responsibility, solidarity. Freedom as capacity for action, equality as access for all to basic goods and services in order to protect human dignity, participation as the need to contribute to the public interest, responsibility for oneself, others and the future of the world, and solidarity between people transcending political, cultural and social barriers. These are, and remain, the hard core of Education for Democratic Citizenship.