

Euro-Patriotism: What's There to Gain for Minorities?

Gita Steiner-Khamsi

The essay draws from qualitative case studies conducted during Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study (1994 – 2002), and points at recent curricular reforms in political education (specially in Europe).

There are several recent developments in political education reform that are highlighted: the fusion of politics and the economy, the emergence of a «postnational model of membership» in European countries (Soysal), the emphasis on «constitutional patriotism» (Kleger), and the dichotomization between «mild capitalism» (European social market economies) and «wild capitalism» (US free market economy). The author labels these recent developments «Euro-Patriotism» and reflects on how these recent reforms in political education may impact minorities in Europe.

This essay¹ explores whether recent developments in political education curricula are likely to strengthen or, alternatively, undermine curricular reforms in multicultural education. It draws from empirical data provided in the IEA Civic Education Study, in particular, from the multiple-case studies that constituted the first phase of this international research project (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta & Schwille, 2002a; Torney-Purta, Schwille & Amadeo, 1999).

There exist at least two avenues of inquiry for illuminating the intersection of political education and multicultural education. A widespread methodological approach examines whether notions of citizenship *explicitly* address disenfranchised groups and minorities. The past two decades have witnessed a proliferation of studies that scrutinize whether minorities are represented and how they are depicted in textbooks. In former Western Europe, triggered by the rise of xenophobia and racism in the 1980s, and in former Central and Eastern Europe, prompted by the fall of Soviet nationalism and the emergence of ethno-nationalism in the 1990s, several researchers in Europe drew special attention to history education.² They examined in detail national history curricula and textbooks with regard to their stereotypical or racist depiction of minorities, in particular immigrants, refugees, and ethnic/linguistic/religious minorities including Jews

and Roma. As a result of these investigations, much has been written about the lack of minority-inclusive curricula and textbooks in European history education.

In comparison to research on history education, European studies on political education, citizenship education, or civic education³ had been relatively slow to adopt such a minority-inclusive research focus. In fact, so much had research on minority-inclusiveness lagged behind that one wondered whether political education had a charter to be exclusive. Was the silence on minorities and absence of minority perspectives in political education deliberately chosen, given that, in life outside of schools, many immigrants did not have citizen rights and immigration was seen, until the early eighties, a passing phenomenon? Thus, whom else was there to prepare for citizenship and democracy except «the natives»? For a long time, it was seen as legitimate that political education only addressed citizens and ignored the masses of residents in European countries, who despite their long-term residence in their country of immigration, were not naturalized and therefore did not possess political rights. For a long time, political education was narrowly defined in terms of government studies or civics, preparing future voters for political participation. Thus, many researchers and practitioners of political education saw only a few or no compelling reasons to explore whether (non-voting) minorities were included in political education.

For a variety of reasons, this situation has changed in some parts of Europe. In countries of the European Unions, residents from other EU countries have lost the stigma of being «foreigners,» «guest workers,» or immigrants, and are now considered European citizens, temporarily or permanently inhabiting one of the states of the European Union. At the same time, there is a visible trend in European curricular reform that signals a departure from a narrow definition of political education, which was very much focused on civic education and government studies, and embraces instead a broader notion encompassing citizenship education and social studies. McLaughlin's distinction between «minimal definitions» (civic education) and «maximal definitions» (citizenship education) is helpful for understanding the recent transformation of political education from having been exclusive, elitist, formal, content-led, knowledge-based to becoming more inclusive, activist, participative, process-led and values-based (McLaughlin, 1992; see also Kerr, 2002, Figure 1). Having said that, it is important to point out that the shift from civic education to citizenship education is not to be exclusively credited to more enlightened, participatory, and minority-inclusive politics and educational reform, but also needs to be seen as a positive side-effect of an overall alerting development in European educational reform that many critics view as the resurgence of the «back to basics» movement (Radtke & Weiss, 2000). Concretely, political education had been declared as a malleable subject and as non-essential for compulsory education. Its instructional time as a stand-alone subject, if it ever existed in that form, was reduced in lower secondary education and delegated to upper secondary or post-compul-

sory education. Increasingly, political education was fused with several other subject matters, notably social studies and history education. These developments occurred very much to the dismay of history educators, who, in turn, experienced over the past decade a dramatic decrease of instructional time for their own subject. Without highlighting the intricacies of political education curricula in European countries, there are a few tendencies that deserve mention. Several European curricula now frame political education as studies in personal, social, or moral development (mainly at primary school level), social studies (primary and lower secondary level), and have fused political education with government studies and economics (upper secondary level). As Schwille & Amadeo (2002, p. 107) have poignantly summarized,

civic education is ubiquitous – potentially everywhere in schools – with students learning civic knowledge, disposition and skills from various courses, extracurricular activities, hidden curricula, peers, and relations between teachers and students more generally.

I would like to add the point here that political education is more ubiquitous than ever. With the exception of England and Wales (Kerr, 2002), where, in 1997, the Labour Government advanced the establishment of a national curriculum for citizenship education, political education has «lost» instructional space and time.

The three factors mentioned above, that is, the reconfiguration of Europe as a new political entity, the shift from a minimal to a maximal definition of political education, and the fusion of political education curricula with other subject matters, have led to a major preoccupation among practitioners, policy makers, and educational researchers as to how to make political education more inclusive, participatory, and effective.

Given these recent developments in politics and educational reform, it is not surprising that the question of whether political education is minority-inclusive has ranked top in most of the recent comparative educational studies on political education (Cogan & Derricott, 2000; Hahn, 1998; Ichilov, 1998; Farnen, Dekker & Meyenberg, 1996; Torney-Purta, Schwille & Amadeo, 1999). These studies, in fact, examine both areas of political struggle that are of concern for minorities (see Fraser, 1997): struggles for social redistribution targeting remedies for overcoming ethnic stratification and unequal access, and struggles for cultural recognition that emphasize the rights to preserve minority languages, cultures, and religions. When dealing with «social problems» in political education, do students, for example, learn about and analyze the reasons why unemployment is unequally distributed with regard to nationality, ethnicity and gender? When «social movements» are discussed in the political education classroom, do teachers provide sufficient instructional time for dealing with anti-racism and minority rights movements? These two examples, the first dealing with social distribution and the second with cultural recognition issues, have been randomly selected from a long list of examples. They illustrate the kind of

questions that educational researchers examine when they focus on minority-inclusiveness in political education.

The intersection of political education and multicultural education, however, can also be studied from another angle. Rather than asking whether, and how, political education in different countries has incorporated minority perspectives and concerns, we could also examine how the transformation of a curricular field (in our case: political education) has affected, or is likely to affect, the various segments or groups of a society differently. In contrast to studies that explicitly examine intended, implemented, and hidden curricula with regard to their inclusiveness or exclusiveness of minorities, the second method of inquiry is relatively underutilized. This second methodological approach adopts a systemic policy research framework in that it analyzes overall changes in a curricular field and explores planned or unplanned effects of these changes on minorities.

This essay adopts the second perspective and offers a few reflections on how recent reforms in political education are likely to impact multicultural education in European countries. My analyses and reflections draw from case studies that were developed by national research teams in twenty-four countries as part of the IEA Civic Education Study.

The IEA Civic Education Study

The Civic Education Study of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) lasted from 1994 until 2002.⁴ Phase 1 of the Civic Education consisted of case studies on civic education. These case studies were conducted by local researchers in the participating countries, who based their findings on a variety of data collection methods such as curricular analysis, policy document analysis, individual interviews, surveys, focus group interviews, or participant observation. Although, several national research teams collected a tremendous amount of quantitative data, Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study is referred to as the Qualitative Phase of the study, mainly because the emphasis was primarily placed on gathering contextual information (country-specific features of civic education) rather than on information collected from standardized tests and attitude scales. Nevertheless, Phase 1 was more than an accumulation of twenty-four country studies, each describing recent developments and special features of civic education in a particular country. The twenty-four research teams developed, under the leadership of an international steering committee, a process-oriented and dialogue-based methodology to secure a «multiple case study» research design (LeTendre, 2002; see also Yin, 1984). They agreed on a conceptual framework, on a set of research, curricular, and policy questions, as well as on rigorous standards of data collection and analysis. These were seen as necessary methodological steps to ensure solid data, clean analysis and to some extent comparability. All national research teams published their

own findings of Phase 1. In addition to the publications by the participating researchers, two international books have been produced so far, which exclusively deal with this qualitative or contextual phase of the IEA Civic Education Study. The first book (Torney-Purta, Schwille & Amadeo, 1999) explains the design of the study in more detail and comprises summaries of the twenty-four case studies. The second book (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta & Schwille, 2002a) highlights some of the methodological challenges and opportunities of studying civic education cross-nationally and presents seven analyses of participating researchers who examined Phase 1 data cross-nationally.

Even though this article exclusively draws from the findings of the contextual phase, it is important to also briefly mention the standardized phase of the Civic Education Study. Phase 2 consisted of standardized surveys that were collaboratively developed and that were, at about the same time, administered to nationally representative samples of students and teachers in the participating countries. Again, the national research teams have published their own findings, usually comparing their country profile with that of civic education in other countries. In addition, two books on cross-national analyses have been published so far; the first focusing on the sample of fourteen year olds (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz 2001) and the second one on the sample of 17-18 year olds (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt & Nikolova, 2002).

The Data that «Talked Back»

Analyzing case studies on political education in twenty-four countries cross-nationally was both a challenging and fascinating task. How can country-specific models of political education be compared without losing the «thick» (Clifford Geertz) descriptions or the «causal web» (Tilly, 1997, p. 49) embedded in each case? How the various researchers compared the case studies cross-nationally was as intriguing as what they had found with regard to similarities and differences in the participating countries. In this essay, however, I will confine myself to a discussion of the findings rather than the methodologies of qualitative comparative research. In reporting on the findings, I will further narrow my discussion on civic education in European countries⁵ and exclusively focus on unexpected results.

In the introductory chapter of the volume *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship*, we remarked that the case study material, which formed the database for the volume, «talked back» (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta & Schwille 2002b, p. 33):

[...], in qualitative cross-national analysis, there is room for dealing with surprises, that is, unexpected findings that can subsequently be used to re-frame a research question. In short, the case study material 'talked back'. [...], while reviewing the qualitative database, three of the authors (Lee, Kontogiannopoulou

-Polydorides and Steiner-Khamsi), for example, found the original conceptual framework of the IEA Civic Education Study too narrow. On the basis of their independently conducted case study analyses, they suggested extending the original conceptual framework by including economic and supranational aspects of citizenship. They noticed that although the case studies were supposed to «speak» exclusively to the three specific domains of citizenship (democracy, national identity, diversity/social cohesion) previously identified (in international meetings with all national research teams) as relevant for all country contexts, many case studies ‘talked back’.

There were, in particular, two unanticipated results, that is, two areas where the «data talked back.» The European case studies all mentioned two central dimensions of recent curriculum reform in political education: the economic dimension and the supranational (European) dimension. While these dimensions were given some weight and consideration in the original design of the IEA Civic Education Study (they were part of an elective, fourth domain of citizenship that case studies could address), it came as a surprise that so many European research teams identified these two dimensions as central areas of recent curriculum reform in their countries. These two new areas of reform, which attracted considerable academic curiosity and policy interest, are presented in the following.

Toward a «Wild» or «Mild» Market Economy?

Until the nineties, the fusion of politics and the economy has been regarded exclusively as a characteristic feature of US public life. In the United States, democracy is defined in terms of the (free market) economy. The US case study of the IEA Civic Education Study found, for example, that when American students were asked «what democracy meant to them, many contrasted it with communism or socialism» (Hahn, 1999, p. 599). For these students the term «democracy» seems to be synonymous with «free market economy.» At first sight, it is striking that the American conception of democracy found such a great resonance in post-socialist European countries. At closer examination, however, we can see that most of these curriculum reforms in political education had been designed and funded by US- based international organizations (specifically Civitas and Open Society Institute/Soros Foundation).

A review of the Bulgarian, Romanian, and Russian case studies from the IEA Civic Education Study, for example, suggests that the «de-ideologization» and «de-politicization» of curricula became a priority in post-socialist educational reform in the early 1990s (Lee, 2002; Mátrai, 2002; Steiner-Khamsi, 2002a). In Bulgaria, for example, the national history has been rewritten three times in three different ways in the past 120 years. Teachers in the social sciences are now mandated to refrain from imposing any political ideology on their students, and in particular from disseminating party propaganda in schools (Balkansky, Za-

harie, Stoyanov & Stoyanova, 1999, p. 98). In fact, so radically were curricula of political education purged not only of any ideological agenda but also from any traits of politicized content, that Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides (2002) felt compelled to critically reflect on and examine how exactly schools manage to keep a highly politicized public out of the depoliticized classrooms.

What was reminiscent of the pre-capitalist past, however, was the conceptual proximity of politics and the economy. In the past, students learned about political economy, based on principles of Marxism-Leninism, whereas in the early transition period after the fall of communism, they learned about the free market economy, driven by US principals of democracy. It was only later in the nineties, when the «transition» took longer than anticipated, unemployment sky-rocketed, public expenditures in the social and educational sectors dramatically decreased, and communist parties regained public support that transition, democracy, and free market economy became ambiguous terms, to say the least, provoking associations with economic hardship, social inequality and «savage capitalism.»

The fusion of politics and the economy has also been visible, albeit for quite different reasons, in the case studies on the Western European countries. The German case study is a good case in point. Teaching about the different economic systems is a core curricular element of political education in German schools. This aspect is particularly important in terms of Germany's political context in which two opposing economic systems merged or, more accurately, were absorbed by one system, that of the Federal Republic of Germany. The economics sections of political education textbooks contrast the model of a «planned economy» (citing the German Democratic Republic as the example) with the model of the «free market economy» (citing the United States as the example). It is noteworthy that the German textbooks provide a critical analysis of both systems, illuminating the disadvantages of each and offering a third model, the German model of «social market economy.» According to the case study authors (Händle, Oesterreich & Trommer, 1997, p. 6), the textbooks present this particular model as a model that maintains a market economy orientation with visible features of a comprehensive social welfare system. It is a model in which «the disadvantages of free-market competition are mitigated by a comprehensive system of social-welfare measures (health insurance, state pension system, unemployment benefits, housing subsidies, and the like)».

This triple distinction of economic systems – planned market economy (former communist systems), free market economy (United States), and social market economy (Western Europe) – can also be found in political education curricula of other Western European countries. Now that planned market economies have been almost entirely eradicated world-wide, several political education curricula in Western European countries tend to situate the two remaining economic/political systems at opposing poles. This dichotomization is well captured in Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides's cross-national analysis (2002, pp. 148-

149), where she distinguishes between «mild capitalism» (social market economy) and «wild capitalism» (free market economy).

Toward Constitutional Patriotism and Postnational Membership

Based on the previous IEA Civic Education Study, which was conducted in ten countries in the 1970s (Torney-Purta, Oppenheim & Farnen, 1975), it was expected that the domain «national identity and sense of belonging» would constitute a core concept of political education. Contrary to the expectations, this particular area of political education underwent a major revision in curricular reform, particularly in Western European countries.

In several countries, this concept has become either meaningless or out-dated, or carries a negative connotation due to a history of abuse with «national identity» in an undesired past (dictatorship or fascism). For example, the author of the Swiss case study reports that the Swiss experts of political education «were not too sure what exactly the term 'national identity' means» (Reichenbach 1999, p. 571). In Italy, political education programs emphasize personal and social identity more than national identity development. The summary of the Italian case study demonstrates convincingly the negative associations that «national identity» provokes in Italian schools (Losito, 1999, pp. 406–407):

The scant importance given to some national symbols in schools such as the national flag or the portrait of the President of the Republic (which are usually relegated to out-of-the-way places) seems to confirm this unwillingness in schools to underline and to encourage feelings and attitudes connected with national identity. To give another example, the national celebration of the Republic (2 June) no longer is a school holiday. The only national celebration that still seems to have some standing is 25 April, the anniversary of liberation from fascism, but festivities are left to individual school initiatives. This reticence may in part be explained by the identification of the idea of «fatherland» and «nation» with the fascist regime [...] and the nationalistic use of these words during fascism. They may carry negative connotations even in a republican post-war Italy.

More than in the other Western European countries, the case studies on political education in Italy, Germany, and Portugal highlight the negative connotations associated with «national identity,» «the people» (German: *das Volk*), or «fatherland.» The authors of the German case study explain the reluctance as follows (Händle, Oesterreich & Trommer 1999, p. 269):

Because of the German crimes committed during the National Socialist period, the concept of nationalism carries negative connotations in Germany. Even concepts such as national identity, national consciousness and national pride are used with reluctance. [...] It comes as no surprise that the experts in our study attached little importance to such concepts as goals of civic education. According to the ma-

majority of experts, neither nationalism as related to the German nation consisting 'of the German people', nor as related to the state of the 'Federal Republic of Germany' is an important component of civic education.

The goal of political education in all those countries with a history of fascism and dictatorship, but also in other Western European countries (e.g., Finland, Netherlands, Switzerland) is clearly not the promotion of a sense of belonging to a people, that is, to an imagined national community with an imagined glorious past (Anderson, 1983). This was one of the most striking findings in Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study. Instead, the goal of political education is to instill loyalty with regard to two other entities: the national constitution and Europe.

Kleger (1997) coined the powerful term «constitutional patriotism» (German: *Verfassungspatriotismus*) to describe the (new) type of patriotism that is emerging in European states. Constitutional patriotism applies to all residents of a country, and not only to citizens with political rights. Thus, Kleger is optimistic that this new type of patriotism replaces older European forms of patriotism that were framed in terms of the «national state» (Tilly, 1993, p. 35) or «one nation – one people.» By definition, (national) patriotism excluded (non-voting) immigrants and ethnic minorities, and precluded the formation of a «transnational citizenship,» that is, membership across national boundaries. For example, 83 percent of the German experts⁶ stated that the goal of political education is to produce «a sense of national unity under the constitution of the Federal Republic.» Furthermore, 64 percent of the experts defined «German nation» as «the people of different cultural and national backgrounds who live together in Germany.» Most experts, however, agreed that these goals of political education are generally accepted, but not achieved in schools (Händle, Oesterreich & Trommer, 1999, p. 269).

In addition to «constitutional patriotism,» there is a second type of patriotism emerging as an explicit curricular goal of political education in Western European countries: loyalty to Europe, and in countries that are member states, patriotism to the European Union. Soysal (1998) eloquently elaborated on this new type of «postnational model of membership.» Lee, drawing from the national case studies of the IEA Civic Education Study, provides the following examples of this newly emerging postnational model of membership in Western European countries (2002, p. 49):

The author of the Netherlands report notes that citizenship discussion in the country focuses on two major topics. The first is the aforementioned gap between citizens and politics, and the second is the issue of European Union citizenship (Dekker, 1999, p. 54). Similar remarks can be found in the German report. The two major issues related to citizenship education in Germany are, first, Germany's role as an integral part of the European Union and, second, Germany's responsibility for developing countries (Händle et al., 1999, pp. 272-273). The Belgian report mentions various efforts within the country to raise attention to 'European

realities' among the population as a whole and among youth in particular. The authors cite a 1995 Eurobarometer survey, which found 67% of the adult inhabitants of Belgium describing themselves as 'very' or 'quite attached' to Europe (Blondin & Schilling, 1999, p. 63). In Switzerland, it is reported that students are much more concerned with the European Union than with the notion of Swiss neutrality (Reichenbach, 1999, p. 571). The Portuguese report mentions several government initiatives to promote awareness of European citizenship. For example, at the school level, the curricula evolve from a regional focus to one that recognizes the need to articulate national identity within a European consciousness. 'The European Union', the authors write, 'emerges as a locus of students' loyalty and consciousness if not of identity and belonging' (Menezes et al., 199, p. 492). In Cyprus, which in 1999 applied to join the European Union and simultaneously declared its European orientations, the orientation toward European citizenship and the realization of the European dimension in Cypriot education is inevitably having an impact on citizenship education (Papanastasiou & Koutselini-Ioannidou, 1999, p. 175).

Nothing to Lose; Anything to Gain?

The findings reported from the cross-national analyses of the IEA Civic Education Study (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta & Schwille, 2002a) highlighted three major recent developments in political education reform: (1) the fusion of politics and the economy, (2) the emphasis on constitutional patriotism rather than on patriotism toward the nation-state (more precisely toward the «national state»; see Tilly, 1993), and (3) the emergence of a postnational model of membership.

The fast pace with which and the extent to which these new goals of political education have found entry into national curricular frameworks of European countries were unexpected and came as a surprise to many national research teams of the IEA Civic Education Study. This is not to suggest that these new goals of political education are actually implemented in schools. How much of what is declared as desirable (intended curriculum) has actually been implemented (actual curriculum) is a different issue altogether and was subject of the Phase 2 study. Phase 2 of the IEA Civic Education Study measured the actual implementation of these political education goals by testing the achievements of students and surveying teachers (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt & Nikolovo, 2002; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001). In contrast to Phase 2 of the Civic Education Study that assessed the outcomes of the implemented curriculum, this particular essay focuses on the explicitly stated goals of political education curricula in European countries.

I suggest that we refer to these three recent developments – fusion of politics and the economy, constitutional patriotism, and postnational membership – as

«Euro-Patriotism.» This term lends itself for summarizing these three major new developments, because it carries a spatial dimension (Europe), an economic connotation (Euro), and a loyalty descriptor (patriotism), all key factors in political education.

As mentioned in the introductory section, this essay attempts to reflect on the impact of political education reforms on minorities. After reporting major trends in the findings of the IEA Civic Education Study, the question now becomes: how is Euro-Patriotism impacting minorities in Europe?

Longer than in history education reform, minorities constituted the absent «other» in political education *as if* this particular curricular field (political education) had a charter to exclude them (or rather us) based on the lack of citizen rights (including voting rights). At first sight it seems therefore that there is nothing to lose, but is there anything to gain from these recent reforms in political education?

I agree with Kleger (1997) that constitutional patriotism is more inclusive than (national) patriotism. It demands belief in and adherence to a constitution rather than to an imagined national community.

There is also something to be said in favor of a multi-national Europe, expanding membership from a national level to a postnational level. It appears that Europe is moving toward an abandonment of national imagined communities, offering itself as the new (European) imagined community, and strengthening – in line with the policy of «The Europe of the Regions» – regional imagined communities. Whatever cultural direction will be more emphasized in the coming years, it will surely be either the European or the regional dimension, but not the national. However, in concert with Appadurai (1994, p. 295), it is important to point out that «[o]ne man's imagined community [...] is another man's political prison.»

Whereas European citizenship is favorable for immigrants of other European countries, allowing them free movement and residence within Europe, it functions as a fortress that shields itself from immigrants from non-European countries, in particular, from Third World Countries and countries in political conflict zones. In this regard the concept of (multi-regional) European citizenship is more closely related to the Soviet notion of «multi-national identity» than the North American notion of «multi-ethnic identity.» The Soviet notion was one of multi-nationalism dating back to Stalin's *nativization policy*, which determined that national cultures needed to be «national in form but socialist in content.» In contrast, the Canadian or US notion of citizenship is one of multi-ethnicity (including multiple «races»), acknowledging the long-standing history of immigration in North America.

Finally, Euro-Patriotism in Western European countries tends to re-frame democracy in terms of the economy, in particular in terms of the European model of social market economy. There are two implications that deserve special attention. The first is the emphasis on social re-distribution and the second is on «mild capitalism» (as opposed to «wild capitalism»).

First, Euro-Patriotism stresses social re-distribution (equal access) rather than cultural recognition struggles (protection of minority languages, cultures, religions). This is quite different from developments in post-socialist European countries. Offe (1996) and Fraser (1997), for example, observed a shift in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe from vertical political struggles (demanding equal access) to horizontal political struggles (demanding cultural rights). In contrast, reviewing the case study material from the IEA Civic Education Study, it appears that the pendulum in Western European political education reform has oscillated in the opposite direction. Here, the new emphasis is on equal access to labor, education, social benefits, political rights, etc., downplaying, to a certain degree, earlier struggles for cultural recognition and minority protection. To phrase it in sociological terminology, the emphasis in Western European countries is currently on ethnic re-stratification of society, ensuring that class is not based on ethnicity.

In my earlier writings on comparative multicultural educational policy studies, I observed the early British attempts of ethnic re-stratification and became witness to the first contours of the emerging «New World Order» (Thatcher/Reagan) as reflected in educational policies of England and Wales (e.g., Steiner-Khamsi, 1989). For example, I was struck by the political campaigns of the Thatcher government at the time that aimed at developing a new middle class consisting of immigrants and ethnic minorities. The government's «solution» to the race riots of the early 80s and the anti-racist movements was to offer minorities equal access to education and the labor market. At that time, I expressed great skepticism about the neo-liberal agenda of generating a kind of «corporate citizenship», and I was quite convinced that these (economic) promises would miss their target, that is, were unlikely to distract from cultural claims made by minority group advocates. Much to my own surprise, more than a decade later, I am seeing the fingerprints of corporate citizenship re-formulated in the goals of political education of Western European countries. Indeed, the fusion of politics and the economy has been striking for several researchers who conducted cross-national analyses of the IEA Civic Education Study data (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta & Schwille, 2002a). What corporate citizenship implies is a re-aggregation of minorities along socio-economic characteristics. It helps a few (those who experienced social mobility) to see themselves as citizens, and it leaves many behind.

Second, Euro-Patriotism draws clear boundaries between European economic systems and the US economic system, distinguishing between and, in fact, polarizing «mild capitalism» and «wild capitalism.» As mentioned earlier in this essay, this recent development needs to be analyzed and interpreted against the background of perceived threats of globalization and Americanization in Europe. The advancement of English as a lingua franca in Europe and on the Internet, the spread of American concepts of managerialism (efficiency and cost-effectiveness) and free market orientation, the economic dependency from

American markets, and the limited role of the State for social welfare, are sore issues in European educational policy, especially in the area of political education.

The review of the case study material leads me to suggest that a new task has been assigned to political education in Western European curricula: informing students about the two remaining economic systems (free market economy and social market economy) and, in line with Euro-Patriotism, emphasizing the strengths of European «mild capitalism.» Of all the other aspects of Euro-Patriotism (postnational membership and constitutional patriotism), this particular aspect, that is, distinguishing between social and free market economies *and* instilling a sense of belonging to a social market economy («mild capitalism»), has been seriously understudied. It deserves more attention and analysis.

Notes

- 1 I developed this essay during the first few months of my sabbatical from Teachers College, Columbia University. The students from my class «Education and Political Change» (School of Education, Stanford University) were a great source of inspiration. I would like to thank especially Thomas F. Luschei, Ph.D. student in the International Comparative Education program at Stanford University, for his invaluable feedback on an earlier version of this essay.
- 2 For a summary see Steiner-Khamsi (1996, 1993). The pioneering role of the Council of Europe for advocating the development of minority-inclusive history education curricula cannot be overstated. In the late 70s and 80s, its efforts were directed toward inclusion of immigrants in history education reform of Western European countries, and specifically combating xenophobia and racism. In the past decade, its sphere of influence expanded to Central and Eastern European countries. There the focus was on inclusion of national minorities (e.g., Hungarian in Romania), ethnic minorities (e.g., Roma), and Jews in history education reform. The Council of Europe consistently exerted pressure on European Ministries of Education to reform their educational systems in compliance with human rights. Later on, in the nineties, the OSCE and the European Union joined these efforts in European educational policy reform.
- 3 There is no international agreement on how to label the curricular field that deals with issues of politics, democracy, governance, or citizenship. The IEA study presented in this article refers to this particular field as civic education, citizenship education, or civics-related education. With the intension of capturing the «maximum definition» of citizenship education (McLaughlin, 1992) that targets political participation of all, that is both citizens and residents, I prefer to use the term «political education.» Incidentally, this is also the term used in German speaking countries (*politische Bildung*).
- 4 Judith Torney-Purta, University of Maryland (College Park, USA), chaired the International Steering Committee of the IEA Civic Education Study throughout the eight-year study. The International Coordination Center for Phase 2 of the study was directed by Rainer Lehmann, based at Humboldt University (Berlin, Germany).
- 5 The IEA Civic Education Study included case studies from the following European countries: Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, England, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovenia, and Switzerland.
- 6 The summary of the German case study is based on a survey. The survey was submitted to 168 experts, and they were asked to formulate the goals of political education and assess whether these goals were implemented in schools (see Händle, Oesterreich & Trommer, 1999, pp. 262 – 263).

Bibliography

- Amadeo, J.-A., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V. & Nikolova, R. (2002). *Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age 17-18. Citizenship and Education in Sixteen Countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1994). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (pp. 31 – 55). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Balkansky, P., Zahariev, Z., Stoyanov, S. & Stoyanova, N. (1999). Challenges in Developing a New System of Civic Education in Conditions of Social Change: Bulgaria. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 89-109). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Blondin, C. & Schillings, P. (1999). Education for Citizenship in the French Community of Belgium: Opportunities to Learn in Addition to the Formal Curriculum. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 61-87). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Cogan, J.J. & Derricott, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Citizenship for the 21st Century: An International Perspective on Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Dekker, H. (1999). Citizenship Conceptions and Competencies in the Subject Matter «Society» in the Dutch Schools. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 437-462). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Farnen, R., Dekker, H. & Meyenberg, R. (Eds.) (1996). *Democracy, Socialization and Conflicting Loyalties in East and West: Cross-National and Comparative Perspectives*. London: St. Martin's Press.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the «Postsocialist» Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Hahn, C.L. (1999). Challenges to Civic Education in the United States. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 583-607). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming Political. Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Händle, C., Oesterreich, D. & Trommer, L. (1999). Concepts of Civic Education in Germany Based on a Survey of Expert Opinion. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 257-284). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Händle, C., Oesterreich, D. & Trommer, L. (1997). *IEA Civic Education Study: A Review of Literature about Policy Questions*. Berlin: Max-Planck Institut für Bildungsforschung.
- Ichilov, O. (Ed.) (1998). *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World*. London: Woburn Press.
- Kerr, D. (2002). An International Review of Citizenship in the Curriculum: The IEA National Case Studies and the INCA Archive. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 207-237). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Kleger, H. (1997). *Transnationale Staatsbürgerschaft*. Frankfurt/M: Campus.
- Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G. (2002). Cultural Appropriation of Social and Political Education. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 137-178). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

- Lee, W. O. (2002). The Emergence of New Citizenship: Looking into the Self and Beyond the Nation. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 37-60). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- LeTendre, G. (2002). Cross-National Studies and the Analysis of Comparative Qualitative Research. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 239 – 277). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Losito, Bruno (1999). Italy: Educating for Democracy in a Changing Democratic Society. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 395-418). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Mátrai, Z. (2002). National Identity Conflicts and Civic Education: A Comparison of Five Countries. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 85-104). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21/3, 235-246.
- Menezes, I., Xavier, E., Cibele, C., Amaro, G. & Campos B.P. (1999). Civic Education Issues and the Intended Curricula in Basic Education in Portugal. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 483-504). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Offe, C. (1996). *Varieties of Transition: The East European and German Experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Papanastasiou, C. & Koutselini-Ioannidou, M. (1999). National Identity in the Civic Education of Cyprus. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 161-177). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Radtke, F.-O. & Weiss, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Schulautonomie, Wohlfahrtsstaat und Chancengleichheit*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Reichenbach, R. (1999). Abandoning the Myth of Exceptionality: On Civic Education in Switzerland. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (pp. 557-582). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Schwille, J. & Amadeo, J.-A. (2002). The Paradoxical Situation of Civic Education in Schools: Ubiquitous and Yet Elusive. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 105-136). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Soysal, Y.N. (1998). Toward a Postnational Model of Membership. In G. Shafir (Ed.), *The Citizenship Debate* (pp. 17-29). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2002a). Spheres of Citizenship. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 179-206). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (1996). Minority-Inclusive History Curricula in Secondary Schools: Adopting Methods of Comparison and Multiperspectivity. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 7/1, 29-44.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (1993). Whose Knowledge, Whose History and Whose Language? Negotiating Educational Policies in Multi-Ethnic Societies. In Council of Europe, UNESCO, OSCE (Eds.), *Education, Migration, and Minorities* (pp. 1-23). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (1989). Kein Raum für Minderheitensprachen in der anti-rassistischen Erziehung. *Deutsch lernen*, 1, 64-76.

- Steiner-Khamsi, G., Torney-Purta, J. & Schwille, J. (Eds.) (2002a). *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G., Torney-Purta, J. & Schwille, J. (2002b). Introduction: Issues and Insights in Cross-National Analysis of Qualitative Studies. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta & J. Schwille (Eds.), *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison* (pp. 1-36). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Tilly, Ch. (1993). *European Revolutions 1492-1992*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tilly, Ch. (1997). Means and Ends of Comparison in Macrosociology. *Comparative Social Research*, 16, 43 – 53.
- Torney-Purta, J., Oppenheim, A.N. & Farnen, R.F. (1975). *Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. & Amadeo, J.-A. (Eds.) (1999). *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Yin, R. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Euro-Patriotismus: Was gibt es für Minderheiten zu gewinnen?

Zusammenfassung

Der Aufsatz bezieht sich auf Länderfallstudien, die im Rahmen der IEA Studie zur politischen Bildung (1994-2002) entwickelt worden sind und fasst die wichtigsten Lehrplanreformen auf dem Gebiet der politischen Bildung zusammen. Unter den europäischen Lehrplanreformen werden die folgenden Entwicklungen besonders hervorgehoben: die Fusion von Politik und Wirtschaft, die Herausbildung eines «postnationalen Modells der Mitgliedschaft» (Soysal) in europäischen Staaten, die Betonung des «Verfassungspatriotismus» (Kleger) sowie eine zunehmende Dichotomisierung zwischen einer «milden Form des Kapitalismus» (europäische Modelle einer sozialen Marktwirtschaft) und einer «wilden Form des Kapitalismus» (US Modell der freien Marktwirtschaft). Die Autorin bezeichnet diese neueren Tendenzen im Bereich der politischen Bildung als «Euro-Patriotismus» und stellt ihre Überlegungen zu den möglichen Folgen dieses «Euro-Patriotismus» für Minderheiten in Europa dar.

Euro-Patriotisme: qu'est-ce que les minorités peuvent en tirer?

Résumé

Le texte se réfère à des analyses de cas nationales réalisées au cours de la première phase de l'étude IEA consacrée à l'éducation civique (1994-2002), en mettant l'accent sur les récentes réformes de plan d'études dans le domaine de l'éducation politique (pour l'essentiel en Europe).

Les aspects suivants des derniers développements dans les réformes de politique d'éducation ont été mis en évidence : la fusion entre la politique et l'économie, l'émergence d'un modèle d'« appartenance postnationale» (Soysal), l'accent mis sur le « patriotisme constitutionnel» (Kleger) et la séparation entre une forme *douce* du capitalisme (modèles européens de l'économie sociale de marché) et une forme *sauvage* (le modèle de l'économie de marché libérale américaine). L'auteur rend compte de ces nouvelles tendances dans le domaine de la formation politique en parlant d'« euro-patriotisme» et propose une réflexion sur les conséquences possibles d'un tel « euro-patriotisme» pour les minorités.

Europatriottismo: Che cosa ne possono ricavare le minoranze?

Riassunto

Il contributo prende spunto dallo studio che nel contesto della ricerca IEA sulla formazione politica (1994-2002) ha esplorato le principali riforme dei programmi scolastici in diversi paesi e ne fa una sintesi. Nell'ambito di queste riforme vengono focalizzate soprattutto le seguenti linee di tendenza: la fusione tra politica e economia, lo sviluppo di un « modello di adesione postnazionale» (Soysal) negli stati europei, l'accentuazione del « patriottismo costituzionale» (Kleger) e la progressiva contrapposizione tra una « forma di capitalismo moderato» (il modello europeo dell'economia di mercato a carattere sociale) e una « forma di capitalismo selvaggio» (il modello americano dell'economia di mercato). L'autrice definisce queste nuove tendenze della formazione politica con il termine di « europatriottismo» e riflette al riguardo dell'incidenza che tali tendenze possono avere sulle minoranze europee.

