



EGGS IN A PAN

Speeches,
Writings and Reflections
by Peter Lauritzen

EGGS IN A PAN

Speeches, Writings and Reflections
by Peter Lauritzen

The views expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Council of Europe.

The Council of Europe has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites.

Copyright of this publication is held by the Council of Europe. No parts of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted for commercial purposes in any form or by any means, electronic (CD-Rom, Internet, etc.) or mechanical including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the permission in writing from the Public Information and Publications Division, Directorate of Communication (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or publishing@coe.int)

Reproduction of material from this publication is authorized for non-commercial education purposes only and on condition that the source is properly quoted.

Council of Europe Publishing
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
<http://book.coe.int>

Editing: Yael Ohana, Antje Rothemund

Design and layout: Péter Molnár
Proofreading: Rachel Appleby
Photo: Lynne Chisholm

Published by the Directorate of Youth and Sport
ISBN: 978-92-871-6492-6
© Council of Europe, August 2008
Printed in Hungary

Prelude

In memory of Peter Lauritzen ...
Developing youth policy
At a global and pan-European level
What do we know about young people?
What do we know about youth policy?

Across borders and sectors
Understanding trends and political developments
Knowledge of multilateral institutions
Analysis, argumentation, strategy, preview

Historical reflection
(Youth) coalition and cooperation
Belief in the power of young people and youth policy
Extra (-ordinary)

Bringing people together
Working on youth policy on the basis
of socio-political developments
Politicizing training activities – social action
Importance of training and having educational staff

In memory of Peter Lauritzen ...
European Youth Centres
All different, all equal
Inspiring and stirring up enthusiasm

Jan Vanbee
Chairperson of the European Steering Committee for Youth (CDEJ)
Brussels, 29 May 2008

Table of Contents

Editorial	11
Antje Rothemund and Yael Ohana	
The Spoken Word	26
‘Intercultural Education’, 2006.	31
‘On Participation – Guiding Questions’, 2006. 2005	35
‘The Social City as a Space for Citizenship in Human Rights Education for Young People’, 2005.	40
‘Thirty Years of Youth Work in the Council of Europe’, 2004.	51
‘Life Long Learning, Non-Formal Learning and Citizen- ship’, 2004.	60
‘Europe, European Union Enlargement and Education’, 2002.	67
‘Post-Face: On Racism and Violence’, 2002.	85
‘The Changing Context of Non-Profit Organizations and Associations in the Enlarged Europe – Comments from a Council of Europe Viewpoint’, 2001.	92

‘On Citizenship’, 2000.	101
‘Are Human Rights (the only) Universal Values?’, 1999.	105
‘The European Federation for Intercultural Learning in Europe Today’, 1998.	116
‘Youth Policy Structures in Europe’, 1993.	124
‘Quo Vadis Europa? National Renewal or European Unification? – Thoughts on Right-Wing Extremism Among Young People in Europe’, 1992	133
‘Youth Attitudes: Past and Present’, 1980.	141
The Written Word	150
‘A European Youth Centre in Budapest – Challenges, Obstacles, Innovations’, 2006.	155
‘The Campaign on Diversity, Human Rights and Participation: ‘All Different – All Equal’ – 10 Years After, 2005.	165
‘European Youth Development and Policy – the Role of NGOs and Public Authority in the Making of the European Citizen’, 2003.	170
‘The White Paper on Youth and the Open Method of Co-ordination: Challenges for Education, Training, Research and Youth Policy Construction in Europe’, 2002.	211

‘Some Comments and Working Definitions’, 2000.	218
‘Vision, Aims and Objectives of a Long Term Cooperation Agreement – About the Added Value of Institutional Cooperation in the Youth Field’, 1999.	234
‘An Experiment in Learning about the Greater Europe: The European Youth Centre Budapest’, 1999.	243
‘Intercultural Learning – One Big Bluff or a Learning Strategy for the Future? Concepts, Objectives and Practices of Intercultural Learning in Informal Education’, 1999.	253
‘Young People in the Focus of Social Science’, 1998.	277
‘Cultural, Education and Youth Policy’, 1990.	281
‘Selected Remarks On ‘Role’ In Simulation Games and Training Situations’, 1980s.	297
‘Ragnar Sem: 10-02-1925 – 10-09-1983’	303
‘Their Violence’, 1981.	308
‘Focus on the ‘Conference on Intolerance in Europe’’	312
‘Is that what the Commission wanted? Comments on the Dialogue between the European Communities and Young People’, 1970.	317
‘Reunification Possible? On the Views of the Young European Federalists’, 1968.	322

Interviews	328
‘Recognition of Non-Formal Education in Europe – An Interview with Mr. Peter Lauritzen’, 2005.	330
‘The Council of Europe’s Youth Centre Past, Present and Future: An Interview with Peter Lauritzen by Lynne Chisholm’, 1995.	336
‘A House for Citizenship Education – Opening the European Youth Centre, Budapest’, 1995.	359
Unstructured Thoughts	366
‘Defining Youth Work’, 2006.	369
‘Wir können nicht gleichzeitig weniger werden, älter und auch noch dümmer’ (<i>‘We cannot simultaneously become fewer, older and, on top of all that, dumber’</i>), 2005.	371
‘On ‘Standards’’, 2004.	380
‘21 Items for the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century’	390
‘Some Unstructured Thoughts on the Future of the Youth Directorate’, 1998.	394
Biography	402
Bibliography	414

Sechs Eier in der Pfanne

EWG verheißungsvoller Anfang — Europa kann Probleme lösen



Junge Lauterberger, Barbiser und Scharzfelder Europa-Interessierte hörten Peter Lauritzen (Mitte), Frank Nieß (links), und J. Runge (rechts) zum aktuellen Thema.

Scharzfeld. Die europäischen Jung-Föderalisten (JEF) und die Junge Union hatten zu einer gemeinsamen Veranstaltung mit dem Bundesvorsitzenden des Europäischen Föderalistischen Studentenbundes Peter Lauritzen und seinem Stellvertreter, Frank Nieß, in die „Tanne“ eingeladen. Das Interesse an dieser Veranstaltung war, gemessen an der Zahl, nicht überwältigend, umso mehr aber beeindruckend nach Kenntnissen und Form der Teilnehmer. Das Ja zu Europa war unüberhörbar, wobei die EWG als verheißungsvoller Anfang nicht aber als Ende angesehen wird. Die selbstgestellte Aufgabe der jungen Generation: den EWG-Marktbürger zum bewußten Europäer machen.

Peter Lauritzen, Geschichtsstudent, 22 Jahre alt, erwies sich als gewandter, mit erstaunlichem Allgemeinwissen und gutem Fingerspitzengefühl begabter Sprecher mit einer Reihe eigener Gedanken. Er legte zunächst plastisch den Begriff der Integration offen: Sechs Eier in einer Pfanne lassen sich als Omelett nicht mehr trennen. Retrospektiver Vorteil: dank der vier Grundfreiheiten und dank der vier Gemeinsamkeiten ist kein Krieg im innereuropäischen Raum mehr möglich. Zukunftspunkte: das wirtschaftspolitische und politische Gewicht des Einzelstaates in der EWG vervielfacht sich nach außen, der (soziale) Kapitalismus erlebt (nach Togliatti) eine Renaissance, die ihn zu großen Leistungen befähigt. Voraussetzung dafür: der EWG-Marktbürger muß zum bewußten Europäer werden.

Lauritzen leitete, auf Deutschland gesehen, wesentliche Möglichkeiten daraus ab, wenn es gelingt die Gegensätzlichkeiten der Außenpolitik auszugleichen. Föderalistische Politik nach Westen und nationale Politik nach Osten macht unglaubwürdig. Man solle der Kraft Europas mehr vertrauen. Polen gehe den Weg zum Nationalstaat, werde aber zögern, sich nach Westen zu orientieren, solange ein westlicher Staat Gebietsansprüche über, die

Oder-Neiße-Linie hinaus anmelde. Ein in Europa aufgehender Nationalstaat Polen werde sich aber zu den vier Freiheiten und vier Gemeinsamkeiten bekennen müssen. — Zur Hallstein-Doktrin: sie muß im Prinzip Gültigkeit behalten, sollte aber geschickter und „individueller“ gehandhabt werden. Wo offensichtliche Pressuren vorliegen, müssen erst die Möglichkeiten am verhängten Verhandlungstisch erschöpft werden, dann aber entsprechende Sanktionen verhängt.

Die Diskussion war lebhaft und ergiebig. Die Selbstverständlichkeit, in einem über die EWG hinausgehenden europäischen Rahmen zu denken, überraschte nicht, deutet aber — trotz des relativ schwachen Besuches — darauf hin, daß die junge Generation leicht über die geschichtlich bedingten Hürden hinwegkommt, unvoreingenommen und nüchtern Zeit- und Gesellschaftsprobleme angeht, Selbstvertrauen besitzt und klare Vorstellungen.

Young people from Bad Lauterberg, Barbis and Scharzfeld with an interest in Europe heard talk by Peter Lauritzen (centre), Frank Niess (left) and J Runge (right) on topical issues

This is one of the first known published pieces that quotes Peter Lauritzen on European matters, at the time a 22-year-old student of history in Munich. The piece appeared in the Bad Lauterberg Tageblatt in March 1965. Peter Lauritzen and colleagues spoke to other young people from Bad Lauterberg, Barbis and Scharzfeld, and held a discussion on Europe. Later Peter Lauritzen was interviewed.

‘Six Eggs In A Pan: EEC A Promising Start – Europe Can Solve Problems’

Scharzfeld – The Young European Federalists (JEF) and the Young Christian Democrats (Junge Union) recently held a joint meeting with the chair of the European Federalist Students’ Association, Peter Lauritzen, and his deputy, Frank Niess, in a local pub. Judging by the numbers, interest in the event was not overwhelming, but the know-how and calibre of the participants was all the more impressive as a result of the intimate setting. Support for Europe

could be heard quite clearly, with the EEC being seen as a promising start, although by no means the end of the process. The task the younger generation has set itself is to turn the citizens of the Common Market into committed Europeans.

Peter Lauritzen, a 22-year-old history student, proved to be a skilful speaker, with impressive general knowledge, keen instinct, and a whole range of ideas of his own. He began with a

graphic illustration of European integration: six eggs forming an omelette in a pan can no longer be separated. In hindsight, this is an advantage. The four basic freedoms and four common principles mean that a war in Europe is no longer possible. And looking to the future, the economic and political weight of the individual states in the EEC is increasingly externally controlled, while (social) capitalism is (according to Togliatti) experiencing a renaissance that should lead to great results. The pre-condition here is that the citizens of the Common Market become committed European citizens.

In Lauritzen's view, there were significant opportunities here for Germany, if the contradictions of its foreign policy could be overcome. Pursuing a federalist policy in the West and a national policy in the East was not credible. It is necessary to have greater faith in the strength of Europe. Poland was taking the route of the nation state, but would be reluctant

to turn towards the West for as long as a Western state laid territorial claims that went beyond the Oder-Neisse Line. As a nation state in Europe, however, Poland would have to commit itself to the four freedoms and four common principles. For its part, the Hallstein Doctrine should, in principle, remain valid, but it should be applied more skilfully and 'more individually'. Where there are obvious pressures, the possibilities at the negotiating table should be exhausted first, but decisive sanctions should be imposed thereafter.

The discussion was lively and fruitful. The matter-of-fact way in which it covered Europe beyond the boundaries of the EEC was not surprising. However, in spite of the relatively low turnout, it suggested that today's young people overcome historical hurdles with ease, tackle contemporary and social problems in a level-headed manner and have both self-confidence and clear ideas. 🐾

Editorial

Peter Lauritzen was a colleague and friend to many, young and old, in the Council of Europe. This was especially the case for the Council of Europe's youth field, where he worked for the entirety of his career as a Council of Europe civil servant, spanning almost thirty-five years.

Until his premature departure, he was among the longest serving members of the staff of the Council of Europe's youth field, having worked for the department responsible for youth affairs (renamed every several years, but today known as the Directorate of Youth and Sport) almost from its very creation. His career coincided with the entire development of the youth field from the opening of the first European Youth Centre in Strasbourg in 1972 to the initial conversations on the elaboration of a new mission statement for the Council of Europe's youth sector in late 2006, the soon to be published 'Agenda 2020'.

Had his untimely death in May 2007 not intervened, Peter Lauritzen would have left the Council of Europe and gone into retirement, thereby definitively marking the end of an era. Over the years, and for the increasingly large and diverse groups of young people who had the opportunity to experience the Council of Europe's youth programme, the very first 'tutor' of the European Youth Centre became an essential representative of its institutional and professional memory and experience, an important role model for colleagues in training and an intellectual leader in the youth field in Europe. As such, and most especially at the time of his departure, Peter Lauritzen was – sometimes painfully – aware

of the changing nature of European cooperation, the influence of its dynamics on the evolution of the youth field and the extent that budget cuts and efficiency logics pose an existential challenge to a field of work rooted in the value of human interaction. At the same time, he was excited by the growing interest demonstrated by an increasing number of Council of Europe member states, international organizations and non-governmental organizations in youth issues, especially in youth policy development, during the latter part of his career.

Approaching four decades of its existence, the Council of Europe youth sector has seen continuous development, enlargement and quick adaptation to the needs and demands of young people in the diverse societies of a rapidly changing Europe. The youth sector's instruments and structures – the European Youth Foundation, the European Youth Centres, the intergovernmental cooperation and the unique co-management structure – stand as steady pillars and have proven to be apt in fulfilling the mandates given to them by the Council's member states. The co-management system is certainly one of the longest lasting examples of participatory democracy in the context of a European institution. While age is not a quality criteria in itself, a fact well understood in the Council of Europe's youth sector, decades of facilitated sharing and evaluation of experience, common reflection and co-production have combined to create its fine reputation as a think-tank, centre of innovation and intellectual leader for the development of youth work and youth policy in Europe. From a first-glance, outside perspective, there is a danger that the sector might be seen as static. But the youth sector has changed substantially over the decades and its contents, fields of work, methodological approaches and partnership networks have become more complex and diversified.

Overall, the sector has broadened in scope, reach and volume of action. Confronted with the demands and hopes of young people and permanent pressure from their associations, the Council of Europe's youth sector has taken the opportunity to react with speed to pressing social and political developments of concern to young people in Europe and the world.

The 'pioneering' years, the 1970s were dedicated to strengthening the European youth structures and their international equivalents, quite rare at the time, and by then, having little access to intergovernmental institutions. Emancipation, liberation and anti-capitalism were the leading concepts of that period. These were reflected in the programmes of the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Centre, which served as a space for heated political discussions that resulted in numerous political declarations. The demands towards the European institution were clear: young people required access and structures for participation.

The 1980s were marked by the notion of global solidarity and intercultural learning. The youth sector moved towards education and capacity building, project development and campaigning. While the North-South dimension and assistance programmes to the so-called 'Third World' were the core of many youth organizations' action, East-West cooperation developed in parallel, led by the non-governmental partners of the youth sector, with all the diplomatic care and political restrictions the times implied. When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, the youth sector was able to react quickly: knowledge, contacts, shared experiences and understanding of young people east of the Iron Curtain already existed. Partners were ready to move into the larger pan-European adventure and to continue the construction of Europe.

The 1990s brought major changes to the youth sector and steady enlargement, both in terms of geography and the nature and scope of the partners involved. The assistance programmes to civil society development in many of the countries applying for membership in the rapidly enlarging Council of Europe and the creation of the second European Youth Centre in Budapest, the ‘All Different – All Equal’ youth campaign in response to growing racism and intolerance, the implementation of an institutionalized partnership programme with the European Commission, the introduction of a system to review national youth policies and, last but not least, the introduction of the Internet, greatly multiplied the partner networks and activity formats of the sector. Open access to participation in the sector’s programmes was created, bringing an end to the relatively hierarchical communication lines that had so far been in place. The newly created youth initiatives and associations of Central and Eastern Europe, the minority young people participating in the ‘All Different – All Equal’ campaign, even civil servants from national and municipal youth structures, all asked for assistance and support. The training activities grew in number and scope in response to the needs expressed by these partners for competence building in the participative and intercultural educational philosophy of the sector. No longer able to respond to the ever-growing demands with its relatively limited budget and human resources, the youth sector set up a pool of freelance trainers to support the development of training programmes and invested in field-training activities with the support of member states and partner institutions. Networking, quality standards, cooperation, synergies and lobbying were important key words of the period.

The new millennium brought about a shift in the way the Council of Europe at large presents its activities, with the introduction

of priority programmes and projects to replace the previously favoured administrative units. Mainstreaming, cross-sector and interdisciplinary cooperation, good governance and the concentration of efforts on promoting the organization's core values, all under increasingly tight budget conditions, became the guiding principles, also for the youth sector. In this framework, the youth sector redefined and regrouped its work priorities under general content headlines, which remain largely valid today: youth policy development, youth participation and active citizenship, human rights education, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion. In response to the atmosphere created by ongoing armed conflicts on the continent, rising social inequality and violence, increasing fear of international terrorism, and the European Union's enlargement, the youth sector developed its Euro-Mediterranean youth programme with the European Commission and other co-financed programmes, intensified its youth policy assistance programmes, worked on conflict resolution and mediation and violence prevention and enlarged its human rights education programme to many more countries and target groups. The scope of the youth sector's work is on the one hand more concisely defined in its work priorities, and on the other hand it has become more complex and diversified, trying to respond to the political, educational and social needs of young people today. The European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth in October 2008 will be dedicated to defining the 'Agenda 2020', a future orientated strategy for the Council of Europe youth sector, aiming to create sustainable results in response to these complex challenges.

The above short and certainly incomplete excursion into the past seems necessary, though, as it is somewhat unusual for the Council of Europe to honour a rank and file civil servant with the publica-

tion of his works. Nevertheless, the Joint Council on Youth, the statutory body of the Council of Europe's youth sector, composed of governmental and non-governmental representatives, decided to do so at its meeting of October 2007. With this decision, the Joint Council acknowledges the substantial contribution Peter Lauritzen made to shaping, guiding and enriching the youth sector throughout his career. There is hardly any large scale project, innovation or milestone in the youth sector's history which is not strongly connected to Peter Lauritzen, to his role as a senior civil servant or to his personality as a charismatic leader, teacher, advisor, intellectual or simply as a very outspoken advocate, especially during times of change, most often accompanied by insecurity.

The form that this honour takes – a publication – is no accident. People who knew Peter Lauritzen well, both inside and outside the Council of Europe, will attest to the fact that he was a 'wordsmith' in the true sense of the phrase. Long-time colleagues and friends link the emergence of his rhetorical and journalistic talent to his personal biography as a young middle class German growing up in post-war Flensburg administered by the British occupation forces. This strongly influenced the kind of education he received – open-minded, progressive, liberal and most of all orientated towards European cooperation. It influenced his wider political socialization too: in late 1950s Flensburg, the British cultural institute called '*Die Brücke*' played an important role in the life of young people. They had the opportunity to read English language newspapers and books, have conversations on the development of Europe as a political reality and generally dabble in all things foreign. But probably most important and significant of all for Peter Lauritzen's interest in words, for his European orientation, and for his fascination with the youth field, was his early as-

sociation with student politics and his active involvement in the Young European Federalists (*Junge Europäische Föderalisten*) and, by association, in the youth movements supporting and promoting European integration.

Later, once a civil servant at the Council of Europe, writing and public speaking became an integral part of Peter Lauritzen's daily work. More often than not, this production took place in the context of the institutional and representational tasks of a career civil servant – reporting to committees, preparing policy documents, acting as secretary to expert groups, taking on the role of a rapporteur, writing mission reports, drafting political declarations, speaking to government officials and making representations to non-governmental youth representatives. At the same time, those who had the opportunity to work with him testify to the extent that his craft was anything but routine or bureaucratic: it always revealed sociological imagination, a breadth of general knowledge and a profound understanding of history and current political affairs. Among the elements of the 'Lauritzen method', then, was an insatiable reading appetite, something that he encouraged younger colleagues to emulate by recommending lists of books and a variety of daily newspapers. In his function as a civil servant, and unlike academics with a classical university profile, Peter Lauritzen did not regularly publish under his own name or record and archive his written production and speeches, despite their substantial volume. In the early years, when he was more directly involved in the delivery of the educational seminars and training programmes organized in the European Youth Centre, Peter Lauritzen spent a good part of his time working on the development of critical reflection among the participants through discourse and interaction – challenging the young people present (often, his peers) to explore and theorize through debate.

It was against this backdrop that the Joint Council charged the secretariat of the Directorate of Youth and Sports to establish a project to archive Peter Lauritzen's accumulated works and to keep his extensive professional library together. When it came to preparing the archive and bibliography of his work, we were surprised (and not a little relieved) to find that thirty-five years' worth of speeches written for superiors and political representatives, calls to action written in times of stagnation (and sometimes frustration), articles published in journals and research publications, policy documents, lectures on youth work, youth policy, and youth research, and all manner of other pieces of work, had found refuge on the shelves of his office at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg and on his work computer, and that they were organized in a logical, if non-standard, manner – fitting enough for the personality and professional that Peter Lauritzen was.

To some of his closer colleagues, the title 'Eggs in a Pan – Speeches, Writings and Reflections by Peter Lauritzen' might seem a little counter-intuitive, as he was known for not being very fond of cooking metaphors (which became quite fashionable during a particular stage of the development of the youth training field in Europe). It deserves some explanation as this phrase is, nevertheless, of Peter Lauritzen's own crafting. It appeared as the title of a short newspaper article, the oldest published piece we were able to find about Peter Lauritzen's thoughts on Europe, which, therefore, has been chosen as the opening piece of this book. Published in a local newspaper in the German Federal State of Lower Saxony, the *Bad Lauterberger Tageblatt* in March 1965, 'Six Eggs in a Pan' quotes Peter Lauritzen, then a 22-year old student of history, as having said in reference to the European Community, "... One can no longer separate eggs in a pan", during a student debate.

This compilation of reflections and ideas, in the form of published and unpublished writings, articles, interviews, speeches and his very special ‘unstructured thoughts’, brings together materials produced by Peter Lauritzen at all stages of his professional career as an international civil servant at the Council of Europe and from his activity in the youth and adult education fields from before he joined the institution in 1972. This collection has five sections. In the first, entitled ‘The Spoken Word’, we present some of Peter Lauritzen’s most important speeches. His talent for public speaking was well known in- and outside the Council of Europe, and we felt it fitting to begin with one of the things he was considered to have ‘done best’. In the second section, entitled ‘The Written Word’, we have gathered published pieces and articles that were especially written for publication. The reader will note the difference in style from section one without difficulty, although Peter Lauritzen’s writing can be characterized as highly journalistic. In the third section, we present three interviews with Peter Lauritzen. This is the shortest section of the book, as we found relatively few interviews. In the fourth section, we present a selection of what have come to be known as Peter Lauritzen’s ‘unstructured thoughts’. These short and usually unpublished pieces were one of the hallmarks of Peter Lauritzen’s approach to communication in the youth sector of the Council of Europe. Each of these sections is introduced by some thoughts about the relationship Peter Lauritzen had to the medium of communication represented by the section, and his style when speaking, writing and so on. Finally, in a short biographical section, we have established a timeline of the milestones of Peter Lauritzen’s career, along with the main developments that took place inside the institution for which he worked, in Europe and in the wider world.

The selection of texts for inclusion in this publication was something of a painstaking task and took much thought for those responsible. Peter Lauritzen's office, work computer and library at home were packed with every kind of written production imaginable, from book chapters he wrote at the request of university professors to simple email correspondence exploring some issue which was on his mind and destined for further reflection by colleagues. The wealth of production that was found during the archiving process posed a significant challenge. From the outset it was clear that we would not be in a position to include all relevant material previously published or even distributed for reflection as a result of the volume found. How does one distinguish between the elements of the work of a lifetime and valorize what is most representative, and most important?

We have, therefore, made a real effort to include what we consider to be 'representative' pieces for each of the categories of production included in the book: speeches, writings, interviews and unstructured thoughts. That has entailed constructing a table of contents that includes pieces covering Peter Lauritzen's extensive thematic repertoire – from intercultural learning and non-formal education to youth policy and the history of the youth sector of the Council of Europe. We considered it important to choose pieces that clearly reflect the political and social *Zeitgeist* in which they were produced, so as to contribute also to the documentation of the historical development of the youth sector and the debates underpinning that development. It has also meant the inclusion of at least one text from as many years as possible since Peter Lauritzen first began writing and publishing. However, it has also meant that we have had to exclude at least twice as much material again, simply because of a lack of space.

The editorial process for this publication also presented other challenges. It was important to all involved in the project that the contents of the book remain as ‘authentically Peter Lauritzen’ as possible and respect his very particular style of public speaking and presenting theoretical or academic reflections. With the objective of not letting ‘Peter’s voice’ get lost, therefore, we made the decision not to edit any of the pieces included in the publication significantly, presenting them either as they were published or as they were circulated to colleagues inside and outside the institution. Therefore, with the exception of the correction of typographical and important grammatical errors, as well as some cuts for editorial purposes, we have not made changes to the pieces included. We hope that this decision will facilitate the reader in understanding the very special and individual nature of Peter Lauritzen’s creative style.

The publication of this collection of Peter Lauritzen’s work would not have been possible without the assistance and hard work of many people. In the first place, the Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe would like to acknowledge with thanks the Joint Council on Youth, which initiated this process. Thanks are due to the many colleagues at the Council of Europe, at the DYS and other services, who assisted in some way with finding texts, tracking down the origins of this or that speech and generally with the detective work involved in the production of this kind of book. Thanks are also due to all those institutions, organizations, newspapers and publishing houses that have promptly provided permission to republish pieces by Peter Lauritzen which previously appeared in one of their publications. And lastly, but by no means least, gratitude is due to Peter Lauritzen’s family, most notably his wife Françoise Lauritzen, for taking such a facilitative

attitude to this project, for providing permission to access Peter Lauritzen's home office and for donating his entire professional library to the Council of Europe's youth sector.

Peter Lauritzen was a very generous and mobile person. His generosity had many faces. He practised an open door policy all his life, to his office and to his home, which was famous for its hospitality, believing firmly in interpersonal dialogue, exchange and discourse as the basis for any form of common endeavour. Numerous ideas and projects were born over a meal or a drink offered by Peter, outside office hours. But his generosity also extended to his knowledge, which he never monopolized. Knowledge is created to be shared, to become common property; this was the credo he passed on to the generations of educational staff and other colleagues that joined the sector during his career. Mobility meant for him 'mobility of mind' – the capacity to respond to societal developments and, sometimes, also to counteract them, to manage positive change without losing sight of the fundamental values of the Council of Europe and a vision of a peaceful and just society. During the last years of his career, he travelled tirelessly all over Europe and beyond, promoting human rights and democracy in and through youth policy development, convinced that European institutions – of which he was a very visible representative – have to understand the reality of their member states in order to develop sustainable action. Several generations of colleagues, representatives of NGOs and governments, youth workers and young people had the privilege and luck to work and meet, and learn with and from Peter Lauritzen, and to enjoy his great sense of humour.

He used to say, "Nothing can replace a personal meeting and a frank and open talk". Sadly, Peter Lauritzen's untimely death

has deprived us of this possibility. Nevertheless, we hope that this book will be a rich source of inspiration, reflection and courage for its readers, as Peter Lauritzen himself was for so many people.

May 2008

Antje Rothmund and Yael Ohana

The Spoken Word

The Spoken Word

Peter Lauritzen was the consummate charismatic speaker. Speaking in public came naturally to him. He demonstrated his rhetorical skills early on, becoming elected to the position of school speaker at the Goethe Gymnasium in his hometown of Flensburg on the German-Danish border. Both talented and passionate, he was able to capture the attention of almost any audience. Friends from his student activist days who had the opportunity to attend his early speaking engagements, have been known to reminisce with fondness, and even a little pride, about how Peter Lauritzen, regularly invited to speak to audiences of important Europeans, was more often than not mistaken for ‘doctor something or other of political sciences’, despite being a humble, and rather young, student of history.

Whatever those auspicious beginnings, though, Peter Lauritzen made his name and acquired his true craft as a speaker in the field of political and non-formal education, in front of audiences first of activist peers working on ideas of Europe, and later, audiences of younger trainees with big questions about international youth work and youth policy. During his time at the Council of Europe, Peter Lauritzen spoke thousands of times to what could be called ‘internal audiences’. He opened and closed study sessions and training courses, symposia, European Youth Weeks and conferences to commemorate the signature of important conventions. He delivered motivational lectures and convincing arguments to the statutory bodies of the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation and to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the value of and need for investment

in youth policy and non-formal education, training, intercultural learning and human rights education. He acted as the general rapporteur for high-level policy conferences and roundtables, bringing together the strands of disparate conversations and debates, and providing coherence and direction to situations where there may not have been any. He was frequently invited to speak to external public audiences – at the events of other international organizations and institutions, student and international non-governmental youth organizations, national governments, research institutions and universities. And, as will be seen from the contents of this section, the scope and range of themes Peter Lauritzen spoke about was enormous.

However, his charisma as a public speaker became increasingly important as he grew older and his audiences became younger and younger in comparison. Many younger educationalist colleagues were first introduced and attracted to the European youth sector through Peter Lauritzen's words. Plenty of people still talk about the first time they heard him speak and how they were enormously inspired. One such person had the following to say on the subject:

I went to my first international seminar in 1994. Here I was, 18 years young, convinced that whoever wanted to say something about young people should not be older than 20 – maximum 25. You see I grew up in a country in which old people with grey hair and funny beards tried to tell us what it means to be young and what we should do to grow up – all the time. I was convinced those times were over. But then, who comes into the room? An old man with grey hair and a funny beard. I thought I was having a *dejà vu*, an encounter of the third kind. And the terror must have been clearly visible on my face.

Peter looked at me and a few others, thought for a minute and then it happened: he put away his notes, just like that, and instead of giving us a speech on democracy and youth participation as he was supposed to, he simply welcomed us and said, “Why don’t you tell me a little bit about what has been going on, what you’ve been doing, where you come from, why you are here...?” I have to admit it today: during this day, my stereotypes about old men with grey hair and funny beards were shattered. It was magic. And it taught me one important lesson: ‘You cannot educate others without learning from them’.¹

This necessarily personal anecdote of a young person inspired by first impressions provides us with an important insight into what might be considered Peter Lauritzen’s ‘style’ as a public speaker. He rarely spoke from a prepared speech, preferring hand-written key words on a notepad, a few guiding ideas to work from once he had felt out the audience’s concerns and expectations, soft or touchy points and even prejudices. He spoke in public in German, French and English, often jumping between the three languages to fully express the meaning of specific professional terms that are difficult to translate as a result of their historical association with a particular linguistic-intellectual tradition. He never gave the same speech twice. Even if he regularly made reference to previous lectures or input sessions, he connected his preparation for speaking engagements with a deep reading of current affairs, politics, cultural and social development, and the latest journalistic take on all of those. And despite the fact that he did not like to speak about himself too often, he always spoke from personal experi-

1 Andreas Karsten, from the tribute he delivered at Peter Lauritzen’s memorial service in the Church of St. Guillaume on June 4, 2007.

ence, thereby representing identity and creating complicity with the audience, speaking not just to their rationality and cognition, but to their values and emotions. Connecting theory and practice, he was able to help his audience to understand the relationship between their lives and what he was talking about.

Peter Lauritzen's approach to presentation probably deserves some attention. He liked to work with metaphors and examples, often drawing analogies for relationships, interconnections and links, on blackboards, whiteboards and flip charts, or on the notepad containing his hand written notes in preparation for a given input session. Among his favourites were circles and triangles, and one of his most famous input sessions used these differing shapes to explain the difference between the Council of Europe, an intergovernmental organization and the European Union, a supra-national organization. He was known to sometimes use overhead slides and a projector, if he felt this would help the audience to understand something a bit more complex. But the visuals never extended to the use of PowerPoint. When it first appeared, he did acknowledge its novelty effect. In latter years, though, in observing how its use became so widespread, and practically no speaker or trainer would get up in front of an audience at the European Youth Centres without a PowerPoint presentation, he would remark (not without a little cynicism) on the lack of creativity and knowledge that its use could disguise in the speaker and the laziness and disconnection from profound debate its use could provoke in the listener. Death by PowerPoint, as it were.

The selection of speeches presented in this section has been made from the much larger number of full transcripts that were found during the archiving process. It represents about one third

of what could have been published. Having said this, references (handwritten notes, typed fragments, conference programmes) were also found to many speeches for which it was not possible to find, acquire or reconstruct transcripts. The selection presented here covers the spectrum of themes that Peter Lauritzen regularly spoke about in public, from the Council of Europe's youth sector and its history to quality in non-formal education to civil society. The selection includes speeches made to internal and external audiences, in the variety of roles from keynote speaker to rapporteur in which Peter Lauritzen was invited to speak, and from as many years as possible for which it was for which full transcripts were found.

‘Intercultural Education’

Peter Lauritzen gave this speech at the launch of the Education Initiative within the ‘1001 Inventions Project’, an undertaking that researched and presented the common heritage shared by Muslim and other communities in Europe, at the Cardwell Auditorium in the Manchester Museum of Science and Industry on 7 March 2006. More information about ‘1001 Inventions Project’ is available at www.1001inventions.com.

Mr. President, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I thank you for the kind words of introduction and the importance you attach to my European and international work. Sounds impressive and is so simple. There is no big difference between the social and cultural fabric of a city of 100 spoken languages such as Manchester and the work my colleagues and I do in education. When I use the tram in my hometown, Strasbourg, I have already more nationalities in one car of the tram than in a seminar room at the European Youth Centre. In a globalized world, the local has become as international as the world at large and our work in the Council of Europe in education might just as well be understood as firmly based in this reality.

Back in 1985 – Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union still existed – I was in charge of organizing, in cooperation with the European Federation of Intercultural Learning, a colloquium on ‘Common Values for Humankind’. The opening speaker was Professor Bogdan Suchodolsky, an eminent researcher in education and

member of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Professor Suchodolsky was a survivor of Auschwitz and he said,

I saw educated people construct the barracks of the camp, I saw educated people do the selection at the ramp, I saw educated people experiment with the health of camp inmates – architects, lawyers and doctors of medicine.

And then he asked, “... What is education without values and convictions?” I have been guided by this question all my life and this is why I am a convinced scholar of the Council of Europe’s answer to this question:

- Human Rights Education, and
- Education for Democratic Citizenship

In my field we try to use these concepts within youth and community work. Human Rights Education is then a whole programme for lowering levels of humiliation and discrimination, and education for democratic citizenship is a ‘learning by doing’ invitation to become involved in culture, social affairs and politics. Seen as large binding orientations in education, there is no distinction between formal and non-formal education here; they can both do different things and are complementary to each other.

Today we have to be able to argue value education within intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning. This is not easy. Who speaks to whom in intercultural dialogue? Am I, as a German Protestant from the North, a religious or cultural representative of some sort? What about me being agnostic? What about transformations stemming from 40 years of international life? In my professional environment we try to respect individuality and we do not want to put people into culture boxes. Everybody deserves to be

discovered in his or her own way, regardless of origins and belongings. Otherness is not a collective quality; it is an individual one.

The most important capacity to have in this context is tolerance of ambiguity. You may not like the concept, but nowhere is it directed against your identity; on the contrary. And who likes ambiguity anyway? What I am talking about is the capacity to listen, and the capacity to accept what is said within a dialogue as equally valid. This is about symmetric communication and it defies dominance. Tolerance of ambiguity goes together with insecurity. By offering insecurity I also offer space for influencing and being influenced, I create fluidity within the dialogue. In a larger sense this is very relevant to young people; insecurity is almost an existential condition of their life, with regard to employment, the value of education and the complex process of identity formation.

In the end, the objective is 'respect'. In the words of Richard Sennet, "... unlike food, respect costs nothing. Why, then, should it be in short supply?" (Sennet, London, 2005). It is, shockingly, and we have to work hard on increasing the supply.

Respect of otherness, individuality, the capacity to live insecurity and ambiguity within communication and the intention to increase 'mixophilia' (Baumann) should be the cornerstones of an educational strategy aiming at a better management of diversity.

Education is one side to be looked at, and the most important one within the '1001 Inventions Project'. However, where we deal with phenomena such as Islamophobia we cannot but also call on the political side of our discussion. Without powerful institutions, without the rule of law and without democracy, education alone

will not reach its objectives. This is why civil society and a lively public sphere are so important: they are the common space between education and politics. Sticking to my field of work, I need all this: strong associations, particularly youth associations, education and training strategies in non-formal education and thus experience-based learning and learner-centredness, cooperation and communication between formal and non-formal education and the back-up of my organization, the Council of Europe, as an institutional framework and reference.

This exhibition calls on cognitive and emotional strands of learning. By learning that 1000 years of European history may appear as dark ages from one viewpoint but have been a lively creative continuum from another, certain condescending attitudes to the Muslim world can no longer be pursued. In this respect it will be so interesting to follow the effects of this exhibition, the teachers' pack and the website all over Europe, and to study its impact on the minds of young people.

This will be a long process. For the third strand of learning, the pragmatic one, we have another answer: our campaign, 'All Different – All Equal' for 'Diversity, Human Rights, Participation'. We do not trust education alone. We need to produce social action and political clout within this campaign, which I hope you will all join actively.

‘On Participation – Guiding Questions’

This is a lecture that was given at the Training Course on the ‘Charter for the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life’ at the European Youth Centre Strasbourg on 22 March 2006. Elements of this piece were later presented at the Youth Event in the context of the Austrian European Union Presidency (29 – 31 March 2006 in Bad Ischl).

It is often suggested that there is a direct relationship between real participatory power of young people and their readiness to get involved in the political process and public policies. This can mean all sorts of things, such as voting rights from a lower age, learner-centredness in education and thus concrete participation in the development of school and higher education curricula, participation in the creation of public spaces in urban areas and rural development, involvement in ecological programmes and a stronger recognition of the consumer status of young people and, hence, their contribution to the economy. Politicians tend to overlook this; future elections might be won with the votes of the over 60s, but what about the real power of young people? Will it exist in a corresponding line to their participation in voting at all sorts of levels - local, national, European? Or is there a very different pattern of participation preparing itself: efficient, real but not reflected in voting procedures? What is the key to understanding the power aspect of participation of young people in public policies?

Looking at this, a reflection on the changing nature of public policy in the youth field comes to mind – from government to governance, from purely state action to a negotiated co-production of public policies in cooperation with civil society, that is, non-profit organizations, including youth associations. The role of the state might become less and less visible in the future and what a country can mobilize in terms of voluntary energy can become crucial for fields such as social services, health care, ecology and education. All this has to do with being able to associate young people to public affairs and to do this with the clear intention of also giving them roles and responsibility very early. Someone who can set up internet sites and develop networks can also have their voice heard in the city council; those who understand complex computer programmes at a young age can also contribute to the teaching of mathematics and information technology at school, and trendsetters in modern lifestyle sports can also say a lot about the organization of urban spaces. Everybody in politics claims the participation of the young – in what exactly? What exactly should young people participate in?

It is true that youth participation is crucial in order to overcome apathy in the political process – but honest policy, close to the people, can do this job even better and if there is none or not enough of it, there is no need to spread moral panic about the young and their distance to public policies instead. Youth participation cannot be had cheaply any more; it has to come over as a real offer to share the power, and it is time that this happened.

For the Council of Europe and the European Commission to work on the participation of young people in public affairs is part of their youth policy mandate, be it in the new policy following

the publication of the White Paper on Youth for the Commission, or in the daily practice of the co-management of funds and programmes between public youth authorities and NGOs in the Council of Europe. But this is not enough. The institutional practice needs to communicate with research findings. In this way, the couple 'public authority – civil society' enlarges into the triangle 'public authority – civil society – research community', and intentions are confronted with evidence.

A whole number of conventions, resolutions and recommendations govern the item of participation within the European Union, the Council of Europe and the United Nations.

The main reference texts are:

- the UN declaration on International Youth Year 'Peace, Participation, Development' of 1985;
- the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- the Recommendation on Young People and Participation by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, 1997;
- the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the EU on Participation of 15 December 1998.

This short list already gives an impression of the item of 'participation' being regularly on the agenda of the international community. All texts have this in common:

- Participation is a principle of social organization that cannot be reserved to specific spheres. It is all embracing and needs to be practised at a local, regional, national, European and international (global) level. It also does not allow for any restrictions according to gender, ethnicity, religion, choice of lifestyle or social status;

- In a nutshell, participation means being involved, having tasks and sharing and taking over responsibility. It means having access and being included.

It also means, and still according to Marshall's (1952) definition:

- access to citizenship rights, elections (passive / active), eligibility for citizen responsibilities, freedom of speech, the right to an answer;
- a minimum of decent living conditions, culturally and socially, and, of course, materially.

Participation is learning and, thus, the school for democracy. It is also the essence of democracy and a pre-requisite to developing a sense of belonging and citizenship, and it is all this at the same time and inseparably interwoven.

The following are some guiding questions for the assessment of the role of social actors:

1. Who is involved? Who are the 'actors'? Public authorities, NGOs, local initiatives, grassroots, networks, agencies, researchers?
2. In what way are actors involved? Formal agreements, integrated policy, treaties, agreed programmes, informal agreements?
3. How are decisions taken? Top-down, democratic steering circles, informal circles?
4. Are roles and competences clearly visible? Coordination, steering, political legitimation, implementation, evaluation – how is this organized?
5. What are the specific resources of the actors? Power, money, formal competences, specific knowledge, cultural competence, local knowledge, commitment, etc?

6. What are the overarching strategies? For example, in local policy concepts, national or European concepts?
7. What are the obstacles to participation?
8. How are children involved? How are young people involved? Are they the actors? On their own or accompanied? What did they learn to be able to act? How have they been prepared for it?

‘The Social City as a Space for Citizenship in Human Rights Education for Young People’

Peter Lauritzen gave this speech to the Start-up Conference for European Partner Cities (Berlin and nine others) involved in the ‘Intercultural Learning and Transnational Dialogue Project on Human Rights Education, Preventing Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance (RAXI), Youth Participation’ organized by the Centre Français de Berlin (CFB), in cooperation with the Council of Europe, the German UNESCO Commission, the Ministry for Family, Senior Citizens, Women and Young People of Germany, the Berlin Senate for Education, Youth and Sport and the German Entimon Project, on 15 November 2005 in Berlin. The transcript of this speech was later published in the conference proceedings.

The Council of Europe is the Human Rights organization par excellence in Europe. There is not only the European Convention on Human Rights and the European Court of Human Rights as the standard setting instrument and institution for the implementation of Human Rights, but there are also all kinds of efforts and activities made to create and maintain a culture of Human Rights in the member countries. These are a club of 46 member states, including the Federation of Russia and all European CIS countries. The core values of the Council of Europe are Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law; the organization is also called ‘the home of democracy’.

Of course, the European space of the Council of Europe, which has a geographic West-East extension from Funchal to Vladivostok, is not a standardized space, where the social, political and cultural reality of its citizens is the same, wherever you are. In fact, there are considerable economic and social differences between member countries and in many cases also within the countries themselves; the efficiency of democratic institutions is very different as well and so are the outreach of media and new technologies, the education system and the opportunities for free movement.

The most fascinating challenge to the organization is its incredible cultural diversity; a source of enjoyment and rejoicing, but also a potential for stereotypes, prejudice, misunderstandings, intolerance and racism. This is what has to be learnt in order for Europe to have a future: the ability and willingness to live with cultural diversity, both within member states and between them.

How can such a big European organization with such a wide mandate reach out to citizens in Europe? How can it reach out to young people? Is there any chance that this organization could make a useful contribution to young people in depreciated urban areas? Does it have any relevance to the concept of the 'social city'?

I would like to take these questions both at theoretical and institutional level and also provide some practical 'hands-on' elements to my answer.

Let us turn to the transformation processes modern nation states are undergoing right now and see how these affect the concept of citizenship. In the old understanding, and indeed today, we are

citizens of one nation-state, accountable to this state's laws and institutions and entitled to access and specific rights and responsibilities. The state

... exercises power resting on a 'tripod of sovereignties' – economic, military and cultural: the ability to balance the books, to control its borders and to legislate the norms and the patterns by which all its subjects were to compose their customary conduct. (Zygmunt Baumann).

How stable is the tripod these days? With Baumann I see the legs of the tripod become increasingly wobbly under the following influences:

- **Globalization.** The speed of global financial transactions, the de-territorialization of company structures and of both capital and labour, the cut-throat competition and what is called today 'wild capitalism', have crumbled the concept of national economy (*Nationalökonomie*). Who balances the books now? Much of the modern welfare state could only be developed because what has been earned was reinvested into state and welfare infrastructure within one territory; the 'national wealth' was subject to social struggles concerning its distribution – what do these social struggles look like now, what is their dimension, where and how do they take place, if at all?
- **European integration.** 25, soon 27 and later more member countries of the Council of Europe are members of the European Union. They have accepted the logic of supra-nationality which simply means that whatever is subject to the European treaties as they stand, is no longer a national matter. It is

a community item. This concerns in some areas (agriculture) already more than 80% of what used to be national competence, in others less (education, culture), but it is a fact, that it is very inconvenient to have an incomplete European Union side by side with incomplete nation states. Logically the Union competence will constantly increase despite occasional setbacks, simply because you cannot really be 'half pregnant' – only by completing the political, economic and social agenda of the European Union can one fully benefit from membership and eventually turn to other crucial areas such as peace and security and ecology more energetically. Which means that already a 'pure' definition of the nation state as a sovereign policy actor is obsolete; within the Union we deal with European states, made up of nations with common objectives, history and destiny.

Globalization and **European** integration being the strongest agents of transformation of the nation state, other strong influences contribute to the modification as well:

- the increasing importance of **civil society**. The nineties of the last century saw the birth of 'governance', a kind of contract between civil society and public authority. In practically all areas of potential government action there will also be interest groups, associations, lobbies and all kinds of other civil society actors around, and they will strongly mark what the legislator will do. They will also stay around and keep an eye on public authority in such a way that government action will become 'governance', which indicates mutual communication and cooperation between state and civil society. This sector has grown so much that Hans Magnus Enzensberger in a *Spiegel*

essay of more than 10 years ago simply put into doubt that any state action against an organized group in society was still possible. Whatever this means for democracy (Is the influence of the Rifle Association on US government really such a good thing?), it clearly means reduction of state power.

- the **'lean state philosophy'**. Everybody demands reduction of public spending, not least through the reduction of a publicly paid work force. Bureaucracies are screened according to market criteria and have to learn how to behave within a market; what can be privatized will be privatized, and what can be outsourced will be outsourced. Within modern service societies the distinctive behaviour of public authority becomes more and more like that of any market actor. Again, the nation-state has less resources, and becomes a lean state indeed.
- **Decentralization.** Whether states are federal states or states with traditions of devolution of power, or, on the contrary, central states with centralized power structures, they all have a tendency to empower local and regional communities and to give these communities strong responsibilities. This is particularly true with regard to social assistance, prevention of risk behaviour and social exclusion, dealing with poverty, exclusion, migration and multicultural affairs in urban areas. The welfare state or the social state appears often in the form of the local community and what it can do or not do. The other side of the coin is the local community as economic actor and area; attractive communities will be able to host industries, training facilities, research and education infrastructures and service providers. This is a positive development, but it weakens the nationstate's power base all the same.
- **International terrorism.** This worldwide development has introduced new dangers to the life and security of citizens which

cannot be met appropriately with the concept of national defence and territorial armies. What is required is worldwide coordination and a combined integrated operation between armies, police forces and secret services. With no international force of this kind in place and faced with insurmountable differences with regard to what is now called 'the war on terror' by the US administration, even the classical function of the nation-state – to protect the integrity of its territory and its citizens – is endangered. The Council of Europe is currently in the process of carrying out an investigation into this matter: have the US been able to torture European citizens in special camps and prisons? Have European citizens been literally kidnapped and brought outside their country? Whatever the answers will be, it seems that international terrorism has created facts outside national and international law to the detriment of the nation state's integrity.

What I want to show is a transformation process of state power. Zygmunt Baumann calls it the divorce of power: the politics stays territorial, while economy, military force and culture become even more global and thus extraterritorial.

In such a world, how can we deal with identity and citizenship? On paper this looks easy: citizenship will have to be understood as a differentiated citizenship, the same for identity. Why can a global citizenship not be a possibility? Many widely-travelled artists and writers have felt they are global citizens. European citizenship is under construction: it grows with the European project. So does European identity. National citizenship and identity are still dominant patterns. They exist and will last. Regional and local citizenships and identities have always been – so

why can citizenship and identity not simply follow the complexity of today's world? Are all these concepts not complementary to each other?

They are, but in reality, this does not work. The above is too abstract or only liveable for a few. For a great many - particularly young - people, identity formation and citizenship become an individual burden because the collective side to identity formation works badly. This overlaps with other developments: secure jobs become part-time jobs, careers turn into a sequence of occupations, good school and university results count only for little on the labour market and flexibility is the number one virtue. All in all, this is a scenario of insecurity and insecurity is what we have to deal with.

What the nation-state cannot provide fully any more, what the European Union will probably never be able to provide and what remains a bit cloudy in global citizenship needs to be tackled from the local level first. There, the idea of 'citizenship' and of 'community' are integrally connected.

Citizenship and community are words that relate to the fundamentally human business of living with others. The two words depend on each other. Citizenship has no meaning on its own; you have to be a citizen of something, namely a community. And there are no communities worth the name, which do not afford members a sense of something shared and a common status of belonging (a status which one can call 'citizenship'). Understood broadly, these concepts are as old as human civilisation itself. (Hall and Williamson 1999, p.1)

Placing understandings of identity and citizenship in a local context is a first step in dealing with insecurity, and all the practical difficulties will be present: what is a community, if we are talking of big cities? A borough? An administrative unit? Maybe, but in the first place it is a human fabric of neighbourhoods, workplaces, educational facilities, town halls, pubs and sport and leisure locations, it is an urban environment and it will be, normally, a heterogeneous community formed of members of many different origins, belonging to different faith groups, representing class-, gender-, age- and income differences. It is a 'warm' context and it can make people experience the emotional side of citizenship; it is belonging, not concept.

It is for this context that the Council of Europe's Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe has, in close cooperation with my service, the Directorate for Youth and Sport, developed the 'Revised European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life'. This charter is a concrete set of guidelines on how to involve young people in sectoral policies which concern them (employment, housing, transport, health, gender, minorities, anti-discrimination, criminal justice, etc.) and how to promote their participation through specific instruments.

Thus the big item of 'participation' is introduced. The more the world shows itself as complex and differentiated, and the more access to power seems impossible, the more disenchantment with the political process will rise, and this is particularly true for young people. Their abstinence from politics has become proverbial; it is of utmost importance to reintroduce youth political participation,

... with the clear intention of also giving them roles and responsibilities at a very young age. Someone who can develop a computer company in a garage can also have his or her voice heard in the city council; someone who understands complex computer programmes at a young age can also contribute to the teaching of mathematics and information technology at school; and trendsetters in modern lifestyle sports can also say a lot about the organization of urban space. (Lauritzen, 2005, p.5).

The most important educational strategy in respect of citizenship and identity is Human Rights Education. Speaking for the youth field, this means for us introducing Human Rights as a condition for human existence and the awareness of and knowledge about it as a prerequisite to lower existing levels of humiliation and discrimination. In other words, we understand Human Rights Education as one way of doing youth and community work. The methodology is based on a very comprehensive handbook, 'Compass'¹. This is a compilation of youth and community work methods which is truly intercultural, inclusive of minorities, sensitive to racism and discrimination and leading to developing coping strategies and solutions. The text exists now in almost 20 languages, including Arabic, and the Directorate of Youth and Sport, and particularly its Youth Centre in Budapest, direct international and national training courses with multipliers in order to make the methods known and effective. Recently a Human Rights Education e-learning community has been created and the whole programme is a huge success.

1 Compass, A manual on human rights education with young people, 2nd Edition, Council of Europe Publishing, 2003. Compass in several languages can be downloaded from the following website: www.eycb.coe.int/compass.

For us, in the Council of Europe, working with young people on items such as citizenship and identity in a changing world means, paradoxically, going local. At a second step it means confronting what makes up our own identity – Human Rights, Democracy, the Rule of Law – with the concrete life circumstances of young people, and showing how relevant these concepts are to living a decent life.

At a third step it means developing youth policies and ensuring that these are closely connected to youth and community work practice. Without opening the big chapter of what youth policies are about in Europe – this is not the right place for it – I would like to point to the triangle of ‘personal development – employment – citizenship’. This basic understanding requires that what is done for young people’s personal development alone, a classical youth work objective, is not enough; there must also be an employment dimension, and what is done for employment might just as well be called ‘vocational training’, if it has no citizenship dimension. By proving the relevance of working with young people, of empowering them and by including them in the running of public affairs, youth and community work is a key area aiming exactly for better employment prospects and active citizenship.

Within the local community, within the social city, citizenship and identity can become real, and human rights a common good. The social city represents the space for reconstruction, which has got lost in the nation-state and is not or may never be there in Europe. For the concept to hold, it needs networking and exchange, it needs transnational associations, intercultural communication, democratic diversity management and a constant awareness of global and European policy processes. This is not about Russians not

being Russians any more or Germans not being Germans or Turks not being Turks – it is about the divorce of affectionate citizenship from power, the incongruence of what is believed to be the unshared power of the nation state and what has become the real structure of power in Europe.

I have said already, with others, that Europe has to learn to live its own cultural diversity successfully. This will not be possible without an idea of social justice, of respect and dignity and of full citizenship for everybody: there is still a long way to go.

‘Thirty Years of Youth Work in the Council of Europe’

This is the speech Peter Lauritzen gave to the Opening Conference of the celebration events for the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe at the Ossolineum National Institute in Wrocław, Poland on 10 December 2004. This version of the speech was published in edited written form in the conference proceedings.

Introduction

The youth field of the Council of Europe is composed of the following elements:

- the European Youth Centre, Strasbourg;
- the European Youth Centre, Budapest;
- the European Youth Foundation;
- the Solidarity Fund for Young People;
- the Partial Agreement on the European Youth Card;
- Intergovernmental cooperation on youth (the Steering Committee for Youth) and Secretariat of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for youth;
- Partnership agreement with the European Commission on training, youth research and EUROMED cooperation;
- Young Political Leaders Programme;
- Programme of field activities in member countries;
- Programme of international youth policy reviews and youth policy advisory missions.

Youth is now part of DG IV and belongs to the Directorate of Youth and Sport. Its most important establishments, the Centres in Strasbourg and Budapest, and the Youth Foundation, are co-managed on a parity basis, that is, their management body is a 'Programming Committee' of eight governments and eight NGOs. The larger statutory construction is made up of the CDEJ, with 48 member governments, and a 30-person Advisory Council, made up exclusively of NGOs. Both meet twice a year as the 'Joint Youth Council', a united body of both the CDEJ and the Advisory Council with the mandate to set work priorities and policy guidelines. This co-management practice has existed since the beginning of operations in 1972 and is probably the longest lasting example of participatory democracy within a European organization. That it has lasted this long is, maybe, not a strong argument, but it has continuously developed into an efficient system of social co-production between the intergovernmental sector and civil society. It has always been and still is an outstanding example of best practice in international youth work provision and youth policy delivery.

The recommendation to create a European Youth Centre was made as early as 1965 by the Parliamentary Assembly and it took seven years until this Centre, planned within the Committee on Out-Of-School Education, could leave its status as an 'Experimental Youth Centre' behind, and move into its premises in 1972. The architecture of the building, created by a Norwegian team, reflected the thinking of a 'laboratory of experimental learning' (which is what the Centre was meant to be) of its time and was enthusiastically received by its users, mainly participants coming through International Non-governmental Youth Organizations (INGYOs). The European Cultural Convention

has always been a key text within the youth field, and its States parties became the reference for membership in the CDEJ, but administratively 'Youth' became a sector of its own, reporting directly to the Secretary General, that is, it did not belong to the then Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport and its committees were not part of the Council for Cultural Cooperation (the CDCC).

This changed only recently with the creation of DG IV – Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, when the lost child returned, together with a 65-person highly diversified staff and a decentralized service. So, what have we done under the European Cultural Convention over 30 years and how can we now best integrate a joint approach with common objectives and complementary working methods?

1. The dominating process concerning young people (and society at large) in the last 30 years has been modernization. However, within the Council of Europe, the pace of modernization is dramatically different than in its member countries. When comparing Germany and Russia, or Armenia and the Netherlands, or Slovakia and Finland, what do such countries have in common with regard to the life situation of young people? Not much at first sight, and thus a coherent statement on young people concerning life trajectories, intergenerational aspects, economic and social status, the sense of belonging to a community, creative potential and access to opportunities can hardly be made throughout the member countries of the Council of Europe. It is not impossible, but it needs thinking about in different modernities and identifying outside common elements of development such as globalization.

2. This is different from the situation before 1989, when there were fairly comparable situations in many member countries, with the exception of Turkey. At the time, transnational categories describing the social and cultural situation of young people had emerged together with common youth agendas as well. Of course, national, regional and cultural differences existed and were even strongly underlined by youth councils and youth movements, but the codes of understanding were clear and so was the place of the Strasbourg-based youth institutions – a political forum, a training centre, a financial mechanism to back up youth NGOs in Europe, intergovernmental cooperation focusing particularly on youth mobility, and a definition of Europe which was wide and inclusive, based on human rights, democracy, social cohesion and cultural difference.

3. At that time (we are speaking of the 1980s), the minority issue – one of the permanent issues on the youth agenda from the outset – had not yet been so overshadowed by regional, ethnic and national interpretations, as is the case today. Minorities defined themselves for example within gender, religion, physical and mental handicaps, sexual preference, social exclusion, lifestyles and youth cultures a good tradition of a transversal definition, which the field always tried to maintain against the aggressive definition of minorities as ethnic unities only.

4. Also, until 1989, the concept of multipliers with regard to the participants of EYC and EYF activities remained unquestioned and so did the concept of membership-based association and the national or regional youth councils. These were considered to be the societal transmission belts of the results of individual learning processes within larger meetings, exchanges and field experienc-

es of young people within Council of Europe activities. And this was also the answer to visibility: within the youth and social work *milieu*, the Council of Europe was quite visible, with the effect of creating a long-lasting friendly climate around budget decisions in favour of young people.

5. Achievements in the 'before 1989 period' were:

- a. The strengthening of transnational European youth structures through highly qualified study sessions, language and training courses, symposia and consultative meetings with youth experts (EYC); contributions of the EYF, both in terms of decentralized youth projects and administrative support, and the co-management feature.
- b. The political capital acquired in that period was probably, in the first place, the youth contribution towards overcoming the Cold War and the East-West division of Europe. Numerous meetings related to the Helsinki Process, the first system of pan-European youth and student cooperation, the early inclusion of participants and youth representatives from Central and Eastern Europe in activities of the youth field, publications and research (Project 121, Joel Kottek's study on youth involvement in the Helsinki process) show the crucial contribution of the youth field to what would become a complete redefinition of Europe soon after. Other examples are the efforts to contribute to democratic youth work in post-fascist countries in the 1970s and the constant work on learning through examples of good practice in the different areas of youth activity. The youth field was an active partner in the North-South Campaign, which was the starting

point for a whole series of Third World activities and it became, in the 1990s, the carrier of the Campaign against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance (RAXI), an experience which in many ways is still not finished and leads today to the successful Human Rights Education Programme based on 'Compass'. Forerunners to the campaign were the two Conferences on Intolerance (1981 and 1989) and the Youth Weeks of Strasbourg (1985) and Bratislava (1992), to be followed by the largest event of this type, European Youth Week in Strasbourg in 1995. It is important to underline that all these activities were organized in cooperation with other Council of Europe departments, task forces and Directorates; some were even supervised by the Deputy Secretary General and Private Office directly (RAXI, creation of the Budapest Centre, Intolerance Conferences) and all have been transversal activities, a pronounced policy of the Secretaries General Oreja and Lalumière during their time in office.

- c. When placing these questions to decades, it could be said that the zenith of political movements – and this was in no way restricted to party political movements – was in the 1970s. At that time, even the Christian Democrat and conservative movements had subscribed to a preamble of the European Coordination Bureau of INGYOs, claiming that they would all work for 'anti-capitalist and emancipatory' objectives; so this indeed was the decade of the left. This was followed, in the 1980s, by the dominance of social movements over the sector, again to be followed by a more heteroclit picture in the 1990s: educational and exchange movements and agencies, lifestyle movements, minority organizations, youth worker networks and youth culture organizations. However,

throughout the 30 years, organizations such as the Scouts and Guides, 4H Clubs, YMCA and YWCA, EFIL and some other exchange organizations, religious youth and student organizations and party political youth organizations, to mention but a few, have kept a continuum of activity and commitment with regard to the youth field of the Council of Europe. It has not always been fair to call these partners 'traditional'; it was done to encourage the sector not to become a closed shop, and to remain constantly open to new members in the club. With hindsight, this has been good, as the area constantly welcomes new members and also loses movements, which have outlived themselves.

- d. The 1980s and 1990s served to build social and educational capital. The Youth field became the focal place for social and intercultural learning and developed highly professional standards for voluntary work, campaigning, training of youth workers, advocacy and lobbying and youth policy development.

6. With the fall of the Berlin wall - the ultimate symbol for the breakdown of the Soviet empire and its ideology - the world changed dramatically, and not only in the East. The Western countries, many of them governed by some form of 'caring capitalism' with strong welfare state components and still defending values such as solidarity and equality, turned to a model of aggressive, globally organized neo-liberalism as if the fall of communism had also meant the end of their own social commitments. Meanwhile, this model has become a global reality: it is intolerant to any non-fiscal approach in governance; it promotes management objectives before political and ethical standards and it increasingly

annihilates the old distinctions between market, public authority, public sphere and civil society – everything is governed by the market, the real winner of the Cold War. For young people, the consequences of this development are known: increased individual competition; flexibility becomes the highest educational ideal; risky behaviour increases; violence, racism, sexism, suicide, idleness and social nihilism become high priority youth issues.

7. For the youth field of the Council of Europe, united in the conviction ‘youth is a resource, not a problem’, the picture painted above is unacceptable. The values of the Council of Europe – such as the principles of equity and fairness, the social embedding of the economy and the democratic process, the obligation of public authority to ensure free education for all, to encourage healthy lifestyles, to build the capacity of civil society and the associative movement, to facilitate the entry into the labour market of young people and to care for children, young people, families and communities, finally to watch over a climate of tolerance and societal dialogue and guarantee the security of minorities remain completely intact – these are achievements of the late twentieth century and late modernity which must not be sacrificed for profits, the financial manoeuvres of a few and an economic concept of governance. This means that the youth field is not as politically neutral as many think. It belongs, in the largest sense, to the ‘counter reformation’ (Bourdieu) as expressed in the global NGO movement of Prague, Seattle, Genoa and Porto Alegre. Other than in 1968, this is not a movement of a particular political orientation and it is not revolutionary in its objectives; it unites such different components as, for example, the Catholic Church and many world religious leaders and movements such as ATTAC, Amnesty International and Greenpeace.

8. The large event on globalization – ‘How Big Is Your World?’ (Strasbourg, May 2004) has shown that the youth field is quite clearly positioned within the global discussions about a better distribution of resources, overcoming extreme poverty, and combating racism, war, discrimination and violence by working on global education for human rights. The field is a production and knowledge centre of ideas concerning citizenship, identity, social responsibility, participation and educational reform. Its products consist of training, communication, networking, project development, social research and social action. It builds capacities whilst sticking to the values of the Council of Europe. About these, there is nothing old-fashioned; they seem to be the mainstream thinking of many young people today in all our member countries. This is, therefore, one important part of the mission statement of the youth field: it associates young people to Council of Europe values and spreads them effectively. The thinking is European and global at the same time and it is multi-polar, complex and committed.

9. The links to this field in DG IV are cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning, non-formal education, the message of the European Year of Citizenship through Education, cultural and social cohesion, and social interaction. On the other hand, by its cross-cultural character, the field also deals with welfare and health policies, criminal justice issues, housing, urban spaces, employment and discrimination issues. This often creates a difference in approach; to make this difference recognizable and use it in a constructive manner will influence, whether the youth field is only administratively attached to DG IV or, as it should be, one of its strong pillars.

‘Life Long Learning, Non-Formal Learning and Citizenship’

This speech was given at the Conference on the theme of non-formal education organized by the Polish National Agency of the YOUTH Programme in Warsaw on 8 December 2004. It was later translated into Polish and published in the conference proceedings entitled ‘Living Learning – Conference Materials’.

Before joining the Council of Europe in 1972, I worked as a director of studies (*Studienleiter*) at one of the European Academies in Germany in Otzenhausen, Saarland. I had the status of a teacher in out-of-school education, my treatment was adjusted to the level of a secondary school teacher and I was one of many. In other words, my work was recognized by public authorities. At the time, there were more than 300 such residential schools and academies in the country, not to speak of very large organizations such as the Red Cross, Caritas, the religious communities and the party political foundations and trade union schools offering comparable jobs. The ‘68 movement was not only a big stimulation and irritation to the agenda of social and political change, but also at the origin of triggering off a big debate on education – in Germany, during the 1960s, only 5% of the youth population passed the *Abitur* (German state exam allowing a student to enter an academic university) and thus acquired the right to join higher education. There was a very conservative and sclerotic school curriculum in place and one could observe an overwhelming influence of the family origin on success in education and entry into the labour market.

To remedy this, a ‘new educational agenda’ was set up:

- education for all
- modernization of the curriculum
- learner participation
- life long learning
- learning by doing
- permanent education
- recurrent education
- out-of-school education
- experimental learning
- social learning

The European organization at the forefront of this agenda was the Council of Europe, working closely with UNESCO and OECD on education (Edding Commission). In fact, the whole educational philosophy of the organization was based on Life Long Learning, and a Europe-wide reform of education was an undisputed work priority of the organization.

The youth organizations, much less of a lobby than they are today but paradoxically more listened to, were clearly on the side of educational reform and promoted what was called ‘out-of-school education’. Consequently the European Youth Centre was a creation of the ‘Out-Of-School Education Committee’ of the Council for Cultural Cooperation (CCC) and the Education Directorate considered the Centre a laboratory for experimental learning and educational reform. Whether the Centre actually did that job and did not function much more like a political forum than an educational project is another matter – it came out of a boom of the educational reform debate.

Other areas of the debate were the following: overcome the ivory tower attitude of universities and get them into the centre of society, create educational leave facilities for all employed, worker's education, consider education piece-meal (do part of it, work, get back into education, etc.), make schools learn from the out-of-school reality and educational methodology, reduce selection, develop social qualifications.

What has become of all this experience during the last thirty years, what has changed, and how can one have another go at educational reform within the life long learning agenda?

Today, we speak of the same items as three decades back, but we have changed the language. We speak of 'non-formal education/learning', we want to impress 'stakeholders', we identify the contribution of education to 'systemic change', we look for 'players' to implement the ideas on the table and we agree on one central educational objective: 'flexibility' of learning approaches in view of the needs of the emerging 'most competitive knowledge-based economy in the world' (Lisbon objective). Is this only a change of language or is there, meanwhile, another driver on board? Does the market now control the education debate and reality? If this is true, what about democracy, the role of citizenship and public authorities, of European institutions and of the civil society?

The most radical difference of the present debate to the '60s and 70s is the definite rupture between the education system and the labour market (c.f. OECD, 'Education and Work: The Views of the Young', Paris 1982). This meant that formal education was deprived of its most precious reward: the entry into a good position in the labour market. Hence education might as well be fun or dif-

ferent or a little less stressful, because the good results – still badly needed – were no guarantee for a safe ticket into a successful life any more. In the '80s this became very much a 'Western' reality, which still lasts and is extending; with the breakdown of socialist economies and the Soviet Union in the '90s the transition countries of Central and Eastern Europe joined the club.

Ever since, sociologists have spoken of 'broken trajectories of youth', referring to the end to the sequence 'childhood – adolescence – youth – adulthood', and introducing what could be considered a new parallelism of these developmental categories: 'adult' kids, 'old' young people encrusted in their parents' homes forever, 'infantile' adults, enjoying a media offer at the level of a permanent children's birthday party, and job and education hoppers, adjusting their life and their ambitions to the economic survival conditions.

The latter is often referred to as the 'risk society' (Beck), thus describing unprecedented opportunities for early success for young people, but also equally unprecedented opportunities for massive failure, social exclusion and poverty. Whilst there is ample proof of the second part of the risk society argument, the first one has become substantially belittled with the hype around 'start-ups' and the New Economy running into a chill-out front.

Time to introduce 'life skills', because that is what it is all about. Learning to be is the overall objective, and this covers employment and citizenship as the two main areas of application.

Participation has to be learned, as does democratic culture and the acceptance of minorities. Learning to be, acquiring life skills, developing an individual quality in tune with social

qualifications, defending an interest, advocating specific agendas, and forming coalitions and teams – all make up the curriculum of non-formal learning. This has been the approach of the associative movement, since it first appeared as a political subject. (Peter Lauritzen, ‘The Making of the European Citizen’, *Handbook of Applied Developmental Sciences, Vol. 3*, p. 366, Sage Publications Inc. Books, USA, 2003)

What we are talking about is an education offer constantly developing within the third sector, the non-profit economy. This sector is, however, a sector

... with a dominating culture of management thinking ... together with a competitive market approach. Many associations have become subject to this process and behave in terms of the market. One can observe a similar trend in public administration. What will happen, when the market is everywhere without distinction of institutions, public welfare, social networks and community values? When all that humans do becomes a product, what has the associative movement become then? (Lauritzen, *op. cit.*, p. 367).

This observation refers to the two faces of the third sector: on the one hand it gives the civil society and the associative movement ample opportunity to show its economic and educational strength; on the other hand it may even out all original, democratic and emancipatory characteristics in the name of a sellable market product or a good service, thus making the civil society and the associative movement lose its very legitimacy.

In trying to find the right balance between public authority, civil society and the market in defining their role in education in gen-

eral and in non-formal education in particular, it seems to me that the Bruges/Copenhagen process has significant potential to pursue both an employability and a citizenship agenda, provided that the social partners and the associations, not least the youth organizations in the European Youth Forum play their role and contribute fully to the process. This gives the European Commission an obligation to steer the learning and knowledge management somehow in parallel between a 'market and employability' agenda and a 'public sphere and citizenship' agenda, ideally creating a maximum of relationships between the two agendas. Debates in various working groups and seminars have begun and it looks as if the non-formal education/learning items of the future could be:

- Construct a positive idea of the world we are living in – global education;
- Define the place of non-formal education/learning in the life long learning agenda;
- Give non-formal education/learning a place and an identity; create the ethics, contents, methods and products of non-profit education offers;
- Promote intergenerational learning – towards a new alliance of childhood, family and youth policies;
- Contribute to the creation of a participative learning culture;
- Strive for equal access to education and learning; combat exclusion;
- Develop learning communities and community-based forms of learning;
- Learn to document all learning steps in life, also the non-successful ones;
- Develop European citizenship – concept and related learning strategies;

- Develop appropriate quality standards, validation and assessment (portfolio, self- assessment) systems in non-formal education/learning.

Life long learning and non-formal education have a lively tradition in Europe. Economic realities, the development of new technologies, globalization and individualization are some of the factors, which have created a completely new context for this sector of learning and associative activity. The new agenda is set by the Lisbon process, and the education investments of member states are of crucial importance, as is the coordinating and steering role of the Commission. All other partners, national governments, researchers and experts, social partners and associations, but also the Council of Europe, UNESCO, OECD and OSCE should play an active role in what is described in one of the working groups of the Bruges/Copenhagen process as 'Making learning attractive and strengthening the links with working life, research and society at large'. A nice big programme that is and youth organizations have their contribution to make.

‘Europe, European Union Enlargement and Education’

These are the concluding remarks Peter Lauritzen made at the closing plenary of the 13-4-10s (thirteen for teens) conference organized by the Hungarian Ministry of Youth and Sport for the then 13 accession countries of the European Union on the theme of ‘Youth Policy Development in the Perspective of the White Paper’. It took place at the European Youth Centre Budapest, from 18 to 21 April 2002.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends and Colleagues,

I would like to thank the Hungarian authorities for the confidence in letting me summarize the results of this important work. That really shows that they are ready to face anything in the future.

To start, I would like to introduce a small reflection which goes a little bit beyond the youth work related reflections which will follow. I refer to the accession process of the European Union in its political dimension. What is going on? Is this the “coming home to Europe”, as was voiced many years back by Václav Havel? Is this a “European Reunification”, as was said yesterday morning by Tamás Deutsch? Is this “the first time they are taking us seriously,” as was said by the Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mircea Gonea, recently in a meeting which I held with the working group on Young People in South Eastern Europe in Bucharest, where he actually said,
... the West has played around with us many times, but I think this time it is serious, this time the accession story to NATO

and the accession story to the European Union is serious, and that is why we also have to work differently on these agendas than we worked in the past.

Maybe the accession process is a little bit of all that, and this is why I think we should learn to link our common work to a larger agenda.

The Cold War is behind us in terms of the running political agenda. But when it comes to memory and attitudes and even to public opinion, doubts come in as to whether this confrontational period is as far behind us as we believe, or are made to believe. For people of my generation, for instance, the Cold War and its influence on education structures and content has marked something like thirty years of our lives, on both sides of the Iron Curtain. How does one get rid of this? Overnight, having a few drinks? I mean, how does this kind of influence actually get out of you, how do you 'de-learn'? I think certain long term effects stay with you: the way you are educated and the way you keep thinking are issues we need to discuss further, and we have to be aware of our sub-conscience, about our stereotypes and about ways to deal with this heritage positively in education.

True, it is the future that counts. But he who does not know and master the past and the related memories is not ready to face the future either, and some debates held presently in *Mittleuropa*¹ on nationality, forced migration, remaining rights, 'gone' rights and

1 This literally translates from German as Central Europe. But the concept that lies behind *Mittleuropa* is more complex and refers to the common imperial history of the central European countries and its legacy on their social and political development.

a new legal reality within the European Union are living proof to this opinion of mine. The order of the world which was created after the Second World War by the three big architects of this order, Stalin, Churchill and Truman, was also an order that forced the creation of ethnic nation-states. What was to be prevented were pockets of German nationality populations, which might serve once again as a pretext to unite any German speaking people within one nation. Hence, through forced migration after 1945, they made sure that ethnic nation states would come into existence, thus laying the foundation for new problems to emerge, which then turn around the difficult adaptation of ethnic nations to modernity and an international competitive economy with open borders for capital flows and the labour force. Which leads to mixed populations as a kind of normality and has always done! The only state where they did not tow this line was Yugoslavia. And it is one of the biggest tragedies that I have witnessed in my lifetime that this multicultural federation did not hold: as if the country had been unduly in advance of its time and was brought back to the historic logic of nation building on ethnic foundations.

Today, talking of Europe is actually to talk of another order than the one created directly after the War. Things have evolved, as we all know. It means an order of open borders, it means an order of mobility and freedom of movement; it means an order of heterogeneous state populations. We have learnt that it is not possible to build Europe on the concept of the ethnic nation, and not even on a kind of multitude of ethnic nation-states. This would be in itself racist and all European populations who have gone through this exercise in the last fifty years know that. They face the resulting difficulties of xenophobia and aggression, which seem to be unavoidable within heterogeneous societies and keep working

on the human right institutions and laws which will help maintain and protect their basic values, and intervene when these are threatened. It is also an order of supra-nationality and it is an order of community rule. This is, of course, a heavy intervention into national sovereignty in the old understanding of sovereignty as an undividable, central power. In this sense, when joining the Union, it is not possible to speak of national sovereignty in the old way any more. You may have your defined areas of competence which the nation-states will keep and these will remain extremely important, but on many other items, and these are set out chapter by chapter within the accession process, there are items where these sovereignties will have to be shared in the future. This happens by the free will of those who take part in the process; it is not something that is imposed. I say 'free will', because people believe that through the accession exercise they are taking part in the large process of creating a human, economic, social and democratic Union in Europe, and they want to be part of it. It is a voluntary process and that is the difference. I sometimes take part in activities where participants tell me, maybe at one o'clock in the morning after some vodkas, that at the end of the day, it is all the same: they were controlled by Moscow in the past, then there was a little break to let them fall on their feet again, and now they will be controlled by Brussels. This kind of statement always makes me angry and sad. This shows somehow a lack of democratic understanding when such statements are made. In this case it is simply not understood why countries are going into this accession process. There have been democratic votes on this item, there have been parliamentary votes, there have been referenda and there will be referenda again when the formal question of joining is on the agenda. Where are the battalions of the European Union, enforcing enlargement? Is it not the other way round: that the accession

process meets with heavy resistance inside the old Union countries and that this resistance has to be overcome?

I think this whole process has to be kept in mind. We are not talking about simply adding opportunities for some privileged young people here. We are talking about opening future life perspectives and about involvement, so that the process of European unity, which has been clearly a 'Western' project, becomes truly pan-European and this needs the support of young people, today and tomorrow. I put forward that there is a larger agenda linked to accession and I feel that it is appropriate at the beginning of this report to come up with this reflection.

The 'White Paper on Youth' is a landmark in European discussions on youth policy and this is due both to its content and to the method used, first and foremost, because it gives young people a foot in the door to the enlargement process. It allows us – at least in those countries where the enlargement process is not yet that far advanced – to say, Youth issues also belong to the agenda. It was said this morning that this argument is not possible, and that procedures are completely separate. I'm not so sure.

Take a country like Romania. I remember that Commissioner Verheugen addressed the Romanian Parliament and there he said,
... if you don't solve a number of problems, such as the problems of street children and children in institutions, or the problem of trafficking of young women and other such problems of this kind, then you will have problems with accession.

So there seems to be a link with a number of items of a societal nature and the possibility to join the Union, and these are in the area

of employment, of social cohesion, in the area of human rights and civil society or in the area of respect for the rights of young women and children. These belong to any community agenda and are to be found implicitly in all the treaties. They are also mentioned in the White Paper, which gives you an occasion to actually say: these are the youth policy items of interest to us and we would like these same items to be included in the debates about the framework conditions and the political context of joining the European Union. That is at least how I would understand the political relevance of the 'White Paper on Youth' and the related open method of coordination in accession countries, once they are included in the procedure. Another effect of this approach is that this way you have direct influence on national legislation, on funding and on the status of NGOs. Hence it would be a good idea to use the White Paper as a kind of register of what is already agreed in youth policy.

Another reflection is that in the preparatory process to working with the White Paper, as this happens in and around this meeting – which I find, and emphasize again, a most welcome initiative – you actually prevent a race towards Brussels one by one, everybody being everybody else's competitor. You unite the 13 on this one occasion, which is a very constructive approach. However, what about this distinction of the 13 and the 15, which I could observe a little during your discussions? Can this not lead into a trap? Into the trap of believing that there are somewhere 15 countries who are already concerned with the White Paper for a while, and who have achieved some unity already? And then there are on the other side some 13, who maybe have to create another kind of unity in conferences such as this one. I'm not so sure whether there is any truth in this distinction, even if there is one in legal and formal

terms, but with regard to contents of youth policy? I wouldn't like to see what a test on the effectiveness of youth policy institutions between Slovenia and Italy would produce. Can you really say what is significantly 'western' in a country and thus progressive, modern, post-modern, etc. and what is significantly 'eastern' and thus pre-modern, or modern for that matter? When Slovenia produced its first youth report on attitudes of young people, youth cultures and behavioural patterns in 1998 (Mirjana Ule and Tanja Rener: 'Youth in Slovenia', Ljubljana 1998), we had a small debate within our staff in the Council of Europe about the values of young people in Central and Eastern Europe: are they different from the values in Western Europe? In the light of the sociological reports available on transition and young people we could not really find confirmation for this idea, however much our previous disposition would suggest that there have to be big differences and that these are here to stay for a long time. Research, not least the study quoted above, did not confirm this disposition either. All we could say is that there are similar values and similar ideas connected to young people in the big Europe, however much the social conditions of learning and living might differ. This is why I voice my word of caution so that you do not get stuck in this logic of the '13' and the '15', not to mention the social differences which might exist within the '13', with countries such as Malta and Cyprus being in the same process as Hungary and Poland.

We do not only benefit from the initiative of the Hungarian Government, but also from the good work of Péter Wootsch, who developed a specific questionnaire for this meeting and a method of getting quick results with it. So, what I'm now trying to do in the second part of this report is to give you a short summary of the results the way I understand them.

I must say that what has been achieved with this questionnaire is quite considerable. In the Council of Europe and its intergovernmental committee on youth (CDEJ) we have not been able to achieve anything similar. When we wanted this kind of information, you and I might address the colleagues from governments here in the room, and say: all this is quite complicated, and we have to ask the minister of this and the minister of that and the statistical office, and at the end of the day we would not get the documentation in the way we wanted it, and it would always be out of date, of course. And also, you would rightly insist on being given some direction with regard to comparability of data and truly European objectives.

Here some magic persuasion in the preparatory process to the conference has functioned and you have sent in information, which is indeed very telling and useful for getting an idea of the kind of data we would need in the future. One of my proposals is that this procedure – and this is in line with what Péter Wootsch and László Szabó have themselves said – should be followed up and should be built upon. By working with more time and effort than has been available during the preparatory process, one could think of using this type of quantitative and qualitative data collection in a more regular and systematic manner, almost like an observatory on youth development in member countries. This kind of approach would be a prerequisite for a youth policy monitoring procedure and it should exist not only for the 13 but very much also for the 15 and for other member countries of the Council of Europe, not anywhere linked to European Union accession. I think we should welcome this initiative and method, keep it and develop it further.

From the filled-in questionnaires we received, we learn that in the candidate countries represented here we have nine countries with parliamentary committees on youth and we have ten countries which have quite explicit and detailed youth laws. Sometimes, in some of the answers, these are really outlined in each and every detail, which is a valuable resource. We are working with twelve questionnaires; one set of country information is not available.

There is one country where youth work is organized at the level of an agency, ten administrations are attached to specific ministries, out of them only two with a Youth and Sports Ministry, Hungary and Romania. And in all other countries 'youth' is integrated into ministries of education. This is an interesting and new trend, changing a practice from the past where there have been specific ministries for 'youth' or state committees at the rank of a ministry. One can see this more and more, how education ministries are taking over youth ministries in Europe – a trend. It has even happened in Russia.

I don't know what that trend really means, apart from lean government and the reduction of the number of portfolios. Sometimes people keep relatively independent youth departments inside the Ministry of Education. But very often this trend means a strong influence of formal education on youth work and it is not always clear how you can actually best work with it. At least this 'ongoing education trend' is coming out strongly from our small survey – nine out of 13.

One country, Lithuania, has a 'State Council on Youth'. I happen to be just now involved with the international review on youth policy in Lithuania and I must say that this is an impressive mo-

del of co-management at all levels – national, regional, local. This State Council is headed by the deputy minister of the Ministry of Social Affairs and includes NGOs at all levels of the decision making. There are difficulties with the required coordination between ministries, which is a more general problem. Questionnaires show that this coordination functions only in the case of two or three countries in a satisfactory way. In youth policy, this is the black hole in governmental organization. So, in some cases this coordination happens by including NGOs; in some countries this is unheard of. All countries have long term projects and one of them, Cyprus, has based its long term project planning on the White Paper already in the sense of making the objectives of the White Paper the basis of long term planning. This approach means also working with social reports and research. The range of themes covers items such as tourism, leisure time, media, regional cooperation, non-formal education, the professional integration of school leavers, the stability pact, healthy life styles and an anti-racism campaign.

Governments use and finance instruments, work formats and civil society actors such as ‘Youth for Europe’ Agencies, education and youth work centres, children and youth institutions, NGOs, drug and dependency centres, health promotion units, local training units and research centres. Some of these actors remain independent (NGOs); others function as an extended government service.

The emphasis is on project financing; in some cases there is no data provided; but generally speaking the trend is that projects are financed in the areas of prevention, youth work, youth centres and clubs, and civil society development through NGOs.

On local government, I'm not too enthusiastic about the results detectable. Generally, everybody says this is what working with young people is about – the local level. Surely there is some decentralization, and there are regional offices. But when you look into the big section reserved in the questionnaire for local government questions, answers are a bit vague and woolly. I'm of course happy for the Council of Europe that our recommendation on participation in municipal life is the basis of local youth work in Bulgaria and has influenced local youth work practices in a few other countries, but on other items requested one might think that on local youth work things can be improved. Take a look at the survey yourself and make up your own mind. I underline this, because people say, quite generally and easily, that youth work in a country where it does not reach out to the local level is simply not efficient. But then there are some countries, and Hungary is one of them, where there is a whole successful policy of directing youth work efforts towards the regional and local levels.

Participation and the role of youth councils come out a little confused. Apparently there is a problem with youth councils in Central and Eastern Europe. However, looking at the questionnaires, it looks as if there are youth councils practically everywhere in the candidate countries, with the exception of Poland and Turkey. Maybe this is an area where the questionnaire does not help, because you have to know about backgrounds, assess the representativeness within the political culture of particular countries and you also need the experience of the European Youth Forum. In the Council of Europe we have identified our lack of grounded knowledge on this item and asked for a larger study on youth councils to still be produced in 2002 and presented for public debate next year.

My own impression, however superficial this maybe, is that youth councils undergo different processes of social change in different countries. What have they become, if you look only ten years back, in the United Kingdom, in Austria or in France? In the two latter countries they have even disappeared (for a while); in others they have changed function in becoming more of a service organization than a political body; in others again they function as ever: lobbying, advocating, and influencing public opinion and public authority. This change in the functions of some, but not all, youth councils, is something that goes on all the time in Europe. And on this item, again, where are the distinctions between the '13' and the '15'? I had actually planned to ask the plenary whether the more complete forms of youth democracy are not developed these days in Central and Eastern Europe. Like many, I hear quite often in more 'Western' contexts that people say, go away with youth councils, go away with organizations, this is stuff from the past. We know what to think of such superficial opinions and we keep trusting in young people to determine themselves how their interests are best articulated and defended. But I almost feel that it is in the accession countries that democratic youth organizations, multipliers and young people at large seek more intensely to find and confirm their place as social actors than in the 'old' democracies. I leave this point up in the air, like a creative doubt about ourselves and our so-called securities.

Local organizations are well spread, says the survey. And again you will see that we have a problem of data reliability when looking through these questionnaires. When it comes to questions such as, 'how many associations are there in your country?', you will find in one country figures such as 50,000, and in another country 4,000. I also think that to understand more about differences

such as that, we would have to know what kind of associations are being referred to. I don't know whether it is very helpful to have these figures without them being specifically qualified.

Again, what is interesting, because it is telling about the governmental activities, is the inventory of activities. Activities under youth are registered in areas such as culture, leisure, religion, recreation, sport, healthcare, social welfare, student policy, political education, professional interest, national identity, intercultural learning and activities for the disabled. I would say that it is a pretty large range of youth work issues, and very complete, and this is what comes back from the answers on what is presented in terms of projects.

On membership in organizations, figures range from two percent to 13 percent. So there is no chance to interpret anything at this stage. This has to be followed up with further questions.

Then we can see that there is a high range of activity at a student level, among student organizations, and in higher education. The list is incomplete; maybe more is going on. The associations mentioned are AIESEC², AEGEE³ and the national student councils.

Programmes concerning citizenship: only a few programmes are mentioned, some programmes in schools, but there is not much NGO activity for the time being. And on voluntary services one

2 AIESEC is the International Association of Students of Economics and Commerce. For more information see: www.aiesec.org.

3 AEGEE is the Association des Etats Généraux des Etudiants de l'Europe / European Students' Forum. For more information see: www.karl.aegEE.org.

has the feeling that there is a little confusion about answers. Commitment to civil society seems to overlap with voluntary service through an organization or a specific programme such as 'European Voluntary Service'.

When it comes to the part called 'key areas of activity' we notice employment, housing, exclusion, risk behaviour, poverty, participation, violence, deterioration of interpersonal relations, increase of social tensions and health policy. This refers to the question, if you had to mention five key areas of your country's work, what would you mention? This is interesting, because this is the first time that items such as violence, tensions, the decline of civil and social behaviour are actually coming up in a European survey. To be continued ...

On non-formal education: lots of activities are reported in leisure centres and clubs, teacher's initiatives during free time, non-formal education, adult education, and the general context of modernization and life long learning. More specifically on life long learning you get six more extensive answers with very interesting projects.

What else is there in this panorama? Very positive reports on e-learning and information technology, both in school and out-of-school. And then there is something which was very much resented in one of the working groups: a seemingly high insecurity about the status of a youth worker. There seem to be, within the 13, practically no standards for this kind of work; people have difficulty in saying what it should even be about. However, it is recognized that a youth training structure belongs to youth policy. So this is an item that deserves further attention.

The strong side of the summary report presented here and at your disposal is that inside the 13 there are many more well functioning youth work structures, democratic structures, and participation structures than one might have assumed. This the questionnaire brings clearly to the surface. There is a good and solid orientation and willingness for action towards developing non-formal education and information technologies. There is also a commitment to political education. There are weaknesses too: they are in the areas of coordination and governance and in the identification of central political actors. When you attempt to read between the lines you get the feeling that the hidden message is: but nobody ever really does anything! As if youth policies were by nature complex and impersonal, without clearly recognizable driving forces and outstanding people. Not that this can be taken as a general rule, particularly not here in Budapest, but there is also a melancholic melody in the air, when working with the answers given.

I will now turn to the last part of my presentation and just get on with saying what this conference proposes as a result of your work in groups, as you have heard it through the reports from the groups already.

On participation: I think that it is a very good idea to propose a training course for adults to teach them how to listen to young people. And to create access to information training and participatory structures, thus making sure that people can take decisions about their own futures themselves. It is also very right to go for empowerment and for the creation of concrete responsibilities, and I have felt that the proposals of this participation working group are very much going in the direction of active, democratic citizenship. And you will have a parallel to that, in the final text: the proposal to work with national action plans.

The 'social factors report' shows that it is not possible to ask people to act in youth work and talk about the autonomy of young people without giving them some sort of condition so that they can handle what they are supposed to do concerning their living conditions, housing, education, and health care. This is an important starting point. The conclusions of the working group are again in the final text, where it says it is important to focus on the need for the coordination of sectoral policies affecting young people. Special mention should be made of a list of about twenty very interesting micro projects, which illustrate the link between youth work and social factors and have been put forward by the group.

The non-formal education group produced a whole number of very interesting proposals. There is no reason to believe that there is any problem between the Council of Europe and the European Commission on the type of proposals made, as some seem to believe. Sometimes I'm not so sure whether, when people in youth work are trained to work for and with Youth for Europe Agencies, we are not rather talking of vocational training, which then might be mixed up with the much bigger item of non-formal education. In fact, I would say that non-formal education is potentially the biggest growth factor for youth work. It prepares you for the information society, for a knowledge-based economy, and for the extension of the third sector, and it prepares you for the change from a pre-modern and modern society into a post-modern service society. And this is a sector which will also have its own economic weight in the future, a development of significant importance to NGOs active in delivering a non-formal education offer and practice. In this respect, I want to mention particularly the recommendation for the recognition of non-formal education presently being prepared by the Council of Europe.

The 'values of youth work group' made their proposal to hold a big forum on youth values, which should be welcomed and advocated. They had a good interactive and sometimes controversial exchange on young people's values today, which in a certain way it would have been nice to extend to the whole conference. How do you judge patriotism: a value to defend, a reactionary concept, a value to fight? This was the stuff of the debates in the group. If you take responsibility for young people as a leader, what should your code of ethics look like? What are the limits of your influence? What are the moments where you have to act, and how?

On 'cooperation', we have heard already about the information portal planned by the European Commission and we have received quite a number of proposals in the youth information field related to EuroDesk and to a Central European Information Centre. Activities have been announced linked to the White Paper and the Open Method of Coordination and particularly to other forthcoming conferences on the same issue.

What is remaining is this question: who will prepare the younger generation for the kind of Europe they will live in, and what then will their loyalty to this system be like? Can we talk of citizenship, of a sense of belonging, of some form of community attachment, and how will this be created, developed, and confirmed? Who will the actors be? Young people themselves? The schools? The parents? The media? The NGOs? Probably all of these, but how will this happen and will it happen?

The big question Europe poses to education is: We have made Europe; how do we make Europeans? Elements of an answer to this question will have to describe how to give young people a hand in

the construction of Europe. The White Paper indicates the chapters of the textbook which need writing: participation, information, values, autonomy, employment, ways to live in an inclusive and democratic environment, and culture. Nobody is waiting for a ready-built European house and nobody wants to live in it. So, make them build their own house; it is their future, after all.

With a last word of thanks and recognition to the organizers, I would like to thank you very much for your attention.

‘Post-Face: On Racism and Violence’

This is the concluding summary that Peter Lauritzen made at the closing plenary of the Research Seminar on ‘Learning from Violence’ organized by the Directorate of Youth and Sport at the European Youth Centre Budapest in October 2002. The transcript of this intervention was subsequently published by the Council of Europe in an edited volume, entitled ‘Learning from Violence – The Youth Dimension’.

The presentation and discussion of the way the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) deals with racism and discrimination showed, in an exemplary manner, how societal developments concerning these items can be followed within member states and brought to public attention. Taking a wider look at the Council of Europe, it is important to take note of committees in the respective areas of education, gender, equality, youth and criminal justice, and to make active use of them by addressing research findings on young people and violence across the Council of Europe, as suggested by the idea of an integrated project.

More particularly, ECRI should also take on questions related to the trafficking of human beings, primarily young women. Furthermore, ECRI may want to look into the concept of multiple discrimination, and make this an operational category in their proceedings. Legal research presented during the meeting showed that this is quite a relevant and workable means of conceptualizing discrimination.

Generally speaking and in line with the 'mainstreaming youth' strategy of the Directorate of Youth and Sport, the youth dimension should be given greater attention, both in research terms and in terms of policy advice in the following areas: racism and discrimination, gender-based violence, domestic and parental violence, homophobia, gangs and hooliganism, bullying and mobbing (violence in schools), violence in institutions, and violence of economic and political systems. The management of an integrated project could play an important role in directing and advising this process.

Violence is not an abstract phenomenon which can be defined in an isolated manner. Violence is contextual and depends on settings and situations. It also needs to be related to the life courses of young people, their trajectories and social relations. Violence has to be decoded and understood, which is a difficult process because young people can be both victims and perpetrators of violence, and occasionally are both at once.

The highly competitive system of global capitalism is at the origin of many developments relating to violence. This ranges from the rich northern hemisphere, living at the cost of the South, from brusque movements of capital creating unemployment and misery in one place and initiating employment and new social infrastructures in another, from whole areas of the world with no chance to overcome their misery and others living in incredible luxury. It also marks the value systems of employee cultures in a violent manner. Once again, this does not remain without effect on young people and the behavioural modes they follow; the film *Fight Club* being a good illustration of this.

From such an observation it seems impossible to arrive at a reality of 'global citizenship' – the differences between the various 'worlds' are simply too big. However, this is exactly what is at stake: to develop the kind of educational strategies that will make the contents and methods of intercultural learning a part of the general curriculum in order to prepare for global citizenship. This cannot be achieved by schools alone; they are presently over-burdened by having to act as the last remaining, and more or less functioning, actor of socialization. What is needed is a new learning relationship between school, non-formal learning actors and the community in cooperation with the media. A prerequisite for the new cooperation is to overcome the ongoing devaluation of the teaching profession and its feminization, which is both a problem for the learning community and for women teachers, who often function on part-time schemes and are employed as cheap labour. Improved teacher training is needed, more in-service training schemes and an educational reform which benefits from the experimental character and the social learning programmes of non-formal education, which is learner-centred and based on participation and the ever changing roles between givers and takers in the learning process – educators and educated. Without these changes in the learning climate, the item of violence in educational institutions cannot be tackled efficiently: democracy can only be learned in a democratic school, responsibility in a participative environment and contextual violence in relation to changing contexts.

Criminal justice systems differ a lot throughout member countries of the Council of Europe. Some transition countries have only now adapted to the specific situation of children and young people. In some of the 'old' democracies, contrary to expecta-

tion, not even the standards of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child are fully respected. Concerning young people, criminal justice systems need to agree on standards of minimum sufficient intervention and clearly be directed towards diverting young people from being caught in the criminal justice system at all. This also means that the system has to be different from the health and welfare systems, which should remain provision apart.

Concrete measures could entail:

- the creation of child and youth ombudspersons;
- close cooperation between justice and local communities;
- effective prevention systems;
- training of police and prison staff;
- training of 'youth judges';
- restorative justice policies.

Much of the present public debate on violence is the production of media and political circles. Absolute figures on violent crime are going down; much of what is reported as youth violence does not figure as heavy offence, and victimization has decreased. Instead, fear of violence has increased. Reasons may be found in the role of the media, presenting the public with a high-tech overkill of ongoing violence and aggression in the world, and violence-based – sometimes extremely aggressive – video games. Another reason is anonymous violence, much related to isolation and solitude in larger urban settings (for example, the Washington sniper); this functions as a magnifying glass for the perception of violence. Alternatively, active policies to revitalize neighbourhoods and proximity and a certain permanence and reliability of human relations need to be put in place.

The 'official' political discourse differs too much from the lived experience of the lives of youth and of people in general. *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*: what has become of this magic triangle of Republican values? The key democratic value of solidarity (*fraternité*) was almost ridiculed in the 1990s and sold on the altar of excessive individualism. This process happened in very different ways in both the transition countries and the 'old' democracies and it has created an enormous vacuum both in the functioning of and in the respect for democratic institutions and responsible social action. The ongoing modernization process, which should be based on the active participation of young people, becomes sidetracked in a process producing 'ego-tacticians' instead of giving room for young people to show their potential as a resource, in individual terms, as well as in terms of active democratic citizenship and as the producers of solidarity. Much of what can be seen as youth related violence today has to do with the lack of trust in the 'good state' and 'good governance', together with an absence of values, positive role models (model adults, model peers) and family structures falling apart, without being replaced by a modern understanding of the family which would include neighbours, friends and the extended family, and be less 'father-centred' than the image of the traditional family. Then, only too often, gangs, groups of hooligans and violent communities take the place of the absent actors of socialization, a process which needs to be reversed to combat violence.

Researching violence with young people is a demanding process, often requiring a very elaborate methodological approach. In certain field studies, this approach has to go together with clearly defined ethical standards. Not all that is said in interviews can be reported; not all that is said can be evaluated. If care and respon-

sibility govern the research, the reward will often be very rich and provide unexpected insights into the nature of violence and its relation to young people. Research may, in this way, open an avenue towards prevention.

Much of what youth research into violence shows is the very important role of prejudice and stereotypes. This can take the form of the racialization of subjects and images, and of the direct connection made between racialized young people and criminalization. Examples concerning Asian communities and the icon of the black violent young man were used to demonstrate this connection, made systematically in the media. Beyond the media, the criminalization of immigration promoted by European states may lead to a justification of violence against them. Remedies for such propaganda can be found in creating safe and open spaces to discuss experiences of prejudice and stereotypes as well as of cooperation with the media. When these public images appear, morals are produced and folk devils are identified. It is important to remain able to argue, correct false information and spread alternative and appropriate information.

The researchers' seminar made a number of more permanent reference points within their discussion on the youth dimension of violence:

- the demographic development leading to the decreasing number of children and young people in European societies;
- the complex values and beliefs of multicultural and multi-religious societies which make it difficult for some to have a proper understanding of legal and constitutional norms coming from a homogenous past with a single religious value system;
- the reduced spaces for the participation of young people;

- the mixture of fear and envy with regard to young people as expressed in 'adult' society;
- the relatively unimportant role of youth policy in governance.

Finally, all participants in the seminar expressed an interest in remaining associated to the 'Integrated Project on Violence in Everyday Life' and to the activities of the Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe.

‘The Changing Context of Non-Profit Organizations and Associations in the Enlarged Europe – Comments from a Council of Europe Viewpoint’

This is the contribution Peter Lauritzen made on behalf of the Council of Europe at the conference entitled ‘Associations and the Emerging Europe’, organized at the European Parliament in Brussels on 19 February 2001 to mark the 100th anniversary of the adoption of the 1901 Law on Association in France.¹

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I thank you for the opportunity to address you at this important celebration of 100 years of the legislation on associations in France, and I congratulate you on this milestone in the development of civil society in Europe. I do this in the name of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Dr. Walter Schwimmer, who would have taken the floor at this assembly, had he not been held back by other business he absolutely had to attend to. In his place, I shall try to contribute to your important debate from a viewpoint inside the Council of Europe.

¹ The Law of 1901 on Associations in France marked a new departure from the past in relation to the development of civil society in that country and others colonized by France. It was introduced by Waldeck-Rousseau, then President of the Council and former Minister of the Interior, and paved the way for the creation of not-for-profit associations (association sans but lucrative). Until the promulgation of this law, a royal decree was required to create an association.

I know, of course, that the relationship to the European Union and the long-lasting debate on the status of a European Association is at the centre of your interest, and I can only associate myself with your efforts. I hope you will not understand it as an interference with this important subject, when I say, from the outset, that we have had a system of recognition and cooperation with NGOs for a long time in the Council of Europe; that there are ways of obtaining consultative status and that the forms of cooperation range from a simple exchange of information to established rights of observation in committees, to specific cooperation projects and, probably the most far-reaching example, to a co-management feature between governments and youth NGOs in the youth field, my field of work. This system will celebrate 30 years of effective work in early summer 2002 and it is alive and well.

You may know that the Council of Europe includes 43 members since the recent accession of Armenia and Azerbaijan, that the Russian Federation is a member and that the eastern border of the organization is actually Japan. With this border only 12 years ago having been somewhere alongside Germany and Austria, I sometimes ask myself whether the peoples in Europe, but also politicians and multipliers like you, have really understood and assumed how profoundly our continent has changed in a very short time. What I represent here is a large pan-European Human Rights organization, which has as its main objectives the promotion of democracy and fair elections, pluralism, cultural diversity, social cohesion, the rule of law, Human Rights and minority rights.

In doing this work, we constantly refer to the concept of civil society and it is by discussing this term a little further that I would like to comment on associations and the European construction as a 'European House' of 43.

I distinguish three basic understandings of civil society, which are not always clearly set out and consequently are mixed up a lot (c.f. 'Civil Society and the Reform of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe: Perspectives from the Council of Europe', James Wimberley, unpublished manuscript).

The first one goes back to the philosophers of the Scottish Enlightenment and had a strong influence on the French Revolution and the resulting concept of *laicism* – a secular state. There is no one instance of moral unity any more. Private property is possible. Associations (guilds) can be founded and will enjoy protection by the state. Common values are reduced to the minimum that the state needs to maintain its functioning. In this understanding, as Wimberley points out, civil society does not imply democracy. It is not bound to particular values. It is simply society minus the state. And it can mean anything 'non state' – political parties, business, associations, organized crime, etc. Claus Offe has taken this view further and excluded market forces from the definition, so that civil society is society minus state minus the market, a viewpoint which was very popular during the height of the social movements in the Eighties.

European and international organizations, and the Council of Europe in particular, have radically changed around this rather negative identification (society minus ...) and linked the concept to common and universal values, to Human Rights. Civil society organizations become, in this context, vectors of democratic life, of the rights of the individual, of social justice and of the environment. They come, in a way, before the state and for some adepts of this understanding the state becomes increasingly a service organization to achieved agreements within the civil society. There

are major differences in this understanding even between member states of the European Union, and the present debate on citizenship in Europe versus European citizenship will certainly move into new and undiscovered territory. Whatever the outcome, this second understanding of civil society defines its subject as a community of values.

The third understanding was brilliantly outlined to us an hour ago by Lester N. Salomon from John Hopkins University. We are talking of civil society as the economy of the non-profit sector – the fastest growing sector of the world economy according to Salomon's studies in twenty countries in the Americas, Asia and the enlarged Europe. We learnt about this approach already through Jeremy Rifkin, and his observation that the birth of capitalism in America was preceded by an enormous associative movement, composed of religious communities and all the networks and traditions brought to the New World by the new citizens coming largely from Europe. This associative patchwork created the trust necessary to establish business relations and was inseparably connected to the development of the economy. Today, Salomon tells us, we witness a global development of the same sort, comparable in its historic importance only to the formation of the modern nation states in the nineteenth century.

What I think one can observe in many of our new member countries in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe (and, frankly, in some old ones as well) is a kind of free mix of the understandings of civil society as I have outlined them so far – the value community for the declarations and Sunday talks, the first, the 'value free understanding' as common practice, and the third understanding as a kind of inaccessible vision. The reason for this

perfectly natural situation has to do with our member countries practically living in several modernities, as sociologists say. Some member countries do actively prepare for the knowledge society, for a post-modern service economy and consequently for an ever increasing space for the non-profit sector – the Netherlands being an example for the latter (c.f. Salomon), Hungary being an example for the knowledge society and the US for service economies. However, other member countries struggle with unacceptable poverty levels. Some would be happy to extend their economy in terms of the second modernity and others again have little tradition in imagining legitimate power outside the state apparatus.

There is a job to be done here – if we want to contribute successfully to civil society development, we have to create some very strong links.

The first one is, indeed, to make sure that working for the values of the Council of Europe, which is equivalent to working for the principles of universal Human Rights, for equity and fairness and against any position of religious, ethnic, national or cultural superiority, is a prerequisite for forming a sustainable social and economic order permitting citizenship. Only by accepting this bond between values and the social fabric is there a chance at all that creativity, entrepreneurship and solidarity will emerge in the civil society and thus create the basis for a growing economy.

This means, on the other hand, that arguments such as, ‘first we build the economy, then we’ll see how much we can afford in education and associative life’ are completely outlived: they describe an understanding in which Marxism and liberal capitalism surprisingly met in their assessments. Today the relationship between

the level of general education and societal activity and economic development can no longer be overlooked, and this gives an enormous importance and responsibility to the associative movement.

Another important link is to non-formal education. Participation has to be learned, so has democratic culture and the acceptance of minorities. Learning to be, acquiring life skills, developing individual qualities in tune with social qualifications, defending an interest, advocating specific agendas, forming coalitions and teams – all this makes up the curriculum of non-formal learning, the educational approach of the associative movement ever since it appeared as a political subject, be it as *education populaire*, workers' education, community work or any other tradition of out-of-school education, including in-company training.

Having pointed to the economic and educational dynamics of the sector, I would like to approach the more difficult territory of possible deteriorations, deformations and dangers facing associative life. I think we should discuss some trends which might deserve critical observation.

Associations in general and the non-formal education sector are more and more instrumentalized to serve aims and objectives which are exclusively defined in economic terms, such as increasing the flexibility and mobility of the labour force. How does this go together with the democratic origins of the associative movement, its specific curriculum of 'political' education and the insistence on being autonomous when setting one's own aims and objectives? Are alliances possible? How far should they go? Or are the economic aims so overriding that there is no option but to follow?

One of the observations that can be made with the growth of the third sector and the non-profit economy is its enormous need for human resources and, consequently, a dominating culture of management thinking and steering of human and financial resources together with a competitive market approach. Many associations have become subject to this process and behave themselves as market subjects. One can observe a similar trend in public administration – what will happen when the market everywhere, without distinction of institutions, public welfare, social networks and community values, when all that humans do has become a product – what has the associative movement become then?

Another observation may lead us to take a look at new forms of competition between public authority and non-profit organizations. In my own work I practise one such example: within the Council of Europe's contribution to Working Table 1 of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, I have taken responsibility for a Working Group on Young People within the Task Force on Education and Youth. This task force is actually run by a national NGO and I report to the Task Force as a member of a European organization. This is a small example only – on a large scale you can see how big humanitarian organisations gradually take over work which used to be done by international organizations. This may very often make a lot of sense, but how do the relations between public authority and associations change, when they become competitors? In South Eastern Europe we find situations where the funds, the staff resources and the experience of a large foundation, the Open Society Institute – Soros Foundation, are superior to those of the educational and cultural ministries in these countries. Fortunately, the OSI is there and provides assistance and quality support to the region, but what does this mean for the *rapport* between public authority and civil society?

What we have been able to see for quite a while now, is the effort of public administration to reduce costs or, as they say, to create a lean state. But not all that was done before can be forgotten about; it has to be done by associations instead. Again, a reasonable and economic approach, and associations may sometimes even take exactly the form public authority needs to have a job done. But, was there not something else? Was the space for associative life not something one had to struggle for? What kind of situation is this, where public authority defines the available space for associations and not these associations themselves?

I can only introduce observations and questions. In the context of what I have said earlier I might add that to my mind the associative movement loses its very legitimacy if it develops into a service structure for the powers that be. In this sense, the third sector economy is a two-faced phenomenon: on the one hand it gives the associative movement ample opportunity to show its economic and educational strength; on the other hand, it may even out all original, democratic and emancipatory characteristics in the name of a sellable market product or a good public service.

Maybe it is enough on a day of celebration and reflection of a great achievement – *la Loi 1901* (the law of 1901) – to introduce some reflections in view of the European and global dimension of our common subject. It would certainly be fascinating to add some remarks on the institution of the transnational association and its crucial function in promoting intercultural learning and examples of good democratic practice in Europe. I shall refrain from this temptation and, coming to the end of this contribution, reiterate a message from the beginning – that we welcome your efforts to create a European Charter of Associations, tirelessly

promoted by some of you here in this room, not least the Chairman of the NGO Liaison Committee of the Council of Europe, Mr. Zielinski, and Mme. Fontaine, President of the European Parliament.

I thank you for your attention.

‘On Citizenship’

This is a contribution to the Meeting of the Curriculum Development and Quality Group, a group of youth and non-formal education specialists tasked with the development of curricula and indicators for quality non-formal education in relation to European citizenship and other key European educational themes, held by the Youth Directorate on 27 and 28 November 2000.

I would like to take my reflection from where Howard Williamson ends his paper, that is, with the quote of the learning objectives for any training course on European citizenship:

... to develop a sense of space and place in contemporary Europe, the skills required to be active agents for change and development, and the knowledge to make informed choices within this context.

This implies, obviously, that I am fully in agreement with the interdependence between citizenship and community (Hall and Williamson, 1999) and the ensuing discussion of shifts in the classical understanding of citizenship being associated to a nation-state and a territory alone. I believe, with Richard Sennet and Saskia Sassen, that there is a global process of de-nationalization underway, simply through the uniformization of consumer habits, work organization, migration and the ways chosen to organize life around the house, children and work by women today. You can draw a picture of this middle class family with computerized work places, largely similar architecture of the living space, similar time spent in commuting and almost identical offers in supermarkets and shopping spaces, and it would be much the same in Toronto, Tokyo, Tel

Aviv, London, Sao Paulo and Cape Town. In Europe, there is, in addition to the globalization of working life, family life and consumption, also a clear tendency to share the old 'indivisible' sovereignty of the nation state both with increased regional and municipal power as with the slowly growing supranational competences of the European Union. What needs to be added is also a considerable extension of the economic sector into public life, leading to a new negotiation of space between public authority, civil society and the economic sector. Sometimes it looks as if the growth of civil society today has come about as a result of attempts to create a lean state administration, rather than as a result of pushing for more liberties by the citizens themselves. Such processes lead, paradoxically and somewhat logically at the same time, also to exactly the opposite movements: xenophobia, nationalism, racism, provincialism, refusal and societal nihilism.

The construction of citizenship in Europe and the beginnings of a community life between European nations and across the borders, are rational and reasonable ways of dealing with the challenges of the future, but they take place against a tableau of fears, suspicions, nostalgia, arrogance and narrow-mindedness which cannot be talked away and often manages to mobilize more energies and emotions than the basically 'cold' (Dahrendorf) project of European political and economic unity. How can education contribute to understanding this mixed picture better; how can 'citizenship' be thought of in multidimensional terms?

For this I would need to refer to Ulrich Beck's term 'reflexive society', inasmuch as this term describes the permanent interpretation of social and political concepts through the society itself, that is, the media, political actors, the research community, and

people themselves. Which means that all definitions are approximations, they are contextual and like 'material' to the democratic process. In this understanding I would then make the proposal to run a course of one week's duration on citizenship in such a way that that the communication between the participants, the trainers and the experts of this course would be identical with the production of their understanding of citizenship, that is, that the course would function like the reflexive society paradigm in a nutshell.

This would function by making sure that the composition of participants would be like a portrayal of different understandings of the European dimension (Union option and larger cooperation option), that there would be a good mix of different political ideas about Europe's future, that there would be a reasonable variety of young people's life styles and associative practices, that the course would include minority youth – in short, that it would be a little world of its own. To some extent this is nothing special; each study session or training course is also this; here the difference would be that a context would be made content. So the participants themselves would define the skills needed to be active agents for change and development, and they would say what knowledge they think is needed to make informed choices within this context. This would then be the starting point for the preparation of a second such course in 2002 and a 'close-to-perfection' course in 2003, which then would be recommended as a stable element of a European citizenship curriculum.

Such a revolving system does not prevent us from taking up ideas such as the 'images of Europe' or any form of controversial discussion on citizenship, community and European items. It would, however, never allow us to go further than the group wants, and in

that sense reproduce community; it would need rules and in that sense reproduce citizenship; it would be intercultural and inclusive of minorities and in that sense reproduce Europe.

There are special qualifications needed for trainers and support staff to work on such a course and a specific working method which only plans educational process to the point of their initiation and not much further, so I restrict myself at this stage to presenting the idea and seeing whether this is acceptable to the group, before going into more detail about this kind of course design.

‘Are Human Rights (the only) Universal Values?’

Peter Lauritzen made this speech to the ‘Human Rights Week’, one of the highlight events organized by the European Youth Centre Budapest during the month of action in celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the Council of Europe in May 1999. This month of action was the original precursor to the current (and much acclaimed) Human Rights Education Programme of the Directorate of Youth and Sports of the Council of Europe. The transcript of this speech was later published in the ‘Human Rights Week Report’ by the European Youth Forum.

In this contribution you will, for a change, not listen to a lawyer. I make my comments in my capacity as an educationalist, as somebody who has worked all his professional life for the recognition and promotion of intercultural learning.

Concerning the question put to the panel and governing this second day of Human Rights Week, you have already heard in the contribution of Judge Vera Duarte a very clear position: yes, Human Rights are universal and absolute. Here we get into trouble with the dynamics of this discussion, for I agree with her. So, this takes some of the charm out of the panel debate where dispute with a position and a counter position is of the essence. All I can offer is to approach the question from a very different angle.

So, I shall take a closer look at the strange way the preparatory group has formulated the guiding question. They ask, “Are Hu-

man Rights (the only) Universal Values?” What I am curious about is the ‘only’, innocently put in brackets. This leads me to introduce the first part of the contribution: Are there Universal Values at all? In the second part of this contribution, I would like to take a look at the cynical nature of the organization of international politics and some recent changes in this long-standing system. And in the third part, I would like to point out the educational strategies which need to be developed so that Human Rights can become a global reality.

1. ‘Are there universal values?’

I would like to share with you a situation of quite a while ago when I was responsible for the organization of a very large colloquium on the theme ‘Common Values for Humankind’ on behalf of the Council of Europe. This was done within the tradition of co-management of our service and in cooperation with the European Federation of Intercultural Learning (EFIL). So, there we were, educationalists from five continents, completely thrilled with our task and ready to go. But then one of us, the director of the organization, Roberto Ruffino, from Italy, did something which was not very nice. He proposed that before we went into our work of programme development, we should discuss the question amongst ourselves in the small preparatory group. After all, we should have a common position as a team; this is obvious.

I should mention that my story takes place before the fall of the Berlin Wall, that the world was still divided and that only a few scientists talked of ‘globalization’. Believe it or not, we could not agree on one single common value between us as a team. Then Roberto said, “I have a proposal – money!” That was an awful

thing to say. Now we all disagreed with him, but could not find a single argument against his proposal. What a defeat: plain materialism took over from our idealism and great ambitions.

In the end, we found a solution for ourselves. We agreed not to agree on a definition of common values and to structure the programme with a situational and differentiated approach: we would work on situations we believed could be found in all cultures and thus come closer to the object of our research.

These situations were:

- mime, gesture, dance, corporeal expression and the relationship to the body;
- food, drink, nourishment and agricultural production;
- architecture, relation to space, nature, ecology;
- political, religious and legal systems.

These were treated as separate workshops. During the colloquium we had to reshuffle the whole thing and introduce another workshop on

- women, family, bringing up children, equality and sexuality.

Such a planning mistake could hardly happen today, but this took place during the 1980s. I quote this example extensively because it illustrates the same phenomenon that Judge Hanne Sophie Greve described yesterday in her intervention. I mean, the reference to the invitation to a group of eminent philosophers meeting in Paris after the war. These were to answer the same question and their result was meant to go into the UNESCO statute. They did not do much better than our preparatory group – the only value they could agree on was human dignity.

But now I shall no longer run away from attempting my own answer to this question. I come back to the 'pyramid of needs' which you developed yesterday with Jim Murdoch during his lecture. Common values are primarily water, food, shelter, the capacity to communicate, to work, to produce and reproduce. After yesterday's discussion, I believe this is not contested by anyone.

Moving on and touching on the organization of society and its constitution through values, many examples can be chosen to back up the condition of universality. Quite a few have been mentioned by Judge Vera Duarte in her paper. Out of the many observations which have been made in the literature on this subject, I chose the identification of an 'axial time' as has been done by Karl Jaspers. Jaspers places this time in the eighth century BC. At this time in the history of humankind, three very developed societies were based on a practically identical code of ethics, without having been, to our knowledge, in any kind of communication with each other. Karl Jaspers mentions Greece and the Greek philosophers, Persia and the spiritual rule of Zarathushtra and China and the teachings of Confucius.

With regard to Human Rights one could also quote the organization of the Kingdom of Ghana (very different from today's State) as described in the UNESCO history of Africa. During the sixteenth century and roughly at the same time as Europe was falling back into medieval darkness during the Thirty Years' War, Ghana was an enlightened society with established rights for individuals and groups and a functioning judiciary. Judge Duarte, in her paper, describes Human Rights even more generally as an old African heritage and memory. And, as many of you know, there has existed a discussion on Human Rights within

the Islamic world from as early as the twelfth century, starting in Egypt and spreading through religious circles in all Muslim countries. All this to say that universal values exist and that Human Rights belong to the world.

2. In this, the second part of my contribution, I would like to show how, progressively with the formation of nation-states, the international organization of politics between these states ended up as a system of negation of the common heritage described above. The emerging system of state cooperation is by nature cynical and splendidly summed up in the notion, 'Right or wrong, my country!' If you want to understand the wars and conflicts of the nineteenth century, it is not difficult. Simply look at the geographical maps of the time and then use the logic, 'my neighbour is my enemy, my neighbour's neighbour is my friend'. Such a system could still be handled by brilliant statesmen such as Talleyrand, Disraeli, Bismarck and Metternich, but it was literally swept away with the emergence of imperialistic and racist ideologies and, soon later, totalitarian systems. The result was shown yesterday in Jim Murdoch's lecture: 75 million victims of this policy in the twentieth century alone, and that is restricting ourselves to Europe.

In one of his last speeches President Mitterrand summed all this up in a shockingly pertinent manner, in only three words. "Nationalism is War", he said before the European Parliament. This is something we will have to think about during this week. Is this true? Could one not be a little nationalistic? And is nationalism not a necessary stage for a nation to go through? My answer is "no". I do not talk about national identity, which it is normal to have and to want to express. I do not talk here about patriotism, which is the defence of the values of your community. I talk about

nationalism, a feeling of superiority over others, who necessarily cannot have the same value as oneself, the nationalist. If this goes together with the idea of a 'pure' nation, an ethnically united and homogenous nation, we are no longer far away from understanding the very nature of the conflict going on at a distance of only some 300 kilometres from here. To state it clearly, the idea of common values among humankind, the universality of Human Rights and the key to all Human Rights bills, that all humans are born equal, cannot go together with nationalism. And they cannot go together with the idea of homogeneity and exclusivity either.

Further, nationalism, be it symbolic or ethnic, is completely out of tune with the organization of modern times and our world today. I refer to knowledge production, communication technologies, global industrial production and the worldwide distribution of goods. Yesterday evening, during our panel discussion on the challenges and achievements of Human Rights, Havard Ovregard asked the panel whether we are not witnessing, in our days, the emergence of a worldwide system of Human Rights as the starting point for the emergence of a worldwide legal system. You all remember the answer of the experts. "No," they said: no world court, no world legislation, no world totalitarianism. But, as a last resort, some final authority would be needed to which one can turn in case of massive violations. And they brought together numerous elements showing how, in recent years, Human Rights issues have been organized more and more efficiently and with some striking successes.

These do not stand alone. They go together with worldwide company legislation, with a breathtaking development of new technologies and information exchange, often bypassing existing le-

gal frameworks. In fact, the old relationship of what used to be called 'domestic' policies and what used to be called 'foreign' policies is changing radically. Foreign matters dominate the domestic and vice versa, and the 'national' economy hardly exists anymore. Never has Romain Rolland's vision of the citizen as being a peasant and at the same time a citizen of the world been so true and so much a socially desirable quality.

In other words, the sovereignty of the nation state crumbles. Instead, a supranational state organization progresses, in the first place in the European Union, but not only there. Close regional cooperation systems and federations are being planned all over the world. The global organization of the economy necessarily has its effect on the organization of states in the world. And here I would like to underline Judge Hanne Sophie Greve's point of yesterday evening. She said that without a strong – in the sense of a 'good' – state, there is no justice. There is no alternative form of social or political organization. However, the state need not be a nation-state and stand alone. There can also be a supranational community or an interstate agreement, as in the Council of Europe or in the United States.

If the organization of the global economy drives state authority, to some extent, into regional and global systems of cooperation, these newly emerging systems need some common philosophy to exist durably. What will this be? In recent comments on the war in Yugoslavia and Kosovo, Jürgen Habermas, Ulrich Beck, Imre Kertész and André Glucksmann have gone as far as to see the birth of a global system of justice in the NATO air strikes on Yugoslavia. And it can be called a system simply because it now has the power of sanction, in the form of a policing force.

3. This, however, makes me think a lot. Enforcement of Human Rights through bombs? Can this work? To be honest with you, it did in my case. I was born in 1942, during the Second World War, in the northern German town of Flensburg. At the end of the war in 1945, and as a three-year-old boy, I don't think I had much of an opinion on all this, but as a survivor, I can say that the bombs of the allied forces most certainly liberated my country. And, in retrospect, I much prefer the British education I received during my upbringing to anything that would have awaited me in Nazi education. Yes, bombs kill and they may kill the innocent, but they can also bring criminal governments down and liberate, as was the case in Germany.

However, do we not have to be extremely careful with comparisons? For me nothing can equal the systematic industrial organization of the extermination of Jews, Gays, Gypsies, Communists and Socialists, Intellectuals, Handicapped and all other weirdly defined *Untermenschen*, with this becoming the very *raison d'être* of the Nazi system. This is a story of in itself and no other persecution and violation of Human Rights, however horrible, should be compared or associated with it. Like everybody else, I can see similarities in the global theatre of atrocities all the time, but for myself, I refuse this comparison and I shall continue my memory work.

The question of the bombs, I leave, consequently, for you to comment upon. My answer to this situation is a different one. First of all, and in the words of Pau Solonilla in his opening speech, I would repeat with him: Democracy, Democracy, Democracy. Secondly, I would like to recall the slogan of the International Youth Year of 1985, which has, after all, been agreed upon with-

in in the United Nations: Development – Peace – Participation. Thirdly, I would say, Education: local, regional, national, and global education.

The subject matter is Human Rights, indivisible, absolute and universal. So, make them known. Don't leave them to the lawyers alone. This is for citizens. Spread the knowledge. "We have made Europe; now we have to make Europeans," Secretary General Daniel Tarschys stated on the occasion of the solemn celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe in the Hungarian Parliament. And since we function within a global and universal system of communication and production, we will have to make world citizens next.

This is a job for education and information. However, education systems and the media remain the strongholds of national bias. Education systems all over the world produce national interpretations of complex realities. This is what they have to do to safeguard continuity. The media, even if largely organized internationally, address themselves strictly to national audiences. A European or world public hardly exists. As a result, the media and education systems reflect less and less the progressively international and global character of human interaction. National sovereignty becomes virtual, and the transnational organization of politics and business escapes the competence of citizens. This is a very confusing situation. How can we regain control? First of all, by accepting the opposition between nationalism, on the one hand, and Human Rights, on the other. Then, by celebrating diversity. Diversity and difference are enjoyable within agreed standards. If these are not guaranteed, a situation of segregation is the result. And, then, finally by being CITIZENS.

According to, probably, the most widely accepted definition of citizenship, as offered by T.H. Marshall, being a citizen means to have and use:

- civil rights (individual freedom, freedom of speech and thought, of beliefs and movement);
- rights securing political participation and the exercise of political power;
- the right to have minimum resources and relative security, allowing for a 'civilized life'.

The next challenge is to prove how such an attitude, based on citizenship, participation, and Human Rights, can be universally understood and shared. Is this impossible? Must not, in this world, everybody be happy in their own way? Is there not a clash of cultures to be observed, as has been described by Samuel Huntington? Should one not be respectful of all social, cultural and religious ways of life and not judge at all? This is an understandable and cautious position and I respect it. But I don't share this attitude of cultural relativism.

Universality and Human Rights determine my ideas and actions also with regard to states and societies not to be found in my immediate vicinity. This is in no way imperialistic. Practically all states on this planet have signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Why not remind them of it, when necessary? Or, do some states just sign anything? If so, they should not be allowed to get away with it. On certain questions we are all in the same club. Respecting the rights of dictators, and practising an out of date idea of respect for national sovereignty, can lead to very painful processes.

Nobody denies the enormous differences in communication and languages, politics, speed of implementation of agreed standards, culture, religion and political systems. They exist and they will go on existing; this is not yet 'one world'. Hence, the need for education. And, within that, two key qualifications in global education are prerequisite: empathy and tolerance of ambiguity; these attitudes, together with the courage to stand up for one's values, culture, convictions and standards, enable intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning.

So, this is the message to the Human Rights Week of the Council of Europe. Let us affirm our strength as educationalists, researchers, activists, civil servants, lawyers and, especially, as citizens. We have to get our act together and become an offensive educational front for the promotion of Human Rights education. All the legal instruments described here, all this wonderful optimism expressed by the Human Rights organizations present here, and the encouraging tone of the contributions of Jim Murdoch, Judge Greve, Judge Duarte, Lotte Leicht and Robert Beasley are certainly a step in the right direction. However, they cannot work without the cooperation of social agents and multipliers that will make Human Rights and common values accessible to the people one meets and with whom one works. There is a strong alliance hidden in the triangle 'Europe – Youth – Human Rights'. Help us to bring the elements together and we will progressively overcome double standards and political corruption. We have a long way to go, but it will be worth it in the end.

‘The European Federation for Intercultural Learning in Europe Today’

Unusually, this contribution was made in abstentia, to the 1998 General Assembly of the European Federation for Intercultural Learning in Lillehammer in Sweden, as a result of an important but unforeseen meeting called by the then Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

First of all my apologies and regrets for not being physically present in Lillehammer due to a last minute call for an important meeting in Strasbourg, where the Secretary General insists on my presence. Secondly, a methodological problem – I never give speeches with a fully elaborated manuscript, because this usually turns into a very dry reading session. The written word is a different matter to the spoken word, and often enough one is the enemy of the other. So what should I do when circumstances force me to use a text only? My solution is to present to you a very open text with statements and maybe even polemics, which are meant to stimulate a discussion rather than prove the general culture of the author. Misunderstandings will be unavoidable; if they are unbearable, I invite you to an email discussion (peter.lauritzen@eycb.hu).

My job description is to develop a few thoughts on the situation of young people today and to prepare the ground for some ensuing debate on the future orientations of EFIL’s work. I shall do

this job within the framework given by the values of my organization, the Council of Europe, for and respecting the dramatically changed political, social and cultural conditions since 1989. Today, in the wake of the 5th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth from 27 – 29 April in Bucharest, the countries concerned are, with very few exceptions, practically all nations making up our new enlarged Europe with its Eastern border, now being Japan.

1. 'Youth' is a sociological construction and the nature of the construction depends on historic, cultural and social conditions. The 20-year-old Serbian conscript, his Gypsy peer in Romania and the young North African in the suburbs of Paris have little in common with a 20-year-old bank employee in the Netherlands, a student in Barcelona or a conscientious objector doing his civil service in Hamburg. And, again, an 8-year-old street kid in Calcutta can be, by force of circumstances, more 'adult = responsible for himself and others' than a 30-year-old long term unemployed 'young person = assisted and dependent on others' in Stockholm. When talking of 'European youth' or 'Youth in Europe', we use a very general descriptive term corresponding to a common reality. Usually the construction of youth also refers to the age group between 15 and 25, but this again is artificial, as I believe I have shown above.

2. Generally, for a society, its vision of the young is also its vision of its own future: the young today are the face of the society of tomorrow. The young are – through the generation treaty and other social institutions – a kind of life insurance for society and a guarantee for the prolongation of its existence. Consequently, all efforts will be undertaken to make young people grow into the existing value system, make them accept and defend it. This

means, on the other hand, that a society losing interest in their young has lost confidence in itself and a society permitting hatred of the young enters the phase of self-hate.

3. Paradoxically, young people are also often the ones who carry the main burden of revolutionary changes, wars and conflicts. The late Romanian sociologist Fred Mahler based a whole theory, called 'Juventology', on this phenomenon. In analogy to the Marxist theory of historical development caused by economic factors and to Klaus Theweleit's theory on gender relations as being the productive force of development, he describes the young as the driving force and *avant-garde* of societal change.

4. This ambiguous situation makes for the irritating positioning of many actors in the youth field, be they civil servants, researchers, experts, NGO representatives and whatever else recognized representatives of youth – they all work with the fragile balance between conservation and social change. In fact, youth policy is, by far, more important than its very low public image suggests. In 1968 this was painfully brought back into the public memory. It is currently forgotten again, but the pendulum always swings back.

5. There are a few topics the majority of youth researchers would agree on:

5.1. The old contract between the education system and the labour market, meaning that good results in education would almost automatically lead to high social status and secure employment, does not exist any more. This contract has also been valid in state-socialist countries and has been at the origin of calculable life plans, which today seem to be gone for good for most young people.

5.2. As a result, youth workers have become reactive to economic developments: their agenda consists of fighting the effects of unemployment, social exclusion and urban violence. They themselves and the young people they are working with can no longer influence their social and political environment in the same proactive way which made voluntary movements so strong at a time.

5.3. This situation puts an end to Margaret Mead's definition of 'youth' as a moratorium, that is, a time between childhood and adulthood where young people can develop their personalities without already risking the sanctions of adulthood.

5.4. This is one of the keys to the explanation of the often deplored apathy of young people with regard to politics and the public sphere: if there is no room to try out participation and citizenship, if young people become less and less important as social actors, what is there left to participate in?

5.5. In conclusion, the old view of 'youth' as a socialization and transition becomes accentuated in the direction of 'youth' as a central and strategic phase; the main choices and decisions determining the rest of the life-course are made and the main social competences and qualifications acquired.

6. Relating these changes with regard to 'youth' as a category in the social and political discourse to other developments, I would like to introduce the following points:

6.1. In preparation for tomorrow's knowledge society, 'adults' can learn more from kids and young people than kids and young people can from adults.

6.2. The well known knowledge transfer from the centres to the periphery is in the process of changing direction. The centres are becoming empty, and new knowledge is coming from the periphery (c.f. discussions on ‘marginalization’); *Newsweek* of 6 October 1997 quotes the following cities as ‘hot’ (in: ‘Generation global, the 10 hottest cities’): Dublin, Reykjavik, San Jose, Cape Town, Budapest, Prague, Sarajevo, Tel Aviv, Saigon and Shanghai. This is where the music plays, where the energy, creativity and entrepreneurship of young people is highly valued.

6.3. Today’s Europe mirrors so many social realities that it is becoming difficult to talk about post-modernity, of second modernity (Giddens) or of one modernity. This is a Europe of several modernities, which has to find its place within a general organization of industrial and financial transactions at global level. Without the construction of several modernities, it becomes practically impossible to establish a transnational European discourse.

6.4. Within these several modernities one can observe an increase of ‘life-style-democracy and culture’ with young people. The higher this ‘life-style-democracy’ is developed – and this can be higher in Budapest than in Berlin – the less important the deformations of the formal political system within the subjective perception of reality by young people are.

6.5. Consequently, changes in sexuality, consumer habits, aesthetics, imagery, fashion, media and information technologies, friendship and neighbourhood, peers, tolerance, new knowledge on intelligence, networking and new forms of work are more exciting than the rituals of public life.

7. What can all this mean for an organization such as EFIL? I am not in a position to advise the organization on anything. However, EFIL being the most outstanding organization within the family of NGOs of the Council of Europe with regard to intercultural learning, a longstanding friend such as me might have his ideas and wish to share them with you. They are:

7.1. Youth and exchange organizations will have to accept the change from 'participants' in activities to 'clients'. I am not necessarily happy about this development, but it is the price we have to pay for the higher individualization of young people and for a decline of the membership concept. Marketing knowledge is needed, and a certain degree of professionalization. I do not make these remarks with regard to existing exchange practice, but with regard to training and intercultural experience.

7.2. It would be wrong to concentrate the concept of Europe on the European Union. The Union is the most ambitious political organization in Europe and the only one with strong political and economic impact, but it does not make sense to think in a Europe of three classes: first class for the members of the Union, second class for the candidates for membership and third class for the others, including the Russian Federation. Instead, a cultural Europe and developing an understanding to include North Africa, Turkey and the Near East. This is the moment to open Europe, not to build new fortresses.

7.3. One of the key concepts in our work will be 'European Citizenship' very soon. Eurobarometer 47.2 shows a strong backing of European Unity by young people, but some irritations on the question of national and European identity.

EFIL might, with its 'double character' as an organization with access to schools and the intercultural field, play an important role in the promotion of European Citizenship and focus on this concept in some of the activities. It would be important to base such a concept on a sense of belonging to a European social collectivity, on memory, on trust in the future and on an opening of minds, which would avoid substituting national boundaries with European ones, but remain open to the world.

7.4. To the extent that EFIL is also an important lobby organization, it would be good if this openness on Europe would also come out within the European Youth Forum and in all forms of cooperation with the European Commission and the Council of Europe.

7.5. Further, with a view on the status on minorities and honouring EFIL's long term commitment to tolerance education through intercultural learning, it is necessary to recall that citizenship includes three levels (c.f. T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class*, 1950):

- civil rights (individual freedom, freedom of speech and thought, of beliefs and movement);
- rights securing political participation and the exercise of political power;
- the right to have minimum resources and relative security, allowing for a 'civilized' life.

8. It is in this combination of safeguarding Human Rights and working on the future European civilization that NGOs and an organization such as EFIL can and will play an important role.

Not enough young citizens are prepared for the changes to come, schools and civil organizations do not invest enough time and energy into the task of 'preparing for Europe within the world'. An exchange organization, an organization made by alumni, teachers and young people, can allocate enormous intellectual resources and experiences. This is not the time to stick with routine; it is time for a new beginning.

‘Youth Policy Structures in Europe’

This speech is probably one of Peter Lauritzen’s most famous. For its time it went a long way, in that it sought to characterize the nature of national governments’ approaches to youth and youth policy in the form of a typology. The typology of youth policy approaches developed has since been adapted, supplemented and quoted in many further publications. It has also become a reference for the National Youth Policy Reviews of the Council of Europe. The speech was made at the ‘Working Conference on East-West Exchanges’ in Potsdam on 30 March 1993 organized by the Ministry for Education, Youth and Sports of the German Federal State of Brandenburg and by the Senator for Youth and Family of the Land of Berlin in cooperation with the Commission of the European Communities, Task Force Human Resources: Education, Training and Youth (Youth Unit) and TACIS, which was opened by the then German Minister for Women and Youth, Angela Merkel. The transcript as it appears here was published in the conference proceedings entitled ‘Youth Exchanges between East and West: Reports, Facts, Opinions - A Reader’.

“Europe today is not a region of 12 but of 40 nations,” Jacques Attali said recently. This is becoming increasingly true for the Council of Europe, where youth cooperation extends to the presently 37 signatory parties to the Cultural Convention. Already in two weeks from now, Ministers of some 40 European states will come together in Vienna to develop a common vision on youth in the greater Europe and to agree on a number of recommendations and resolutions. In Vienna and here in Potsdam, are all those governments and youth services, the youth organizations and exchange agencies always aware of the enormous diversity they rep-

resent in terms of administrative practice, philosophical and political approach to young people and their role in society, financial resources, legal status and relevance to young people at large?

Youth policy structures differ from each other at many levels: at local, regional, national, European and the international/world level. And these structures are shaped and used by a whole variety of actors: governments, media, non-governmental organizations, little or non-formalized initiatives of young people, schools, universities, companies, agencies and youth services.

There should, indeed, be some large representative study available which would provide facts and figures, explanations and interpretations and, first and foremost, some guidance through the reality of youth policy organization in Europe. We are not saying that we are without some texts and materials – there are innumerable presentations of national governments and NGOs, there are useful brochures and presentations such as the EUROPA ABC of the Council of Europe and the bulk of studies and presentations related to particular programmes and measures run by the European Commission. There will be, at the end of the this year, a comparative study on ‘Associative Life in Europe’, available at the Council of Europe, and we have made good use of the Chisholm / Bergeret study and the descriptive summary of national reports concerning youth policies and animation within the 12 and distributed by the task force. But a representative study covering all the countries of the ‘new Europe’ which uses clear descriptions for youth policy development does not exist. Maybe, bringing about such a study could be a valuable project for discussion between the Commission and the Council of Europe when talking about concrete projects of cooperation.

My contribution will have to be restricted to introducing some of the difficulties which will have to be met by the authors of such a study. And, already when only attempting a sketchy presentation of some of the key problems, I come up against this classical diplomatic difficulty:

- in your reporting on what kinds of structure exist and for what reason in a particular country you will necessarily use some categories which will represent opinion and might not include some very important historic or cultural specifics of that country – do what you like, you are biased;
- therefore, you should never give the impression that certain aspects of youth policy may be better organized in one country than in another. So, you might as well say nothing.

This means I will refrain from putting names to countries in such an introduction; this should be reserved for a more complete and careful approach. Instead, I will talk of ‘some regions in Europe’, of ‘certain countries’ of ‘one country, and so on, and you will make up your own minds.

However, nobody can change that in ‘corridor-talk’ we speak quite carelessly of the Nordics, the Latin countries, the British and the Irish, Germans and German-speaking countries, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and so on. These references are meant geographically and linguistically but they often carry with them a whole lot of social, political and cultural implications, which receive their importance from not being pronounced and remaining ‘unsaid’.

Are these colloquial groupings of countries valid? Do some neighbouring countries have all these affinities and homogenei-

ties, which outside observers attach to them? Also, we are talking about democracies here. What may have been a certain youth policy understanding in one country may change substantially with a new government. An important question: what distinguishes youth policies between European countries more: being part of a particular national cultural history and tradition or being part of a particular party political (and potentially transnational) youth policy profile?

In this context, what does it really tell you, whether the youth authority in one country is with the ministry of youth and sports, in another with youth and family or youth and women or with a youth ministry all on its own. Or, whether youth makes up part of the ministry of social affairs, of education, of culture or of domestic affairs. What does it tell you, when there is no national youth authority at all or when the competence for youth is placed directly within the Prime Minister's Office?

Obviously the priority given to youth matters within government organization together with a reasonable percentage of the national budget and the recognition of the rights of children and young people, can be used for classification, but how is the social situation of young people within a country, their degree of satisfaction with their lives, their prospects for the future and their confidence in themselves and the society they live in related to government youth policies? Can this be clearly distinguished from educational and labour market policies or are education and preparation for professional life the specific feature to refer to? To put it even more radically: where and when does youth policy influence the life of young people at all?

Internationally, youth policy appears predominantly as a sub-category of foreign cultural policy and is, not surprisingly, highly formalized. This categorization may make sense for bilateral agreements in the youth field, but it does not cover well the reality of multilateral youth policy cooperation, which may just as much be on social or educational policy.

In any case, both the Council of Europe and the Commission are, if for different reasons, hesitant to speak of a youth policy which can be properly defined and legitimated in institutional terms. However, the various exchange programmes and training initiatives, the projects sponsored and, more generally, all the attempts made to associate young people more closely to the construction of Europe have produced the elements of what might one day be called a European youth policy. The cornerstones of such a policy would be participation, mobility, training and intercultural learning and it will need a lot of time and effort to assure the financial means and the political framework which would make such a policy potentially beneficial for each young citizen in the European Community and in the member countries of the Council of Europe.

Turning the focus back on national youth policies, I intend to follow the precautions which I spelt out earlier and to avoid any strict classification of existing youth policies, because this would only confirm stereotypes and inevitably turn out to be biased. Instead, I will introduce six basic types of government understanding of how to go about youth policy; that is, I will describe approaches and attitudes which I had the pleasure of observing and sharing as a kind of participant observer in many years of service to intergovernmental youth bodies. You will see that

some of these understandings are contradictory to each other; hence, some of our difficulties in arriving at a common notion of youth policy.

1. The government as a Super-NGO, the 'NGO of NGOs'

This is a government which is mixing up with civil society and behaving either occasionally or permanently as a kind of public conscience. Such a government runs activities and projects by itself, works with, through and above non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and, largely by the same rules, is extremely flexible and presents itself as the advocate of the non-organized, the marginalized and any minority group.

2. The government as a partner to civil society

In this case youth policy measures are discussed and developed together with youth organizations, agencies, youth services, and so on. Voluntary organizations may be entrusted with important budgets; the government takes risks and shares powers. At an international level, the co-management feature of the European Youth Centre and the European Youth Foundation in Strasbourg corresponds to this understanding.

3. *Laissez-faire* government

This approach would say: there are young people and they may have their special problems. So have others, and there is no reason to create particular discriminatory schemes in favour of young people and against the overall population. When people are legally adults they must all be treated the same.

4. Interventionist government

Here we talk of governments which react exclusively to burning contemporary problems with young people, such as drug abuse, an increase in violence and juvenile delinquency, unemployment, and so on. The government reaction to these problems may foresee large budgets, but it is always limited in time and needs to produce some visible results quickly. The action is efficient and follows the model of the fire brigade. No long term strategy.

5. 'Father State's' government

The government acts as a sort of benevolent authority, confident in its role. This role is basically the role of the big educator; young people need space to develop, they need to be encouraged and, sometimes, punished. The relationship between the government and NGOs is asymmetric; there is a hierarchy and it has to be respected.

6. The controlling government

Such a government represents a nervous, insecure state authority. It is in fact afraid of the reactions of young people and needs to be constantly informed about what 'they' are planning next. It cannot accept young people as an autonomous, critical part of society. Its youth policy instruments will be used as a 'pre-warning system'.

Obviously, no one member country of the European Community and the Council of Europe corresponds entirely to the approaches portrayed in this summary of youth policies in Europe. But what about some mixing of these very basic ideal-types? Are they really

so far from the truth, once you have produced your own mixed assessment?

Having talked about what might distinguish these, I would now like to introduce what might unite them. In December 1992, in Utrecht, the youth authorities of the Netherlands held a conference with a similar participation and also in cooperation with the Commission and the Council of Europe. On this occasion we were able to agree on eight indicators, which together make up a national or international youth policy. I would like to reintroduce these indicators:

- There needs to be legislation concerning young people;
- There need to be financial resources within the state budget;
- There must be a non-governmental infrastructure;
- There should be some voluntary and professional training structure;
- There needs to be independent research into youth matters;
- There need to be advisory bodies to the government;
- There should be a communication network at national, regional and local level between authorities, youth movements and agencies;
- Opportunities for innovation and development should be provided.

When using these indicators you will have to admit that in some European countries all of them are met, a few in some others and practically none of them in some others again. To overcome this striking disparity we should learn, across the borders of diplomatic respect and insistence on national sovereignty, to spend some more time on the content, the methods and the general importance attached to youth policies in our countries and within in-

ternational meetings. After all, we are not sharing big secrets here and as youth policy experts we all belong to the underdogs in the political system, another striking similarity that might as well, in these days of budgetary restriction, be introduced as a ninth element into the list of indicators.

Youth ministers, youth politicians in- and outside Parliaments, youth administrators, youth representatives and youth experts should try to work hard, nationally and internationally, for a recognized role in the coordination of youth policies, regardless of whether these cover education, labour market issues, housing or health care. Youth policy should no longer be defined by what it is not and cannot be, but by what it is asked to do and by what it can potentially do for young people.

There is, however, still a long way to go.

The views expressed in this article are those of the author, and do not represent any official position of the European Commission.

‘Quo Vadis Europa? National Renewal or European Unification? – Thoughts on Right-Wing Extremism Among Young People in Europe’

Peter Lauritzen made this speech to the participants of the ‘Youth Forum’ that took place at Lycée Hubert Clement, Esch sur Alzette, in Luxembourg, on 11 January 1992. This intervention was written and delivered in German.

I would like to begin with a biographical detail which I believe is entirely relevant to our subject today. I was born in Flensburg on the German-Danish border, so I have known since childhood what a border means. As I spent my childhood in Flensburg immediately after the Second World War, I also had plenty of opportunities to gain an outside perspective on my own country (Germany). In such a short time after the war, it was not a very attractive picture – Danish contemporaries helped me to understand that the way in which nations see themselves does not necessarily correspond to the way their neighbours see them. Nowadays, we talk about self-perceptions and outside perceptions and regard the ability to differentiate between the two perspectives as a key qualification in social and intercultural learning.

Experiences of marginality – geographical, historical and political – probably provide more incentives for crossing borders than does a life which is safe in the heartland of a nation, where there

is always the risk of affirmative self-perception without correction by other views from across a border. To bring these biographical comments to a close then, it is hardly surprising that my generation, the post-war generation, who later became the 'sceptical generation' (according to Helmut Schelsky), placed all their political hopes on an emerging Europe, a Europe which put a lasting end to the nationalist quarrels and wars of the continent's past.

As a place where every 20 km journey takes you to another country, Luxembourg must be an interesting mix of national identity and border crossing; in other words, a country which does not have far to go to see itself as part of Europe and which is totally familiar with the resulting experiences of cultural domination by the German and French languages and co-existence with nationals of both nations.

Why then has right-wing extremism and its power of attraction on young people become a topical issue even here?

I would urge you not to make things too easy by immediately quoting unemployment and social hardship on the one hand, and migrant workers, asylum seekers and refugees on the other, as obvious reasons for the rise in right-wing extremism. Although that would not be totally incorrect, there might just be more comprehensive explanations from which we can learn more.

If we run the images of the last two years through our minds, the world we see is totally different from the Cold War years. There are the unforgettable scenes from Berlin, with the Wall coming down and a whole people being reunited. Then there is the image of that passenger ship in the Mediterranean, whose rump can

hardly be seen for the people swarming around it, and there are the terrible pictures of the civil war in Yugoslavia. A poet and an electrician become heads of state and a vast empire falls apart. One of the cosmonauts currently circling the planet was seen off by the President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev. What will he discover when he comes back to earth in March this year?

Some of the world's states are re-arming, while others are dis-arming and the old fear of a global military confrontation between East and West is being replaced by diffuse anxieties about 'nuclear material and know-how going astray'. The list of new impressions is endless and the question is: would a politician, philosopher, journalist or ordinary citizen, who, actually, at present, has a view of the world, be able to understand the impact of all the processes taking place? In such eventful times, why should we not just admit our own uncertainty and disorientation and gradually set about appropriating the new world and making it part of our own lives again, just as the old pre-1989 world was?

Many people are unable to cope with a task like that; their responses are more direct: if the old enemy 'global communism' no longer exists, a new one needs to be invented. Xenophobia, or hatred of foreigners, is booming and is directed against many different groups; there is antisemitism in countries with no Jews, Roma and Sinti are welcome targets, and the many Africans and Asians brought in by the former communist governments under the slogan of friendship between peoples are being subjected to aggressive persecution like the jetsam of history. Politicians are conjuring up horror scenarios: how many millions are going to flood into Europe from the South and East? Even though the figures are changing only slightly and the whole of Europe is currently taking

in fewer refugees than Thailand or Pakistan, fear of the imminent 'wave of immigrants' has become a constant in the demagogue's arsenal in public debate. Some of those now worrying about growing right-wing extremism among young people played a major part in making it possible in the first place.

I should now like to introduce two further aspects into the debate:

- the new guises of racism
- the economic determinant of extremism and fundamentalism.

In his comprehensive study *La force du préjugé* (*The Force of Prejudice*, Paris, 1988), Pierre Henri Taguieff drew attention to the changing face of racism: the well known version of biological supremacy, as propounded by the racial theory of the National Socialists, has more or less disappeared, except among a few scatterbrains. The racism of today has adopted a cultural guise: it emphasizes the 'natural' differences between cultures, religions, regions and ethnic groups and opposes integration, universal principles, equality and harmonization. Dealing with this type of racism is not so easy: are we not all opposed to centralism from Berlin, Paris or Brussels? Is emphasis of the autonomy of the regions and respect for cultural differences not one of the core messages of my own organization, the Council of Europe? You have to listen very carefully: in which context and with what aim do the new priests of insurmountable differences come forward? One indicator for differentiating a basically racist cultural discourse from its democratic counterpart is the way in which the concept of identity is addressed.

Identity is generally seen as a concept involving the exclusion of others and a refusal to accept diversity. This all too simplistic

approach neglects the fact that identity is also compatible with shared features within a mental image of diversity, and that differentiating ourselves from others does not necessarily involve excluding them. There are many levels of identity, ranging from personal identity to identification with the social groups and classes to which we as individuals belong.

Different regional and national identities have existed within Europe for centuries. European identity is accordingly a broad concept, which in no way prevents us from sharing our collective identity as Europeans with all members of the human race worldwide.

The abuse of the concept of European identity by ideologues that exploited it for very specific purposes and values (in the Fascist Era, during the Cold War, during Europe's economic expansion) should not stand in the way here any longer. Perhaps 'Western' values are really actually shared European values, which are now being rediscovered in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, too?

If that is the case, then we do have to address the concept of the multicultural society; recognition of the 'otherness' of fellow citizens on the grounds of religious, cultural, ethnic or any other kinds of differences does not indicate distance from them but is a challenge to engage in debate and join together in shaping our lives on the basis of the same individual and social rights.

I should also like to pick up another of Taguieff's thoughts: building on his description of the rise of the French National Front in close connection with its demonization by the left, he draws attention to a fatal similarity between 'fascists' and 'anti-fascists', namely the attempts by both sides to exclude their opponents

from the community of humankind. Indeed, where is the actual difference between those who wish to push particular groups out of society, regardless of the side they come from? Translated into the reality of youth work, that means that no upstanding social workers will want to dirty their hands with those disgusting skin-heads, but they are all really proud of what they do to integrate young Turks.

Efforts to deal with the reality of the multicultural society and the growing potential for violence among young people must be based on constitutional principles and the will to achieve integration; any other approach has the inevitable effect of making us like the people we want to counter.

In line with the theories of Robert Kurz (*Der Kollaps der Modernisierung*, [*The Collapse of Modernization*], Frankfurt, 1991), a second point here concerns the process of the internationalization of the world economy. This trend, that has been under way for many years with production centres in Europe, North America and South East Asia, is in stark contrast to the wave of 'small' national economies currently emerging in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe in particular. Kurz describes the new state units as 'ethnically pseudo-national' and says they have no prospects for the future against the background of economic globalization. However, one can ask the question: who in the world has any chance at all of competing successfully with European, Asian and American producers? Is the flight into symbolic nationalism, extremist accentuation of one's own identities and, in other parts of the world, fundamentalism, not directly related to the fact that the winners and losers of the global economy are decided in advance? Why do so many countries want to join the European

Community? Because of commitment to Europe or because of resignation in face of the above?

Against this backdrop, it is perhaps clearer why so many young people in Europe do not necessarily regard the formation of a European single market and the possibilities of increased mobility for young people in work, cultural and training terms as offering them great personal opportunities. On the contrary, just as in the example of global economic trends, many of them are afraid of the modernizing pressures of the new Europe and do not believe that they will be among the winners. The model young European of the future will be a kind of multilingual computer expert with great interest in the culture and spheres of life of European peoples. With nationally organized schools, very unequal qualification opportunities and high structural unemployment, how many young people can actually develop an optimistic European perspective for their own lives? And if they are not going to be among the winners, why should they accept the situation without protest?

These explanations for right-wing extremism involve a welcome reduction of complexity, whose attractiveness increases if Europe is transformed from a project into reality. It cannot be ruled out that Western Europe will also witness new nationalist and regionalist movements that will aggressively resist the idea of sharing with others, the multicultural society and Europe as a political and social concept, and we must assume that such movements will be particularly attractive to young people.

In times like this, there are calls for enlightenment and political education, and youth organizations need to prove themselves. That is not as easy now as it once was: young people today can

scarcely be described as a generation; youth researchers talk of a plurality of lifestyles and plans for life among young people, and refer to increasing individualization. This is accompanied by growing detachment from political parties, associations and trade unions and by schools' only limited impact in terms of political, historical and social knowledge.

If we are to prevent the potential division of young people's expectations for the future into an optimistic, European and secure future and a pessimistic, threatening and insecure future, it will be important to give young people access to the content and experiences of intercultural learning through a kind of concerted effort involving schools, associations and the media. If a synthesis of qualifications and social skills can be achieved in the area of training and further training and if the process could be opened up to other countries and cultures, the current threat of anti-modern, nationalist thinking among many young people can possibly still be averted.

However, a strategy of this kind demands willingness to adapt schools and vocational training to the realities of Europe, which, in turn, demands willingness to move forward with a radical rethink.

The new Europe cannot be built with national means. If its development is prevented by national inflexibility, our continent will face a new phase of nationalism. Right-wing extremism is only the warning sign of a danger that is actually much more far-reaching than it could ever be itself.

‘Youth Attitudes: Past and Present’

This speech was made in contribution to the Congress of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP) on 1 December 1980. It was originally given in German.

I can only talk about young people's expectations regarding employment and training from a very specific perspective. I was invited here to represent the European Youth Centre and will therefore mainly base my comments on observations resulting from its work. Before doing so, I probably need briefly to describe the European Youth Centre.

The European Youth Centre is a Council of Europe training centre located in Strasbourg. Information material is available here in the room and we would, of course, be delighted if some of you were able to visit the centre in spite of your busy schedules. The main features of the centre are as follows:

1. To my knowledge, the centre is the only training agency that is run directly by a European institution within its own responsibility. The educational and administrative staff are Council of Europe employees and officials, and the training and accommodation activity is one of the Council of Europe's key programme areas.
2. The European Youth Centre's services are used almost exclusively by international youth organizations. These include major European youth organizations run by political parties, trade unions and churches, as well as many other associations with wide ranging objectives which are active in cultural and social work for young people and, more recently, also in the environmental sector.

3. The European Youth Centre is run on the principle of co-management by governments and youth organizations, which jointly form the centre's board. The main responsibility of the latter is the programme of the youth centre. The programme comprises study sessions, colloquia and language courses. All activities are open to participants from the member states of the European Cultural Convention.

4. One of the European Youth Centre's most important objectives is the involvement of young workers in its activities. It may, therefore, be of interest to you that the centre operates a system of compensation for young workers who lose earnings for taking part in an activity at the centre, and has experience of conducting special language courses for young workers.

From the point of view of youth associations and their work, it is difficult to isolate young people's attitudes and expectations regarding training and employment from their general attitudes to society, the future and politics. The representatives of youth associations are quite used to debates about young people's attitudes taking place as a specific form of debate on future social policy objectives. Young people's attitudes are the result of many different experiences in the family, at school, at work and in leisure activities, reflected and intensified by the media and powerful consumer industries. However, they are, in principle, not independent of society in general and are usually not directed against it either. Ultimately, all educationalists, academics and politicians must avoid the temptation of projecting their own hopes, wishes and frustrations regarding social trends onto 'youth', and thereby lending a degree of drama to the debate on young people that it would not have on its own.

Compared with the 1968 youth movement, which was driven by the idea of broad democratization, by protest and revolt against ossified social structures and by discussion and criticism, today's generation of 20-year-olds seem to be conformist and apolitical, indeed, for some people, reactionary even. In particular, young people's apparent strong conformity with performance requirements in schools, universities and the workplace are put forward in support of this view. Young people also show declining willingness to become involved in political and trade union organizations, combined with concentration on their own small groups and their private lives. Politicians are talking, with some relief, about a reversal in trends and, were it not for the increasing reluctance among young people to vote in parliamentary elections, society could really not be more pleased with the younger generation than it has been for a long time.

It is easy to draw the wrong conclusions here, and some 'old comrades' of the 1968 movement now run the risk of entering into a surely unintentional alliance with the representatives of the establishment when they join them in condemning young people's limited political awareness. Perhaps they are even both implied in the text of the Pink Floyd song from *The Wall* that has become the anthem of school children worldwide:

We don't need no education,
We don't need no thought control,
No dark sarcasm in the classroom,
Teacher – leave us kids alone!

It no longer matters whether teaching is done in the interests of emancipation or of preserving the existing system – the at-

titude of the teachers themselves is attacked. Twelve years after 1968, have young people really become so apolitical? It is obvious, after all, that the education sector does not create any jobs by itself, but rather governs access to jobs. And since it has the task of categorizing and selecting, why should young people jeopardize their chances by supporting models of democracy that have no prospect of success? Creativity and willingness to criticize should be seen in conjunction with awareness of secure job prospects and opportunities for life and if good education and training is still the best guarantee of finding employment, as is maintained in all quarters, it is hardly surprising that young people tend towards conformism given today's labour market situation.

Under these circumstances, it is neither possible nor desirable to draw general conclusions about young people's attitudes regarding training and employment. The fact is that we are faced with a whole series of contradictions:

- on the one hand, there are many young people who are fully focused on the requirements of education and employment and accept the principles of performance and competition;
- on the other, there are many young people who are convinced that the social model based on economic growth has no future and are already adapting to new lifestyles in the widest range of alternative movements;
- on the one hand, there are many young people who, with maximum flexibility, do their jobs without showing any interest in them as a career, while devoting all their energy to other interests in their free time;
- on the other, there are the far too large numbers of unemployed young people who realize while still at school that

- they will end up unemployed and whose profound resignation can scarcely be overcome;
- and, lastly, there are the many young people who have qualifications today which would have opened up excellent job prospects 10 years ago and who now have to take on jobs far below their potential or in areas for which they have no training.

The list could be a lot longer – but it should suffice to illustrate a development with which youth associations are confronted as proxies for the major groups and institutions in society: an increasing tendency among young people to turn away from anything that smacks of structure, organization or society. There are good reasons for this, however.

Young people find national and international politics hard to understand, if not totally unfathomable. There are various examples here, for instance, the operation of the European Communities, especially the Common Agricultural Policy. The relationship between the deliberate production of surpluses in Europe and famine disasters in the Third World is utterly impossible to explain. The relationship between energy price trends, currency systems, inflation and labour market trends is now too complex to be understood. And while it is indisputable that modern states have to spend large sums on defence, it is hardly possible to explain that the costs should be as high as they are now and that an increase is supposedly in the interest of all citizens. Does the peaceful use of nuclear power actually involve unacceptable risks or not? Is much of our food tainted with dangerous chemicals or not? Does a change in government actually change anything or not?

There are too many unanswered questions, anxieties and fears.

Many young people respond to the complexity of politics by deliberately turning to the straightforward, the genuine and the personal – a kind of pronounced subjectivism. It is not so much what people say that counts, but how they say it and whether they really mean it. It is not efforts on behalf of any particular ideological principle that matter, but concrete changes in human relationships in families, among friends or in small, uncomplicated groups. It is not a change in government that is most important, but success at grassroots level.

This subjectivism is surely not apolitical and most definitely not reactionary. It is arguably only the historic response to the self-appointed masters of the objective principles of 1968. However, the question does arise as to whether subjectivism, youth culture and the move away from society do not create scope for dangerous trends. To my mind, these include the current tendency in many European countries to leave politics to the specialists and regard it as unfathomable and irrelevant for ourselves. The modern state accordingly ends up degenerating into a kind of maintenance agency, and we all know that that is no good in the long run. Increasing bureaucracy, ossified structures and detachment from the interests of ordinary people are the inevitable result, with many young people's relationships with state and society taking on the air of a self-fulfilling prophecy: with time, government and politics actually do become just as unbearable as people had always thought they were when they were young.

There is no alternative: all those who believe in representative democracy – whether they are communists, socialists, liberals or

conservatives – must join forces in considering what type of political education can help narrow the increasing divide between them and young people. Neither trade unions nor employers can have any interest in young workers behaving like flocks of sheep. It is time for the discussion about attitudes to training and employment to be incorporated into the discussion about the values which young people should go by as they plan their lives.

The Written Word

The Written Word

Peter Lauritzen had a special relationship with words, with texts, and with reading. Everyone who knew him became aware of this sooner or later. Colleagues and friends who were close to him marvelled at the breadth and size of the political science and education library he kept at home. *Stagiaires*, junior colleagues and the occasional Masters' student visiting the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg would scour the shelves of his office for key political, intercultural and non-formal education texts and then pick his brains for lists of additional reading material, not on the shelves, but neatly stored away in his cerebral bibliography of nearly everything ever written on young people and European society and politics.

Why did Peter Lauritzen develop such a symbiotic relationship with writing as a medium of communication? As early as his student activist days in Hamburg, in the mid 1960s, he worked as the editor of a student newspaper, although this was something rather common for young people with intellectual ambitions at the time. He chose to study at a university where young people, during World War II, had tried and failed to defend the inviolability of their freedom of expression by printing and distributing illegal pamphlets, although this might only have been a highly symbolic coincidence of sorts. It was probably much simpler. From early on he was known to have a strong urge to communicate and to express himself, and to create and feed debate and discourse. He was an avid reader and was a convinced proponent of learning through the medium of writing.

He had the greatest respect for the written word, profoundly appreciating academic authors and researchers whose professional choice to become members of that community meant they could ‘write for a living’. At the same time, he did not consider himself as part of that community and rarely had (or even took) the opportunity to publish under his own name. Nevertheless, and the contents of this section entitled ‘The Written Word’ will attest to this, he wrote all the time. Especially in the later years of his career at the European Youth Centre, he produced text after text, often on demand from the higher echelons of the Council of Europe. In many ways, he, too, wrote for a living.

Peter Lauritzen’s ‘ghost-writing’, an integral part of the work of an international civil servant, deserves some more attention. In his capacity as secretary to any number of committees, as senior colleague in the education team, as the one who remembered the whole development of the youth sector of the Council of Europe, who was at every ministerial conference, and as the one who inevitably oversaw the organization of every major symposium, conference or research seminar organized by the youth sector of the Council of Europe, Peter Lauritzen spent large parts of his career at the Council of Europe writing for and with others. He wrote political declarations, policy papers, secretariat memos, articles, reports, research papers, introductions to publications, prefaces, speeches and every other kind of piece imaginable.

One of his key talents was that in so doing, he was able to build consensus among divergent positions, bridge gaps in knowledge and overcome limited vision, summarize the essentials, and bring together all the threads. Those who worked with

him closely remember several occasions when the success of important political events was at stake, as the diverse opinions expressed during the debates seemed simply to be incompatible. In such situations, Peter Lauritzen would activate incredible energy and concentration, go back to the ‘drawing board’, draft and consult through the night, and produce the draft of a common statement and declaration by the morning, and as if by magic, such texts would be adopted and allow all concerned to leave the event with a sense of achievement and satisfaction.

Occasionally, Peter Lauritzen was invited to write and to publish in an academic journal or book series he respected and read regularly. He got excited about these rare opportunities to contribute with his words to the academic discourse on subjects close to his professional reference and heart, and spent hours pouring over reference texts and books in preparation for his articles. At the same time, he was always critical of academics who were unable to relate to real life and who happily lived in their ivory towers. This was especially apparent in his approach to youth research and the youth research community, and in how he went about building up a credible and relevant research agenda for the youth sector of the Council of Europe. So, in his daily practice, as well as in his writing, Peter Lauritzen exemplified the importance of being embedded in the community of practice that one seeks to represent and to be a part of. He coherently placed his writing in the context of the so-called ‘magic triangle’ of policy, practice and research, feeding theoretical imagination with the latest practical and political developments. One colleague and friend has coined this ‘the Lauritzen method’.¹

1 Gavan Titley, “Human Geometry” in Otten et al. (Eds.) *Born in Flensburg, Europe. Journeys with Peter Lauritzen*, Dialog & Demokratie e.V, Berlin, 2008.

Peter Lauritzen's writing style could probably best be described as 'journalistic'. He wrote as he spoke, always interrogating and questioning and debating for and against, helping the reader to enter complex themes and issues through simple, but never simplistic, scenarios they could relate to. He wrote from his experiences and to the experiences of others. He was inspired by 'real' life, his own and those he had empirically studied or read about in the numerous daily and weekly newspapers and many books of fiction he consumed with speed and gusto.

In the old days, in his own youth, Peter Lauritzen wrote by hand, retyped on a manual typewriter using layers of carbon paper to produce the number of copies required by professors or employers, and then made tedious corrections by hand. One of his tried and tested methods for constructing reports and policy documents was to use a pair of scissors and glue, and piece together the 'whole' like a jigsaw, thus also leaving space and opportunity for others to comment and contribute. Some of these old 'originals' were found in his office among the piles of chronologically ordered papers from his entire career. While he was openly critical of and sceptical towards modern information technologies, often questioning with conviction its increasing 'big brother factor', Peter Lauritzen was nevertheless an enthusiast, starting with the electric typewriter, progressing to a word processor and best of all email. This is indeed something for which we are grateful, considering the wealth of previously undiscovered written material found on his office hard drive that might have been lost to the youth field had it not been stored digitally.

In this section, therefore, we have tried to bring together some of Peter Lauritzen's most 'prize' pieces of writing – those he pub-

lished for wider audiences, for public consumption. It includes pieces especially commissioned for publication in academic journals or publications in the fields of psychology, intercultural studies and education, contributions made to publications on the occasion of special European anniversaries or milestones, articles published in newspapers and magazines of the various organizations for which he worked at different moments in his career, and working documents that were drafted to provide conceptual grounding and leadership to ambitious Council of Europe initiatives in the field of youth.

‘A European Youth Centre in Budapest – Challenges, Obstacles, Innovations’

This article was commissioned for and published in ‘Young People at the Heart of Europe – 10 Years of the European Youth Centre Budapest’, the publication prepared to mark the 10th anniversary of the opening of the European Youth Centre Budapest (Council of Europe Publishing, 2006), a critical Council of Europe enlargement project. Peter Lauritzen played a key and instrumental role in its conceptual development, preparation and implementation and was Acting Executive Director of the European Youth Centre in Budapest from 1995 to 1999, during its crucial pilot phase.

Budapest? What comes to mind? My first trip in 1966, for instance. At the time I was a student and with a friend we were on a six-week car tour through the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania: all the visas that were needed, the bureaucracy, the border controls and the constant packing and unpacking of the car for the benefit of suspicious border guards. It was all pretty grotty, to be honest. But we forgot all that when we compared the beautiful landscapes we crossed, the wonderful people we met and the impressive capitals we visited. Budapest, at the time and on a hot summer’s day, was a revelation. I felt as if I had arrived in the heart of Europe, unusual during the Cold War. The town had resisted: it was still visibly battered from the 1956 resistance to Soviet tanks and it showed its scars. I was full of ambiguous

impressions and thoughts – would I only have this one short impression of the town during our limited stay? Would I ever come back as a tourist or in some other capacity? All I remember is that I tried to hold on to the time to be sure that none of my impressions would get lost, and that all would be treasured.

Had anybody told me that one day I would be able to travel freely in and out of Hungary and that I would even work in Budapest, I would have openly declared that person insane. In 1966 I was 24 years of age and like so many others, I had my certainties: that the division of Germany was, in a way, deserved – the price to pay for the crimes of the Nazi regime and that it would last for ever; that the Soviet occupation of Central and Eastern Europe was, no matter how contested by the populations and no matter how unfair or unjustified, a fact which could not be removed, and that borders, fair or unfair, must not be touched; that there was a real balance of power in the world, between East and West (even if there were also the non-aligned countries) and that this power was in possession of a military destruction capability which was able to blow up the planet several times. This ‘balance of horror’ was accompanied by a period of full employment, material satisfaction and a kind of calm life, in comfort zones such as Western and Northern Europe. At the time Spain and Portugal were dictatorships. Soon after, the Colonels would take over Greece and the 1968 student uprisings were still to come. How could anybody have imagined today’s Europe? I did not come across a single text which described a reality anywhere near to that of Europe today, even if sci-fi literature and truly futuristic policy projections did exist, a dozen a dime.

Working for the Council of Europe from 1972, then an organization with 17 member states, I witnessed the incredible trans-

formations Europe has gone through over the last 30 years. The Western European dictatorships in Spain and Portugal fell and the Council of Europe was called upon to assist in transition and democratization. In the youth field of the Council of Europe, this meant we were called upon to develop political education programmes. Beginning as a party political process, it soon came to mean the development of strong social movements. This was a time when the term 'civil society' was not yet in circulation. The Helsinki process started and *Solidarność* stirred up established Communism in Poland. What had looked unmoveable for so long showed first signs of openness and revolt. At the same time there was fear: if any of this goes too far too quickly, how will it influence the war and peace agenda? The youth field of the Council of Europe, through establishments such as the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Centre, became a pillar in this ongoing process of gaining space for freedom and democracy, access to Human Rights and exchange between political systems, which remained enemies.

The creation of the European Youth Centre Budapest belongs to this context. Hungary was the first country of Central Europe to join the Council of Europe and showed from the outset a great openness to European cooperation in the areas of education, culture and youth (c.f. the 'U-rope' Seminar of 1991). At the beginning of the 1990s, a broad debate had begun on how to re-orient the work priorities of the youth field in a way that could assist the new states in Central and Eastern Europe to become fully fledged members of the community of Council of Europe member states as quickly as possible. Documents such as the final text of the European Youth Ministers Conference that took place in Lisbon in 1990, the conferences of Utrecht, Berlin and Kiev,

all between 1992 and 1994, and the Final Text of the European Youth Ministers Conference in Vienna of 1993 bear witness to this new, pan-European and integration orientated policy in the field of youth. Within the larger Council of Europe context the Final Declaration of the 1st Summit of the Heads of State and Government (Vienna 1993), which endorsed the European Youth Campaign against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance and the Demosthenes programme (a wide assistance programme aimed at promoting the core values of the Council of Europe) lent impetus to the transition process of the Council of Europe itself, from a Western European organization to a truly pan-European one.

The project of a 'Second European Youth Centre' was part of these debates from the Lisbon Conference in 1990. The various steps of the process of creating the Centre from an ambitious idea to its present state are described elsewhere. The result is known. Budapest was chosen as the location and the old Hotel Ifjúság, on Zivatar utca in the Second District and just opposite the beautiful Hungarian Parliament building with its magical view over the whole inner city area of Budapest, was reconstructed according to the needs of young people, youth experts and other users, such as local groups, international organizations and Council of Europe committees and expert groups.

Sent for a three-year assignment as Executive Director, when I arrived at the building, which was still to become the European Youth Centre Budapest one night in October 1995, the minibus driver who had picked me up at the airport did not want me to leave the bus. He could not imagine that this inaccessible building site was to be my new home. Indeed, this was the place. We

had already scheduled activities in the building and were not pleased with the fact that the building work had dragged on. So we forced ourselves into an unfinished building, starting with my arrival, and soon followed by the arrival of a whole training course for youth leaders. Risks were minimized through the active cooperation of the architect and his team, and the building was made fully operational as planned, and ready for inauguration on December 15, 1995.

We had finally arrived in Budapest. What was there to do? What was different from our work in Strasbourg? Or, was this not exactly what we were supposed to be – a kind of European spaceship of cooperation, without any preference for one particular culture, country or political system, which had landed in Budapest, but might as well have landed in Bratislava, Vilnius, Kraków or Bucharest? Now that we had the European Youth Centre Budapest, we asked ourselves why on earth the Hungarian authorities would have gone through all the trouble of rebuilding the Hotel Ifjúság and of accepting the cost of its maintenance for an indefinite period, if there was no added value to the country. But is a European organization entitled and able to provide added value to one member country alone? Convincing answers had to be found to these questions, and answers could not consist of empty words. An example of cooperation which was also of practical value and which could set standards of cooperation in the areas of learning, cultural life, youth policy development, research and youth and community work had to be developed.

This is what the youth field in the Council of Europe is about and this is what the European Youth Centre Budapest had to be about. The youth field of the Council of Europe, one of the last

remaining socio-topes of co-management in Europe and probably the only example of such within a European or international organization, had widely discussed these questions, and support for the 'EYCB project' was not unanimous at all times. Only success would convince doubters and provide the necessary majorities for staff and budget decisions to be pushed through for the benefit of the Centre. Among those to be convinced, there were countries who were quite convinced of the concept of a 'Second European Youth Centre', but who did not agree with its being located in Budapest. Why not in any other town one could care to mention? Other countries, NGOs and European civil servants opposed the idea of the establishment of a fixed building with high running costs. What about an itinerant structure, a kind of internationally mobile training and meeting system, a 'decentralized centre', they asked? Was this not much more economic, a modern approach corresponding to networking and the latest new information and communication technologies? But then, did we not already have a European Youth Foundation as a well-functioning decentralized system of youth cooperation? Some felt that a new centre would mean enlarged administration and that was not what they wanted: they wanted the bulk of the money for activities and projects and this required downsizing the administration.

At times the front of the sceptics was quite strong. What did the defenders of the project have to say? They argued with the importance of visibility and symbolic policy, with the need to create a collective memory of youth and community work cooperation, the value of professional support through in-residence staff, the need for institution building and the multi-functionality of the planned building which would not only host activities, but be a living organism, a small world of the Council of Europe in Buda-

pest. Many of the pro-arguments overlap with the reasoning given for the creation of the North-South Centre for Global Interdependence and Solidarity in Lisbon, the Centre for Modern Languages in Graz and the Council of Europe offices in new member countries. Young people were an ever-growing group of learners and social players in Europe – one home was not enough for them. They needed Budapest and Strasbourg. It was only logical that the Council of Europe would not operate in a Euro-centric manner and concentrate everything in Strasbourg. It was time to accept working and living within Central Europe.

But there were further confusions. This Centre in Budapest – was it a regional centre? Or was this just an attempt to lower costs, particularly travel costs? This did not meet the approval of the statutory organs at all – both Budapest and Strasbourg had to be open to participants from all signatory parties to the Cultural Convention; there was no question of allowing ‘Eastern’ or ‘Western’ exclusivity. A more complex way of situating the Centre had to be found.

Firstly, the building, so generously given over to the Council of Europe by the Hungarian authorities, had to serve the neighbourhood, the local community and Hungarian young people at large. This was to be achieved by creating a ‘Youth Information Centre’ on the premises of the EYCB. The project took some years to come to fruition, but today the *Mobilitás* Information Service is successfully running, housed in the building and working in close cooperation with the overall programme. Secondly, for the Centre to be economically viable, a considerable percentage of its income had to be earned by letting out the Centre for use by NGOs, agencies and international organizations with their seat in Budapest.

Similarly, public authorities were encouraged to use the Centre. For a while the idea that the Centre could be used by Hungarian organizations at a preferential rate was even considered, but it was something that did not come about in the end due to Council of Europe financial rules. However, this was a European Centre and it was only logical that the Council of Europe would make wide use of it. Hence the Centre also developed cooperation schemes with the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, which now regularly organize committee meetings in the EYCB. The same logic applied to other Council of Europe services and European conferences and meetings of political significance.

But all these activities were to stand back when it came to the priority use of the Centre: the running of international study sessions and training courses for young people. This was the *raison d'être* of the place and all other activity formats were to be run in parallel. For the management of the EYCB it is, however, frustrating to run a kind of programme mosaic around the ordinary programme of the youth field. It is interesting to see how in the last few years the programme has become a unit, and how much the various activities fit together, both in terms of content and methodology, regardless of who is the owner of the activity. It was only a question of time until this approach would generate the Human Rights Education Programme and the 'Compass' process, today the trade mark of the house and, indeed, of the Directorate of Youth and Sport.

In administrative terms, the running of the Centre was not always a joyride. Of course, a structural problem with all organizations, the centre does not trust the periphery. So I found myself con-

fronted with the unforgettable statement of one high official in the finance department: “We will watch you like an insect in a jam jar”. I had not expected otherwise. Much water went under the Chain Bridge before the Centre had appropriate staff resources, integrated financial procedures, full access to the intranet, working computers, control and evaluation mechanisms, the right kind of service companies, operational interpretation equipment and up-to-date conference technology, a well developed infrastructure, a pleasant restaurant and, in summer, a nice garden. After the recent refurbishment of the facades and the substantial reconstruction work ordered by the Hungarian authorities, the EYCB looks to me like a real gem: a fantastic work facility very well managed by the present Executive Director and her staff.

Which leads us back to one of the questions at the beginning: What is the added value of the EYCB to the Council of Europe and to the Hungarian authorities, the two bosses of the place? To tell you the truth, I do not think that the interests of both bosses are different from each other. Hungary has, with this Centre, shown altruism and generosity, but it has also shown that a modern nation needs networks and agencies, places and spaces where the European dimension of citizenship can be negotiated, learned and be seen as a living practice. Modern nations need to work on non-formal education, civil society, evidence-based childhood and youth policies; they need to handle intercultural societal developments, dialogue and learning schemes; they need to create access for minorities and to demonstrate and celebrate diversity. This can be done in many ways: the 33-year history of the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg has certainly been a very successful one. It is only logical to have given this approach a second incarnation in Budapest.

It will have to be seen how the EYCB develops with the times. The Human Rights Education Programme is now a cornerstone, and the ordinary youth programme of the Council of Europe is running practice, as are the self-financed activities. Will there be a regional component, particularly in view of South Eastern Europe? Will the debate on the changing learning habits of young people, the Life Long Learning Process and the items related to a knowledge-based society win broader space? The EYCB has done a lot of work on violence prevention and created large visibility for its 'Living Library' concept – will this be extended? And items such as unemployment and a new concept of work, leisure and family – will they be looked into more? The EYCB has its hands full. But to me it is also like a bicycle, which will fall over when not in motion. I trust in its capacity to face the future and wish it all the best for the next decade.

To come back to my visit to Budapest in 1966 – I never thought that one day I would have a home in this place. I had one, for almost four years. But even having been back in my second hometown Strasbourg for quite some time now and enjoying my life here – to say it in the words of a song by Marlene Dietrich, "... I still have a suitcase in Budapest".

‘The Campaign on Diversity, Human Rights and Participation: ‘All Different – All Equal’ – 10 Years After’

This is an excerpt from an internal paper prepared by Peter Lauritzen to encourage reflection among colleagues at the Directorate of Youth and Sport on the raison d'être of the Second European Youth Campaign 'All Different – All Equal' undertaken by the Council of Europe's youth sector from 2006 to 2008. This more conceptual piece was later published along with internal organizational considerations, in a working document that was used to present the Campaign concept to the co-managed Statutory Bodies of the Directorate of Youth and Sport and other sectors of the Council of Europe.

ON ACCESS AND INCLUSION

Access and Inclusion – this is, in a nutshell, what all policy with and for young people is about. ‘All Different – All Equal’ was the slogan chosen as a logo 10 years ago, when the Council of Europe ran a big youth campaign against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance. It cannot be said in a shorter way or more precisely that all human beings are different as to their individuality, their talents, their gifts and their potential, but that they are all equal before the law, as citizens and with regard to their Human Rights as enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights.

He who reduces political language to difference only, will come out as an individualist and social Darwinist; he who does the same with regard to equality will end up as a collectivist. It is only by keeping the concepts of difference and equality in balance that one can speak of a fair and just society.

But to mobilize the positive energies of young people to the best of their potential in learning, active citizenship and employment, public policy has to create and maintain equality of opportunity, in other words: access to education, access to leisure time facilities, access to citizenship, access to the labour market. And this can only happen if it is inclusive of young women, inclusive of minorities, inclusive of disabled young people and inclusive of young people living on the margins of society.

There cannot be a youth policy providing benefits for only a few; an exclusive youth policy would be wrong and racist by nature. However, reality shows a different picture. The gap between the educated and the less educated widens, jobs are not for everybody and certainly not the qualified ones, and all kinds of discriminations spread.

This is where the elements of the campaign have to come together – it needs to be an anti-racism campaign, because it is inclusive of all groups of young people hit by aggression and discrimination; it needs to be a Human Rights campaign, because it is based on the respect of human dignity and it calls on public authority, the media and the population at large to stand up for this respect; it needs to be a Participation campaign because it promotes a fair and just policy for and with young people as a result of social co-production between civil society and public authority.

Three entrances to arrive at the core of the campaign have been suggested: Diversity as a condition for cultural and social life, the promotion of Human Rights, and Participation as the concept of active democratic citizenship. Indeed, there is a lot of work to be done on all three items. But how are they connected?

This is where access and inclusion come in. If progress on providing access for all young people can be made and if all of them can be included in the full range of public policy offers, the prerequisite to achieve progress within the three dimensions of the campaign exists. If one imagines the campaign as a circus with simultaneous activities in three arenas, there needs to be something which is common and which makes up the circus: the fight against racism, antisemitism, islamophobia, sexism, nationalism, gypsism, homophobia, xenophobia and intolerance. All these 'isms' stand for different concepts of exclusion, be they ethnic, territorial, spiritual, societal, physical or economic. The best way of limiting their devastating effect on public opinion, politics and the life of people is to provide access to education and work, to the protection of human rights and dignity, to cultural life and to active citizenship.

ON SOLIDARITY – SOCIAL COHESION – GLOBALIZATION

Out of the three values of the French revolution '*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*' (Liberty, Equality, Solidarity) it seems that *fraternité* (solidarity) and *égalité* (equality) have become the big losers during the nineties of the last century. Much of what youth work is about has to do with empathy, solidarity and responsibility. These are 'youth work' core values; they are acquired through non-formal, informal and social learning within youth organizations, in neighbourhoods, in sport and leisure activities and within Euro-

pean and international youth exchanges, work camps, seminars and voluntary work. There was a time, where this work was mainstream. Is this still the case?

The youth field is increasingly under pressure to prove that it is useful, that it produces added value and that it can still be justified to spend public finance in this field. There is fiscal pressure on all public spending which cannot prove a 'good return' effect, and 'economism' has become almost a new ideology. All public authorities need to adapt to severe budget cuts; as a result of increasing health and social costs and the high costs of dealing with massive unemployment, it has become tough for civil society organizations to keep levels of appropriate funding going.

However, one can almost physically feel the needs of citizens, young or old, to live in a society, which provides guidance, a sense of belonging and a minimum of decent living conditions. 'Economism' or neo-liberalism is not the answer; this becomes an agreement across political boards. Guidance, a sense of belonging and a minimum of decent living conditions are prerequisites for participation. If one tries in this context to speak of 'solidarity' then the answer will be that this is an ideology which is loaded, old-fashioned and is a non-systemic concept. So people speak of 'social cohesion' instead, which is fine but in the end it is also programmatic. How far have many of our societies already disintegrated? Where do societies stand today between the poles of 'freedom' and 'security'? Which pole attracts people more?

A campaign is not a discussion club; actors in this campaign need to agree on its character as outlined above and on the necessity to link the concepts of solidarity and participation with individual

freedom and cultural production. This is not easy, because it demands a constant effort to create a balanced relationship between these concepts: if one of them is exaggerated, it becomes insignificant and throws over the whole system.

Not everywhere in Europe, but certainly in its traditional centre (the periphery is in better shape) it has become obvious that many young people feel distant to or even ignore European institutions and governments and, even worse, they also feel ignored by these governments and European institutions. So they create their own fields of participation and social action, outside the political spectrum. The phenomenon is known; what is the Council of Europe going to do about it?

The answer of the Council of Europe is the following: continued cooperation between research, civil society and public authority, even if it is sometimes tough. It is necessary to distinguish structural change within industrial production and distribution (a permanent process), the influence of globalization, European integration and European and international cooperation. These are all different matters, but to citizens they appear like one big cloud of threat. An important job of political education is to demystify these processes, to identify the place for citizenship, to keep young people as social actors and not to lose sight of the European Project, which for the Council of Europe is a really pan-European Project of justice, decent living conditions and democratic security within a culture of peace.

‘European Youth Development and Policy – the Role of NGOs and Public Authority in the Making of the European Citizen’

This article was co-authored with Irena Guidikova, at the time Research Officer at the Youth Directorate, and published in Jacobs, Francine, Lerner, Richard M., Wertlieb, Donald. (Eds.) (2003). ‘The Handbook of Developmental Sciences, Vol. 3, Promoting Positive Youth and Family Development, Community Systems, Citizenship and Civil Society’. United States: Sage Publications Inc. Books. It draws heavily on two speeches made in 2001 about the relationship between public authority and civic associations, also published in this volume.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the changing context of non-profit organizations and associations in the enlarged Europe from a Council of Europe viewpoint. To introduce this discussion, it is useful to note that in 2001, France celebrated the 100th birthday of the law of 1901, a milestone for democratic development in the country. The birthday marks the recognition of non-profit organizations; the law gave them status and is, in a way, the beginning of civil society in a very traditional country and at the same time, at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the authoritarian state or even plain dictatorship was the rule in many countries of the old continent.

Today, France registers 880,000 associations, and 740,000 of them do not have a single paid staff member – living proof of the attraction and effectiveness of voluntarism and voluntary service. Half (46%) of the sector is financed by voluntary contributions and the other half (54%) by public authorities. In comparison, in the United States, 1.14 million associations employ more than 10 million paid members of staff, who manage to make 100 million volunteers invest 4 hours per week to their specific cause, a remarkable turnout, compared to the investment. The comparison is incomplete, as in France more than 100,000 paid staff work in the voluntary sector, but they are usually employed by public authorities and do not appear within the statistics of organizations. This introduces a first problem: a description of the associative or NGO sector in Europe will have to constantly reflect the interrelation between public (state) authority and the NGO sector; the sector cannot be described in isolation. Furthermore, this relationship may be very different between European countries, simply because these countries attach significantly different importance to civil society, citizens' initiatives, and the role of associations. The types may range from paternalistic, authoritarian models of sometimes-unacceptable dependency, to equal and fair sharing of clearly identified tasks between NGOs and the state (e.g. in the health sector).

The significant changes in Europe, and not only there, after the breakdown of the Berlin wall, have added to the problem of forming a proper picture of the situation. In the larger Europe of today, more than 20 countries can be considered transition countries, with the relationship between state authority and civil society in transition.

EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL SOCIETY

With the emerging role of European organizations – first the Council of Europe in 1949, an interstate organization that emerged from the shadows of Auschwitz and the devastation of the World War II and with a strong Human Rights commitment, to the development in 1954 of the organizations that led eventually to the European Union (EU) in its present form (Coal and Steel Community, EURATOM, European Economic Community) – NGOs have established specific patterns of cooperation that will be my main reference point in reporting current trends and developments in the NGO sector in Europe.

The Council of Europe established two lines of cooperation with civil society from the outset. One was to the workers' movement as organized in trade unions, and one was to entrepreneurs. This principle of associating capital and work became a widely recognized and practised cooperation with social partners, both inside member countries and in European institutions (c.f. Economic and Social Committee, European Union). The Council of Europe recognized and cooperated with NGOs for a long time. There are ways of obtaining Consultative Status with the organization, and they cooperate in a number of ways, ranging from a simple exchange of information to established rights of observation in intergovernmental committees, to concrete cooperation projects, and, in probably the most far-reaching example, to a co-management arrangement between governments and youth NGOs for the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation. This system will celebrate 30 years of effective work in early summer 2002, and it is alive and well.

Meanwhile, the Council of Europe consists of 43 member countries, following the accession of Armenia and Azerbaijan in January 2001. The Federation of Russia is a member, and the eastern border of the organization is actually Japan. Only 12 years ago, this border was somewhere alongside the German and Austrian border, which raises the question of whether not only the citizens in Europe but also politicians and the media really understand how profoundly the continent has changed in a very short time. The Council of Europe has thus become a large pan-European Human Rights organization, with its European Convention on Human Rights and the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg now a constitutional reality on a continental scale. The main objectives of the organization are the promotion of democracy and fair elections, pluralism, cultural diversity, social cohesion, the rule of law, Human Rights, and minority rights.

To provide the service for the citizens for which it is meant, the organization constantly refers to the concept of civil society, and it is through further discussion of this term that I would like to comment on associations and the European construction, as in a 'European House' of 43.

I distinguish three basic concepts of civil society, which are not always clearly set out and consequently are frequently confused. The first one originated with the philosophers of the Scottish enlightenment and strongly influenced the French revolution and the resulting concept of laicism – a secular state. There is no one instance of moral unity any more, private property is possible, and associations (guilds) can be founded and will enjoy protection by the state. Common values are reduced to the minimum number that the state needs to function. In this view, as Wimberley points

out, civil society does not imply democracy; it is not bound to particular values. It is simply society minus state. And it can mean anything 'not state' – political parties, businesses, associations, organized crime, and so forth. This view is furthered by excluding market forces from the definition, so that civil society becomes society minus state minus the market, which was seen during the height of the social movements in the Eighties.

European and international organizations, and the Council of Europe in particular, have changed this rather negative identification (society minus...) radically, and have linked the concept to common and universal values and to Human Rights. Civil society organizations become, in this context, vectors of democratic life, of the rights of the individual, of social justice, and of the environment. They come, in a way, before the state, and for some protagonists of this understanding, the state should become a service organization to achieve agreements within the civil society. There are heavy disagreements on this viewpoint, even between member states of the European Union, and the present debate on citizenship in Europe versus European citizenship will certainly move into new and yet undiscovered territory. Whatever the outcome, this second concept of civil society defines its subject as a community of values.

The third concept is most prominently represented and researched by Lester N. Salamon (1999) of the John Hopkins Centre of Civil Society Studies, Baltimore. In this view, we consider civil society as the economy of the non-profit sector – the fastest growing sector of the world economy, according to Salamon's studies in 20 countries in the Americas, Asia, and the enlarged Europe. This approach was discussed by Jeremy Rifkin when he observed that the birth of capitalism in America was preceded by the associative

movement of the nineteenth century, composed of religious communities and all the networks and traditions brought to the New World by the new citizens, who came largely from Europe. This associative patchwork created the trust necessary to establish business relations and was inseparably connected to economic development. Today, Salamon tells us, we witness a global development of the same sort, comparable in its historic importance only to the formation of modern nation states in the nineteenth century.

What one can observe in many of new member countries of the Council of Europe in Central, Eastern, and South Eastern Europe (and, frankly, in some old ones as well) is a free mix of the concepts of civil society as outlined so far: the value community is referred to for political declarations and Sunday talks; the first – ‘value free’ – concept is, however, common practice, and the third concept remains an inaccessible vision. The reason for this situation is that the countries referred to here are functioning in several stages of development at the same time – a double reality, because this is also true inside the countries as well. Some countries do actively prepare for the knowledge society, for a post-modern service economy, and consequently for an ever-increasing role for the non-profit sector – the Netherlands being the most prominent example, with 16% of their GNP already produced by the non-profit sector (Salamon, 1999). However other European countries struggle with unacceptable poverty levels; some would be happy to extend their economy in terms of the second modernity, and others again have little or no tradition in imagining any kind of legitimate power outside the state apparatus. There is a job to be done here: if one wants to contribute successfully to civil society development being spread equally across Europe, some very strong links have to be created.

VALUES, NON-FORMAL EDUCATION, AND CITIZENSHIP

The first one is, indeed, to make sure that working for the values of the Council of Europe, which is equivalent to working for the principles of universal human rights, for equity and fairness, and against any position of religious, ethnic, national, or cultural superiority, is a prerequisite to forming a sustainable social and economic order permitting citizenship. Only the acceptance of this bond between values and the social fabric allows a chance for creativity, entrepreneurship, and solidarity to emerge in the civil society and thus create the basis for a growing economy.

This means, on the other hand, that arguments such as, “first we build the economy, then we see how much we can afford in education and associative life” are outdated; they describe a view in which Marxism and neo-liberal capitalism surprisingly meet in their assessment. Today, the relationship between the level of general education and societal activity and economic development can no longer be overlooked, and this gives an enormous importance and responsibility to the associative movement as the main provider of non-formal education and a key player in educational reform.

This makes non-formal education the other link. Participation has to be learned, as does democratic culture and the acceptance of minorities. Learning to be, acquiring life skills, developing an individual quality in tune with social qualifications, defending an interest, advocating specific agendas, and forming coalitions and teams, all make up the curriculum of non-formal learning. This has been the educational approach of the associative movement since it first appeared as a political subject, be it as *education populaire* (popular education) in France, workers’ education, community work, or

any other tradition of out-of-school education, including company training, elsewhere.

Having pointed to the economic and educational dynamics of the sector, I would like to approach the more difficult territory of possible deteriorations, deformations, and dangers facing associative life. I would also like to discuss some trends that deserve critical observation.

Associations in general and the non-formal education sector specifically are more and more organized to serve aims and objectives that are exclusively defined in economic terms, such as increasing the flexibility and mobility of the labour force. How does this fit with the democratic origins of the associative movement, its specific curriculum of 'political' education, and the insistence on being autonomous when setting aims and objectives, as has been so far in European practice? Are new alliances possible? How far should they go? Or are the economic aims so overriding that there is no option but to follow the trend?

One observation on the growth of the third sector and the non-profit economy is its enormous need for human resources and, consequently, a dominating culture of management thinking and steering human and financial resources, together with a competitive market approach. Many associations have become subject to this process and behave in terms of the market. One can observe a similar trend in public administration. What will happen when the market is everywhere, without distinction of institutions, public welfare, social networks, and community values? When all that humans do becomes a product, what has the associative movement become then?

EFFECTS ON THE ASSOCIATIVE MOVEMENT IN EUROPE

The trend for some time now has been the effort of public administration to reduce costs, or create a lean state. However, not all services provided by public authority can suddenly be abandoned. They must be provided by associations instead. In Europe, this is a new and sometimes shocking development. What used to be a public service is now outsourced to a private company, which has grown out of an association that has adapted and taken exactly the approach public authority needs to get a job done. But, was there not something else? Wasn't the role for associative life something one had to struggle for 'against' the state? What kind of situation is this, in which public authority and the market define the available role for associations and not these associations themselves?

There is always the risk that the associative movement loses its very legitimacy if it develops into a service structure for the powers that be. In this sense, the third-sector economy is a two-faced phenomenon: on the one hand it gives the associative movement ample opportunity to show its economic and educational strength; on the other hand, it may even out all original, democratic, and emancipatory characteristics in the name of a saleable market product or a good public service.

It seems to be understood in Europe that there is a transnational and global dimension to this development. This is why there is work done on the institution of the transnational association and its crucial function in promoting intercultural learning and examples of good democratic practice in Europe. There is also a movement, strongly supported by European Parliament, to create a Eu-

ropean Charter of Associations, providing status and recognition at the same level as that enjoyed by the social partners already.

All these developments will culminate in one big new project: the making of the European citizen. European unity slowly but steadily progresses into a currency union, a social and fiscal union, a supranational system of business law, and a European bureaucracy with very far reaching competences.

The constitutional process is somewhat indirect, but with 15 countries already members of the union, four to six to follow during the next four years, and a total of 31 members envisaged at the end of the decade, the political and administrative process of uniting Europe will seriously have to catch up with the democratic deficit it creates compared to the national political process. This may sound artificial, but after having made Europe, one has to make Europeans. This is where the discussion of European citizenship and the role of the civil society in the emerging Europe come into play.

European citizenship means, for young people in Europe, ...to develop a sense of space and place in contemporary Europe, the skills required to be active agents for change and development, and the knowledge to make informed choices within this context (Williamson & Hall, 1999).

This implies interdependency between citizenship and community, and it leads to the discussion of shifts in the classical understanding of citizenship being associated to a nation state and/or a territory alone. I follow Richard Sennett and Saskia Sassen (1998) in their assessment that there is a global process of de-

nationalization underway. This occurs through the uniformity of consumer habits, work organization, migration, and the ways chosen to organize life around the house, children, and work by women today. One can draw a picture of this middle class family with computerized workplaces, largely similar architecture of the living space, similar time spent in commuting, and almost identical offers in supermarkets and shopping spaces. It would look much the same in Toronto, Tokyo, Tel Aviv, London, Sao Paulo, or Cape Town. In Europe, there is also, in addition to the globalization of working life, family life, and consumption, a clear tendency to share the old 'indivisible' sovereignty of the nation state both with increased regional and municipal power as with the slowly growing supranational competences of the European Union as outlined earlier. Such processes lead, paradoxically and somewhat logically at the same time, to exactly the opposite movements – xenophobia, nationalism, racism, provincialism, refusal, and societal nihilism.

TOWARD EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

The construction of citizenship in Europe and the beginnings of a community life between European nations and across the borders, are rational and reasonable ways of dealing with the challenges of the future, but they take place against a tableau of fears, suspicions, nostalgia, arrogance, and narrow-mindedness that cannot be talked away and often manages to mobilize more energies and emotions than the basically 'cold' project of European political and economic unity. How can education contribute to understanding this mixed picture better? How can 'citizenship' be thought of in multidimensional terms? What can the role of NGOs and associations be in this context?

Ulrich Beck's (1999) term 'reflexive society' is useful in promoting this understanding further. This term describes the permanent interpretation of social and political concepts through the society itself (i.e. the media, political actors, the research community, and people themselves). This means that all definitions are approximations, they are contextual and like 'material' to the democratic process. This again allows for a new discussion of civil society issues outside the national context and prepares for the global and transnational construction that will be progressively needed to bring the democratic organization in tune with the supranational and global mode of business and bureaucratic reality of Europe today.

So far I have discussed various concepts of civil society in Europe, some trends of the associative movements, some new challenges, and as the first and most important one, the construction of European citizenship. Next, I would like to focus this debate on young people in Europe. Within this reality, we find the Council of Europe, the European Union, and UNICEF as the main players with regard to youth and childhood policies or, to integrate both approaches, policies for 'young people', which, in the understanding of UNICEF, includes the 13- to 17-year-old.

To do this also in terms of specific aims and objectives, I have tried to integrate existing texts as they have been voted and authorized within the last 5 years by the three organizations mentioned and within the European Youth Forum, a large European lobby and advocacy forum, composed of 96 international youth movements and national youth councils and with an impressive record of influencing European and United Nations (UN) organizations (www.youthforum.org). I would call this an integrated young people's agenda for youth, childhood, and family policies in Europe.

OVERALL GOAL OF THE AGENDA

Young people shall have opportunities to fully develop their individual and social capacities in a safe environment, and an enabling culture by participating in the development of democratic, human rights-based, interethnic societies. Young people shall be empowered to take responsibility in the transformation of countries in transition. Realizing this goal for young people will contribute to human development and rights by maximizing the resource that young people represent in their communities and societies; breaking intergenerational patterns of poverty, socio-economic exclusion, gender and ethnic discrimination, exploitation, and abuse; preventing public health hazards, including HIV/AIDS; and decreasing the numbers of particularly disadvantaged youth and protecting their rights. Young people, including the most marginalized and disadvantaged, should be able to do the following:

- develop their physical, intellectual, and psycho-social capacities to their full potential and develop values that promote equity, peace, interethnic tolerance, justice, human rights, and positive gender relations;
- participate in the formulation and implementation of youth policies through public authorities, youth associations, specialized agencies, and youth information systems, based on their evolving capacities;
- participate in the development of and have access to a range of opportunities and services that are fundamental to their development and to their ability to contribute to their families, communities, and societies;
- live and learn in safe and supportive environments and contribute to meeting and protecting the rights of future generations.

Implementation

Meeting and protecting the development and the participation rights of young people is important because it will enable them to do the following:

- play an active role in the decisions that affect their lives, their families, communities and society at large, including national democratic processes; contribute to their families and communities, based on their evolving capacities and with appropriate recognition and remuneration for their efforts; support each other; and be a force for positive change in their families and societies;
- develop and maintain mutually respectful, equitable, and responsible relationships, particularly as these relate to gender; avoid discriminatory attitudes and behaviour, and develop human rights;
- develop the necessary skills and capacities that they will need to avoid situations that undermine their rights, such as exploitative and hazardous work conditions, sexual exploitation, and domestic and other forms of violence and abuse;
- take full advantage of the opportunities that are available to them in a changing world, including globalization and the information/communication revolution, and help them adapt and cope with the challenges that they face during their transition to adulthood and as adults;
- develop health-promoting attitudes and practices and make choices, now and in the future, that enable them to avoid the high-risk behaviours and settings that give rise to a range of problems, such as HIV/AIDS, STDs, early marriage, and pregnancy; the use of illicit drugs, alcohol, and tobacco, accidents; and violence, that have implications for their generation and the next;

- become healthy, literate, and productive adults who can provide positive role models and mentoring for subsequent generations.

Key Objectives Within European Programmes

To achieve their full potential and to contribute positively to their society, young people need to participate in and benefit from a range of policies and programmes. Adequate financial and human resources need to be made available to ensure that young people can do the following:

- develop their physical, intellectual, and psycho-social capacities to their full potential and develop values that promote equity, peace, interethnic tolerance, justice, human rights, and positive gender relations;
- develop and practise life skills, with the support of parents, schools, NGOs, and youth organizations that help them cope with peer pressure and develop self-esteem, including critical thinking, decision making, social responsibility awareness, social interaction skills, communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, and other psycho-social competencies;
- have ongoing access to relevant and reliable information¹;
- have access to youth, sports, music, and other leisure facilities that take into consideration the specific needs of young people living with disabilities;
- participate in the formulation and implementation of youth policies through public authorities, youth and student associations, specialized agencies, and youth information systems, based on their evolving capacities;

¹ Information from a variety of sources, including parents, peers, service providers, youth and student associations, international organizations, and the news and entertainment media, including age-appropriate and gender-sensitive information on sexual and reproductive health, illicit drugs, alcohol, tobacco, accidents, and violence.

- ensure that young people participate in decisions that affect their lives, their families, and their communities, that they support each other as they face the challenges and opportunities of the transition into adulthood;
- ensure young people's participation in the development and provision of youth-friendly health and counselling services, child-friendly schools, peer programmes, news and entertainment media programmes directed at young people, and in the regular collection, analysis, and widespread dissemination of quantitative and qualitative data on the status of youth at sub national and national levels;
- provide training for adults, including parents and service providers, to create opportunities and support for youth participation;
- participate in the development of and have access to a range of opportunities and services that are fundamental to their development and to their ability to contribute to their families, communities, and societies;
- provide equal access to quality formal and non-formal education and training;
- develop livelihood/employment skills with support from a range of partners, including parents, teachers, youth organizations, NGOs, and the private sector;
- have equal access to employment opportunities that are appropriate to their evolving capacities, contribute to their development, and are adequately remunerated;
- have equal access to youth-friendly health and counselling services²;

2 Services should provide timely and appropriate health care for young people, including voluntary and confidential HIV prevention information, testing, and counselling; adequate rehabilitation from the use of illicit drugs and tobacco; and counselling and support for adolescents exposed to violence and abuse.

- have a distinct (juvenile) justice system that includes adequate attention to delinquency prevention, systems of diversion from the formal justice system, and an emphasis on restorative justice and reintegration;
- have access to youth work provision;
- live and learn in safe and supportive environments and contribute to meeting and protecting the rights of future generations;
- participate in and benefit from the development, implementation, and monitoring of policies and legislation that promote and protect their rights;
- benefit from supportive societal values and norms (gender equity, respect for diversity, democratic decision making) that contribute to their health, education, and development and counter harmful traditional practices that undermine their rights.

For particularly disadvantaged and marginalized young people, it will additionally be important to provide the following:

- opportunities for a second-chance education for young people who have never been to school or dropped out of school, support alternative approaches to creating safe and supportive learning environments, and ensure the inclusion of young people with disabilities, those affected by HIV/ AIDS, adolescents leaving care, and other disadvantaged youth;
- support programmes that promote reconciliation and reintegration of young people affected by war and other forms of conflict and violence, especially for refugee and internally displaced (IDP) children and youth and young demobilized soldiers;
- programmes to meet the psycho-social needs of disadvantaged young people, such as those living in conflict situations

- and other emergencies and those exposed to physical or psychological abuse;
- an end to exposure to hazardous and exploitative work conditions and child labour;
 - rehabilitation and integration of young people living with disabilities;
 - programmes that focus on prevention, alleviation, and rehabilitation for young people who are sexually abused or exploited and those exposed to violence.

Strategies

Advocate for the rights of young people, emphasizing that this is a priority area for action that in general has been much neglected and that has wide-ranging implications for the present and the future.

- Generate political commitment for increased attention to protecting young people's rights to development and participation, including the creation of community demand at national level for meeting and protecting the rights of young people and the mobilization of young people themselves.
- Advocate for the mobilization and allocation of sufficient financial and human resources to support capacity development and the acceleration of national policies and programmes.
- Promote a positive vision of young people, their development, and their contributions to society, a vision that portrays young people as a resource to be developed and nurtured, rather than as a set of problems to be solved or high-risk behaviours to be avoided.³

³ The media in particular should promote a positive image of young people and raise debate and dialogue in society about youth issues, including factors that undermine the health and development of adolescent girls and boys.

- Promote a framework for policies and programmes that facilitates the convergence of a range of sectors and partners around young people – a framework that brings people and organizations together to meet and protect the rights of young people.
- Develop and sustain partnerships between member states, international and national organizations, and civil society to focus on young people, including partnerships with youth and student associations, private sector, NGOs, religious institutions, and the news and entertainment media.
- Advocate with and support member states to conduct research/situation analysis on young people and disseminate the results among Stability Pact members and throughout South Eastern Europe.
- Develop consensus about priorities and urge/appeal to/advocate with member states to define national goals, target, and indicators, based on the problems and the particularly disadvantaged individuals and groups identified during the situation assessment and analysis, and develop National Action Plans for Young People.
- Place particular emphasis on the different needs of young people, and mainstream gender considerations throughout the strategies and activities, ensuring also that in all policies and programmes, the rights of the most disadvantaged young people are given special attention.

The preceding points will appear in meetings of the executive body of the European Youth Forum, statutory meetings of the youth field of the Council of Europe, and consultative and research meetings of UNICEF. They meet with no opposition of the European Union, who are presently in the middle of a process

of producing a White Paper on Youth Policy in which much of what is set out here will most certainly reappear.

Youth as a Resource, Not as a Problem

Turning back to the Council of Europe and after some 30 years of youth policy in Europe, it is obvious that between countries coming together at the occasion of the European Conferences of Ministers responsible for Youth, it has been almost impossible to agree on detailed European youth programmes, based on reliable youth policy indicators and carried out with the assistance of NGOs. What has been possible was to draw up conclusions and recommendations on youth mobility, social exclusion, training, youth research, intercultural learning, youth information, and the funding and good administration of all sorts of youth support schemes. The art of the business has always been to agree on instruments and tools of cooperation in the youth field, hardly on substance and detail. There was and is, however, the one bond and conviction between member states and within the NGO community: 'Youth is a resource, not a problem'; and there was and is some common idea that a society without an idea of the situation of its youth is probably a society without an idea of its own future.

But it has not been possible, in particular since 1989 and the end of the Cold War with all its hidden propaganda implications on youth work and youth policy, to produce a transnational analysis on the social situation of young people in all member countries. For this, the economic and social conditions, access to work and qualification, and the freedom of expression of young people are too different between member countries and regions in Europe.

Social cohesion, equality of opportunity, and a life free of the burden to care for daily survival remain, for the time being, promises and visions; they are not reality yet in the greater Europe. However, what needs to be worked on is clear among governments and NGOs. The items are as follows:

- social change and the transformations related to the knowledge society and new technologies;
- education, in particular non-formal education and learning;
- citizenship and participation;
- regional Youth Cooperation: Baltic Sea Cooperation, EURO-MED South Eastern Europe;
- vulnerable youth and social exclusion;
- human rights education and youth empowerment;
- racism and intolerance, violence;
- drugs and substance abuse, healthy lifestyles;
- promotion of youth policy.

National reports on youth and the international reviews drawn up within the Council of Europe so far cover Finland, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Estonia, and Romania. Reports on Luxembourg and Lithuania are under preparation. Already this restricted sample of countries shows significant differences between the countries on these items.

This is why it seems to be more promising and useful at this stage to agree on a number of tools and instruments needed to construct a youth policy. The following elements find agreement in Europe (Utrecht Conference on Youth Cooperation, 1992). Youth policy needs provide the following:

- legislation on youth;
- a state budget;

- national, regional, and municipal youth administration;
- a civil society youth representation, and advisory bodies to the government;
- research on young people;
- a provision for national youth training and leader training;
- national, regional, and local youth information;
- an innovative character to youth work practice.

There is no ‘must’ that only when all eight levels are activated can one speak of a youth policy, but a majority of youth experts would agree that these levels are good indicators of the performance of youth policy measures in member countries of the Council of Europe.

Furthermore, the youth field keeps working with a number of international texts and conventions and follows their implementation at national level. These include the following:

- The Declaration of the United Nations on International Year of Youth ‘Peace, Participation, Development’ (1985)
- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)
- The European Charter on Participation of Young People in Municipal and Regional Life of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities in Europe (1992)
- The Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on ‘Young People and Participation’ (1997)
- The Resolution of the Council and Ministers for Youth meeting within the Council of Europe 8th February (1999)
- The final text of the First World Conference of Ministers of Youth of the United Nations, Lisbon (1998)

These texts are what people make of them. Even if there is no army behind them to make sure that they are followed to the letter, why would youth ministers and authorities, NGOs, and parliaments agree on them when they have already decided to ignore them afterwards?

It is the right of civil servants, experts, researchers, youth leaders, and young people at large to insist that such texts and agreements be followed and implemented. Thus, at the end of the day, one can say that the international community has some understanding of what youth policy is and should be about, what its instruments and levels should be, what can be agreed on under the conditions of international conventions and treaties and what the work priorities should be for the future. These, within the Council of Europe, are clearly outlined as follows:

- Participation
- Non-formal education
- South Eastern Europe
- Human rights education

According to the working method of the organization, these priorities are to be understood as baskets (cf. Helsinki process) that will be filled by projects and activities of NGOs active within these items. These NGOs will be the youth wings of party political, religious, or trade union organizations; they will be organizations of the Scouts and Guides type, YMCA or YWCA, 4-H Clubs, youth exchange organizations, work camp organizations, lifestyle organizations, peace and ecology movements, youth culture organizations, social movements, and educational organizations. The Council of Europe works with more than 200 of them, because the Council works exclusively with and through international secre-

tariats. In the case of the European Union, the numbers are much higher, because the Union includes local, grassroots and national organizations that are in contact with the national agencies for the youth programme. These, however, are larger than the priorities of the Council. Both organizations are running a partnership programme on European-level youth workers training together, and again citizenship and training qualifications are in the focus.

CONCLUSIONS

Today's Youth – Tomorrow's Future

The saying 'today's youth – tomorrow's future' is one of these commonplace sayings that young people in particular can't hear any more. They would like to be at the centre of attention of policy makers and of business and education authorities right now, not in some distant future.

But there is no contradiction in saying this and dealing with young people seriously now and not later. There are some more fundamental considerations behind the analogy of youth and the future.

A society not able to treat its young people as a resource will not have much chance to get on in the global competition of knowledge-based economies, cannot rely on democratic security to last, and will run unprepared into increasingly sharp conflicts about the share of the burden of welfare costs in the future. Societies without an idea about the future of young people will not have much of an idea about their own future, either. The social situation of young people in a country is thus like a special access code to read the future.

This is why it is so dramatic to see a whole generation disappear in some African countries, due to AIDS, to see so many children and youth deprived of opportunities to live and learn in war and conflict zones, and to still witness that a world richer than ever cannot manage to eradicate poverty, famine, and widespread diseases.

Nobody denies that young people can cause problems. Some are delinquents, some live risky lives, some are enclosed in inaccessible youth cultures; there is violence, even racist violence and hooliganism and so on - so what is new? This is what a democratic society and good governance can deal with within the existing legal frameworks. What cannot be dealt with is the growing apathy of young people within the democratic process, a poor preparation for the labour market by the education system, and dropping birth rates literally everywhere, increasingly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

What can we do? Experts and researchers agree today that the notion of 'generation' can hardly be used any more because there are fewer significant distinctions between them. A youthful lifestyle seems to be like a lifelong programme; it is almost absurd: with a constantly aging society the media wants everybody to be eternally young. The 35-year-old unemployed German is clearly not of a young age any more, but remains in the kind of dependency that is so typical for youth status. And the 8-year-old street kid in Calcutta might care for a whole family and be, despite his age, of adult status. What were the 'rites of passage' from youth to adulthood have largely disappeared, and what Margaret Mead (1970) called the 'moratorium' when speaking of the condition of youth has become a rare commodity; the moratorium used to describe youth as the time of social learning and experiment, in which the

dependent child status would gradually change into the responsible adult status. During that time, sanctions would be mild, experiences could be made, and great tolerance toward youth would be the norm.

This is theory today. Ulrich Beck (1999) has introduced the term 'risk society' in this respect, and he has shown that young people today can rise higher and fall deeper earlier and earlier - no moratorium any more. Maybe it is time to revisit the concept of participation. There is a direct relationship between real participatory power for young people and their readiness to get involved in the political process. This means all sorts of things, such as voting rights from the age of 16 (for some, even earlier), learner centredness in education and thus concrete participation in school and university curricula (not in the formal sense of the past, but in the sense of creating production units in learning together with young people), participation in the creation of public spaces in urban environments and a stronger recognition of the consumer status of young people. For politicians, this is easy to overlook. Maybe the elections of tomorrow are won with the votes of the over 60-year-old, but only a few young people can have economic power and influence much beyond the role they are given in public life.

It is also important to better recognize the important role of civil society and of non-profit organizations and of youth organizations therein. The role of the state might become less and less visible and important in the future and what a country can mobilize in terms of voluntary energy can be crucial for fields such as social services, ecology, and education. All this has to do with being able to associate young people to public affairs and to do this with the clear intention to also give them roles and responsibili-

ties very early. Someone who can develop a computer company in the garage can also have their voice in the city council, the person who can understand complex computer software at a young age also has something to say in the teaching of mathematics, and a trendsetter in modern lifestyle sports can also say something on how urban space can be organized better. Youth participation is crucial in overcoming apathy to the political process - it cannot be had cheaply any more; it has to be a real offer to share the power, and it is time that this happened.

The same is true for non-formal education. Much is said and written today about educational reform. For young people it seems to be understood that they need to be better prepared for an ever-changing labour market (flexibility), that their social and communicative capacities need to be more developed, that knowledge of new information technologies is indispensable, and that the knowledge of other cultures in the world and of foreign languages is needed as well. Where the school curriculum does not contribute to reaching these aims, there is the offer of non-formal education as already competently practised for some time within youth organizations.

This is wrong and right at the same time. To prepare for the knowledge-based economy is the job of the entire education system, be it formal or non-formal. All that counts is that a minimum standard canon of what has to be learned is fixed (i.e., mathematics, mother tongue, arts, literature, history) and completed by a participatory method in cooperation with the social partners and young people themselves on what is needed for 'being' (i.e., to be prepared to work, find, and equip a house, sustain oneself, friends, a family, and so on). This might be radical for anybody working

in traditional schools, but it is needed all the same, and all reports tell us that this is the direction in which to move.

Talking of education means also valuing education. It is often said that young people don't want to hear of Europe any more, have no idea of the European Union or of the Council of Europe and of all these international jungles of political, financial and military cooperation schemes. Is this really true? The respect of human rights ranks very high on the priority list of young people, according to many polls; so do a healthy environment and the respect of nature, friendship, and solidarity with the oppressed. These are all items on the agendas of European and international organizations. The youth sector of the Council of Europe runs a very successful Human Rights Education Programme, and young people love it. The 'All Equal—All Different' antiracism campaign was a big success, and the need for young people to be involved in fighting for a fair and equitable, sustainable, and just development cannot be denied. It is for the European and international organizations to bridge the gap, not for the young people. Organizations and institutions get their value from the recognition and involvement of citizens; when they lose it, they have to question themselves first. Consequently, the international community and in particular the Council of Europe is called on to make even stronger efforts to reach the minds of young people through education, community experience, participation, and cultural and social action. This is particularly true in conflict zones such as South Eastern Europe and the Caucasus area, in which the Council of Europe needs to continue and reinforce its commitments with regard to the young people living there.

Youth policies need to be holistic in dealing with the young as unique and resourceful people. Whether they play or go to school,

whether they engage in sports and physical activity, or whether they learn at the workplace, whether they are included or excluded from society, whether they are employed, unemployed, studying, on top of their lives, or suffering – it will always be the one unique young person that is subject to youth policy and policy at large. Youth policies are complex systems of governance, which only too often in history have been oversimplified, reduced to short term purposes and objectives, and ideologically abused. This is why they have to be anchored in universal values of human rights; in objectives such as fairness, equity, and social cohesion; and in concrete tasks such as contributing to civil society and democratic security.

As a result of differences in the history of nations in Europe, youth policies and the understandings of civil society will and do vary from country to country. However, certain trends in contemporary youth policy can be identified at the European level:

1. A growing integration of childhood and youth policies with regard to early adolescence, more particularly the 12- to 16-year-old age range, and an increasing change in language official texts to the child-inclusive notion of ‘young people’.
2. A recognition of the condition of ‘vulnerability’ of young people not only with regard to an age segment, but also concerning gender, minority youth, youth cultures and youth expression, refugee youth and children, lifestyles, and exclusion.
3. A close relationship of youth policy to welfare and family policy due to having identical problems to solve – the sharing of welfare and health costs between the generations in times of sharply dropping birth rates, new forms of time management between work leisure and

personal life organization, child- and family-friendly pre-school and school arrangements, keeping inclusiveness as the governing principle of social policy, and securing equal access of women to education, jobs, political representation, and the public sphere.

4. A contribution of youth policy to educational reform through the promotion of social learning, out-of-school education, and non-formal learning as part of lifelong learning and by promoting a spirit of active citizenship, entrepreneurship, personal initiative, and community life.

5. A strong tendency towards freedom of cultural expression, creativity, and individuality, which has paved the way for young people today making their mark as media and culture producers in the same way that they have influenced political and social realities in the past.

6. Numerous attempts to find common ground with regard to physical activity and sport in specific youth projects, aimed at developing a sense of fair play and tolerance. This trend is supported by new forms of fun and lifestyle physical activity, which merge with youth culture and community values.

7. The promotion of healthy lifestyles and the prevention of risk behaviour in young people as a fight against self-destruction, violence in daily life, and a negative view of the world and young people's own future.

8. At the European level, an effective organization of regional youth policies in the Barents' Sea region, the Baltic Sea region, South Eastern Europe, and the European Mediterranean region,

which add to already existing schemes such as the Nordic Cooperation, the Benelux Ccooperation, the Franco-German Youth Office, the German-Polish Youth Office, and a wide network of bilateral relations in the youth field.

These trends can be observed in all member countries, independent of their economic and social differences. They should be spotted and systematically organized within a youth policy stocktaking exercise, with the aim of providing data and establishing 'youth policy indicators,' similar to the educational and social indicators used within OECD. This would allow a fresh approach to European youth policy at the beginning of the twenty-first century, which would on the one hand be respectful of existing difference and on the other hand indicate areas of common action between public authority and civil society actors in the youth field.

A Changing Proposal for Cooperation and Coordination of Youth Research

Social theory is expected to help individuals and groups make sense of, and have a better grip on, the changing contexts of their lives. It is no longer available as a tool for manipulating the course of history. More than a decade ago, Jürgen Habermas (Habermas, 1989) proclaimed the end of the 'social utopia' as a leading paradigm of social and political thought and practice. Helmut Hartwig (Hartwig, 1993) called this process **a shift from the social paradigm to a cultural-symbolic paradigm.**

Within the framework of the social paradigm, the family was the main vector of moral/religious socialization; state-managed education systems and agents such as political parties and NGOs guid-

ed young people's political socialization. The media (including the electronic media) and the market are the main factors of economic socialization in contemporary 'Western' societies.

The 'cultural' component of Hartwig's cultural-symbolic paradigm refers to the fact that people are no longer driven by a desire to improve their well-being through collective action. Instead, and this is particularly true for young people, the creation of and playing with their own identity seems to constitute a central objective in most people's lives. The 'symbolic' component refers to the nature of power. Abstract information units, such as stock market and currency rates, consumer prices, unemployment rates, economic growth statistics, budget deficit thresholds, and environmental risks, appear as objectivities that a single government cannot change but that determine rigorously its scope of intervention. In these conditions, individuals' relationship to power becomes largely disembodied, which is translated in phenomena as diverse as a sharp rise in juvenile delinquency and school violence, a rising disinterest in the democratic political game, and a growing influence of the sects (especially in 'transition' countries), to mention just a few.

This is an example of how general social theory can help understand, at least partly, the nature of (post) modern youth. According to economic theory, on the other hand, the concept of youth today is intimately linked to that of sustainable development. Activities, apparently far away from direct production and market exchange, have been proven to affect the functioning of economic systems and their productivity in the long term: ecological challenges, urban crises, social cohesion, human rights protection, inclusion of young people, protection of the elderly, management of

personal psychological problems, and identity crises. The concept of 'sustainable development' has been attached to these new factors. Most European countries are currently facing similar challenges with regard to youth policy. High rates of school dropout and a deteriorating labour market for poorly qualified young people; the emergence of youth unemployment as a structural problem; and the lengthening of the unemployment periods suggest that there is a danger of establishing a perpetual underclass (in some countries there are already three consecutive generations of unemployed). Growing youth delinquency and the striking inefficiency of juvenile justice and prevention systems is another problem common to most of the European states.

The **sustainability argument** is also important for social policy partly because of the need to make policies related, for instance, to education, or redistributive pension schemes, work in the longer run, despite weakening socialization mechanisms and the cultural and welfare gap between generations. Social policy should not fail to acknowledge the structural nature of youth and find new imaginative answers for a better distribution of risks and rights among the age groups. The **modernization** of youth policies will require a transition from a universalistic structure-based approach to one based on individualized assessment of conditions and processes in youth transitions. The difficulty in establishing the structure and content of holistic, transversal youth policy reflects in a way the difficult birth of a theory of youth - its nature, its role in social change, intergenerational relations, and individual development. Youth policy remains largely compartmentalized between administrative departments caring for education, welfare, work, and leisure/culture; youth research is still scattered between scientific disciplines⁴ and national/local projects, and its products are rarely

suitable for international comparative analysis or complex theory development.

Youth research should have a major role in helping understand and constructively address the range of issues discussed earlier in this chapter. In reality, youth research is most often used to explain the growing mismatch between young people's biographies and the institutional structures that govern their transitions to adulthood. To contribute competently to the debate on choices, in terms of social institutions and, particularly, educational and welfare infrastructure that would permit shaping the future society into one which corresponds to young people's cultural individualism while preserving the standards of social justice, equality of opportunity, political participation, and welfare rights, youth research will need much investment and stronger political support.

In some countries, for example in the majority of the Nordic countries, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, and Russia, the status of youth researchers vis-à-vis the public administration is respectable, which results in a high number of surveys funded by the state and local authorities as well as support for academic training in youth research. In other countries, youth research is hardly recognized politically and academically as a sound area of research, and therefore has to share resources with other related disciplines (Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania). It seems that the efforts to develop a programme for research cooperation in Europe raise the awareness and stimulate the government agencies responsible for youth in certain countries to

4 Youth research is naturally an interdisciplinary field, loosely made up of the facts, knowledge, and a theoretical contribution of a range of disciplines such as sociology, gender studies, economics, social policy, psychology, cultural studies, and many more.

take steps towards a more substantial and structured support for youth research.

Youth research institutes exist in Norway, Germany, the Czech Republic, France, Austria, and Romania. In most of the other countries, informal networks of researchers have appeared with the aim of stimulating contacts, flow of information, and negotiations for research funds.

Globally, there are a few national institutions centralizing the storage and diffusion of research information and data – for instance the Australian Clearinghouse for Youth Studies⁵, The U.S. National Youth Development Information Centre⁶, the Canadian (Quebec) Observatory of Youth and Society⁷. Research Committee 34, ‘Sociology of Youth,’⁸ of the International Sociological Association has made an enormous contribution to maintaining contacts and exchange between researchers from both sides of the Iron Curtain and today across the borders of both rich and poor countries. However, detached from operational policy and funding systems, it lacks a means of attracting big numbers (there are only around 100 members at the moment) or structuring and guiding the development of a global, policy-relevant research agenda. The international youth research community can boast a few informal transnational networks, two international journals (*Young and Journal of Youth Studies*), and a couple of large conferences annually. There is an obvious and acute need to establish a youth research coordination agency - at the European level to start with.

5 <http://info.utas.edu.au/docs/ahugo/NCYS/guide.html>

6 www.nydic.org

7 <http://obs-jeunes.inrs-culture.uquebec.ca>

8 www.alli.fi/nuorisotutkimus/ibyr/1_99_editorial.html

In most of the developed countries, broad studies on youth are carried out more or less regularly for the ultimate purpose of informing youth policy making, but researchers are rarely consulted on the potential consequences of policy decisions. The international coordination agency could promote a model for interaction between researchers and public authorities, which could in turn induce a shift of national routines toward a more direct involvement of researchers in the various stages of policy making.

Such a coordination structure would primarily serve the purpose of locating, storing, and diffusing quantitative and qualitative youth research information - in particular 'grey literature' (research reports and conference papers), publications, ongoing projects, funding, and professional opportunities. The Council of Europe has already set up a part of the necessary information infrastructure: the European Directory of Youth Research, available online⁹, provides detailed profiles and contact information on over 400 researchers and 200 research institutions specializing in youth studies. The European Youth Research Bibliography¹⁰ is a pan-European database on scientific publications in the field.

One of the reasons for including youth research cooperation in the programme of the Council of Europe's youth sector has been the opportunities it offers for involving international youth organizations in the dynamics of research management and in research activities themselves to stimulate action research and to reinforce the utilization of scientific data and analysis in international youth work. On the other hand, the oceans of experience

9 www.coe.fr/youth/english/directorysearch.htm

10 <http://eyrb.epm.se>

in intercultural pedagogy, international youth work, leadership and youth structures, youth policy issues reflected in the reports from the training activities of the European Youth Centres, and the work of the youth policy committee are a rich source of material for scientific reflection and analysis. These sources provide a useful basis for evaluating the international transferability of experience and 'good practice' in youth work and youth policy and in turn developing a European agenda for research and practice in the field of youth.

A European (or, for that matter, international beyond Europe) youth research coordination agency would help train a new generation of young academics into the complexities of youth issues and into the methods and techniques of cross-national and cross-cultural research and communication. The Council of Europe's Training Seminar for young social scientists is a very successful pioneer initiative in this respect. The agency should also carry out some developmental work in relation to setting up a European/global agenda for youth research, reflecting current policy priorities and pointing out gaps in the knowledge on certain youth issues. It could also be instrumental in establishing international standards/benchmarks for youth policy, as well as appropriate performance indicators and monitoring mechanisms.

The agency could be the driving force for a further conceptualization of youth policy. Starting from data contained in the National Youth Policy Reviews carried out by the Council of Europe (see earlier), 'ideal types' of youth policy could be drawn to facilitate expert analysis and policy development consultancy, which is now requested by various European countries and potentially useful for transition countries worldwide. These models will by

no means be prescriptive but will enable reflection at national and international level on (a) the interaction between historic/cultural context and structural changes that determine the level of success of youth policy strategies; (b) the interrelation between various policy arenas concerning youth (culture, education, social protection, family, criminal justice); and (c) the development of youth participation in policy making.

An international youth research coordination agency would no doubt commit some resources to encouraging regional networking. For instance, in Europe, research is linguistically, conceptually, and methodologically dominated by an Anglo-Saxon-Nordic paradigm, which alienates research communities from the southern and eastern parts of the continent and leads to a distorted perception of issues and trends at European level. Regional South and East networking would help research communities establish their own discourse and theoretical perspectives, which would then 'communicate' with those dominating at the moment.

Research is a fertile source of innovation in social practice. For instance, action research techniques, which have been successfully experimented with in the Netherlands, have generated imaginative and productive programmes in the field of prevention and social reintegration of marginalized young people. Another research project with a built-in experimental component promises interesting insights into the integration of citizenship and employability concerns in youth participation projects¹¹ and youth-worker training.

11 The 'Youth Policy and Participation' (YOYO) project recently funded by the European Commission will end in 2004.

On the other hand, social research should be encouraged to take a more critical stand towards policy realities and developments – for instance, with regard to the increasing role of NGOs in political decision making, which is changing profoundly the meaning and rules of the democratic game (transparency, accountability, and social control over power).

Research has confirmed that young people's relationship to NGOs is a dynamic one - at a statistical level, there are some variations over time, but the general trends indicate a steady decline in NGO membership and voluntary engagement over the last few decades.¹² However, attempts to seriously mobilize the analytical power of social science to explain this trend are rare and utterly unconvincing. Strong consumerist attitudes, weakening trust in collective decision making structures and processes, and individualizations are among the most often quoted reasons for the decline in youth NGO membership and political participation.

There certainly are other reasons, too. The fact that NGOs are now a recognized partner of governments, and therefore a de facto element of the same political consultation (and even decision making) machinery that young people tend to increasingly mistrust, probably also plays a role for the cooling off between the young and associations. Living predominantly from public funds (especially in Europe), associations have lost to a certain extent their critical edge and anti-establishment appeal.

The non-formal learning dimension of NGOs' activities, although designed to give individuals stronger control over their learning

¹² Eurobarometer studies 34.2, 34.0, and 47.2.

agenda, is still very much 'systematic,' 'supervised,' and 'socializing' to really appeal to post-modern cyber-kids. This non-formal education process (seminars, meetings, preparation of field activities) should not be confused with the informal learning that accompanies any interaction with people or the natural and social environment that, in an NGO context, seems to be particularly rich and stimulating. At a time when formal education activities occupy an increasing portion of young people's lives, strictly informal learning (i.e., totally unintentional and unrecognized as such) has much stronger emotional appeal than any sort of 'guided' and 'planned' activities NGOs could offer.

Furthermore, NGOs' playground and competence often remain local or national whereas young people's identity develops increasingly as global. Although chiefly due to the multiple national and EU programmes for youth mobility and exchange, an ever-growing number of young people participate in activities taking place outside their local context; those young people are still a tiny minority. On the other hand, youth exchanges, work camps, and other forms of collective youth work often tend to encourage young people to look for pragmatic local solutions to global issues (poverty, environmental problems, etc.) rather than making them feel a part of a global youth community sharing the same values and aspirations.

The youth-NGO relationship issue is only an illustration of the types of puzzling question the quickly changing European and global reality presents to societal actors. Answers to those questions can only be found with the help of abundant, reliable, easily accessible research information and knowledge. It is up to the concerned societal actors to make the necessary investment to make sure that this knowledge exists in the necessary quantity, quality, and shape.

REFERENCES

- Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society* (M. Ritter, Trs.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The theory of communicative action* (T. McCarthy, Trs.). Boston: Beacon.
- Hartwig, H. (1993). Youth culture – forever? *Young*, 1 (3).
- Mead, M. (1970). *Culture and commitment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Salamon, L. N., Anheier, H. K., List, R., Toepler, S., Sakolowski, S. W., et al. (1999). *Dimensions of the nonprofit sector*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.
- Sennett, R. & Sassen, S. (1998). *The corrosion of character*. New York: Norton.
- Williamson, H. & Hall, T. (1999). *Citizenship and community*. Leicester, England: National Youth Agency.

‘The White Paper on Youth and the Open Method of Coordination: Challenges for Education, Training, Research and Youth Policy Construction in Europe’

This article considers discussions that took place around the publication of the European Commission’s ‘White Paper on Youth – A New Impetus for Youth’ and was published in Coyote (Issue 6, November 2002), a magazine on issues around youth, training and Europe, published by the Partnership on Youth between the Council of Europe and the European Commission.

Many years of European political and economic cooperation and integration have left their mark on the life situations of young people who grow up within the member countries of the European Union and also in the candidate countries preparing for membership. Mobility schemes for students and young people, freedom of movement of the work force, numerous occasions for experience-based intercultural learning in educational and cultural exchanges, school curricula and university courses on Euro-knowledge and growing media coverage on European matters have prepared a process of overcoming the old divisions of ‘foreign’ and ‘domestic’ policy. The European Union in the first place, but also the economic reality of globalization and the presence of other European and international organizations are

at the origin of new shifts in the understanding of citizenship and an enlargement of the concept of community beyond the nation state.

However, all this also means a kind of ‘banalization’ of the concept of Europe. Most young people, when hearing that this is a rather unique and new historic situation and a model for peace in the world and that this Europe is a ‘champion of values’ (White Paper), will not be too impressed – for them this reality has always been around, so why bother? This form of non-committed acceptance of European realities invites people almost to take a distance to what is felt to be ‘European bureaucracy’ and to deny, in fact, that citizens may have any influence on developments. The situation is potentially destructive and it is not for nothing that through the creation of the Convention and a new approach on governance, the European institutions have given a signal that democracy is at the heart of their concerns and that a ‘citizens’ Europe’ badly needs to see the light of the day.

It is probably not wrong to see the White Paper in this context. Of course, European cooperation on youth matters is not a new thing and there is a reality of European youth work in Europe today, which literally stands on the shoulders of many years of successful programme and training activity within the youth programmes of the Commission, the activities of the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Forum. As a consequence, there are whole tribes of hundreds of NGO representatives, government experts, youth agency staff, youth researchers and trainers and youth workers around, who are working regularly on transnational youth and childhood issues. And, these are followed closely by quite a few

European and UN officials working for the youth field in Brussels, Strasbourg, Budapest, Paris, Geneva and New York. Of course, all of these international youth actors have their own agendas, their own professional profile, speak their own language and pursue their own sets of interests, and all this despite an 'official' language, which constantly underlines synergies and an everlasting spirit of cooperation. The reality presents quite a different picture, sometimes: rupture of information flows for the sake of keeping information monopolies and controlling access, tough competition within the 'youth market' and political differences and personal and institutional jealousies of all kinds. This is not the rule, of course, but only too real for comfort nevertheless. Tribes behave tribally and territories have to be defended; that is all there is to it.

So, a new impetus for European youth is quite timely and my thesis in this short contribution is that the White Paper will make the difference; it is a decisive contribution to overcoming fragmentation whilst being respectful of differences. In saying this I do not judge the content; I can fully understand that many young people might be disappointed with the outcome after the long rounds of consultation. I read the paper differently, like a register on what commands consensus within the Union and well beyond, and I rely on the very existence of the paper and the working method of open coordination, which goes with its further development and the implementation of its proposals. Undeniably, the youth page in Europe is very much 'under construction' and it needs a real common effort of youth workers and trainers, researchers and experts, civil servants and agency workers and young people themselves to at least arrive at laying some foundations to the often quoted construction of Europe.

To do this successfully some answers are needed with regard to the following:

- the enlargement process of the European Union, the emergence of a pan-European dimension in Community policies and the reorganization of the club – who may join, who has to stay out?
- the necessary reform of the education system in view of making young people fit for the reality of a global world, communication and cooperation within the information society, life long learning from a very young age, a new balance of formal, informal and non-formal education and a knowledge-based economy;
- new shifts in the anchorage of loyalty, bonds and a sense of belonging in the local community and the nation-state towards multiple bonding and an ever growing dimension of European citizenship;
- Europe's place in a world of global civil wars with its particular place within the anti-terrorism agenda, responsibility in crisis regions outside the continent as well, military commitments and humanitarian duties on a global scale;
- the future of the 'employment for all' concept and equity and fairness with regard to access to the labour market, to quality vocational training and to second-chance opportunities;
- the promotion of gender equality, minority rights, a culture of Human Rights and the respect of human dignity.

Nobody says that the White Paper contains the answers to the complex problems outlined, but with its dimensions of participation, values, education, employment and autonomy it opens doors to the 'future-lab' Europe will have to become again, if it wants to live up to its ambitions. The White Paper also recognizes the end

of traditional youth trajectories and the reality of a risk society; it is a relatively open document and the best way to respond to its 'participation' chapter would certainly be to participate in its further development.

To do this, 'tribes' will have to leave their territories. One can hear, ever so often, that trainers and youth workers badly need results of good youth research and would like to strengthen the link to research. Researchers again willingly accept working within educational projects; within the Council of Europe they run training activities themselves, accompany training the trainers courses (ATTE) and the citizenship course within the partnership agreement on European level youth worker training, and long term evaluations of specific training courses such as the 'Participation and Citizenship' course. There are growing needs for governments to work with comparable data on youth policy development and to get an idea of the effectiveness of European level trainings. To be in a position to give competent advice on youth policy, European organizations rely on the close cooperation of all relevant youth actors. Hence, within the Task Force Education and Youth of the Stability Pact in South Eastern Europe, such forms of cooperation between researchers (PRONI), NGOs (European Youth Forum, Save the Children, Scouts, Care International), governments (Hungary, Romania, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro amongst others) and European and international organizations (European Commission, Council of Europe, UNICEF, World Bank) have been quite successful in the construction of youth policy, national action plans, training policies and youth project development. Similarly, the Curriculum and Quality Development Group on European level youth worker training brought together trainers, researchers, youth workers, NGO representatives, and Youth for

Europe National Agencies and was chaired by both the European Commission and the Council of Europe. These are real, productive synergies and they inspire hope for an improved climate of cooperation. If the open method of coordination on the White Paper becomes a reality, certain requirements will have to be fulfilled: the partners in the process will have to agree on indicators of youth policy development, they will have to agree on areas where they will promote benchmarking and they will need some monitoring mechanism. For the non-formal educational vocation of the youth field they will have to work on setting standards, defining quality, validating success and achieving a greater recognition of the field within the education system. And they will have to define the place of employment in their youth policies, not to speak of 'neighbouring' policies such as the promotion of healthy lifestyles, housing, sport and leisure and cultural creation.

This is what the White Paper can kick off with; its potential is considerable. When arguing for cooperation and underlining the strong need of incorporating the trainers and the researchers communities in working on the European youth construction, I am nowhere inviting for anything such as pro-European propaganda; far from it. But education is never apolitical and social research is not neutral. At a time of seemingly very heavy insecurity of citizens in Europe with regard to their future, one can witness a surprising success of populist and nationalist attitudes, often also accompanied by hatred and racism. This might be the historically unavoidable backlash to the European reality of today and, thus, paradoxically, almost proof for the rationale of European unity. But without some clear commitment of all actors involved to finding their own way into making Europe a democratic community, these ghosts of the past could take more space than any

of us would like. The White Paper on youth should, therefore, figure in the agenda of European trainings, be used to trigger off discussions, and its further process should be closely followed by the research community and civil society at large.

‘Some Comments and Working Definitions’

This is a paper that Peter Lauritzen shared with colleagues in advance of an ‘in-house seminar’ in January 2000. In-house seminars are sporadically organized by the Directorate of Youth and Sport to provide the whole service with the opportunity to reflect on the strategic direction taken by the youth sector in the light of latest research and policy developments in Europe. This document was authored in two stages, the first during Peter Lauritzen’s end-of-year holidays, which in 1999/2000 were spent in Ashgabat in Turkmenistan, then duty station of his wife Françoise, an official of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. He completed it with the second part upon his return to Strasbourg.

PART 1, 9 JANUARY 2000 ASHGABAT, TURKMENISTAN

I understand the exercise as an occasion to exchange information on a number of key issues, permanently in use in texts and presentations of the Directorate of Youth and Sports. In my understanding the purpose is not to provide colleagues with definitions in a legal or juridical sense. On the contrary, the point is to understand the contextual character of some of these notions, their cultural variations, their production as a result of a construction, their relation to social, cultural and educational sciences and their – often very differing – use within international and European organizations.

The aim would be to achieve an inter-subjective understanding, sharing and possession of terms and concepts amongst staff participating in the exercise, which would be of help in committees, study sessions, meetings, training sessions and publications.

The terms are:

- participation
- non-formal education
- life long learning
- civil society
- Human Rights education
- European citizenship

Three of these are identical with the priorities as expressed in the Work Programme 2000 – 2003; the other three are closely linked. Since we are at the beginning of such work amongst staff and within the new administrative structures concerning the youth field, I underline the personal character of this paper. It is, however, not at all an isolated text, but a sum of reflections shared with NGOs and governments at various occasions within the last two months. As I am writing this in Ashgabat, Turkmenistan, I hope you will not be too critical if my quotation technique is not up to the social science level; I can only refer to the few materials I brought with me and to my memory.

Participation

THE key concept of our work is, 'Youth is a resource, not a problem'. In our way of dealing with this item we find our own identity and the possibility to distinguish our approach from the very valid practices of others in youth work, such as social assistance,

prevention, health care, children's work, sports, and so on. Where there is a participative idea in these practices, we can create links and cooperation; where these are public authority or private activities for young people, without their participation they will not belong to our scope of activity and interest.

This has already been expressed in the Statutes of the EYC and the EYF since their foundation, has been anchored into the co-management feature and has been reinforced in all texts following. In a certain way this is the mission statement of the entire service.

Some important texts in this respect are:

- the UN declaration on International Youth Year, 'Peace, Participation, Development' of 1985;
- the Report on Participation of Young People in Europe of the Parliamentary Assembly by Miguel Angel Martinez and Recommendations, 1985;
- the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- the Liangochien recommendation of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (CLARE) on participation of young people in municipalities;
- the CDEJ Report, 'Participation as a Means of Integrating Young People at Risk into Society', 1990;
- the CDEJ Publication, 'The Participation of Young People', 1997;
- the Recommendation on Young People and Participation by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, 1997;
- the Resolution on Participation of Young People of the European Parliament of 1996;
- the Recommendation of the EU Youth Ministers' Conference in Cork, 1996;

- the Braga Declaration of NGOs preceding the First UN World Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, 1998;
- the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the EU of 15 December 1998.

The list is not complete but sufficient proof that European institutions and the UN have regularly worked on the subject. Going through all the texts they will show two things they all have in common:

1. Participation is a principal of social organization that cannot be reserved to specific spheres; it is all-embracing and needs to be practised at local, regional, national, European and international (global) level. It can also not be restricted by gender, ethnicity, religion, lifestyle or social status.
2. In a nutshell, participation means being involved, having tasks and sharing and taking over responsibility.

One of the more recent publications of the CDEJ, *'Keys to Youth Participation in Eastern Europe'*, by Siyka Kovacheva (1999) contains an excellent introduction to participation. In this introduction reference is made to large divergence in the use of the concept of participation:

- on the one hand, there is the traditional idea of participation as a means of introducing young people to adult values (Parsons, Schelsky);
- on the other hand, there is the approach of 'Juventology' (Mahier, Mitev) emphasizing the role of the young as social actors in times of transition and social change. This approach has recently been confirmed through historiographic

research in France (I will dig the reference out of a December issue of *Libération*), where the distinction is made between ‘puberty’ and ‘adolescence’, puberty being a universal and periodical condition of the young, adolescence being the political awakening of the young generation in the nineteenth century, and ever since then its appearance as a historical subject in revolutions, protests, radical change and societal development.

A position that we should all be able to take a stand on is the classical citizenship-centred position of T.H. Marshall (1952). This approach presupposes awareness of young people of belonging to a social class, gender, religion, or set of beliefs, ethnic origin, a nation, region, etc, that is, of having an accepted space for the development of their identity. Then there are three main elements:

- access to citizenship rights, elections, decisions, etc.;
- eligibility to citizens’ responsibilities, freedom of speech, right to an answer;
- a minimum of decent living conditions, culturally and socially and, of course, materially.

Participation is then the school for democracy, the essence of democracy and the prerequisite to developing a sense of belonging and citizenship and all that at the same time.

This latter understanding is mainly referred to in UN, EU and Council of Europe texts. The first two, almost opposed understandings, have to be looked into as well. Who, when promoting participation, intends to invest into the passive acceptance of adult values through young people, and who consciously promotes the function of young people as actors of social change?

This question we should discuss. And we should be aware of the fact that new dimensions of participation come up and are not treated in our texts: lifestyles, consumption, new technologies, fashion, music, for example. What, in all this, is only ever changing socio-cultural context, peer group attitudes, and so on, and what indicates new dimensions?

Non-Formal Education

A new debate on an old subject. Is it necessary to remind people of the historic fact, that formal/formalized education is the new-comer in the business? Schools and Universities only come up as late as from the thirteenth century; they are the creation of a few monks and religious scholars – so, what was education like before then? Non-existing?

In our field the debate was introduced in a parallel manner into the CDEJ, following the Bucharest Conference, and into the NGOs, more particularly the European Youth Forum, following a strong lobby initiative on the subject carried by the Scouts and Guides, YMCA and YWCA, MIJARC and a few others. Their very comprehensive brochure on ‘Non-Formal Education’ had a certain influence on UN and European organizations. Other elements having an impact on re-discussing non-formal education within the Council of Europe are debates on the forthcoming knowledge society, apparent failures of formal education to prepare young people for the labour market and the risk society, a downgrading of formal education in Central and Eastern Europe and the increasing speed with which knowledge becomes irrelevant. In this situation many items become mixed up: recurrent education, permanent education, further education, life long learning, adult educa-

tion, non-formal education and informal education – not to speak of new forms of vocational training preparing for the acquisition of key qualifications, training, coaching and personal development consultancies.

Here the European Youth Forum proposes to focus on youth work and non-formal education, and to distinguish this from informal education by its planned, intentional and systematic character. Informal education would then be what can be learnt in daily life through the media, the Internet, cultural and social manifestations, individual studies, and so on. Non-formal education is social learning, aiming at the development of social qualifications. Its distinction from formal learning is that there are no certificates and no individual assessments of learning success.

The CDEJ, though only at the beginning of a process, has brought the concept into close connection with social cohesion and brought forward ‘flexibility’ as a main training objective.

These understandings are on the move. They are only preliminary agreements anyway, so nobody can prevent us from going further. Lasse Siurala, in his presentation before the Joint Meeting, put ‘learning relationships’ into the focus of his considerations and formulated six strands of further action in pursuing the work on non-formal education.

I have, in recent lectures, expressed some astonishment about this subject appearing as a new one, as if *education populaire*, *folkeoplysning* (popular education), workers’ education and youth and adult education had not existed before. This is a whole learning and training market, occupying more than half a million peo-

ple in Europe, a good part of third sector employment and blossoming since the end of the nineteenth century. Recent youth studies develop the issue of youth movements and the content of their work in close relation to the curricula of the early free school movement; the *Jugendbewegung* (youth movement) in Germany (Hoher Meissen) was in many ways a movement pushing for access to education, at the time reserved to a small bourgeois elite. Therefore I insist that non-formal education is a constitutional element of the youth movement. However, there is nothing to do; this knowledge has been largely lost and will have to be reconstituted.

In preparing for a symposium-type activity to be held within the ordinary programme on this subject I would propose the following:

- not to be too dogmatic about the distinction of 'non-formal' and 'informal'; when taking a closer look it will become very difficult to uphold;
- the same is even true for 'non-formal' and 'formal'. Schools and universities change; teaching often resembles each other in all three categories;
- to describe, instead, learning of young people in programmes preparing for tomorrow's world and to define it more precisely in spaces for transnational European training and learning, such as those provided through the Youth Centres and the Foundation.

I also think that the time has come to discuss standards. If we appear in the future with a sharper profile on training and learning, we should not shy away from a job that the Council of Europe is good at: the setting of standards for qualified European level youth leader training, agreed upon by our member states and, at the end of the

day, submitted as a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers. This would happen with the intention of helping to bring about a training offer for:

- youth and social workers active in project work;
- intercultural trainers;
- youth information officers;
- support staff for youth activities in governments, agencies, NGOs and international institutions;
- administrators and managers in the field;
- researchers and field workers.

This means that the symposium-type activity on non-formal education will have to be the first step within a strategy, that the educational offer of the Youth and Sports Directorate has to become the top in Europe and be an example of what we have in mind when talking about standards, that we keep a sense of what is needed in practice and expected of us together with a good theory on non-formal learning, namely, that there is no split between theory and practice, and that we use the symposium-type activity to open minds, create synergies and produce clear objectives.

PART 2, 12 JANUARY 2000
STRASBOURG, FRANCE

Back in Strasbourg again and having read the other contributions, I shall now say a few things on **Life Long Learning** and then keep my other contributions on citizenship, human rights education and civil society very short, because there is enough on the table on these concepts for at least a one-day seminar.

For Manuela du Bois-Reymond, the term 'life long learning' is actually being used in an inflationary manner, without referring clearly to age groups, or social contexts, for example. It means different things in texts of the EU, UNESCO, the Council of Europe and OECD. For her, the term lives a life of its own and is being used to fit whatever interests bureaucrats and politicians need. Within her larger, very differentiated article on 'Lifelong Learning in Relation to Four Types of Learners', she suggests a heuristic approach to the social distribution of life long learning in Western European societies according to these four types of learners. These are not empirically constructed learning biographies, modelled on learner types, but theoretically pictured frameworks of learning histories based on educational sociology and youth- and life-course research.

They are:

- the learner type of intrinsically motivated intellectuals;
- the extrinsically motivated mass-learner represented by the modern school youth;
- the extrinsically motivated learner type in continuous re-qualification;
- the learner type of intrinsically motivated 'trend-setters'.

The article is available; I shall not report on it further. What I will do, however, for the discussion is to suggest that there is a great danger in discussing non-formal education and life long learning in the context of our work, to become eclectic and pick bits and pieces of *à la mode* (in fashion) discussions without a social analysis. It does not make sense for me to work on the second and third learner types as described by Manuela, because these will be subject to the market offer of parallel (to formal education) teaching and

learning markets with the aim of adapting qualifications to labour market (or risk society, or leisure, or family, etc) requirements. Our learning objective remains the largely autonomous multiplier / networker / educator / youth worker who corresponds to types one and four in this typology. I don't want to overstrain the example – my invitation is not to confuse life long learning within social learning programmes for young people with the general requirements of a changing labour market. We are something else: our work relates to identity formation, value education, a sense of belonging, religion / ideology / ideas of man sort of inspiration, and that is something other than training flexibility.

Hans Magnus Enzensberger made a provocative observation in this context in a recent article (*Der Spiegel*, No. 2/2000). According to him the now governing digital capitalism denies radically formerly existing codes of ethics and replaces these with qualities and behaviours which were rather suspect not so long ago. The cardinal virtue is now flexibility. This is accompanied by a vigorous, ego-strong and often not-caring attitude of pushing for your own aims and objectives, mobility and the willingness to learn fast and permanently. Anyone who cannot stand the pace is to be absorbed.

In Enzensberger's typology this creates a new social stratification. At the top of the system are **chameleons**. They are what David Riesman described many years back as 'steered from the outside' characters, but in no way passive; on the contrary, they are dynamic workaholics. They have nothing to do with material production. They are agents, brokers, consultants, lawyers, media people, entertainers, science-, money- and information managers. They don't deal with hardware, they deal with software. You find them in finance, computer industries and telecommunications.

This new class makes the gains. They are already reproducing. People with talent do not go to universities or into politics any more; they become software entrepreneurs.

A second class with good survival prospects are the **hedgehogs**. They are not at all flexible. They have taken refuge in institutions. They are not mobile. Doing it this way, bureaucrats in local, national and international organisms, parties, associations, trade unions and all kinds of corporations have successfully resisted all changes in the labour market. The more this market produces and creates complexity, the more the hedgehogs will have to follow with regulations and controls. Given that they number in the millions, they don't have to worry for their future.

Other forms of work and employment will permanently be reduced. Those concerned with this development could be described as **beavers**. Their more classical sectors of productivity shrink through automats and robots, rationalization and transfer of production into low cost regions. So the beavers build dams, which break, one after the other. Certain work forms, as in agriculture, can only be kept going through heavy subventions; others disappear gradually (Rikfins).

In this typology the last category cannot receive any animal totem – nature knows no such superfluous species. They are those people who are potentially considered redundant by digital capitalism. They are the majority of any population. The unemployed, the single mothers, the migrants and asylum seekers, the losers in the qualification system, the not-so-flexible ones – they represent the reserve armies for part-time jobs, black labour, prostitution, and so on.

Why do I add this, maybe, cynical and entertaining view? First of all, because it is not so wrong and it's also thought provoking, I hope. And then – whom are we working for? According to all our texts I guess it is the fourth category, the socially excluded. According to our results, however, I believe that we 'produce' a few chameleons, mainly hedgehogs and some beavers.

So, both in view of the emerging new classes of digital capitalism and of the four learner types, we would have to be clear about who we are working for. Are we pretending one thing and doing the other? Or could one also read the world radically differently, and get the chameleons back to where they belong; gifted technicians, the old 'intelligentsia' of socialist systems, no more no less? Only when this is answered, is there room for a qualified educational debate on non-formal learning, related methodologies, the relation to life long learning and the place for transnational European level youth work in the modern landscape of education and training.

On **Human Rights Education**, another of our work priorities, I would like to restrict myself to underlining that this is now a summary notion for what we did before within our Intolerance Conferences, antiracism efforts, minority work, social cohesion orientation and work with marginalized groups. The Human Rights Convention is the central document to refer to, but this is not the bible and we work differently from the Human Rights advisers and consultants also active as our colleagues in Central and Eastern Europe. We remain active in awareness raising and training of activists, we contribute to the work of the Human Rights Directorate and cooperate where we can, but we have our own interpretation. This must not be forgotten when we get the regular ironic requests on our competence in the field: we

have this competence within our educational role and within our stimulating function for the building of networks, projects and – more generally – spreading the message and providing examples of good practice. It would be good if, before the preparations for any larger event in 2000 in this area of work begin, we could form an inter-secretariat working party together with colleagues from Human Rights and Education in order to make sure of synergies, of avoiding double work and misunderstandings and of getting the maximum support.

Civil Society appears in other contributions, so I will keep my comments short. We do, in fact, have three understandings:

1. Civil Society is society minus state (Wimberley). It is the mafia, the trade unions, small and medium enterprises, the Nazi Party, Greenpeace, and so on. It is not a morally loaded category; it is as old as secularization and means that power, materially and spiritually, no longer exists within one instance or place, but has split into two sectors. The only distinction for the ‘non-state’ sector is, then, what is governed by law and what is not. This is a useful memory to have for transition societies, which may allow the decrease of state power, but will not tolerate an alternative state philosophy (Eastern Europe in the seventies and eighties, China today).

2. Civil Society is everything not state and not market (Hendrikson, Offe), that is, associations, neighbourhood initiatives, youth organizations, churches – there is no definition but a negative one: it must not be controlled by public authority and it must not be profit making. I think that this has been the leading definition for us so far.

3. Civil Society describes the space for active citizenship. It may interfere with public authority, it may make money, it can be state intended and it can represent a whole new sector of economic production and reproduction (Third Sector). It goes together with values such as pluralism, respect for Human Rights, the Rule of Law, Democracy, and it respects and encourages individuality and autonomy. One of its expressions is communitarism, another the Internet, and another is youth culture. This understanding gains ground and is largely uncontroversial within the Council of Europe.

My *plaidoyer* (plea) is the same as always: we should know how we use the term when working with it and we should create, where we can, links to participation, non-formal education and Human Rights education.

On European Citizenship

Some names: Thomas Mann and Bertold Brecht during their exile in the USA, Amin Malouf, Leo Tolstoi, Ephraim Kishon – all European Citizens, in exile, in Egypt, in Russia and in Israel. Our definition is based on belonging to a community of values. Considerations of a geographical nature or political opportunity complete the approach to understanding the concept, but they are of secondary importance. If this were different we would have to say that Russia stops at the Urals, that we like Istanbul and Izmir, but Anatolia is not so European after all, and that the Mediterranean has to be divided into a European and a North African sphere. Unavoidably the European Union will one day create the status of a European State Citizen; but this is another matter. The Council of Europe will have to use the notion of *citoyennité*

européenne as a product of a certain upbringing and as a conditioning of the mind towards Human Rights and Dignity, Democracy, Social Cohesion and Equality of Opportunity and Equality before the Law and the respect of Nature through ecological policies. If we choose any other way of arguing citizenship, we will have to speak up against countries that are already members and thus violate their territorial integrity, and we will discriminate against individuals or groups of people enjoying the status of citizen in several of our own member countries.

What is so wrong or so romantic or so traditional about this old wish of Romain Rolland, “ ... to be a peasant and a citizen of the world”? That is grassroots and the Internet in one, and somewhere between these two poles we have to situate European citizenship as a concept.

Finally, it would be highly desirable if the debate of the seminar could be seen as the beginning of something, and would therefore avoid putting people into boxes – we have to deal with change, this we all know, but we are not in the situation of being able to discuss ‘traditionalists’ against ‘modernizers’, for example. Just as the fight against the destruction of solidarity might look hopelessly out of the real world, many of the protagonists of individualism are not so far away from Margaret Thatcher’s, “There is no such thing as society”. So who is who’s reactionary is not as clear as it might look.

‘Vision, Aims and Objectives of a Longterm Cooperation Agreement – About The Added Value of Institutional Cooperation in the Youth Field’

This document was drafted in 1999 as a basis for a conceptual discussion on the strategic development of the Partnership Agreement between the Directorate of Youth and Sport and the European Commission in the field of Youth.

1. Within the Covenant concluded between the European Commission and the Council of Europe on cooperation in the field of youth worker training, the element of innovation plays a strong role. This is laid down in Article 1 of the Covenant on its purpose, where one can read, that,

... The purpose of this Covenant is to provide a framework for the joint development and funding of new European youth work training courses by the Commission and the Council.

It is again referred to in Annex B to the Covenant where – as a purpose of measure - it says,

(the Covenant) ... will also provide a basis for an **innovative** approach in this field, in terms of the partners involved in cooperation at European level, the target public and the methods and content of the training offered.

2. New youth work training courses and innovation in the field: what has been reached in the running of the Covenant in 1999, and what is envisaged for a continuation of this cooperation between the Commission and the Council in the year 2000 and after? Another important notion in Article 1 as quoted above is 'joint development'. Is this restricted to technical cooperation? Or is this a conceptual effort, such as the setting of common quality standards, an agreement on key values and a curriculum construction of exemplary nature in the field of non-formal education at European level?

3. These questions need further clarification and they should be at the centre of our discussions. Answers could help in defining better what the Governing Board of the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation have insisted on: that the implementation of the Covenant should produce an 'added value'.

4. This has to be interpreted against a whole background of considerations:

- The cooperation between the Council and the Commission has a long history. To give it the form of a cooperation agreement marks substantial progress and is welcomed by all actors in the field.
- For the programmes of the European Youth Centres the administrative and financial formula for the implementation of the Covenant found between the Council and the Commission means a heavy shift from the number of study sessions towards an increased number of training courses.
- This represents a new offer at the expense of existing opportunities, a situation not welcomed by all users of the Centres' facilities.

- For the Centres already operating at the limit of their physical and human capacities for a long time, this means an additional effort to cope with quantitative and qualitative demands in the field of youth worker training.
- Both the Council and the Commission are perfectly able to competently run their different youth programmes autonomously. To replace their good punctual cooperation of the past with a long term cooperation project within a legally defined framework and thus mutually give up part of their autonomy in the implementation of youth worker training programmes needs a degree of motivation which has to go beyond the political opportunity of the day.

5. What could the elements for such a legitimation be? They would have to deal with both youth policy and non-formal education. Together, they would represent the 'added value'. To be able to develop a vision and then to relate aims and objectives to that vision there needs to be some agreement on what European youth leader training means to the future of young citizens living in Europe. This should be a permanent debate and for the purpose of this paper I do not refer to this very popular 'Europe, *quo vadis?*' kind of thinking. Instead, I concentrate on the emergence of European Citizenship. This is a field where the Council of Europe constantly breaks new ground with its purpose to create greater unity between its member countries, the Human Rights philosophy and instruments, a policy of striving for greater social cohesion and the respect for cultural diversity on the one hand and the Commission with its constantly increasing civil competencies since the treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam on the other. On 'citizenship' they meet common ground.

European Citizenship might very well one day take the concrete form of a European passport in the place of national ones, of European borders creating a new definition of being 'in' and/or 'out' and of a legally secured and democratically legitimated European Union identity. This being on its way or not does not stop anybody from working on a broader understanding of European Citizenship as the affirmation of a coherent set of democratic values and social practices which together respect both similarities and differences and make the European civilization of today.

In this sense there is a way to understand European Citizenship as a sense of belonging – inside or outside the Union. To work towards such an understanding, and increasingly help this Europe of citizens to become true, is the vision expressed.

Consequently, for the Council of Europe, and in accordance with the Action Plan of the Heads of States and Governments on Education for Democratic Citizenship, the youth worker training programmes should be examples of non-formal education for European Citizenship.

6. What is the range of items which are on the European youth agenda today, and which ones could make up part of the subject matter for such a programme? When going through this – incomplete – list, are there certain items that are of higher importance to the Commission, others that are more important for the Council of Europe and others again that are equally important both to the Council and the Commission? Youth worker training as part of European Citizenship Programmes could be run on:

- Voluntary Service;
- Minority Youth in Europe;

- Social Exclusion;
- Intercultural Learning;
- Human Rights Education;
- Civil Society;
- Participation;
- Peace and Conflict Education;
- Youth Unemployment and the Future of Work;
- Young Today - Youth Cultures, Tribes and Lifestyles;
- New Technologies;
- Preparing for the Knowledge Society;
- Youth Work as Non-Formal Education – An Alternative?;
- Youth Information;
- Youth Mobility;
- Equality of Opportunity in Europe;
- Combating Racism and Xenophobia;
- Project Management;
- Management of Youth Organizations;
- Specific Regional Youth Cooperation Schemes and Initiatives (Central and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean, North Africa);
- Youth Policy in Europe.

As stated above, the list could be extended. No item has been invented; they all figure regularly in our programmes. If out of these twenty-one items, five would have to be chosen: which ones would be those with a priority for the Commission, and which ones would be the priority programmes of the Council? And – once the choice is made – how many common choices will come out between the Commission and the Council? Will these be identical with the list of activities set out in Annex B to the Covenant? And which are the texts and mandates and policy instructions which are behind the choice of one item against another?

Furthermore, which would be the items of highest importance to trainers, which ones to youth organizations, to agencies, to governments?

Differences might be expected; agreements and unity of choice can be counted as added value, because they indicate strong institutional impact on both sides. Is there any other way to assure the joint development of programmes as foreseen within the Covenant?

7. Traditionally, the European Commission and the Council of Europe work with different publics, which does not exclude overlaps and identical publics on some occasions. This is because their programmes must be accessible for any young citizen within the Union and in respect of the principle of subsidiarity the Commission works through competent national agencies and additionally runs joint programmes for these agencies. Multilateral work is the exception, not the rule. For the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation, multilateral work is the purpose of being; to possibly allow for pilot projects at local level within the European Youth Foundation and to stimulate local youth projects through the Long Term Training Courses are relatively recent developments.

These different publics - how do they appear within the programmes run under the Covenant so far in 1999? Are these more 'Council of Europe publics' or 'Commission and national agencies publics'? Are there any significant differences between these two different origins of recruitment coming out in the evaluations or is this distinction insignificant?

On the search for 'added value' it would be certainly a good idea to specify training needs according to publics and to work for a

good mix of differentiated (professional and semi-professional youth workers, INGYOs, local and regional youth workers, staff of agencies and networks, etc.) and common programmes (interest in participation exclusively determined by the character of the activity, not by specific training background). The Council of Europe, with an emphasis on working with new partners, might come across new and interesting publics through the Partnership Programme, just as the Commission might consider giving more room to trans- and multicultural organizations and agencies within this programme.

8. With the countries of Central and Eastern Europe seeking membership in the European Union, the needs for qualified youth worker training at European level have become even bigger. It is also foreseeable that the situation in South Eastern Europe will require heavy efforts for reconciliation and reconstruction work in the youth field very soon. Even with all the potential coming together within the partnership programme, this can only be a modest contribution to much bigger needs. In this situation one should concentrate on programmes and training formats which can set standards, can be run by voluntary youth workers, don't need highly sophisticated technical equipment and are of a 'non partisan' type of political education. In other words: the Partnership Programme should create model programmes and not become a system of answering to all kinds of training requests as they come along. Model programmes need to start as pilot programmes, they need time and human investment, they must allow for trial and error and they need to be followed professionally. However, one such programme can, through its potential for repetition, have a higher impact than ten ordinary sessions.

European level model youth worker programmes, well documented and clearly set out with regard to standards and requirements, flexible and adaptable to changing geographic, social and economic conditions, should become the core of the training effort within the Covenant. They would be new, innovative and the result of a joint development; an added value for sure.

9. It is strange: on the one hand youth, as social workers claim, there are not enough readable and user-friendly publications on international and European youth work on the table and, consequently, there is a need for such publications; on the other hand, people say that there is a whole flood of books, papers, brochures and webpages accessible, they deplore a whole jungle of information which, often enough, does not even offer much variation with regard to content and methodology. Who is right? I don't dare to decide, but it would seem very unprofessional to me to go straight into the proliferation of even more materials for the good purpose. A critical screening of the educational production of the last ten years on European level youth worker training would look like a reasonable thing to do; there is more need for the re-editing and proper presentation of educational production in this field, than for some completely new productions. Here the added value would consist of respecting an existing body of experience and making this available for youth worker training today.

10. The Council and Europe and the European Commission have been working for ages on the status and profile of youth workers, social workers and trainers in Europe with the aim of unifying profiles, increasing mobility and creating a European certificate for this kind of work. Governments, Social Work Colleges and Agencies have been keenly interested in creating some form of a European

standard setting framework for professional and voluntary activity in the field of European level youth worker training as well. Despite these efforts, this work has been done so far to no avail.

Is it not time to pick up the loose ends of this process again? Is a partnership programme not exactly the framework allowing for a new initiative? This would open the very exciting possibility of using the next Covenant, beginning with the year 2000, as an experimental training field, which would specifically develop the professional standards and profiles which, in a much more formal procedure, one day European institutions and governments might agree on as a European status to youth and social workers and trainers active in this field? Some added value that would be.

11. A partnership agreement, a covenant on youth work training – the prominence of this achievement may lead to exclusivity, which would be regrettable. Cooperation with the Commission in the youth field needs to extend to youth research cooperation, youth policy development, cooperation on Humanitarian Action, Voluntary Service and the construction of a knowledge pool on youth in Europe. There is still much room left to develop the appropriate forms of cooperation in these extended areas of cooperation. Youth worker training is only one aspect of the cooperation item between the European Commission and the Council of Europe and there is no end to the possibilities of creating added values in some of the domains mentioned above.

‘An Experiment in Learning about the Greater Europe: The European Youth Centre Budapest’

This article was published in Volume 2 of the European Yearbook on Youth Policy and Research: Intercultural Reconstruction – Trends and Challenges in 1999 (de Gruyter), an initiative of the Circle for Youth Research Cooperation in Europe, an early move to develop European cooperation in the field of youth research. The article was more than likely written more than a year before.

This contribution presents the political, institutional and educational aspects of one of the latest creations of the Council of Europe: the European Youth Centre in Budapest (EYCB), a 70-room, 110-bed residential educational establishment, reconstructed and redecorated as a purpose-built conference and training centre. Inaugurated on 15 December 1995, the Centre now regularly runs an annual programme of 70 – 80 activities. Some of them are organized by the EYCB, while others are only held there. The programme is divided into study sessions with international youth organizations, training courses, larger conferences and symposia, expert meetings, and a certain number of Council of Europe statutory activities. The EYCB is based on the model of the European Youth Centre Strasbourg, which has been run on a similar formula since 1972. Both Centres are part of the Council of Europe’s Youth Directorate and function on the basis of the co-management formula between governments

and youth organizations. One may wonder why the Council of Europe does not simply finance the selected youth programmes and support schemes for international youth mobility. Why should it set up two educational centres with staff, building costs and related expenses for international residential activities? Why does it export this way of work to a Central European country? Why is this done within the context of an extension policy of training for youth workers in Central and Eastern Europe? The answer could simply be that there was a political will for such action, that this kind of work has been successful for the last 25 years and that the governments of Hungary, Poland and Slovakia offered sites to host such a Centre. In the article some of the more complex reasons connected with setting up the European Youth Centre in Budapest are studied from a 'decentralized' perspective.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S CONCEPT OF A YOUTH CENTRE

In Member States, youth centres are usually local meeting points and clubs for young people. The Council of Europe uses this term to designate a centre of knowledge and experience about youth and youth affairs in Europe. Within the Youth Directorate and its two youth centres, this ambition (supported by 47 countries, i.e. the signatory parties to the Cultural Convention) is translated via a specific work programme dealing with international youth mobility, participation of young people in society and public affairs, methods of out-of-school education, antiracist education, intercultural learning, associative life in Europe and the development of civil society in Member States. These subjects form part of the Council of Europe's major objective to contribute to a policy of democratic security in its member states.

In youth work, the Council of Europe concentrates on the training of multipliers, network managers and project leaders, who are always linked to a local, national or international organization, youth service, administration or agency. These Centres are thus residential educational establishments with a shared responsibility between young people as users and participants, their sending organizations, governments and the Council of Europe. Everyone has a role: governments set policy objectives and provide the funds; youth organizations put these objectives into practice in the form of European projects and through national and local youth work. The Council of Europe, which is practically the statutory and political 'home' of this construction, provides professional assistance and monitors quality standards.

The residential character of the Centre gives a special identity to this kind of work. Different partners live and work together for at least one week to design longer lasting projects of cooperation, to take part in some of the more specific international training programmes and language courses (language courses last two to four weeks; long term training courses six to seven months). This way young people with an international commitment have 'their own house' in Europe where they can experience an intercultural atmosphere.

The advantage of a residential training centre is its ability to function as a production unit for all partners involved. However, there are also some disadvantages: cliques may form and create a certain exclusivity, complicity between the various partners may lead to complacency, youth groups who generally combat social exclusion may develop patterns of exclusive behaviour themselves, the international level may generate a life of its own, some pro-

grammes may lack innovation and the distance between down-to-earth problems of youth work may grow. All this can, indeed, be observed. The question is, which elements in this development are specific to young people and which can be found in all highly formalized systems of international cooperation and communication.

Moreover, the youth field is often under the strong influence of jargon, fashion and lifestyle-related forms of political correctness. In the late 1970s, the dominant language was class conscious, revolutionary and internationalist. In the 1980s, it became ecological, grassroots-centred, provincial and emotional, often anti-European or at least anti-EU. In the 1990s, it has become individualistic, lifestyle-oriented, very private and insecure with regard to society. This 'sociolect' can often be observed in the themes of study sessions and symposia. It is sometimes difficult to see the connection between the work done in the youth field and the general objectives of the Council of Europe whose approach differs from the one adopted by the EU. The EU youth work is targeted at young people resident in the EU. Appearances can, however, be deceptive: the Council of Europe constantly works in both the youth field and the training sector. Its aim is to set up transnational associations to train suitable leaders.

This kind of youth and training work has existed for more than 25 years, and it is not difficult to prove that it has succeeded in reaching its objectives as stipulated in the statute of the European Youth Centre (1972) '... to produce the political, social and cultural leaders of tomorrow and to give young people a hand in building Europe. To make Europe the property of its young citizens is the idea of a European Youth Centre', be it in Strasbourg, in Budapest or elsewhere.

REASONS FOR ESTABLISHING A YOUTH CENTRE IN CENTRAL EUROPE

A youth centre as described above is a rather expensive training provision, but also the most efficient: and a certain political constellation is a prerequisite for its establishment. The EYC in Strasbourg is the result of the '1968 hangover' of quite a number of governments. Creating a European Youth Centre within the Council of Europe was envisaged as a remedy for the emotional distance between youth and Europe (i.e. its bureaucratic institutions). In 1989, the situation was similar. Socialist regimes faded away by the dozen and 'new democracies' were born. They quickly became members of the Council of Europe, and the organization invested a great deal of energy in overcoming the old East-West divisions, ensuring the rule of law, providing advice on democratic constitutions and parliamentary, pluralistic systems of legitimization. Education played an important role in this process, and the youth field has contributed very actively to the Council of Europe's specific assistance programme.

A whole system of communist state provisions for youth – covering the complete biography of a young person from childhood to entry into working life – had collapsed. Irrespective of its ideological orientation, the system functioned and had to be replaced in one way or another. The organization of leisure was taken over by the profit-making sector, but left out those with a low or zero income. The formerly state controlled youth work and youth research were discredited. How could they gain new legitimacy, find new funds or generate interest in their results? With the disappearance of state youth organizations and their bureaucrats, 'youth affairs' became a new issue in terms of government organization and, understandably, a very delicate one. What should the

new 'youth authority' be like under the conditions of democratic change? The end of the informal contract between the education system and the labour market (also noted in Western Europe since the beginning of the 1980s) made itself particularly felt in countries with practically no experience in handling unemployment.

The alleged brotherhood of 'socialist internationalism' proved to be an empty formula. The world has been aware of this fact since the events in Berlin in 1953, in Budapest in 1956 and in Prague in 1968, but the extent of the deficit in cross-border contacts between neighbours in Central and Eastern Europe still came as a surprise. The situation was not comparable to the intense exchanges of business partners, politicians, associations and parties, schools, universities and youth organizations that had developed in Western Europe after the war. How could one initiate a system of similarly efficient regional contacts and international exchange?

Based on the experience of the EYC in Strasbourg, the Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth adopted the proposal for the creation of a similar centre in Central or Eastern Europe in 1990 to extend training and cooperation in the youth field.

THE EUROPEAN YOUTH CENTRE BUDAPEST

It took five years to create the EYC in Budapest. The initial enthusiasm of the early 1990s was followed by lengthy discussions about practical modalities, phases of disappointment, expectation and innovative reflection. In the end, the idea survived against the odds, although some contradictions remain. The slogan 'through the pessimism of analysis towards the optimism of action' is a good description of the role and function of the European

Youth Centre Budapest. The Governing Board decided that there should be one coherent programme of educational activities. They could either be held in Strasbourg or in Budapest and should be carried out in the same way. Proclaiming that the EYC in Budapest should not be an 'Eastern ghetto', and emphasizing the pan-European nature, somewhat hindered the learning process within Central and Eastern Europe. This approach, however, also meant that the youth field would not be given the same chances within Central and Eastern European countries that the Western countries had enjoyed for so many years: to get to know their neighbours well, to work together without the risk of losing identity, to resist dominant cultures in the building of Europe, and to actively enjoy diversity. Western organizations would 'enlarge' and set the agenda. Western values were to be adopted, and Western working methods were to be used. As a consequence, the European Youth Centre in Budapest has had some difficulty in evaluating its regional impact. At present, it can only be shown implicitly through pan-European activities held either in Strasbourg or Budapest.

Having missed the peak time of political backing in 1989-90, it soon became clear that the Budapest Centre would have to live with a very modest budget, in no way comparable to that of the EYC in Strasbourg. Since a budget is nothing but an expression of political will by the means allocated to a project, a strategy against structural under-financing had to be found in order to avoid the building, generously offered by the Hungarian authorities, remaining empty during the greater part of the year.

In the end, this handicap turned into an advantage: as the facilities are twice as large as the requirements of the youth programme, the Centre can host various other Council of Europe activities,

particularly those of the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport and of the Parliamentary Assembly. It has become the training centre for all multilateral youth training activities of the European Union in the area; it is used by UNESCO, UNHCR and other UN agencies and also hosts international activities of the Hungarian authorities and NGOs. This 'co-habitation' with various partners is not only required to balance the budget but is also an opportunity to create synergies and new forms of cooperation. The necessity of utilizing existing facilities to the full has led to a certain 'hotel-type service' orientation of the Budapest Centre. However, at times of increasing individualism, members of youth movements are gradually turning into clients with very clear ideas about expected services.

ACTIVITIES

In 1996, 70 activities were held at the European Youth Centre Budapest; 52 of these concerned the Council of Europe's principle objectives, that is, human rights, civil society, cultural diversity and social cohesion. These activities helped the EYCB to reach a number of objectives. The occupation rate ensured a balanced budget. 54.4% of the budget was covered by the programme activities of the Youth Directorate and 45.6% by other sources (European Union, Council of Europe, Foundations, etc.), thus rendering the 'mixed' programme and management a feasible formula. Roughly one third of the programme dealt with themes such as racism, minorities, and social exclusion, and another third with training, education and mobility. The remaining part consisted of artistic programmes, information on European unity, Hungarian and local youth work items and women's issues. One of the priorities of the Council of Europe is the reconstruction of civil society

in former Yugoslavia. In 1996, there were four activities related to this topic, particularly in connection with the Democratic Leadership Programme.

The concept of a 'mixed' programme was introduced by Peter Leuprecht, the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe. It also includes the possibility of creating synergies and enhancing cross-fertilization rather than complementarity between different Council of Europe services. The European Youth Centre Budapest is one element among others which fosters such 'inter-service cooperation' and has succeeded in including very different activities from various Directorates in its programme.

OUTLOOK

The Committee of Ministers established the European Youth Centre in Budapest for an experimental period of three years. In the case of a favourable evaluation, the Committee of Ministers can decide to turn this Centre into a permanent institution of the Council of Europe (at the earliest on 15 December 1998). The evaluation will include political, educational, economic and managerial aspects, but the European Youth Centre in Budapest will also have to meet the high expectations related to its work. The items below indicate what still needs to be done to complement the present achievements and to fully use the potential of, currently, the only establishment of the Council of Europe in Central and Eastern Europe:

- consolidation of the programme through multi-disciplinary projects to be run with other Council of Europe sectors and in economic terms;
- improvement of services (restaurant, hotel, conference infra-

- structure, library and documentation);
- creation of a youth information centre open to the public (due to the internal reorganization of the Hungarian youth authorities, this project is presently on hold);
 - development of a joint education and training programme with the European Union and for this area;
 - creation of specific cooperation programmes with the Central European Initiative;
 - development of specific youth training programmes with Hungarian NGOs;
 - cooperation with the Central European University;
 - a publication programme: bulletin, course reports, studies, etc;
 - creation of a Central Europe 'knowledge pool' of researchers, youth experts, educationalists, writers and journalists, young people, politicians and artists.

‘Intercultural Learning – One Big Bluff or a Learning Strategy for the Future? Concepts, Objectives and Practices of Intercultural Learning in Informal Education’

This article was published in the European Journal of Intercultural Studies, Vol. 9, Supplement, 1998 and later republished, in a slightly different version, in Volume 2 of the European Yearbook on Youth Policy and Research: Intercultural Reconstruction – Trends and Challenges, Circle for Youth Research Cooperation in Europe, De Gruyter, 1999.

During the eighties we witnessed a very intense debate in many European countries regarding the right way of living together. How members of different nations, religious beliefs, ethnic origins and lifestyles could coexist was a question at the forefront of many people’s minds. ‘Europe will be multicultural or it will not be’, was one of the slogans of the time. ‘Difference’ and ‘divergence’, simply descriptive categories, almost became values, while individuals discussed various models of living together and coping with diversity. These were models such as the ‘melting pot’, ‘salad bowl’, ‘assimilation’ and ‘integration’. Of course, as always, xenophobia and intolerance existed as well. On the whole, the idea that a modern society would also be a heterogeneous society, one that would be open to and accept the coexistence of multiple cultures, looked as if it was being successfully implemented.

As the next century arrives, one can no longer be so sure that this is the case. Prominent voices can be heard saying that the multicultural society cannot work (for a recent example see *'The defeat of the multicultural society'*, *Der Spiegel*, 1997). European integration has been recently described as leading to an erosion of democracy. The enormous pressure on politicians to produce solutions for the unemployed and the socially excluded has brought back the idea of 'our own people first', and seriously puts at risk what seemed to have been achieved a decade ago. Europe presently faces a difficult time with new controversies concerning the future of the European Union and its enlargement with candidates from Central and Eastern Europe.

The debate on Europe overlaps with a major restructuring of European societies, causing high unemployment figures in some places, serious doubts about the future of the welfare state, pension systems, social security and the authority of the state. Some consider this an appropriate occasion to return to national clichés and stereotypes, to revitalize 'left / right' divisions in society and to hang on to old habits of social conflict and interaction. Others are attempting to find new ways of understanding citizenship and participation in what is being called 'second modernity' (Anthony Giddens), and can be overheard discussing communitarianism, globalization and interculturality as new facts of life.

As has often been the case in history, when something new is emerging and something old has not yet disappeared, the situation presents itself as paradoxical. The paradox consists, on the one hand, of considerable progress regarding the European integration process, a successful reorganization of the economy in various European countries, a more balanced world economy and the emer-

gence of global thinking. On the other hand, there is the parallel scenario of a dictatorial European bureaucracy, of an economy producing more and more socially excluded people and the seemingly unstoppable progress of a 'cold capitalism' that leaves little room for humanity and a dignified existence.

Given the foregoing, it becomes essential to discuss political education under the present paradoxical political and historical conditions. Assuming that there is no way back to the old national curricula relation to social and political learning, we might ask what an alternative reference system could look like.

THE EVOLUTION OF LEARNING

"Imagine: aliens from another planet land on planet earth and end up in a school. How would they describe their impressions? They would say: in this place young human beings watch old human beings at work" (Riconscente, 1997, p. 33). This represents only one way of looking at what is happening today with respect to learning in the media age, about interactive learning systems and ways of catching up in the area of knowledge and skills. Some authors have conveyed some bad news to the school system: they believe that if it is not radically changed it is bound to disappear (Manuela du Bois-Reymond).

Researchers and experts who deal with contemporary youth are not surprised by these developments – they have observed for quite some time an increase of self-socialization in the biographies of young people. Now that the carrot and stick relationship between the learning system and the labour market has disappeared, young people are free to think about education and learning as

they like, and find their own ways of decoding the world and developing their own lifestyles.

What are these new learning imperatives? Some of them are not so new at all, but now have a better chance of being heard:

- learning by doing;
- learning to learn;
- life long learning;
- de-learning and re-learning.

One can observe a shift from learning within formal systems to learning in informal systems. The learning experience itself is considered to be as important as the certificate acquired.

Education experts agree on the necessity to speak two modern languages (in addition to one's mother tongue), to become computer literate and to become socially and culturally competent. The young citizen of the future will, as a true member of the information society, be a good communicator. They will also be able to cope with the bombardment of information (so characteristic of our times) while in the area of social relationships, they will become a sharing person, curious about other cultures.

Numerous articles and human resource workshops have focused on how to acquire essential social qualifications, how to make sure that learning is cognitive as well as emotional and pragmatic, and how to assess progress in social learning. One of the aspects of the revolution of learning is the ability for intercultural communication. This quality is usually approached in the same way as the acquisition of linguistic competence: there is a certain tendency to

treat it as a form of interpersonal diplomacy and as a desirable aspect of general culture.

We consider this view to be too restrictive. For us, intercultural learning is identical to political socialization within the context of 'second modernity'. It implies an understanding of the world as well as the development of the personal qualifications to become a social actor in this world. It also implies learning how to exist and survive in a paradoxical historical situation.

ORIGINS AND OBJECTIVES OF INTERCULTURAL LEARNING

Culture and cultural artefacts reflect the values and expressions of particular societies. Consequently, intercultural communication must have existed throughout the ages – practically in all instances where there has been some contact leading to a mutual understanding between two cultures. Should this scenario include wars, imperialism and oppression as well? Not in our opinion. We are, instead, looking for a modern interpretation of the concept, born after the devastating world wars and industrial genocides of the previous century.

Important programmes in the field of cross-cultural research were initiated by (of all people!) the United States Army in the 1950s and 1960s. Still convinced they were the beloved heroes who had liberated Europe from Nazi occupation and the Pacific from Japanese imperialism, the US Army did not quite understand why they were suddenly seen by so many as the enemy during the Korean war and as the imperialists during the Vietnam war. How had they become 'the ugly Americans' so quickly after the end of World War II? What kind of behavioural change was needed to the correct this image?

Another source of learning about foreign culture originates in the difficult situations regarding human resources in multinational companies. Staff experienced a variety of personal and professional problems, including high divorce rates and a steady increase in cases of depressions, indicating serious problems that were often caused by cultural misunderstandings and clashes. "Executives view other cultures as unfortunate deviations from the norm ..." (Laurent, 1997). He also comments, in the same article, that,

[t]here are as many potential management theories and approaches as there are societies and cultures. Every culture has some unique specific insight, sensitivity, and skills to contribute to the art of management. Every culture has also some unique and specific blind spot. The art of management has no homeland. The world becomes a pool of truth and wisdom to draw from in order to invent new ways of managing and organizing tomorrow's transnational corporations.

Given this history, we should no longer really be surprised to find that a recently published manual on intercultural learning was compiled by BMW (1997), until now unknown as a centre of educational research. The President of the company, in his foreword, underlines explicitly the relationship between economic success and an open multicultural world.

In addition to its origins in behaviourism, the interest in intercultural issues has innumerable other sources: archaeology, anthropology, cross-cultural psychological, cultural studies, sociolinguistics, comparative theology, developmental psychology, historiography and geography, the fine arts and literature. Those interested in knowledge production regarding cultural differences

have been, in addition to the already mentioned army and business individuals and researchers, educationalists and artists dealing with cultural exchange programmes and, in particular, youth exchange organizers.

The latter succeeded, during the seventies and eighties, in introducing standards regarding the quality of intercultural programmes for young people. These standards subsequently penetrated the language of youth programmes and services of the UN, UNESCO, the EU, the Council of Europe and the Franco-German Youth Office. The 'intercultural learning' concept was also embraced by NGOs working with surpa- and international organizations.

In some cases the term replaced other, increasingly controversial, concepts such as 'European awareness', 'European identity', 'international understanding', 'Youth of the world', and whatever else may have existed as an empty slogan in the history of international relations after World War II. These novel concepts, for reasons of political convenience, have not really helped in clarifying the concept of intercultural learning. It seems that they are concepts that anybody can use in international meetings, without risking ever being asked what they actually mean. This situation is clouded even more by the existence of a number of 'neighbouring concepts', such as 'multicultural education', 'minority education', 'Human Rights Education' and 'European education'.

What follows is an attempt to provide more clarity. This attempt will suffer from the inherent weaknesses of any descriptive approach and from a certain degree of subjectivism.

THE RELATION OF INFORMAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

There is a fairly simple way of sorting out the problem regarding the neighbouring concepts. If they could be classified as special understandings of intercultural, and if intercultural learning was an undisputed dimension of all these categories of learning, there would be no problem. However, educational literature shows that multicultural learning is overwhelmingly referred to as education in the classroom. Indeed, the multicultural composition of schools in practically all large urban areas in Europe requires a great deal of reflection concerning the appropriate curriculum to be used. But schools teach national values and educate students within the code of one national, dominant culture.

This also holds true for minority education. Whatever the definition of a minority might be, the expression makes no sense without an intimate relationship with a dominant, possibly oppressive majority. Formal and informal training programmes will aim at teaching anything from resistance and survival techniques to fully-fledged cooperation and integration. But the cultural tension between majority and minority, domination and being dominated, will remain.

Human Rights education points the way towards the universal values of humankind, as expressed in the guaranteed rights of the individual laid down in the Universal Declaration of the United Nations and the European Convention of the Council of Europe. There is a catalogue of rights and there are / should be sanctions when violations occur. Knowledge of one's own basic rights must be taught to the residents of all countries that have signed the

Declaration and Convention. Again, this needs to be learnt mainly in school. Specific training programmes for target groups are also necessary, for the police and prison wardens.

What would a true European education look like? Assuming the residents of the European Union will soon become citizens of a supranational Europe, a political education programme for this new reality could quite readily be designed. However, it has already been quite amusing to observe educationalists search for reasons why the 'true dimensions' of Europe were initially confined to six countries, then nine countries, yet again 12 a few years later, 15 at present, 20 in several years and who knows how many in a few decades? The author is a civil servant at the Council of Europe, who at the beginning of his career worked for an organization with 17 member states. Presently his field of work (youth, education, culture and sports) serves 47 countries and has expanded its Eastern border to Japan. It is thus important to warn against any limitation on the range of what is European; and this is not only in respect of geography.

Intercultural learning is discovery and transgression, change and revision, insecurity and uncertainty, openness and curiosity. It is a programme that opposes any limitation of the mind by national, continental, religious, ideological, ethnic, gender or political dogma. At the same time, since it is also political socialization, it does not accept cultural relativism. The qualities related to this learning process can, of course, be acquired in many ways: any lengthy international experience in family life, studies abroad, business, voluntary service, conscious travelling (as opposed to mass tourism), reading and discussing, meditation and project building.

We shall concentrate our efforts by focussing on a very specific form of activity: the international training sessions for young people such as can be found in the annual programmes of the European Youth Centres located in Strasbourg and Budapest. Like most of the activities financed by the European Youth Foundation and the European Union (the ‘Youth for Europe’ programmes), these activities aim at the creation of cooperation projects between young people, which may last for quite some time. However, the beginning of the project building process tends to be a one-to-two-week session, which takes place in a residential environment with participants between 18 and 30 years of age. Usually, the number of participants will range from 25 to 30 and the participants will tend to come from 15 to 20 countries. They are usually members of international non-governmental youth organizations (INGYOs), minority groups, local youth groups or they will be social workers and young educationalists active within youth exchange agencies. Their programme will be planned by an educational team, which will almost always refer to intercultural learning as their common educational approach.

THE SEQUENCE OF DECONSTRUCTION AND OF RECONSTRUCTION

Who are the participants in international activities? A Dane, a Spaniard, an Indian, a Nigerian – whatever their origin, they will have been told that they should view themselves as ambassadors of their countries, and this is where the deconstruction process has to begin. Be yourself, a person, a *Mensch*¹, but not some self-declared representative of your home region. This is one of the

¹ This German word literally means human being. Its colloquial meaning equates with ‘good person’ or ‘decent person’. This usage is common in Yiddish.

first things to learn and understand. This sounds easier than it is. Aren't international meetings composed of delegates? And, aren't these people mandated by their country, their trade union, their youth club, their gender and their minority group? Is one not sent to represent something?

Most international meetings are set up to do everything to please the 'delegate'. In order to provide a feeling of comfort they will find the flag of their country on the conference table or some other symbol representing the organization sending them. The food will be neutral airline type food and the language will be politically correct and strongly influenced by, respectively, the UN, EU, OSCE or Council of Europe jargon. Who understands all these acronyms and abbreviations anyway? Simultaneous interpretation will be provided and if the organizers are afraid of one thing, it will be any form of complaint, which could lead to an 'incident'. Over the centuries, diplomacy has developed highly sophisticated forms of communication regarding controversial issues between peoples, and the observer can only admire how some professionals arrange international meetings in such a perfect manner that peace and understanding are made possible and durable.

Could this be a model of communication between young people of different origins? To the extent education relates to respect for others, politeness and general culture, this could hardly do any harm. For the purposes of an educational exercise, however, the diplomatic model offers us little. Instead of creating a feeling of comfort, intercultural learning situations are designed to make participants slightly uneasy. How else can the most important attitude in this learning process – tolerance of ambiguity – be promoted?

Identity

The concept of 'identity' is very difficult to work with. Again, this is one of those concepts that allows for too much vagueness. While identity can be described very well as an individual quality and in ways which make clear distinctions possible, it loses this clarity when talking about group, regional or even national identities.

The term 'scientism' describes the transfer of results and methods from one field of research to another, where these results are not appropriate (for example, the results of biological research used in sociology). To avoid making the 'scientistic' mistake of using an expression which belongs to studies of the individual to describe, without further discussion, larger social and political entities, we need to become aware of the constructed nature of identity, of its contextuality and even programmatic nature. The concept of 'national character' is irrelevant if analyzed from an informed position. Although its condition cannot be proved, we still hear references to it in politics and the media every day. Propaganda does not only deform reality, it also determines it. As a consequence, you can find 'interculturalists' who will seriously spend their time distinguishing the characteristics of the Sicilian, the Englishman or the Swedish woman, produce a caricature and then destroy their self-produced alien in the name of fighting prejudice.

Maybe we can, by using the concept of 'tolerance of ambiguity' and facing the unavoidable fact that we cannot leave 'identity' behind us, use this term as an expression of the sum of the life experiences of a person, as it is reflected in his or her individuality.

One's individuality can be composed of genetic, environmental and educational factors in an inexplicable mixture. 'After Dolly'² we might even say that we can do without any further scientific progress for the time being; we still have our hands full coping with determinists who want to isolate one of these factors and claim its absolute superiority, to the detriment of the others. 'All Different – All Equal' was the slogan of the recent Council of Europe campaign against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance. This slogan represents the shortest expression to capture the inseparably social and individual character of human mankind.

The dimensions of individual differences are manifold and the richness of cultural diversity can be studied in a variety of domains including the relation to time, coping with climate, food preparation, dance and gestures, its relation to space and nature, relation to other living organisms, architecture, the human body, sexuality and commerce. These are just a few of the dimensions that define who we are (cultural and societal organizations relating to religion, politics, family, and heritage [sites, oral history, texts, symbols and myths] representing the actual level of coping with this reality within given societies).

What arouses our curiosity are answers to questions such as, what on earth did this Saracen businessman during the crusades think when he first saw a sweating ironclad knight on horseback enter his territory? In fact, we cannot know. But it is very un-

² Dolly was an ewe (July 5, 1996 – February 14, 2003) that was the first animal to be cloned from an adult somatic cell, using the process of nuclear transfer. She was cloned by Ian Wilmut, Keith Campbell and colleagues at the Roslin Institute in Edinburgh, Scotland. Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dolly_the_sheep.

likely that he thought something like, “Oh, here comes a crusader and he wants to free the Holy Land, so I had better go and join my people”. In any case, he for sure got an idea of what an ‘alien’ is.

When 25 young people come together for a certain amount of time as an international community somewhere in Europe, with its war-torn areas, its anarchistic spots, its enormous differences in living standards and life prospects, is the situation of those who intend to work together for some time so different from the Crusader and Saracen? These young people might come from Bosnia or Chechnya, from Estonia or Portugal. They may be conscientious objectors or soldiers, students or young unemployed people, Muslims, Christian, Jews, gay or lesbian, young people of North African (*Maghreb*) origin from France, or young Turks from Germany, men or women, poor or well-off and whatever else might make them different – what can the educational team which proposes a programme to such a group actually know about their lives? Is everybody actually living in the same reality? Do at least two of them share the same preoccupations?

There are basically two ways of finding the answers to these questions. One can tell participants what they should think and assess whether ‘treatment’ has succeeded (mission, instruction). One can also listen to them and give everybody the same space, the same attention, the same possibility to participate and construct. It should not come as a surprise to find us advocating for the second route. But, what are we then? Are we the members of educational teams and organizers or perhaps, neuters, the media or clowns? If we are not missionaries of our own thinking and convictions, how can we communicate at all?

We can tackle some of these issues by creating situations that deconstruct the layers of identity. The activities also involve us, the educational team, in the same way they do any participant. Games, role play, artistic productions and exhibitions, frequently changing informal situations, group work and various other programmatic statements in front of the entire group help to introduce a process of mutual opening. Religious orientations, lifestyles, hopes and aspirations, heroes and idols become subject to an intense exchange of views and opinions, as do preferences and likings with respect to fashion, music, film, arts and literature. It is of the utmost importance that all this can happen within an appropriate, warm and welcoming environment, such as a residential training centre. Such a centre allows for the sharing of one's life during meal times, parties, excursions and whatever else takes place on the informal agenda of such events.

This is where tolerance of ambiguity can develop. The objective of activities geared towards developing this critical element in intercultural learning is to allow participants to discover that different 'truths' exist in the world at the same time. Participants discover the many beauties of the many ways of life, without any one being better than the other.

This is not easy to put into practice as an educational approach. Many people with a 'closed identity', which is always a produced identity, will find this style of learning unbearable. They are searching for clear messages and orientations, probably viewing ambiguity as exactly the one thing to avoid in life. They will refuse to accept the concept of tolerance of ambiguity and discontinue 'playing the game'. This is an inherent risk in intercultural education and training. It also points to one of the most important

misconceptions about tolerance: it has to be learned – we are not born with it. Learning also necessarily creates biases and stereotypes. If these remain intact and unchallenged and people choose, consequently, to take unyielding positions, they will decide about their ‘range of tolerance’ on their own. This also means that they will sanction any violation of what they have decided to ‘tolerate’. Hence the particular vocabulary that speaks of ‘guest-workers’, ‘host-countries’, ‘level of saturation of tolerance’, and so on.

When practising tolerance of ambiguity, doubt and self-criticism will challenge preconceived ideas. They have to be revisited and revised time and again, and within a community. The best concept to describe this process is that of ‘discourse’ (Jürgen Habermas). Without convictions and ‘personality’, such a discourse cannot happen. In the same way as the discursive tradition constitutes democracy and equity within the communication process itself, intercultural learning can add a global communication dimension to the commercial and political ones we already have.

Empathy

In Europe and North America, for certain, and in some other parts of the world as well, there are a few shared moments in history that are ‘shared moments’; almost everybody in one generation will remember exactly where and when a certain piece of news reached him or her: the assassination of President Kennedy, the murder of John Lennon, the night the Berlin Wall came down, the shooting of Yitzhak Rabin. These represent a few, selected moments of communion and they highlight the emotional quality of empathy. We have to admit that we do not know what a comparable emotion would be for Iranians or Chinese today, and

it would be very difficult to even think about one such moment in the entirety of known history of humankind which could have been felt by everybody on the planet. But we trust that empathy is a quality belonging to each of the world religions and potentially to every human being. To describe this quality in a simple definition will not do. Maybe one key to understanding this quality could be contained in the meaning of the expression 'to put oneself in someone else's shoes' or, to quote an old Indian chief (instead of using a European proverb), 'don't judge anyone else before you have walked one moon in his shoes' (oral tradition, no written source available).

One of our educational staff members has actually made a discovery game out of these expressions. She asks participants to form a circle and take off their right shoe. Then she asks everybody in the circle to move over one step and to put on the shoe of his or her right-hand neighbour and to keep it on for a moment. Afterwards, there can be a discussion on how it felt. This little exercise demonstrates perfectly the whole range, from comfort to pain, that empathic behaviour entails, and it also shows that it has to be learned. Emotional acceptance, intellectual respect and some idea of belonging to 'one human race' (with reference to the UNESCO charter) are achievements of a learning process. It is not something that can be counted on or taken for granted at the beginning of a meeting between young people with different origins.

To develop empathy in an international group is a prerequisite for reconstruction in the educational process. This is a strictly interpersonal category and it does not belong to the world of representation, delegation and mandates.

Solidarity

Within the learning process described here, solidarity represents the practical, social and political side of empathy. Whereas listening and understanding can remain restricted to an exchange between two individuals, the capacity to work in a team, to function as a group and to share is essential for any social interaction.

During the ‘first modernity’ much of what solidarity meant to people and society was learned within existing *milieux* and class structures, within large families and larger religious communities. For some time (and until recently) the capacity to feel that one belonged to a larger group and to function in it was also demanded by powerful social movements, such as the feminist movement, the peace movement, the ecological movement, and of course, the workers’ movement.

Recently, social analysts have observed a deterioration of particular *milieux* and class structures, increased competitive behaviour, very strong individualism and a detachment from larger communities. Developments such as post-materialism, individualism, hedonism, cocooning and de-politicization add further elements to the overall picture, connecting with loss of values and social Darwinism. We can justifiably ask where this road is taking us.

In embracing Anthony Giddens’ concept of ‘second modernity’, which also seems more appropriate to post-socialist societies in Central and Eastern Europe, we reject this view of a society disintegrating into miniscule units, incapable of producing social and political agents of change. In fact, political discourse has changed with respect to its form and format. New media and new tech-

nologies have influenced this process enormously, but the need to interpret the world, the need to take a position and join others and the awareness that democracy is fragile and has to be defended against its enemies is as alive as always.

A 'lifestyle democracy' does not have to be egotistical and apolitical. It is just different. In many ways it opens up possibilities for the creation of a more heterogeneous profile of society in those countries with a homogenous state tradition. This could bridge the gap between the 'foreigner' and the 'indigenous' – an indispensable process if ever we are to ever speak of 'European citizenship'.

To combat widespread cultural pessimism, education needs to help fill this gap and replace what other socialization agents can no longer accomplish. Our assumption is that if young people can gain experiences in which they can create projects together with others from very different economic, religious and cultural backgrounds, they will become more convinced that they can engage in social action in their own home environments. They will also come to believe that they will not have to face the many risks in today's societies alone. 'You Never Walk Alone' is the title of a publication on marginalization and youth cultures, written by young people and edited by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, Advisory Committee EYC / EYF, 1996).

Solidarity can be learned within small groups by means of well-honed exercises. However, the connection to intercultural learning is also a cognitive one. To understand the implications of globalization and to orient oneself towards European developments, such as the creation of a common social policy within the

EU and the safeguarding of Human Rights in the member states of the Council of Europe, these 'major themes' need to be part of one's political education. These themes will not normally be on the agenda of civic education curricula, though. The measure of a democracy can be made by examining its record of dealing with minorities and foreigners. This may not be a very popular statement within the political climate of the moment, but is it inaccurate?

Learning to be in solidarity with others and learning about solidarity in general is related to the interdependence of today's world, to peace and development and to the existence of 'one world'. 'Think globally, act locally' is a good slogan. The statement is easily made, but hard to put into everyday practice.

Intercultural learning puts participants in situations where they experience, sometimes painfully, how their own identity has been created (deconstruction, de-learning). Participants learn about the discrepancy between self-image and public image and the limits of voluntary efforts. If they are able to accept ambiguity as a dimension of international meetings and if they have become genuinely curious about their fellow participants and take an interest in them, then they can take the next steps: demonstrating solidarity, cooperating and developing projects together. To the extent that participants belong to formal organizations, they will now discover that being a delegate carries a different meaning.

Creativity

It needs to be emphasized time and time again: culture mixing is attractive. It promotes innovation, lets out creative energies and

has been a driving force in history. European societies in particular are to a great extent the product of North-South and East-West migrations. If we understand how nations came into existence and how they are influenced by cross-cultural encounters, racial or ethnic purity arguments appear ridiculous. One would wish that all those who embrace racial arguments when discussing nationality would try to live entirely without potatoes, coffee, tea, tobacco, pasta, medicine and mathematics, to mention just a few essentials of today's life in Europe, which in a world of closed borders would never have found their way to us.

By sharing experiences in a culturally mixed working atmosphere, by benefiting from a variety of philosophical traditions and by exchanging different perspectives on problems and problem solving, we become more creative in our approach to new situations.

THE GLOBAL LEARNING COMMUNITY

There have been more genocides since Auschwitz than in all of recorded history before Auschwitz. Trusting that humankind will learn from history seems to be somewhat unfounded. In a recent address to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Daniel Tarschys, Secretary General of the organization, commented,

...In the euphoria following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of our continent, who imagined the cataclysms of Albania, or Bosnia, or Chechnya? Yet there they are – A, B, and C. The new primer of European security is right in front of us. Seven years after the liberation from totalitarian systems, it is high time to recognize that we are only beginners in this school of democracy, than no-one knows fully how to master the new problems of European security. (Tarschys, 1997)

If we agree that we, as beginners, have a lot to learn, we must accept that educational objectives in political socialization need to go beyond the requirements of a national curriculum. The existence of a nation state has been a reality for some countries such as Norway, Germany and Italy for less than 150 years. These political entities now control education, the media and the political process. They will continue doing so. However, relations between cultures and the quality of intercultural communication tend to escape national control.

This provides intercultural learning with a very special role in formal and informal education. Such learning operates not in opposition to the reality of a world of nations, but as a bridge between cultural, religious and philosophical movements and the political organization of international relations. It could represent the 'school of democracy' that the Secretary General of the Council of Europe mentioned in the speech quoted above.

The intercultural learning community needs to be global in dimension. This global context of communication can be experienced in Europe by means of exploring and discovering, exchanging and cooperating. A 'fortress Europe' approach to international affairs would be nothing more than the extension of traditional nationalism with wider borders and with the old aim of dominance. Several learning paradigms are possible. Interculturalists have been thinking about intercultural ashrams, where people would learn about themselves and others over a longer period of time, using meditation, another religion and another culture. They have also proposed working with the old idea of 'academia', as proposed in Greek philosophy.

We have seen a number of these old ideas, as well as a good number of new impulses come from young people, come together in our activities around the idea of an 'imagined community'. Such a concept allows an understanding of the individual as a cultural being and as a social constructor. It also allows us to concentrate on the social and political contents of a European community as a community of Europeans, on civil society, on community building, on local action and on global responsibility.

The fulfilment of one of our dreams would be an enormous pool of expertise with respect to living democracy, experience in participation and intercultural communication.

A very worthwhile aim would be for people to possess a European and global dimension in their thinking and acting. This aim is very ambitious indeed. Who can seriously pretend to be 'globally-minded'? However, a citizen of a European nation state with limited political awareness, reaching only to the borders of their country is, willy-nilly, a political cripple. Even if this is to be a reality for constitutional purposes, this should not be imperative for the future, and certainly not in the field of learning. The only way to liberate international relations from their inherently cynical character is to gradually enlarge the territory connected through binding agreements. Such agreements between states and inter- and supranational organizations can move us closer towards common values. These do not have to be invented; they already exist.

We can find some of our more basic shared values in international (cooperation) documents. If only the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights and the European Convention of Human Rights, the UNESCO Charter, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the recommendations of the UN conferences on the environment (Rio), women (Beijing), and housing (Istanbul) would be taken seriously, ... what a wonderful world it could be! (Louis Armstrong)

REFERENCES

- Eberhard, I. (1997). LIFE – Ideen und Materialien für interkulturelles Lernen. Munich: BMW AG
- Council of Europe, Advisory Committee EYC/EYF (1996), 'You never walk alone', Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Der Spiegel (1997). The defeat of the multicultural society.
- Laurent, A. (1997). The world is a puzzle, *New World* (2), p. 66.
- Riconscente, M (1997). *Die Zeit*, p. 33.
- Tarschys, D. (1997). Speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, 22 April 1997, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

‘Young People in the Focus of Social Studies’

Peter Lauritzen wrote this short article about some of the basic assumptions of youth research sometime in 1998. It was never published, but he circulated it among colleagues for reflection.

1. The situation of young people in society and comments on their social role and social situation are usually the result of a research construction. There are situations where their specificity within a chosen study is so low that they can be neglected as a social category, there are normative constructions by which they literally disappear (such as, everybody over the age of 18 is to be considered a responsible adult) and there can be a refusal to introduce ‘young people’ as a research category altogether, because the category remains purely descriptive and cannot be determined within any theoretically based system. Finally, what is ‘young’ depends on historical circumstances and related conditions of social change; so youth can be at best an indicator of social change.

2. As valid as this may be, the other truth is that over the last 20 years a body of knowledge has grown on youth, making its mark as ‘youth research’. This is a composed field of studies and research, made up of sociologists, development psychologists, criminologists, anthropologists and political scientists. These researchers form a network, communicate in specific publications, hold symposia and colloquia, have gained recognition with national au-

thorities and international organizations and have, over the last 20 years, become a kind of ‘knowledge pool’ on young people.

3. Some of the basic assumptions of youth research are the following:

- young people are a resource for society, not a problem. The way society treats this resource indicates how much a society has trust in itself and in its future;
- in all social systems young people represent the potential for the prolongation of the existing value system and for the security of the older generation. They are the ‘life insurance’ of a society;
- in times of revolutions, transition and heavy social change, young people will play a crucial role, which they will always lose when the phase of the consolidation of the ‘new value system’ approaches. They will be the soldiers, the militants, the activists, and often they will be at the source of social unrest. Some social scientists go as far as to refer to ‘Juventology’ in describing this paradox of being the agent of conservation at the same time as the agent of social change;
- ‘youth’ has been generally understood as a ‘moratorium’ (Margaret Mead), that is, the phase between dependency equalling childhood and adulthood equalling full personal and social responsibility. In this understanding, youth is the time of growing into responsibility, personally and socially. This process of socialization has its family, formal education, social class, peer group and lifestyle context and – with this view of things – will lead to social status and full citizenship;
- This ideal type view, which in both capitalist and socialist countries corresponded strongly to the social reality until the early 1980s, is certainly no longer standard setting for a majority of young people. Researchers speak of the end of ‘rites

of passage', that is, of no clear distinctions any more between childhood, youth and adulthood; they speak of the rupture of the contract between the education system and the labour market, that is, of no corresponding reward between performance in the formal education system and remuneration in work if there is access to work at all; and they speak of a 'risk society', namely, the gradual disappearance of social nets and family support which could help bridge transitional life conditions.

4. The disappearance of youth

Late entry, if at all, into the labour market goes together, for many researchers, with identifying youth with periods of continued dependency. In this case youth age definitions as in many national legislations and the UN (e.g. 16 – 25 years of age) become artificial. For many sociologists, 'youth' has become an open age scale. This leads to the disappearance of the 'moratorium', but also to a number of biological, generational, personal development and social categories traditionally used to understand the 'youth' condition.

At the same time, the market and its machinery of consumption propagate eternal youth. The strategists of human consumer habits agree that habits form early and try to introduce to young people what is expected to last for life.

By being politically and socially extended and economically eternalized, youth becomes ubiquitous, mind-besetting and totalitarian. In other words, it disappears or can only be defined and concretized in categories of marginalization and social exclusion.

This closes the circle: at the outset we saw that youth is a resource for a society, not a problem. Now we see that it can only be recognized as a problem.

5. Research questions

- Can the circle of deconstruction of youth be broken?
- Are differences in biographies and distinctions between generations important to social construction, social justice and social dynamics?
- Will 'youth' completely become a function of market mechanisms?
- Can these mechanisms be influenced by consumers?
- Are the young running the market or is the market running them?
- Within this culture of hedonism and consumerism, what place remains for the political system and for social responsibilities?
- Is civil society the all-embracing category to describe the relations between the market, public sphere and governance?
- Or is it the losing element between a development towards mindless consumerism and authoritarian government?
- And, what is the role of the young in all of this?

‘Cultural, Education and Youth Policy’

*This article was commissioned for and published in **Forty Years of the Council of Europe – Renaissance in a pan-European Perspective**, Schmuck, O. (Ed.), Europa Union Verlag, 1990. Europa Union Verlag was the publishing house of the European Movement in Germany. The article and the book were originally published in German.*

1. WIDE-RANGING EXPECTATIONS AND DEMANDS

In speeches and articles about European cultural policy, we frequently come up against the comments made by Jean Monnet in his later life, on looking back to the founding years of the European Community, that now he would begin with culture rather than with coal and steel, followed by agriculture. These oft-quoted comments contrast strangely with another view heard at least as frequently: diversity, regionalism, differences and variety are characteristic features of European culture. In the words of José Vidal-Beneyto, Director of Education, Culture and Sport at the Council of Europe,

... any synthesis or even rational amalgamation is inconceivable. To talk of European culture ... is linguistic obfuscation. At the very most, and that is no minor matter, we can talk of recommendations, pointers and values, with which we can begin to understand one another, but which clearly do not form a coherent, incontestable system.¹

¹ *Europäische Zeitung*, October 1989, p. 40.

The concepts of ‘European identity’ and the ‘European dimension’ (for example, in education) occur in many Council of Europe resolutions and recommendations. However, the correlation is only clear in the context of concrete social, cultural or political projects: in themselves, the concepts are so abstract that – like the saying about principles which are held up so high that you can easily slip through beneath them – every cultural policy player in Europe can live with them.

The situation with European education policy is not much different. Here too, no-one would think of proposing a binding, uniform European model for school, vocational or university education. That would run contrary to the established cultural heritage and European diversity in the education sector.

In the youth sector, too, things are only a little better. At the Council of Europe, and in terms of a clear conceptual profile, it is still far too early to talk of a European youth policy. However, agreements are gradually emerging at local, regional and national level in the member states, giving an indication of the possible content of such a policy.

In any case, the concepts overlap: education policy forms part of cultural policy, while youth policy is to some extent also an aspect of education policy, and so on. There is, however, the question of how long the Council of Europe can afford to keep all its working concepts in cultural, education and youth policy as open as possible and put the idea of tolerance and respect for the differences in development in Europe before the principle of joint action, which, in a body comprising so many states, is necessarily tied up with the formation of majorities and minorities, with dominance and zones of influence, and with ‘winning’ and ‘losing’.

It is not hard to see that the European Community will also become a social and cultural community and one day a political union. Karl Deutsch was right all along: the spill over effects from the economy are being felt already and affect central areas of cultural, education and youth policy, for example, school and university qualifications, vocational training, mobility, initial and further training, language skills, new technologies, audiovisual media, regional development and the promotion of metropolitan areas (capitals of culture). The European Single Market is almost upon us, it is not long until 1 January 1993 now, and the year 2000 we hear so much about is not that far off either – ‘European citizens’ are wanted, and quick!

They must be able to speak foreign languages and understand the social, cultural and historical background of other peoples in Europe; they must be mobile and creative and have no fears in the face of new technology. In view of the still largely nationally orientated education and information practices in schools and universities, in the media, in political parties and in voluntary associations, bringing about a fundamental collective rethink in the direction of Europe can only be described as a huge task.

The great social transformations taking place in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe are also causing lasting changes in Europe’s post-1945 political order. At the beginning of 1990, it is hard to predict the impact of this process on the Atlantic alliance, European integration, other systems of international cooperation and, ultimately, European societies themselves. However, there are good reasons for being optimistic about the future: the arms race between the two blocs will be replaced by a system of collective security, the ideas of Human Rights and fundamental freedoms and democratic pluralism will replace single-party rule

and command economies will gradually be transformed into social market economies. Awareness of environmental issues will continue to grow. This trend, which was still inconceivable only two years ago, now seems possible and also politically feasible.

These developments require action and are having a huge impact on the Council of Europe. For cultural, education and youth policy, as in almost all other sectors in the Council, there is a simultaneous need to identify methods of cooperating with the European Communities (EC) and to move forward with the process of opening up towards Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe.

This task is a little like squaring the circle and has thrown up questions such as the following at activities in the European Youth Centre:

- Is there a culture of the EC? Or why does the Commission offer exchange programmes for young people such as Comett, Erasmus und Youth for Europe, which are open solely to people who live in EC countries? Are Prague, Stockholm, Warsaw, Zurich, Budapest and Vienna not sites of European culture in the eyes of the EC?
- Is the EC an open system or is it one that seals itself off and, in the cultural sector, is not prepared for exchanges with other experiences, values and methods? Is it necessary to adapt to the EC or is the EC also capable of adapting?
- Where does the Council of Europe stand in these developments? Is it a separate, independent forum for international cooperation in the cultural, education and youth sectors, which is important in its own right to the member states, or is it only a kind of waiting room for the countries of Central,

Eastern and South Eastern Europe until they are at last fit for full membership of the EC?

- And where does all that leave the countries of Western Europe which, for various reasons, cannot or do not wish to join the EC and which so far have felt that their idea of European co-operation was well catered for within the Council of Europe?

Questions such as these raise substantial doubts about the concept of 'European identity' among the young participants at events held by the European Youth Centre, including, for instance, for those whose very benefit all the older generation's efforts to build Europe are supposedly intended. These doubts need to be taken seriously. They can lead to intolerance, xenophobia and nationalism, especially among the younger generation. Nevertheless, the task of European cultural, education and youth policy is precisely to ensure that tomorrow's European 'citizens' fully subscribe to the experiential knowledge, sense of belonging and utopia of European identity. In order to take on this task from the intellectual position of the Council of Europe, further conceptual clarification is necessary: identity is commonly seen as a concept involving the exclusion of others and refusal to accept diversity. This all too simplistic approach neglects the fact that identity is also compatible with shared features within a mental image of diversity and that differentiating ourselves from others does not necessarily involve excluding them. There are many levels of identity, ranging from personal identity to identification with the social groups and classes to which we as individuals belong.

Different regional and national identities have existed within Europe for centuries. European identity is accordingly a broad concept that in no way prevents us from sharing our collective identity as Europeans with all members of the human race worldwide.

The abuse of the concept of European identity by ideologues that exploited it for very specific purposes and values (in the Fascist Era, during the Cold War, during Europe's economic expansion) should not stand in the way here any longer. Perhaps 'Western' values are really actually shared European values, which are now being rediscovered in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, too?

2. MODUS OPERANDI, METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

The culture, education and youth sector is somewhat unusual in the work of the Council of Europe in that it is governed by fewer conventions than the other sectors. The 130 conventions adopted by the Council of Europe to date are actually regarded as the organization's real achievement.

In the culture and education sector, however, there are only four conventions:

- the European Cultural Convention, which provides the legal framework for cooperation that extends beyond the Council's 23 member states, the additional states currently being the Holy See, Yugoslavia, Poland and Hungary;
- the European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas leading to Admission to Universities (1953);
- the European Convention on the Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1956), which is mainly of relevance for the recognition of periods of study abroad by modern language students;
- the European Convention on the Academic Recognition of University Qualifications (1959), which, for instance, covers the use of foreign university degrees but not the recognition of university studies for professional purposes.

In the youth sector, work is under way on a proposed European convention on youth mobility. Whether this will be successful will probably become apparent at the third Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth in Lisbon on 20 and 21 September 1990.

Other conventions, which are generally held to be of relevance to the culture, education and youth sector (for example, transfrontier television) come under the responsibility of other sectors of the Council of Europe's work. Sport (anti-doping convention) will not be dealt with at all here. It can, therefore, be seen that conferences, exhibitions, symposiums and expert discussions also play a key part in achieving the culture and education sector's objectives. The starkest contrast to the Council of Europe's traditional intergovernmental activities can be found in the youth sector.

3. YOUTH WORK AT THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE²

Youth work at the Council of Europe is divided into three areas of activity:

- The activities of the European Youth Centre, an international youth training and meeting centre, whose purpose is to involve young people and youth NGOs in building Europe;
- The activities of the European Youth Foundation, an international funding agency for youth work in the member states;
- The activities of the Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Cooperation in the Youth Field (CDEJ), an intergovernmental group of experts on youth issues, which is also in

² For more details here, see Richard Corbett, *Ein Dach für die Jugend Europas: Die Zusammenarbeit von Jugendorganisationen im Rahmen von EG und Europarat*, ('An Umbrella for Europe's Youth: Cooperation of Youth Organizations in the framework of the EC and the Council of Europe') in *Integration*, Year 11, No 3/88, p. 112 et seq.

charge of preparation of the Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth.

The Youth Centre and the Youth Foundation operate on the principle of co-management between non-governmental youth organizations and governments, while the CDEJ is a purely intergovernmental activity.

3.1. The European Youth Centre

The European Youth Centre performs many different functions. First and foremost, it is an international youth training centre for youth organizations. It offers a wide range of international study sessions, language courses, training activities for youth leaders, symposia and expert meetings. As the centre is open to all 23 Council of Europe member states and a whole range of types of organizations and youth work, its educational approach can only be described in very broad categories, the key areas being human rights, democratic pluralism, international understanding and the development of a European community of states. The most important standards are the Statute of the Council of Europe and the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The centre's methods are based on intercultural learning and thematic group work. The teaching staff, called tutors, mainly act as advisers to teams that the respective youth organizations themselves have chosen for 'their' activities in the youth centre. In some cases, for instance in training for youth leaders, the centre also runs activities where it alone is responsible for the content and methods. To sum up, the European Youth Centre could be described as a youth training agency institutionally embodied in and belonging to the Council of Eu-

rope, whose educational approach is based on an intercultural co-operation model for youth work.

3.2. The European Youth Foundation

The European Youth Foundation provides financial support for international youth activities. Since its inception in 1973, it has distributed over 50 million FRF³ to over 100 different organizations for international projects involving 50,000 young people from around 40 countries. From its budget, to which the 23 Council of Europe member states contribute, the Foundation provides grants for youth organizations and for events and seminars covering a whole range of topics, with the focus in recent years having been on issues such as unemployment, women's rights, peace and disarmament, ecology and the environment. It provides further support to publications and documentation on youth issues. It also makes regular grants to international youth organizations to cover their administrative expenses. Every year, approximately 5,000 young people take part in activities of different kinds for which the foundation provides funding.

3.3. The Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Cooperation in the Youth Field (CDEJ)

At intergovernmental level, the cooperation between the signatory states of the European Cultural Convention is coordinated by the Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Cooperation in the Youth Field (CDEJ). Among other things, the committee has

³ At the time of writing of this article, the Council of Europe's budget was calculated and operated in French Francs (FRF). The Euro equivalent of this sum is approximately 76,225,000.

considered the situation of young people in the member states, youth mobility and the promotion of youth participation. It also did the groundwork for the Conferences of European Ministers responsible for Youth held in Strasbourg in 1985 during International Youth Year and in Oslo in 1988. It is currently preparing the Third Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth in Lisbon. For the first time, Poland and Hungary will also be taking part as ordinary members of the conference, which they participate in as parties to the European Cultural Convention. In line with the co-management principle of the youth sector, representatives of European youth organizations also take part in these conferences.

Without going into the details of the huge number of youth policy and social issues which are constantly discussed in the youth sector, it can be said that the following specific projects are decisive for the future of the youth sector in the Council of Europe:

- Removal of barriers to youth mobility. This can be achieved through a host of individual measures by governments or through the drafting of a European convention on youth mobility;
- Development of a European network for promoting youth information and youth counselling. On the basis of a recommendation by the Committee of Ministers, this is done through international and national measures and in cooperation with youth information centres and organizations;
- Introduction of a European system of youth cards. It is still unclear what institutional role the Council of Europe will play in such a system; one of its committees of experts is working on the matter;

- Training of teaching staff for youth exchange measures. This is one of the areas of activity in which the youth sector cooperates closely with the EC;
- Publication of teaching material in the area of intercultural learning. There are great needs for material and know-how here, and the centre's tutors will place major emphasis on increasing the output of relevant material in future;
- Opening up the sector to youth movements from Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe. To this end, the Centre and the Foundation are currently developing a broad range of information and training events;
- Preparation for the Europe of 1993. Young people from EC member states make up 80% the young people in Council of Europe member states – there can be no doubt that the youth and social policy consequences of the Single Market will be the focus of many events of the European Youth Centre and the European Youth Foundation;
- Development of a multidisciplinary Council of Europe project to combat intolerance in Europe. That was the central demand of the second Conference on Intolerance in Europe (December 1989) and, in line with the resolutions adopted there, will mean the culture, education, social and youth sector joining forces with the human rights and fundamental freedoms sector.

With its youth work to date, the Council of Europe has ensured that international structures for youth organizations have been able to develop over the last 20 years without resort to shady funding⁴. It is now in the process of supplementing its work, which

⁴ See Per Fischer, '40 Jahre Europarat – Vom gescheiterten Föderator zum 'kreativen Trainingscenter'' (40 Years of the Council of Europe – From Failed Federalist to Creative Training Centre), in *Integration*, Year 12, 3/89, p. 122.

focused strongly on out-of-school education for young people in the 1970s and 1980s, with other areas of activity: youth research, youth documentation and youth information in Europe and a system of intergovernmental cooperation at expert level.

Overall, it seems that this area of the Council of Europe's activity is ready both for cooperation with the EC and for opening up to new member states in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe.

4. THE CULTURE AND EDUCATION SECTOR

Cooperation with the member states in this area is covered by the European Cultural Convention and the Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC). The latter body, which comprises experts from foreign ministries and the ministries responsible for culture and education, is generally regarded as being cumbersome in operation.

Be that as it may, experience shows that countries which want to become involved in the Council of Europe usually look first to cooperation with the CDCC. That was true of Finland, which has been a full member of the Council of Europe since 5 May 1989, and it may also be true of Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland – all three governments having made corresponding declarations of intent. And without a special role for the CDCC, no progress will be made in the particularly complex area of 'cooperation with the Soviet Union' either.

For the immediate future, the CDCC's programme is focused on three main areas:

- experiencing cultural diversity;
- strengthening European identity;
- understanding the problems of society.

The task of raising awareness of cultural diversity concerns core activities where the Council of Europe is both innovative and efficient: language teaching, which draws on knowledge from communication and comparative cultural research; the links between computer science and linguistics in the area of 'language industries'; and the promotion of regional languages. Further activities include practical cooperation projects involving libraries and cultural documentation centres, the EUDISED educational science thesaurus (European Documentation and Information System for Education), and projects to promote reading and poetry.

As a contribution to the key area of strengthening European identity, the Council of Europe regularly holds widely acclaimed art exhibitions with cross-sectoral themes from European culture, it is developing a programme to promote European film production (EURIMAGES) and it is rediscovering historical routes that once were important channels for communicating European culture (for example, Baroque Route, Silk Route), while also supporting the work of cultural centres in the member states.

Culture and cultural policy need to be subjected to public debate and, indeed, controversy if they are to keep on moving forward in pace with political and social realities. The Council of Europe therefore launches topics of cultural debate at national and regional level, encourages comparative assessments and analyzes and support efforts to promote cultural research.

What this programme of cultural cooperation does not include is the field of education, with its more specific tasks (except for the promotion of language learning).

In this area, the Council of Europe has set itself three goals:

- adapting education policy to the needs of social change;
- increasing the quality and efficiency of education systems;
- promoting intercultural learning.

In the area of school education, the achievements of the Council of Europe's work lie in the development and support of European teacher training seminars and teacher exchange schemes, the promotion of European awareness in schools through competitions and pupil exchanges, cooperation between education scientists and teachers in curriculum development, the introduction of models for human rights education, media education and intercultural learning and, lastly, as already mentioned, a project to promote language teaching.

In the area of out-of-school education, the Council of Europe's achievements include the following: the promotion of programmes for the long term unemployed, groups at risk of poverty and peripheral regions, the promotion of programmes for retirement, adult education in towns and municipalities, literacy programmes and the promotion of further training opportunities (for example, through distance learning).

In the area of higher education, the Council of Europe's activities include the following: the organization of European workshops of academics, the promotion of mobility for academic staff, work on the recognition of qualifications and academic titles in the member states and scientific cooperation in the field of the prediction and prevention of natural and technological disasters.

The list of the Council's activities in the cultural sector is longer than the areas presented here and it should be no surprise that cultural diversity is also reflected in a diverse programme.

5. MUCH REMAINS TO BE DONE

While the Council of Europe's exhibitions, its cultural routes and its foreign languages project keep up international interest in the organization, it is clear that it has, nevertheless, lost its lead in other areas of activity. Over 20 years ago, the Council of Europe led the debate in Europe about further education; that is no longer the case. For instance, the Council of Europe has hardly anything innovative to say about vocational training, which actually almost completely dominates current debate about further education. It really is doubtful whether it is enough to concentrate on strategies for marginal groups, especially against the background of the developments in the EC and in East-West relations at present. Perhaps education strategies geared towards economic and social development and renewed recognition of vocational training's place in further education could give fresh impetus to the Council's activities in the education sector. Today's citizens tend to react sceptically when there is so much to be 'preserved', as is often the case in Council of Europe cultural projects. They would prefer to see the Council as a pioneer or a body promoting change, rather than as a museum warden. Without complaining, attention must once again be drawn to the organization's limited financial resources: it has only 1.3% of the EC's budget at its disposal (DEM 117 million in 1989⁵) and only a fraction of that goes to culture, education and youth.

5 The equivalent of 117 million Deutschmarks (DEM) is approximately 59,820,000 Euros.

The economic development of Europe as a whole is surely the most pressing need of our time. If there is no hope of development for Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe or, for that matter, all of Southern Europe, the situation in Europe will remain unstable. However, the relevant economic developments are closely tied up with cultural exchanges and cultures learning more about one another. What actually remains from the heyday of great trading nations or leagues? Cultural heritage tells us about the impact the Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Romans and the Genoese or, indeed, Spain, Great Britain and France had on other peoples. Languages, religions, customs and architecture are all too often the product of migrations dictated by economics.

Europe now has the unique opportunity of growing together economically and culturally – without imperialism, colonialism, fascism or any other supremacist ideology. If this opportunity is to be seized properly, all the experience gathered to date in international cooperation in the culture, education and youth sectors must be incorporated in the historical process. If that happens, the future for the Council of Europe looks bright.

‘Selected Remarks on ‘Role’ In Simulation Games Training Situations’

This short conceptual excursion into the methodological concerns of an educationalist working at European level in intercultural programmes for young people was probably authored in the mid- to late 1980s, a time when Peter Lauritzen was active in developing the training programme of the Youth Directorate and was still regularly working in face to face educational situations in the activities of the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg. As can be readily understood from the piece, this was a time when the ‘pedagogy’ proposed by the European Youth Centre Strasbourg still needed to be ‘explained’.

Sociology of education and social psychology have developed a number of key notions that might be helpful to understand ‘role’.

The following short, incomplete definitions are based on Mead, Goffman, Erikson and Habermas.

IDENTITY

Identity is composed of personal and social identity. Personal identity stands for: uniqueness of an individual, his biography, his socialization and maturation process. Social identity stands for the norms and patterns of behaviour that have been taken over from society, and also the incorporated expectations of society towards

an individual. Identity can be described as the **balance** between personal and social identity, which influence each other mutually.

Importance for the simulation game: in the case where a person does not manage this balance, for whatever reason, this will influence their mode of communication and action. This non-balance may be the result of longer term developments, may have become structural, or it might also be caused by a strange new **situation** (first time at an international seminar, first time taking part in a simulation game, etc.).

ROLE-DISTANCE

Role-distance can be seen as the capacity of a person to reflect about roles taken previously, to adapt the role-interpretation to new circumstances and to relate societal norms to personal behaviour. As the definition now stands, it still includes types of opportunistic behaviour. Role-distance is probably only possible to develop for people who manage to keep their **identity**, which requires a certain amount of self-reflection. Opportunism would be the sudden change of one set of norms to another and as complete a role-adaptation as possible to the new requirements. Role-distance, on the contrary, is the way to keep a balance between personalised social identity in an ongoing process of reflection and management of new situations.

Importance for the simulation game: games of a longer duration (in this case, 3 days) ask for a very strong identification with the roles to be played. Players who have difficulties in creating a certain role-distance during the game might find themselves being quite confused at the end of the exercise. This confusion may be the beginning of a reflection and – in that case – very healthy.

It may also dismantle deep-rooted insecurity, leaving the players alone with the frightening experience that they have been able to play successfully, for example, their own enemies. We shall have to come back to this point when talking about the role of the educational team during the game.

TOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY

With tolerance of ambiguity we mean the capacity of a person to tolerate diverging expectations and needs in order to take account of them when solving a problem or taking a decision. This includes the capacity to tolerate contradictions, to exercise self-control and also to take uncomfortable situations upon oneself, if need be. We might also associate tolerance of ambiguity with some good old-fashioned democratic virtues such as patience and common sense.

Importance for the simulation game: within the game, tolerance of ambiguity will be required at several levels:

- keep a cool head with regard to **all** incoming solutions and proposals until a decision is needed;
- make use of the potential of **all** group members within the game; keep one's own wish to dominate under control;
- keep the game connected to all previous steps of the training course;
- stay open for the richness represented by the **intercultural** composition of the players, and learn about the related variety of role-interpretations.

The interrelation is obvious: for a person without identity and the capacity of role-distance, tolerance of ambiguity will be impossible to achieve.

EMPATHY

Empathy is manifested when someone is able to develop an idea of a given partner in a communication process, about the aims and possibilities to act and when he manages at the same time to keep his own intentions balanced with these. In other words empathy could be seen as a kind of anticipation of mutual interests within a communication process, related to a common goal or task that the partners in that process want to realize.

Importance for the simulation game: to develop empathy will, to some extent, be difficult for the players as the communication process will be quite influenced by intercultural variables which in turn will necessarily create insecurity when judging the intentions and possible scope of action of other players. However, when the game starts, participants already have one week's common experience behind them, which will certainly help overcome insecurity.

Apart from the culture problem, the capacity to act with empathy will, within the game, be most difficult to achieve for players who might be strongly marked by dogmatic thinking or rigid types of behaviour.

INTERACTION / COMMUNICATION

Interaction means mutual influencing. As we have seen, this is by no means a mechanical process, but a very complex one, marked by mutual anticipation of intentions, interpretation of roles and role-taking. This very abbreviated version of what is called 'symbolic interactionism' in a much more complete theory needs an additional qualification: until now, when talking about interaction,

we have almost taken it for granted that the partners in interaction would act under equal conditions. Identity, role-distance, tolerance of ambiguity and empathy can create this equality in interaction. Instead, most of us are used to and marked by non-equal (asymmetric) conditions of communication. Fairly often the process of mutual influence and mutual role-taking is made impossible by economic and political power conditions which turn communication into the well known one way street of order and obedience or stop the communication process altogether by simply imposing themselves. Achievement of symmetry of communication (equality) sounds utopian. But without trying to approach this aim, we will simply never have democratic communication conditions.

Importance for the simulation game: one of the intentions of the game is to stimulate as many interactions as possible. The groups will – at least at the beginning of the game – have the impression of acting under equal conditions. They will soon discover that this is not the case. How are they going to cope with this? Will the better-placed ones exploit their power in an ‘irresponsible’ way? Will they turn to formalism and not contribute anything to the game once they have understood that they have a powerful position anyway? Will the less powerful ones explode in blind activism? Will they be frustrated and give up? In any case, the experience of asymmetric conditions of communication and the ways found to cope with that situation, especially ways to identify the reasons for inequality, are of central importance within the game. An additional difficulty for interpretation of what will happen during the game is the fact that the game is played by youth leaders from about 15 European nations, using only two conference languages (English and French). Asymmetric communication can therefore not only be understood as a result of economic or polit-

ical power but also very much as a problem of language performance and cultural perception.

CONCLUSION

The educational aims of the simulation game 'European Youth Conference of the Council of Europe' within the European Youth Centre's training course for youth leaders are only to some extent controlled by what has been learnt during the course and an adaptation to the action conditions of international youth work. The focus of attention is mainly on the type of role interpretation the players will develop during the game. Will they simply reproduce what happens in other statutory organs of youth policy anyway? Will they play under the conditions of an international event in a completely different way to what they would have done at home? Will the game force them to be honest with themselves as to **why** they want to work in international youth work? Will they be able to create something new? The indicators which will help answer these questions during the evaluation will depend on the degree of **communicative competence** that players can develop under game conditions: identity, role-distance, tolerance of ambiguity, empathy.

‘Ragnar Sem: 10-02-1925 – 10-09-1983’

This obituary and tribute to the first of Director of the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg, Ragnar Sem, was published in the European Youth Centre’s Bulletin after his death in a car accident in September 1983.

Ragnar Sem died in a car accident on Saturday, September 10 1983, near Strasbourg. He was 58 years of age. Ragnar retired on 1 May the same year from his position as Director of the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe. Soon afterwards he married an English friend. He then went back home to Norway. Ragnar Sem, a journalist, had planned to visit Strasbourg again, the town where he had spent 20 years of his career working at the Council of Europe. In fact, after his career as a civil servant at the Council of Europe, he had wanted to take up his former occupation again. This visit to Strasbourg was to attend the wedding of the daughter of an old friend.

Death struck at a moment when things were getting better for him. Those who had met him during the short period before his accident were struck by the impression of a man of invincible optimism, brought with him from Norway. They will remember a man set apart by a unique blend of charm, sometimes aggressive, of dry humour, irony and scepticism – all in all of Ragnar Sem, the energetic and strong-willed man they had known for years.

It is not easy to translate the deep sorrow and the shock that his Strasbourg friends felt. Did he really matter as a politician,

an educator or a civil servant? Perhaps, but we will never know. What matters is that he was a man who was unable to compromise on his way of life. His closest friends could not but be impressed. In the international environment in which he lived, he stood out, with a personality and a charisma so rare. In our artificial world, pretty words, high positions and 'make-believes' often matter more than principles. This was never the case with Ragnar. He had no pity for those who lost themselves in international cooperation. He would laugh at the bureaucrats and 'apparatchiks' that he had to deal with so often in his life. Those who had daily contact with him could only imagine the contempt he felt for those who did not have the courage to stand by their opinions. For Ragnar, those who did not care what kind of work they did as long as it was well paid were alien. However, he never objected to international cooperation in its essence – overcoming nationalisms, stereotypes and prejudices in order to build a peaceful community of States and societies in Europe and in the world. In his professional life, he was always able to stay Norwegian, proud of his origins and of his national identity, as well as being a European and an internationalist. He was a fighter. Without his action, the construction of a European Youth Centre would still be on the agenda of a Strasbourg commission.

However, the EYC, created thanks to Ragnar Sem, has existed for ten years. In this Centre more than 10,000 young people have learnt about other countries and cultures. They have learnt languages and had the advantage of living in an international community. They have learnt that they, too, can fall into the trap of stubborn nationalism and temptation, which they have now learnt to reject in favour of broader visions. No such thing can be found

anywhere else in Europe, be it Oslo, Athens, Lisbon or Vienna. The thriving youth community of 21 European countries, which is revitalized everyday in Strasbourg, will always keep Ragnar Sem's name alive.

His youth can hardly be compared to the youth of the participants coming to Strasbourg nowadays. After a happy childhood spent in Skien, which he enjoyed recalling, his first adult years were marked by the German occupation, his involvement in the Resistance and after the end of the war, by a time spent in the British army. In the aftermath of the war, as a trainee journalist, Ragnar witnessed the first steps in European cooperation that we know today: French-German reconciliation, attempts to create a political and economic union in post-war Europe. This might have made a significant impression on him. But he never became one of those blind Europeans whom you could call European nationalists.

A critical mind, always awake, he did not adapt easily. First a liberal, he became a socialist, but maintained a deep distrust and hostility towards centralists and bureaucrats. He was totally convinced of the historical necessity of uniting workers and the progressive middle class, unions and social democrats. He ardently defended this belief in countless discussions throughout Europe. Ragnar always respected his political adversary. In the end he judged people not according to their political label but according to their human qualities – solidarity, friendship, open-mindedness and creativity.

Ragnar was not only an inspiration to the creation of the European Youth Centre, the greatest project of his life, but he also left his footprint on the Norwegian Council of Youth, the European Youth Foundation and numerous journalist and political associa-

tions. He was one of the founding members of the Council of Europe staff trade union and its first executive secretary.

There were many people in Europe who deeply loved this man. Fighting, carrying contradictions, a soldier in times of peace, man of peace in times of conflict: these are some of the thoughts that come to mind when I think of Ragnar Sem.

He lived his life to the full, sometimes even dangerously: he worked in journalism in London, he was the Director of a youth conference at the United Nations in New York, he was an officer in a United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo, he conducted missions for the United Nations and UNESCO, and finally, he worked for the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. A versatile professional – a journalist, educator, an officer in the military, a civil servant, a manager: in a nutshell, a man that one couldn't understand or describe easily.

What he created in Strasbourg will remain, but some of Ragnar's other characteristics might fade into oblivion. And yet they deserve to be remembered: his incredibly single-minded fight against the after-effects of a long disease, the suffering he experienced in the face of human stupidity, arrogance and apathy, his impatience and his clarity of vision. His utopia? Undoubtedly, a world democracy. In his discussions and in his political interviews, he never failed to remind us of the responsibility which fell on Scandinavians (however limited their means) to advance this cause.

This man, a politician through and through, would ceaselessly point out that nothing mattered more in political life than formal and social education. It is quite logical, therefore, that he managed

to be the Director of the most important European institution for international work in the youth field for more than ten years.

Youth organization representatives, state delegates, Council of Europe colleagues, the people of Strasbourg: countless people mourn Ragnar. On their behalf I would like to say that Ragnar Sem's name will remain alive in the memory of many Europeans.

‘Their Violence’

*This article, about the phenomenon of violence perpetrated by young people, was published in **Forum 21**, the magazine of the Council of Europe (No. 2, 1981). **Forum 21** refers to the number of member states in the Council of Europe at the time.*

A new debate about youth is raging in many European countries. For many social scientists and politicians, the outlines of the debate are still hazy: they do not know if they are dealing with a new youth movement, with the creation of specific youth sub-cultures or, indeed, whether the younger generation has a radically different view of the state and society; they do not know how to react.

Some find the whole thing perfectly clear: a new youth revolt is in progress, whose distinctive feature is the unthinking use of violence. Everything that looks like ‘action’ is trotted out as evidence: spectacular clashes between ecologists and the police at anti-nuclear demonstrations; ejection of squatters; young people as the moving force in racial disturbances; big city vandalism.

The mechanism is well known: it is difficult to discuss complex social developments, and people who understand something of them tend to prefer a language that not many understand. It is hard to give a picture of the exchange of ideas, but easy to present violence and its consequences. So the debate about young people and their problems is reduced to talking of their violence.

In this process, central insights are often ignored, insights gained from discussion of previous youth movements, but which apparently must be learned afresh every time.

SAFETY VALVE

The first is that there is no youth problem except in relation to society as a whole. Young people react vehemently and radically to general social problems; they have not yet become adapted; they haven't learnt the rules yet. As a group in transition from education to working life, as yet unhampered by the complex ties of a family and a job, they often react more freely, more spontaneously, sometimes violently, to injustice, restriction and oppression.

So far, so good. We know already that if you are not a revolutionary at 20 you have no heart, and if you are still one at 30 you have no brains. As long as everything remains within bounds, youth protests act as a kind of moral conflict on behalf of the generation and are not unwelcome as an alibi and a social safety valve. We are all familiar with the well established doctor or lawyer who talks with muted pride about his 'very revolutionary son', confident that this state of affairs will be no more lasting than an attack of flu.

NO FUTURE

What has changed today? Why is there no consolation in thinking back to earlier generation conflicts? Probably, because anxiety about the future is not a privilege of youth. It is simply that in young people, it expresses itself without restraint, and many

young people's state of mind can be summed up in two short words: 'no future'. Behind this lies fear of unemployment, fear of war, fear of continuing destruction of the natural environment, fear of a world of petty regulations and concrete – are these felt by young people alone? Young people, as the group with the longest future ahead of them, express their existential fears openly and unaffectedly, fears which many adults are loath to express or to admit.

At the same time, many young people bluntly deny that politicians have any capacity to build a humane society. As moral sticklers, they refuse to accept the rules of the political game, the contradictions, the necessity for compromise, the separation of powers, the differences between the state order and the economic order, the complex web of relationships prevailing in the international community.

All of this is subjectively experienced by many young people as 'the system'. You can escape from a system, you can fight it or fit into it – but you do not identify with it. The basic principle of democratic society – 'We, the citizens, are the state' – is threatened, and violent forms of social conflict arise. They are to be regretted and condemned: but we cannot say that they will not happen in the future.

BREEDING TERRORISTS

Politicians and leaders of opinion will have to face many problems: will they foster the existing fears and use them for their own ends, will they regard young people as criminals and treat them one and all as budding terrorists? Or will they try to mobilize the

feeling of democratic unity by being willing to enter into dialogue, by giving people a greater measure of autonomy, by establishing open communication and solidarity? There are some problem areas where, by trying to appear strong, the state may in the long run turn out to have been weak, namely in the areas of peace and disarmament, the immigration problem, housing shortage and squatting, ecology and the anti-nuclear movement.

Many young people have actively committed themselves in these areas; acts of violence have occurred and more will occur. Anyone who avoids facing the underlying causes and uses the violence of a few to discredit the many young people whose approach to the central problems of our society is critical and committed, need not worry about any shortage in the next generation of European terrorists: they're breeding them themselves.

‘Focus on the ‘Conference on Intolerance in Europe’

This editorial, published in the European Youth Centre Bulletin, No. 1, 1981 introduces the background concerns that led to the organization of the 1st Council of Europe ‘Conference on Intolerance’, and takes a novel look at the big European Dreams of the time that were felt to be threatened by the phenomenon of intolerance.

News 1980: Nazis assassinate two Vietnamese refugees in a Hamburg refugee camp; more than a hundred people die after a fascist bomb attack on Bologna’s train station; the Munich *Oktoberfest* ends in the slaughter of a dozen visitors by a bomb set off by a young Nazi; a Synagogue in Paris is set on fire and people are killed in the street by explosives hidden in a car.

Are the horrors of the past coming back? Certainly an increase in open and violent antisemitism can be seen and worries about the shadows of the past are more than justified. Are these singular, unconnected events or do these horrific news items represent the tip of an iceberg, and will we have to prepare for worse things to come?

It is difficult to answer. How can one today distinguish clearly between antisemitism, racism, xenophobia, and intolerance? Are these events referred to really so different from comparatively less dramatic ones such as the pulling down of immigrant’s homes by bulldozers, ordered by Communist mayors in some French communities, the increasing violence against young immigrants and

migrants in some European countries, the pushing around of Roma/Sintis (Gypsies) at many European borders? The list could easily be extended, but why only talk about European events? What about the Soviet Union and Afghanistan? What about Iran, El Salvador, Palestine, Kampuchea? The media confront us with too much news on acts of violence and breaches of international law for us to process. Who has even the faintest idea about all the 240 regional conflicts that have broken out in the world since the Second World War, counted as wars by the United Nations because a couple of thousand people died in them?

There is no simple explanation that can help us find an orientation on how to prevent acts of violence and wars in the future. There are, however, all kinds of doctrines and positions of vested interest and if we follow, willingly or unwillingly, any of these doctrines and interest positions, we are convinced of being 'objective'. But can one remain objective without trusting in a set of values or religious belief or an ideology; in other words, can one think of a human existence 'free of values' and fumble one's way through life and politics just by being pragmatic?

It is again time to ask these kinds of questions. Undoubtedly, we do not live in a world of peace and understanding (and never have done) and even in Europe, **intolerance** is on the increase. So if intolerance in **Europe** is the issue here, this is not to forget about the many worldwide problems but to concentrate on a region in which the results of reflections and actions of democrats might still come in time to prevent intolerance and open aggression from becoming a pattern of daily existence. There is no doubt that other areas of the world could only benefit from a Europe that successfully manages to contain the forces of intolerance.

What are the odds of this happening? Europeans have had a number of pleasant dreams shattered since 1949 – if the creation of the Council of Europe can be taken as the historic landmark of the reopening of communication between European peoples and governments, and the regaining of a European identity.

Dream no. 1, at least for many Europeans in Central Europe, was the dream of a European Federation, or, in a less dogmatic form, of European Political Unity. Parts of the dream found their way into the Treaty of Rome, relics can be studied in the European Parliament, but the most prominent product of today's European Communities – the Common Agricultural Policy – has turned into a nightmare.

Dream no. 2, not unconnected to No. 1, consisted of a European economy of eternal growth, an affluent society that would manage to cope with most of its problems simply through becoming richer. A look at today's employment figures, energy prices, inflation rates and investment rates marks the end of that dream.

Dream no. 3, was a dream of peace and disarmament with Europe playing a key role in decreasing the tensions between the superpowers and diminishing the barriers between East and West Europe through increasing trade and human relations. Few people still have that dream. On the contrary, the arms race has accelerated.

All three dreams can be connected with the phenomenon of intolerance: if the idea of European Unity cannot be revitalized in the sense of constructive European cooperation, envisaging new forms of cooperation with the Third World and thus forming

a regional contribution to a new international order, **nationalism** is waiting around the corner. If Europeans do not prepare for a slower pace in the economy and for alternatives to present energy sources, **authoritarian forms of government** may well impose themselves. If the idea of *détente* is sacrificed to the arms race, the risk of war will become uncontrollable.

The 'Conference on Intolerance in Europe', as organized by the European Youth Centre in December 1980, had to place itself in a context free of illusions. Under the present circumstances, for an open dialogue on increasing intolerance in Europe to exist between governments, youth organizations and researchers, is already a success as such. The conclusions of this Conference and many of the reflections related to it – which you are invited to study in this issue of the Centre's Bulletin – should lead to an intensified struggle against intolerance in Europe.

In an opening address to the Conference, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Mr. Van der Klaauw, introduced the instrument to be used in this struggle – an 'effective political democracy'. He linked the efficiency of a democracy to its capability to defend Human Rights.

Naturally, during a conference on intolerance, the yardstick of Human Rights becomes **minority rights**. It will be interesting to follow up the reaction of young people and of youth organizations in Europe to many of the questions and problems brought up by the Conference.

Maybe I forgot to mention another dream that is approaching its end: Dream no. 4 is the one of everlasting youth and the confi-

dence in youth and youthful behaviour to remain a dominant pattern in society. At least those young people today, looking for jobs, facing poor career prospects or seeking proper housing already have an idea of how quickly one can become a member of a **minority group**, and an object of intolerance.

‘Is that what the Commission wanted? Comments on the Dialogue between the European Communities and Young People’

This article by Peter Lauritzen, published in the newspaper of the Europa Union of the same name for which he worked in Hamburg in April 1970, treats the question of relations between European youth movements and organizations and the European Communities. This article was originally written and published in German.

‘Young people and the European Community’ is the heading of a text by the Directorate General for Information of the Commission of the European Communities that describes the starting point for a major colloquy between the Commission and youth organizations as follows. In its declaration of 1 July 1968, the Commission of the European Communities stated:

...But Europe is not only customs tariffs. Europe does not belong only to the manufacturers, the farmers or the technocrats ... Europe is not only the Europe of the Governments, of the Parliaments or of the administrators. It must also be the Europe of the peoples, of the workers, of youth, of man himself. Everything – or nearly everything – still remains to be done.

It announced its intention to hold three colloquies, one of which would have the purpose of

... discussing with representatives of youth organizations what can be done so that today's young people look to the future more confidently and help to shape it.

The youth colloquy is due to be held in Brussels from 12 to 14 June (1970). Around 250 youth representatives have been invited and six national preparatory colloquies and a preparatory conference with representatives of political party youth organizations are taking place before the mammoth event itself. The preparatory conference and the national colloquies in the Netherlands and Germany have already taken place – and it must already be asked whether the Commission knew what it was getting itself into in when it began this process in 1968. Did Brussels really expect a response like the one below?

...The unification of European states that has occurred to date has improved the profit expectations of big industry and brought about a concentration of economic and hence also political power in Europe. This capitalist integration is taking place while the labour movement is split into many parties and trade unions. The European Economic Community is the Europe of high finance, not of the European people. We demand the creation of a socialist Europe of the working masses.

That was the declaration issued by the socialist group of young politicians in Brussels on 11 February (1970), the particular significance of which probably lies in the fact that every member state was represented in the group. Opposing views by conservative or liberal participants are not reported in the proceedings of the session; apparently they were unable to form official groups during the first meeting.

Clearly the formation of such groups was also not the intention of the Commission, which, according to its initial announcement, is seeking dialogue with 'young people', presumably suggesting that they go about political activities in a different way from adults. The Commission would hardly have come up with the idea of holding a colloquy with the latter. And there are real grounds for amazement about the method that the Commission chose for the preparations: national preparatory colloquies! Is the European Parliament not constantly cited as proof that the level of integration and the state of European awareness today already allows for cooperation in political groups, in which shared political views take precedence over national allegiances? And is the need for a democratic counterpoint to the omnipotence of the Council of Ministers ('All Power to the Councils!' Six European Heads of Government?) not cited as justification for the direct election of the European Parliament and calls to give it specific powers?

The Commission could have modelled the youth colloquy on the Parliament and provided for various transnational preparatory colloquies with political youth organizations that would have had the task of preparing with their political partners from the member states, which could then have engaged in real debate with the Commission in Brussels. Was the Commission afraid of such debate? Or was it just out of habit that it opted for national preparation (the method of the Council of Ministers), a practice widely regarded as reactionary?

The result was a meeting in Wiesbaden on 20 and 21 March (1970) of associations which probably would not have come together for any other reason: the Young Socialists and the Young Christian Democrats, German Youth in the East (DJO) and the Young Eu-

ropean Federalists, the Social Democratic Student Association (SHB) and the German Sport Federation Youth League (DSJ), the Youth Organization of the Confederation of Trade Unions and the Youth Organization of the Civil Servants' Federation, the Red Cross Youth Organization and the Hikers' Youth Association (DWJ); in short, all the organizations that could be reached through the various national organizations for young people, young politicians and students.

The only common denominator between these associations is that, for financial reasons, they are all members of umbrella organizations. Would there be political consensus or heightened political controversy on the subject of European integration against this backdrop? Agriculture negotiations in the Council of Ministers must be a real pleasure by comparison. Confronted with a procedure that they usually battle against, namely the obligation to find the lowest common denominator at national level, confronted with a concept of 'youth' which seems to imply some kind of pre-political reserve, and confronted with the widest range of motives, intentions and know-how conceivable in any assembly, the Young European Federalists had a clear choice: to leave or to form a political group after all. They opted for the latter. The Young Socialists, the Trade Union Youth Organization, the Social Democratic Student Association, the European Federalist Student Association and the Young European Federalists gave cooperation a chance and it worked. Both in the procedural and in the substantive debates, it became clear that these various associations were prepared to enter into real dialogue with the Commission. This dialogue remained fruitful both in the plenary debates and in the workshops in spite of all the differing views – for which credit is also due to Manfred Lahnstein, Deputy Head of the Private Of-

fice of Commissioner Wilhelm Haferkamp, and the Commission officials who were present at the colloquy in Wiesbaden.

This openness for cooperation was also underlined in a motion tabled at the beginning of the closing plenary debate by the Young European Federalists, which gave the participants the opportunity to sign the conclusions of the discussions so as to allow identification of alternative positions within the broad spectrum of views. In rejecting the motion, the gathering destroyed the last remnant of political representativeness that an *ad hoc* assembly conducting a vote should be granted. For the above-mentioned associations, it was clear then that the Wiesbaden event could only serve the purpose of clarifying the participants' own positions and seeking to engage in joint reflection in the workshops with the Commission officials, who were quite critical in some cases. Going by the experience in Wiesbaden, the strategy for the main colloquy can only be to overcome the approach of national youth representative bodies in a transnational, progressive group with the goal of politicizing the youth colloquy. That is the only way of ensuring that the confrontation of two empty phrases – 'Europe' holds talks with 'youth' – is turned into a political event where the political practices of the European Communities can be looked at critically.

‘Reunification Possible? On the Views of the Young European Federalists’

*Peter Lauritzen explores the prospects for German reunification in this article, published in **Europa Union**, the newspaper of the European Movement in Germany, in May 1968, just seven years after the erection of the Berlin Wall. This article was originally written and published in German.*

The reunification of West Germany and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in a German nation-state is not possible. The West German government does not have the means of implementing a policy aimed at that goal. Nor does it have any allies for it.

The nation-state is not a politically desirable goal, as it is unsuited to the demands placed on it today. In the fields of economic policy, foreign policy, security policy and technology, it is necessary to achieve the requisite objectives through the policy of European integration. The success of European integration policy should be judged by the extent to which appropriate supranational structures are developed for problems that cannot be solved objectively at the nation state level. Insofar as we succeed in realizing such supranational structures in a European federation, the question of whether one or two German states take part in the process will become irrelevant. The involvement of West Germany in this process in the pre-federal European Communities is a decision in

favour of the policy of European integration and the dismantling of national sovereignty. It is therefore both necessary and only honest to give up the policy of reunification in the nation-state sense, as it is neither possible nor desirable.

The social models in Western and Eastern Europe are fundamentally different. Mutual respect for the systems in full knowledge of their differences is a precondition for cooperation policy. The stronger the national differences that develop between the socialist states of Eastern Europe, the greater will be the scope for the policy of cooperation. However, closer cooperation will be possible only if the security interests of the Soviet Union are not affected. If the process of national emancipation and social evolution which has begun in almost all socialist states except the GDR continues, it is possible that socialist variants of West European organizational models for intergovernmental and supranational cooperation will emerge, as socialist nation-states no longer offer the appropriate dimensions either.

West Germany and the GDR are structural elements of the two systems. The firm integration of the two German states in overarching structures is consistent with the security interests of the other states of Western and Eastern Europe. The governments of the two states should recognize that cooperation policy cannot ignore the other state and shape their policy accordingly. The two governments should not see themselves as the exponents of a conflict about the social order of a future German nation-state but as component states in structures whose social principles are not compatible, but which can and should engage politically with each other while retaining their differences. Therefore, it is necessary to abandon the current politics along the four directions of

the compass and to regard European integration not as a potential contradiction to primarily nation-state governed *Ostpolitik*¹, but rather as a political process through which the institutional pre-conditions for an Eastern Europe policy can emerge.

The problems facing West Germany in its policy towards Eastern Europe are as follows:

1. The existence of the GDR as a state and its calls for diplomatic recognition.
2. West Germany's legal claim on the territories east of the Oder and Neisse.
3. The West German government's desire to defend its security with nuclear weapons.
4. The fear and the allegation of the East European states and the Soviet Union that West Germany is pursuing a revisionist and revanchist policy.

Re 1: The existence of the GDR as a state cannot be questioned. The recognition of that state by West Germany is not appropriate if it takes place because the West German government sees it as a tactically convenient route to a German nation-state. However, it is fully appropriate to integrate the GDR into an Eastern Europe policy devised at the level of the European Communities, including the diplomatic recognition of the GDR by European institutions. If West Germany pursues a consistent European policy, it can show in its policy at the European institutions that the isola-

1 Literally this means Eastern Policy, but it refers specifically to the engagement of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany under Willi Brandt with its Eastern European neighbours, including the German Democratic Republic. The *Ostpolitik* included a set of treaties made between the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Soviet Union between 1970 and 1972.

tion of the GDR is not the goal of its policy of cooperation with Eastern Europe.

Re 2: Legal claims on the Oder-Neisse territories must not lead to a policy of revision of the existing position. A declaration that the West German government does not intend to assert its legal claims is overdue. The continued dismantling of national sovereignty in Western Europe offers the Polish people the best guarantee that the territorial integrity of Poland is not under threat.

Re 3: The current level of armament means that any non-nuclear defence strategy is unrealistic. The efforts by the West German government to acquire nuclear weapons as a means of defending West German security are therefore legitimate. Any attempts at national solutions are pointless. European states must work towards a solution that ultimately enables them to guarantee their own security.

Re 4: Stepping up the policy of European integration is an effective response to the socialist states' repeated accusations that West Germany is revisionist and revanchist.

There are great opportunities for West Germany in policy towards Eastern Europe today if it succeeds in presenting its policy jointly with other states and pushing forward the work of European institutions. If, however, it also continues its policy based on restoration of the nation-state in its Eastern Europe policy, its opportunities will be very limited from the outset.

Interviews

Interviews

This section containing interviews with Peter Lauritzen is the shortest in this book. This is quite simply because very few interviews were found in the archives and among the papers he collected in his office. It is not entirely clear whether this is primarily because he was not regularly asked to give interviews because a civil servant might not be as interesting to the media as a political representative, or rather because the interviews he did give took place mainly during missions and visits to member states, and were, therefore, given to local or national media, and broadcast or published in the language of the country concerned. Another plausible explanation might be that Peter Lauritzen really preferred to write or speak in person and did not enjoy to be falsely quoted or to have his opinions and statements misrepresented or misinterpreted.

But, on occasion, he contributed to a publication by giving an interview in which he spoke about his work or someone else wrote about his work. In his earlier years as a student activist and journalist with the Young European Federalists and the *Europa Union* in Germany, interviews were more frequent.

In this section, then, we have included three pieces which are representative of the kind of interview Peter Lauritzen occasionally gave. In the first, from 2005, he was asked to provide insights into one of the key themes of his late professional career, the recognition of non-formal education, for a publication prepared by the Belgrade-based *Hajde Da!*, an association promoting non-formal education in the context of Serbian youth and education sec-

tor reform. In the second, from 1995, he talks at length to Lynne Chisholm, a long-standing colleague in the field of youth research cooperation, about the latest developments and innovations in the Council of Europe's youth sector. Finally, in the third, again from 1995, we meet Peter Lauritzen in his role as Director of the newly opened European Youth Centre in Budapest.

‘Recognition of Non-Formal Education in Europe – An Interview with Mr. Peter Lauritzen’

*This frank interview was published in 2005 in **Non-formal Education in Europe – A Step Towards Recognition of Non-Formal Education in Serbia and Montenegro** by Hajde Da!, a Belgrade based association active in the field of non-formal education with young people, and treats latest European developments that can underpin voluntary and associative efforts to recognize non-formal education.*

Mr. Peter Lauritzen is one of the leading European experts in the field of development of youth policy and a great advocate of non-formal education in Europe. Peter currently holds the position of Head of Youth Department in the Council of Europe’s Directorate of Youth and Sport. We interviewed him in July 2005.

1. If non-formal education/learning were a cake, what would it taste like?

PL: Dangerous comparison, the one with the cake. What does the cake-symbolism refer to in Serbian semiotics? As you know, in English ‘you cannot have your cake and eat it’ and that would make Non-Formal Learning (NFL) a fairly airy thing. Trying to understand what you mean I imagine one of these long-lasting biscuits sailors would take with them on long tours; so the taste would be salty and very dry; but it would nourish you over a long time.

2. What is the common interest of Vocational Educational Training (VET) and the youth field in recognition of non-formal education in Europe?

PL: Whether you take the Bologna process or all that is being said on citizenship through education in the Council of Europe, or whether you take the working groups around the Life Long Learning process and the Bruges-Copenhagen process: they all agree that learning has to contain – amongst others - three components:

- a. personal development
- b. vocational training; life skills
- c. active citizenship

This triad has to appear, whatever the dominating learning area is. So far everybody agrees; conflicts arise when we talk about learning organization in more detail. A recognition strategy could be helpful in sorting this out. It might lead to a mutual recognition between youth organizations, faith communities, adult education, e-learning communities and media-based learning, youth and community work, second-chance learning, *education populaire* and experimental learning on the one hand and VET providers and formal education on the other. In the interest of improved learning conditions for everybody, recognition may pave the way to reshaping the learning landscape, and then the youth organizations would clearly be on the winning side. However, there is no recognition without quality standards, control, capacity to repeat learning settings, structured curricula and some form of professional assessment. Youth organizations who do not want this and feel that it is an intervention into their own learning culture have, in fact, nothing to gain; gain is reserved to those youth organizations and youth and community workers who seek recognition as learning providers.

3. What do we lose and what do we gain with recognition of non-formal education?

PL: What you lose and what you gain cannot be discussed without creating a social/political/cultural context. In my mind, NFL belongs to a democratic learning culture. It takes place anyway, planned or accidentally. It may take place within the school or out-of-school, complimentary to it or, in some cases, as an alternative. Whilst formal education is known to everybody and belongs to each citizens' biography, NFL is dispersed, varied and – as a public process and good – literally unknown. To make it visible, one has to show what it does and **prove** it. School does this; why should NFL get away with it? There are good arguments to go against recognition in many contexts: when it is undesirable that public authority regulates the sector, when a space of freedom from school type learning is needed, when the surrounding societal context is authoritarian and controlling, when large bodies such as churches or political and ecological communities search their own space outside the state – in all such cases one can lose by going for recognition. Recognition does imply being recognized by European institutions, national and local government and social partners, which means that it has to be very clear what is subject to recognition: the learning provider? The learning process? The methodologies used? The learning environment? The learning objectives? Their impact on democracy? The success of the learner? One can lose freedom and spontaneity; one can win greater support, enlarging the learning offer, open new careers and guidance options, influence the formal education system and political status, enlarge the participation offer, include minorities, promote gender equality,

give greater justice in learning careers and professional perspectives for youth and community staff. Ideally, all these achievements need not be reached by losing freedom and spontaneity: a mature society and public authority should be able to recognize NFL as an instance of critical rationalism and analysis, and foster its developmental potential regardless of the powers that be.

4. What is quality in non-formal education, and who should set the quality standards?

PL: Clarity of aims and objectives, appropriate material learning conditions, trained staff (voluntary or professional), learner-centredness, solution-focused, a variety of methods used, a good balance between individual and group learning, proper timing of steps in respect of learning, relaxation and private time, room for intercultural relations and reflection of their influence on the learning process, a good knowledge of previous learning histories and good information on the intended use of the learning, a reasonable balance between cognitive and skills training, attraction of and in the learning process, self-reflexivity, assessment of progress and difficulties, self-assessment and group evaluation. The quality standards should grow out of a process of development and gradual agreement between public authority and learning providers in cooperation with the research community. This should lead to an agreed assessment system, the training of assessors and the implementation of an efficient and transparent system. Some countries have this; it can work. The European Conference of Ministers of Education (Oslo, June 2004) has also passed guidelines on the assessment of NFL.

5. What European tools can help recognition of non-formal education in Serbia and Montenegro?

PL: The existing tools: ‘Europass’¹, the modern language portfolio, agreed VET standards, the youth work portfolio (in preparation at the Council of Europe) – there is no reason to suggest anything else but the existing European standards and tools. There are, of course, also some national examples: the Finnish study book, the French practice (in France a right for assessment in NFL activities already exists), the UK youth work portfolio, and so on. As for national examples, one has to shop around to see what fits the Serbian situation best and then adapt it.

6. And, finally, your recommendations for recognition of non-formal education in Serbia and Montenegro?

PL: I would not have any, here, from my workstation in Strasbourg. Instead, I will send you as an appendix the results of a recent consultation between governments, NGOs, trainers, agencies and foundation in Sofia (6-8 June 2005), carried out in cooperation with the Bulgarian government, the Stability Pact Working Table 1, the European Commission and the Council of Europe. This text contains concrete suggestions with regard to training, embedded in political and social recommendations. The process initiated by the

¹ Europass makes qualifications and skills better understood throughout Europe. People who are looking for a job – whether in their own country or abroad – can use Europass to present their qualifications and skills so that employers can correctly understand and appreciate them. The Europass service, provided through a network of national centres and an Internet portal, provides a number of instruments to make this process easier including a European CV format and certificates for the recognition of non-formal learning experiences in the context of youth work. See http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc46_en.htm.

text will continue in March 2006 with a South Eastern European Youth Ministers' Conference and a number of follow-up activities. Participants from Serbia and Montenegro have participated in the drafting of the text, so I believe that this regional approach may be just as true to Serbia and Montenegro. As I produced the text as secretary to the meeting, there is no need to invent anything new.

‘The Council of Europe’s Youth Centre Past, Present and Future: An Interview with Peter Lauritzen by Lynne Chisholm’

*In this interview, published in Volume 1 of the **European Yearbook of Youth Policy and Research** (De Gruyter, 1995), an initiative of the Circle for Youth Research Cooperation in Europe (CYRCE), Lynne Chisholm asks Peter Lauritzen to take a look back, and a look forward to the situation of the youth sector of the Council of Europe.*

Introduction

Coming into contact with the EYC (European Youth Centre) and its work can be a curious and unsettling experience for those whose daily lives are spent in formal educational institutions, whether as students or teachers. The resourcing infrastructure that supports its education and training activities, the ‘whole-person based’ teaching and learning principles and methods, and the quality of the interactional relationships between tutors, administrative and support staff and course participants – all these, taken together, create an atmosphere and a context with which few of us elsewhere are regularly familiar, especially after a decade or more of budget austerity in education and youth work in much of Western Europe.

Certainly my students unanimously concluded that they had never seen or experienced anything like it when they visited the Centre

in the summer of 1994.¹ Indeed, they had never heard of the EYC before they began the education degree course unit that took them there, though all will become non-school educational practitioners in social, community and youth work when they have completed their studies.

As a matter of fact, many of them had, at best, a vague understanding of what the Council of Europe is altogether and how it differs from the European Union.² They came away from Strasbourg with an experience many described as “unique and fascinating” – one which began with registering that all doors are literally open all of the time, continued through a collective *rite de pas-*

1 Some 45 undergraduate students studying *Pädagogik* at the University of Marburg Institute for Education took part in the course unit ‘Transnational Youth Education and Youth Work’ in the summer semester 1994. I had decided to offer this option after having myself been able to observe, participate in and learn from the EYC’s work over a period of some years as an outside consultant / expert. It had become evident that students knew very little about international and multilateral youth work, and its contextualization within youth policies at national and European levels. As part of the course, the students were able to spend two days at the Centre, during which they both learned about its work ‘on site’ and themselves experienced, almost as participants would do so, how intercultural learning principles can be turned into practice. The group produced a dossier in which they documented and evaluated what they had seen and learned: this dossier (in German) is now in the EYC Library. It is important to add here that without the generous and voluntary commitment of the time and skills of the Centre’s staff – especially that of Antje Rothemund, EYC Tutor – this unique opportunity could not have been realized.

2 As to this knowledge deficit, my CYRCE colleague Sybille Hübner-Funk recently discovered in one of her sociological seminars at Hamburg University (winter term 1994/1995) that 17 out of 29 students aged 21 to 37 (20 of them females), who filled in an open questionnaire, did not associate anything with ‘Europe as defined by the Council of Europe’, and five openly admitted that they did not know the purpose or function of this organization. This implies that about 80% of these Hamburg students of sociology and education have a knowledge gap regarding the Council of Europe! Their main ideas relate to the EEC or rather the EU perspectives, but they are quite ignorant as to its growth and/or further integration. “This integration cannot be imposed from above,” is their general position: yet they admit that, “when we look at the everyday attitudes of most people in Europe, there is still a long way to go before shall achieve a higher degree of unification”.

sage (rite of passage) in which they founded cultures and societies without the help of language, and concluded with a sudden, shocking recognition of their own lack of active participation in democratic associative life.

They all learned the enormous potential of an educational practice that is committed to – and tries to live, in itself – the values of cultural diversity, democracy, solidarity and tolerance within the framework of human rights, mutual respect and freedom (see here Council of Europe, 1993a, 1993b). At the same time, they recognized that a very specific confluence of resources and framing procedures assures and protects the Centre's work; this may not be a model that is wholly transferable into the everyday, and it is not an experience that can be offered to all young people through their youth organizations and associations, let alone to those who are not involved in these activities and structures.

Effectively disseminated – whether through people or materials – however, the EYC's values can act as a leading, innovative edge in youth education, training and in intercultural learning pedagogy.³ This is particularly so given the rotation principles that are applied

3 See Mark Taylor, in the *European Yearbook of Youth Policy and Research* (De Gruyter, 1995), Volume 1 (i.e. this volume), intercultural learning pedagogy as understood today originates, by and large, in the meetings and exchange programmes initiated after World War II to promote international reconciliation and understanding between young people, in particular Germans and US Americans. Evaluation of these programmes during the 1970s in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) produced what became, and still remains, the benchmark account of intercultural learning (Breitenbach, 1979; Oberste-Lehn/Wende 1990; Otten/Treuheit 1994). Though well known in youth work practitioner circles at multilateral and international level, this material remains largely unknown to people outside German speaking educational and youth theory and research discourse in Europe. It has not intersected at all, for example, with the development of multicultural and antiracist educational theory, policy and practice (whether school or non-school based) in the UK. (For a recent comprehensive review and evaluation, see Rattansi 1992.)

not only in the EYC's co-management system (see further below) but also to the staffing. The education tutors who support and facilitate the study sessions and training courses requested and co-organized by youth associations are appointed on five-year, non-renewable contracts. Tutors should come with professional, in-the-field experience to offer to the Centre – and should return to the field with enhanced and broadened skills to improve the quality of training and youth work. In other words, they are pivotal to two-way innovation and renewal processes into and arising from the Centres work. Practically speaking, the EYC, as a fully-equipped residential international meeting and educational centre with an annual programme budget of FRF 19 million in 1995 (approx. 2,896,500 Euros), can accommodate up to 75 visitors, who contribute a maximum of FRF 225 in 1995 (approx. 34.5 Euros) towards the costs of attending their course and who are eligible, in addition, to receive compensation for any loss of earnings incurred by doing so. The Centre's annual programme comprises about forty 4- to 6-day study sessions, each with a maximum of 35 participants, supplemented by (an increasing number of) longer term initial and in-service training courses for those working in youth organizations in administrative, policy making, political and pedagogic capacities. All activities, with very few exceptions indeed, are multilateral in nature and participation; the study sessions are, on principle, initiated by youth organizations and associations themselves, the Centre and its staff support and advise, but do not direct and control.⁴

⁴ The Youth Directorate provides a range of informational material about its structures and activities. See for example, the EYF booklet *'Europa ABC: A guide to international youth work'* and the EYC *'Training Course Resource Files'* (twelve booklets to date). These, and a wide selection of additional documents, are available on request from the EYC / EYF, 30 rue Pierre de Coubertin, F-67000, Strasbourg.

The EYC itself is one pillar of the Council of Europe's Youth Directorate. Its 'sister' pillar, with whom it shares close relations and the same building, is the European Youth Foundation (EYF). The EYF, with an annual budget of FRF 18 million in 1995 (approx. 2,745,000 Euros), makes available grants for multilateral activities (typically seminars, conferences and youth camps) undertaken by organizations (national and international) that serve to promote peace, understanding and cooperation in Europe and across the globe. Both were established in 1972, and both are overseen by governing boards made up of equal numbers, on the one hand of non-governmental youth organizations (INGYOs) and National Youth Councils (NYCs), and, on the other hand, of Council of Europe member states government representatives. Ultimately, the Youth Directorate reports to the European Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Cooperation in the Youth Field (CDEJ), whose membership is made up of representatives of all countries who are signatories to the Council of Europe's Cultural Convention. The CDEJ examines and compares youth policies in its member states, exchanges information and experiences on youth affairs, and works to the Conferences of Ministers responsible for Youth. The EYC itself functions as the Secretariat to the Conferences, which have been held four times since their inception during the International Year of Youth in 1985 (in Strasbourg; 1987 in Oslo; 1990 in Lisbon; and 1993 in Vienna). The equal representation and full responsibility accorded to youth organizations – and hence, to young people themselves – in the Youth Directorate's policy making and decision making structures is what is meant by the term 'co-management'. This, as Peter Lauritzen – Deputy Director of the EYC – says in interview, is

unusual and possibly unique: “Basically it’s like putting a youth club in the middle of a ministry,” he explains.

The co-management principle represents, above all, the conviction that its young people cannot learn about or become indissolubly committed to democratic practice and responsible citizenship if they are not accorded the opportunity to be trusted to do it themselves. Secondly, it accords young people respect as active citizens who have something specific to contribute to the polity and whose life circumstances and views deserve to be taken no less seriously than those of adults, especially of adults in powerful social and political positions. In Peter Lauritzen’s view, the task of formulating and implementing a genuinely global and integrated European youth policy that not only seriously addresses the contemporary exigencies of young people’s lives and futures but also regards young people as a socially important – but by no means homogeneous – category of citizens in their own right has never been more urgent than it is today:

...In my opinion, a society at odds with its own youth and which considers young people to be, in general, a problem group rather than a resource shows signs of a society in decline (1993: 38).

The European Youth Centre sees itself as one element of a counter-strategy to perspectives like these. On the threshold of the establishment of a second EYC in Budapest and the launching of the Youth Campaign within the Council of Europe’s ‘Antiracist Campaign’, Peter Lauritzen reflects on the development of the Centre – which will celebrate its Silver Jubilee in 1997 – and the prospects for its work in the coming years.

Interview⁵

Lynne Chisholm: If you look back to where the Centre started from and where it is now, what have been the main lines of development?

Peter Lauritzen: First of all, it isn't fair to talk about the Centre without talking about the Foundation at the same time. In political terms, both have forerunners to what has subsequently become the picture of the 'New Europe'. Not that the Centre and the Foundation actually did much in political terms, but those who were ready to spend money on the Centre and to organize the political lobbying for its establishment had some ideas in their minds. It was not insignificant that Willi Brandt, in his first government declaration when he became West German Chancellor in 1969, explicitly mentioned the European Youth Foundation in the context of building understanding between young people – and he already had East-West cooperation in mind. The Foundation was the financial instrument for that and was very quickly used by youth structures to prepare what later on became the framework for youth and student cooperation. The Centre, on the other hand, has, from the outset, worked much more with **international** rather than national committees and groups. It has been more a training and meeting place for educationalists within youth organizations, and it has developed a remarkable dynamic. It was originally a pretty small place, really; it only could run one study session at a time. At that time, between 1972 and 1979, before the house was enlarged, we didn't have more than 600 – 700 participants per year. From the outset, the interna-

⁵ Recorded between sessions during the Long Term Training Course at the European Youth Centre, Strasbourg, October 1994.

tional youth organizations were politically pretty strong and had a lot to say with regard to their 'mother parties', their trade unions or the other 'adult' structures to which they belonged. Remember, this was 1968 and all that, and people had actually started the 'long march through the institutions', had started to use and instrumentalize the youth sections of organizations. In those days, for example, the Young Socialists would say, "... we are going to be the party of the 1980s". And that's in fact what they did. When I look at today's election campaigns, all over Europe, I see people coming up who were at the Centre's seminars and language courses in its early years, people who on their way up have spent some time within international youth structures. Naturally, in those days the element of intercultural training, youth work methods or long term training courses was out of fashion; they didn't want to know about it then.

They wanted to have a place exclusively for socialist education or socialist catholic education or catholic Christian democrat education or whatever it was they represented. Their particular INGYO identities were stronger than anything else and it was hard work to get them to share in the common experience of the European Youth Centre, something that is almost taken for granted today. Between then and now, we have moved from one training course to four, we have moved from three or four language courses to 12 – but this is only the quantitative aspect. In my view, the more confrontational ways of working that were typical in the 1970s and early 1980s have been replaced by a more cooperative model that makes fewer distinctions along ideological lines between organizations and groups. I think this corresponds to what is going on in most European societies just now. In the challenge of building up democratic youth structures in Central and Eastern Europe, or of generating synergies to run a successful antiracist campaign and so on, people are

underlining more the need for cooperation between themselves. That's the moment when they suddenly realize they need more infrastructural help in working together – through the Centre and the Foundation and in terms of training. When the Centre started, people approached the idea of training in a much more particularistic way. Socialists would say, “we need training for socialists”. Now they say, “we need good training, full stop. And then we'll do what we think is useful with the skills we gain afterwards”.

LC: How did you manage to bring about that change – or were you mainly reactive to changing demands?

PL: Every innovation within this co-management system has been an uphill battle – long term training courses are a good example of that. Only when we could actually show by evaluations that this course model is successful in practice could we introduce it into the regular annual programme. The most recent example is the ‘training for trainers’ concept – we've had a big debate about whether and why it is necessary. I am sure this will go on. It's inherent in the co-management system that people are happy with the status quo and they always feel that the Centre Secretariat is becoming too strong, always going beyond its brief, and constantly developing new-fangled ideas. So it is a strange dynamic, because innovation **should** come from **them**, but instead, it often comes from the Secretariat and is felt as a threat. This is understandable, though, because there are not so many places where multilateral youth work is financed and carried out the way it is done here. In comparison to other large exchange programmes and bilateral systems, or to the big chunk that sports organizations, for example, get out of international organizations, the Centre is rather a minuscule operation. People tend to stick to it

and do not want to lose it through other people who constantly want to develop it into something else.

LC: As I see it, there are two major lines of work at the Centre. On the one hand there is a political line; on the other hand there is an educational line. As far as the political angle is concerned, the idea of co-management, which is really quite special, reflects particular kinds of values and principles about the way political life could be organized in societies. To what extent would you say that this co-management principle has proved its worth?

PL: It has certainly proved its worth. In the first place, it is a matter of coherence. We know very well that you can't teach democracy at school. Where schools themselves are not democratic organizations the message cannot be understood. The same is true here. We are running an international youth centre – the EYC – and an international foundation – the EYF. If we are now starting to develop particular training programmes for Central and Eastern Europe in cooperation with youth organizations there, then it is **they** who must say what will happen in those programmes. It is not the administrators, teachers or tutors who are going to give the content. In fact we can go further, because we have to recognize that they, too, have a wealth of educational experience and practice to offer us. And that must also come through. So in the end it is quite logical that they propose how they want to work with the Centre.

On the other hand, nobody anywhere just gives youth organizations a big sum of money or some stuff and says, "Do what you like with it". So the other side to it is our governing board, that is, now ten – next year 12 – members from the Council's [in October 1994]

33 member states who take a close look at what we do, and who try to see to what extent they can create links between their national obligations within their respective ministries and the further development of the Centres work. This has proved itself a successful method in the sense that it has turned out not to be a permanent and obvious confrontation between national committees, international groups and governments themselves. They might differ on lots of questions, but you would hardly ever find all the governments in one corner and all the youth organizations in another. The dividing lines, if there are any, are then rather between Latin culture, Germanic culture, little-Europe culture, and whatever else we are going to meet in the future, or Scandinavian understandings of what the youth work project is versus other understandings of what it is. These lines cut across the whole scene, regardless of whether we are looking at governments or voluntary associations.

There are simply different European traditions of non-school, non-formal education. They make themselves felt, over and over again. Our model has proved itself successful in terms of multinational cooperation, and it has proved itself successful for more than 20 years in running a very interesting programme as well as constantly producing new ways of working and reacting quite sensitively to the changes within associative life in Europe, I would say. And we are always looking for new challenges – such as now, the building up of a second Centre in Budapest, or our attempts to get some programming between the more centralized activities of the Centre and the more decentralized activities of the Foundation.

LC: This is the point I'd like to move onto now. Thinking about the experiences that you gained over the past years at the Centre in Strasbourg, and now with the particular challenges you face in

opening the Budapest Centre – indeed after the opening up of Central and Eastern Europe – what sort of lessons if any will you be able to take with you into the development of the second Centre?

PL: I would not know, quite honestly; I would not know. I'm very impressed by the saying that it takes six months to build up a market economy, six years to build up a democracy and 60 years to build up civil society. It's not meant to be taken literally, of course, but it makes you realize that when we say, "... a democratic society today must be a civil society", to convey what we mean to Central and Eastern Europe is extremely difficult: why we do this, and why we want to do these things. Well, we shouldn't hide the fact that, whatever else we are or are not, we also represent a certain set of values, human rights, democracy, the rule of law. And above all, for me anyway, civil society means autonomous citizens who actually take their own decisions about their lives and don't depend on the big state to do this for them. And that is new for many people in Central and Eastern Europe – not for everybody, of course, but for many. It's not something that is particularly difficult to understand in intellectual terms but it's something very difficult to live and to learn.

One of the problems of **our** work, then, is whether it is possible to provide training about immaterial values such as these. What seems to happen easily, successfully and fast in Central and Eastern Europe at the moment is the famous six-month business of building up a market economy, where loads of American-style trainers come and tell people how to make a bargain. This seems to dock up with cognitive structures that have been there all the time, but just needed to be rerouted from bureaucratic to capitalist contexts. That does not seem to be such a big challenge. But when the ques-

tion is to develop ideas such as teambuilding, such as developing responsibility for yourself, such as fostering cultural attitudes that give you a wider range of responses to your neighbours than being hostile to them – in other words – doing what we usually call ‘intercultural learning’, that is, being exposed to insecurity, developing a tolerance of ambiguity, gaining the capacity to organize solidarity, having empathy – all these social qualifications need to be cultivated, too, by education and training. At the Centre, we know and we can show that we have been able to do it. So why shouldn’t we be able to do the same in Central and Eastern Europe?

One more word with regard to one particular chunk of the whole thing. There is a big debate now to enlarge the Council of Europe with the accession of the Russian Federation. We are already running a lot of programmes there, and when we come to this kind of thing – intercultural learning and so on – their answer is, “that is exactly what we need”, because this is a country composed of many nations and ethnic groups who – now that there is no strong, organized ideology any more that keeps them together – need other ways of expressing themselves as the empire they are. And it can’t all be done by the Orthodox Church. I believe that we have a good opportunity with what we have been able to do between Spaniards, Portuguese, Italians, Germans, French and Norwegians, to do this now in other areas of Europe. I don’t see insurmountable difficulties. It’s just a lot of work.

LC: From the point of applied research and evaluation, in fact this kind of change and development is quite exciting, because it offers a ‘real life laboratory’ for developing and using models which have been developed in one particular set of cultural and political environments and seeing how you can apply them in another.

PL: I would think this is a bit of a temptation that should be resisted, that is, to use models which have been developed somewhere else. Our own attitudes, which we have acquired in this long-standing process of cultural work in Western Europe – I think we might still use that term – is coming now to the test and **will** undergo transformation in working in Central and Eastern Europe. That's for sure. And if it's not a two-way process, in which you also transform yourself, then it can't succeed, because people over there will immediately see it as a kind of exportation of models. They seem to be already a little bit sick of that. They seem to be very interested in being able to identify their own identities in such a way that this is actually going to be **their** own job. **We** seem to be very irritated about the fact that this definition process about their own identities, at least for the time being, comes out in a very nationalistic – if not chauvinistic and aggressive – manner. So the problem for us all is how to say, "... listen, we are really interested in how you are going to express yourselves and what your place in Europe will turn out to be in the future. We don't want to stand in your way; on the contrary. We want to build this Europe together. But it can't be done if you don't share some basic values with us. Let's talk about it. We have something to say about this that expresses ourselves, too. For example, what kind of citizenship status the Estonians are planning to give to the Russians who live there. Or that we regard it as our problem, too, how Gypsies are actually treated in Romania, Hungary and Slovakia. We are not going to leave you on your own with these questions – because we have not done this before in Europe, we have not done this with the situation of the Portuguese, the Greek or Turkish or Italian migrant workers. We have not always done well, but we have recognized that this is a new transnational obligation and we extend this understanding

to Central and Eastern Europe.” How are we going to say these things, and get them across in the right way?

LC: This might imply that when you are thinking about the kind of programmes that you are going to be operating at the second Centre in the first two or three years – or longer – that they might be quite distinctive.

PL: That remains to be seen. For the time being, this Budapest project is being set up largely on the same principles as here in Strasbourg and under the responsibility of the same Governing Board. The starting point is that there is no distinction apart from being geographically somewhere else. Therefore, it shall not have a programme structure specially geared towards Central and Eastern Europe. This was very important to make the project acceptable to all the member governments, because there was some fear that we would create a Central and Eastern European ghetto somewhere and have a Western Centre here. That would have been contrary to the way pan-European developments are now understood in the Council of Europe. But even if we say that it will be the same story – so within two years, let’s say, two training courses there, 26 study sessions, one or two symposia and one or two of our statutory meetings, which would mean we’d be using the two Centres equally – it will still be different, because the second Centre is in the middle of Budapest and the Strasbourg Centre is a relatively isolated operation, way outside the town. Some people used to say they have the feeling when they come through the door, that they are leaving the ‘French sector’.⁶

⁶ This is an expression referring to the warning notices in (divided) Berlin, indicating that crossing the border meant entering another sector, especially – in Cold War terms – the ‘Soviet sector’.

LC: That's exactly what my students said when they came here. They said it looked like a prison from the outside!

PL: So we do not want to do this in Budapest, we have plans for the integration of this place into the cultural life of the city. We also want to make it accessible to the Budapest public. It's not such an easy thing to do, though, because the Council of Europe is governed by conventions, immunities and privileges that include responsibility of the organization for everybody in its buildings. I think it can be solved. There are technical ways of doing that. Most people who have been working on this project so far have been very open about it all, they have said, "no, it's not going to be just any Centre somewhere, but it will be the Budapest Centre," which makes it possible to understand more and better about the differences between Eastern and Western Europe.

LC: What you are talking about is one element of the whole – the development of the Council's work is one element in the scheme of politics, education and policy cooperation across all of Europe. You've often said that the Council of Europe and its Youth Directorate cannot possibly address all these issues by itself. It does not have the resources available to do so. The question then arises: what sorts of partnerships – co-management of a rather different kind, perhaps! – do you think it is important and necessary to develop in the next few years to ensure that the work of the Council in this area remains as productive and as appropriate as it can?

PL: I think we have a relatively clear vision of what we are going to do. The question is whether we are allowed to do it, because we have to operate within a very specific mandate and we are in fact part of an intergovernmental organization. Maybe we still have

to learn to give more importance to anything that falls under the term ‘associations’. There is a big tradition of working with associations in the Council of Europe, which gets consulted by them on everything. The Council has recognized over 300 international organizations – but the intense way of working with them that we have here at the Centre, the co-management, the fact that they are partly our bosses, is unique in the Council and often creates astonishment, sometimes refusal to accept it and even great interest in how it is possible. Basically it’s like putting a youth club in the middle of a ministry. This does not happen too often to my knowledge. It also transforms the ideas administrators have about themselves – in the Centre, administrators and teachers live side by side. But it **can** be done.

The partners: the directions in which we are already moving are intensifying – this is a task and a mandate for the development of international youth organizations and international cooperation of national youth committees. The stronger they are, the better we are; there is a connection between the two. We have no opposition to that; and, despite the fact that there are serious changes in young people’s commitment to associations, we still firmly believe that democratic and participatory attitudes can be and are learned in youth organizations – of all sorts. For us, associations aren’t ‘out’ or old-fashioned. However, we know and can see that associative life has changed a lot since the 1970s and will carry on doing so. The media and new technologies make a difference – and so do stronger social divisions. Social change necessarily affects youth organizations. This means for us that we are giving more importance now to networking, and that brings us lots of partners that ten years ago wouldn’t have got a look in as far as this whole area of activity is concerned. A decade ago people were obsessed with

arguing about what counts as social work, what is youth work, what is private, what is public, and so on. These debates seem to have gone. We don't have such a big problem any more with the distinctions between professional and non-professional work, all those old debates. Networking around projects is becoming something really popular not only within youth organizations, but also in our way of doing things at the Centre. Nowadays, we might work for one project with a local authority in one country, with the government in another, with a youth organization in the third, and with some other kind of institute or agency in yet another country. We're talking about the flexibilization of partners around the things that we do.

We've also grown into another role with regard to quite a few governments who want to see us now as advisers. Therefore, we have to develop advice structures that we have not had before. Often, particularly within the assistance programme for Central and Eastern Europe, we very quickly have to build teams with a specific background. We may be giving advice on child policies in one country, on youth legislation in another, on finance systems in another, or on youth information in another. That also means that the partners change, because if you're always thinking of the big associations, these might not be the key to the whole thing, as with local youth information centres and drop-in counselling services. They take part in what we are doing here these days – they used to keep out of the game, but they are now very much interested in the system of cooperation.

We are also working with youth cooperation systems that have been developed within the European Commission, such as Youth for Europe and so on. So today you might find people coming

here for some training course, then they go off and build an agency for the Youth for Europe Programme somewhere, then they take some training model from here and use it in something they are doing there. Or we do the same, so it is a sort of two-way traffic. There is a kind of mutual influence of these youth work practices, even if in one country you'll find more going on in youth exchanges, and with us it is more focused on training. These worlds are very close together. I think we'll be doing more and more of this in the future, trying to avoid duplication of efforts and trying to profit from the experiences we have made in a systematic exchange of information and experiences.

You yourself know better than most that we are desperately trying to get some youth research cooperation going in Europe. There are enough ideas, there is enough goodwill: there is in fact no outside blockage to that. It's not been followed up here so far because we have a lack of staff and financial resources, so we've had to restrict ourselves – as international organizations so often do – to sort of providing just meeting facilities. After a while, a talk shop wants to become action and we are now at this stage. I hope this will become better in the future. Also there we can't do it on our own, we have to develop forms of cooperation with the European Union. Various ways of doing it are under discussion, and I'm sure in a year's time I could give you a more precise answer than I can now.

LC: Perhaps for the next Yearbook? Well, resources are always limited, however many you have, so you always have to make priorities. If I ask you – not in your official capacity as the representative of the organization for which you work, but as someone with wide-ranging experience and competence in the field – if

you were able to decide where resources ought to be preferentially placed for the next five years in this whole area, what would be your priorities?

PL: That is very tricky to answer, because I cannot completely separate my opinions from my public existence. Fortunately, though, I haven't had to do that too much in the past. So if I have to personalize this a bit after all, I would say that we have an urgent need to make the Council's antiracist campaign a success – and that will be my priority for the next year and a half, together with all the other services we provide as a matter of course. The campaign generates a lot of knock-on effects, for example, I hope, some thinking about how to stop the whole process of Europe becoming more barbaric by the day by rescuing some of the civilized values that we thought we had secured over a decade ago. It also forces open, I think, hidden barriers within the Council – services that are used to working separately, such as education, culture and youth – which might find ways of cooperation which last longer than this campaign. This is very important: we must overcome this kind of filing box thinking that you find so often not only in national government organizations but also in international structures. The campaign will also be helpful in parts of Central and Eastern Europe, in particular, in bringing some outside pressure to bear in creating youth structures that will last longer than the campaign itself. I think there is a lot in it. For me this whole campaign, the way it is conceived, is a very complex operation. So I think I underline it as priority number one now.

The second priority – and this is only a chronological priority, not one of importance – is the second Centre in Budapest. We have a certain reputation with this one in Strasbourg; we cannot afford

to run the other one on the rocks. It must be just as good as this one. This is a very difficult thing to do.

My third priority would be the promotion of youth mobility, participation and training. These are the three big themes, and we must learn to connect them better. Within the three, the training programmes are, in the end, getting the upper hand. In fact, the biggest part of budgetary resources is spent on them, quite rightly so, and we should continue to diversify. It is, of course, always difficult to evaluate the quality of what has been done after the event, but it is not always the responsibility of the provider if something has not worked out, because we don't, after all, control the general political climate in Europe. We control very little at all. So, for example, the big interest that there was in mobility schemes ten years ago has receded, or rather the interest is still there, but it is more difficult now to organize that interest in the ways it comes across through the youth ministries as opposed to the home affairs ministries, which seemingly have divergent interests. This may make certain programmes a failure, without there being a particular failure of a person, a mechanism, an organism or a decision making body. Some things meet with too many obstacles, that's all. You just have to keep on trying. I think that at the moment, the field of youth mobility in Europe has been sold to us as symbolizing the big opening up of Europe. To fight against that is a very tall order, probably more than we can do here in the Council of Europe.

Against all that, though, I think we are unstoppable as far as intensifying training is concerned. As I said, participation and mobility are very much related, but what we are really good at here, better than anybody else, are inventive training schemes in intercultural

learning and in youth work at the international level. So if I had to answer the question about priorities in the sense of what is the absolutely essential that we can't do without, if we had to make a choice, in the end, just staying more or less faithful to my own identity as a trainer, I would say it is the training, regardless of how important everything else is.

REFERENCES

- Breitenbach, D. (Ed.). (1979). *Kommunikationsbarrieren in der internationalen Jugendarbeit* [Communication barriers in international youth work]. 5 vols. Saarbrücken/Fort Lauderdale: Breitenbach Verlag.
- Council of Europe. (1993a). *Young people in greater Europe. Explanatory Memorandum and Declaration, 4th Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Youth, Vienna. April.*
- Council of Europe. (1993b). *Vienna Declaration. Council of Europe Summit in Vienna, Strasbourg. October.*
- Lauritzen, P. (1993). *Youth policy structures in Europe*, pp. 36–40, in *Youth exchanges between East and West. Reports, facts, opinions: a reader. Task Force Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth (Youth Unit) (Ed.). Strasbourg: Commission of the European Communities.*
- Oberste-Lehn H. and W. Wende. (Eds.). (1990). *Handbuch internationale Jugendarbeit – interkulturelles Lernen* [Handbook of international youth work – Intercultural learning]. Düsseldorf: Der kleine Verlag.

- Otten, H. and W. Treuheit. (Eds.). *Interkulturelles Lernen in Theorie and Praxis. Ein Handbuch für Jugendarbeit und Weiterbildung. Schriften des IKAB [Intercultural learning in theory and practice: A handbook for youth work and further education]*. vol. 5. Opladen: Leske-Budrich.
- Rattansi, A. (1992). *Changing the subject? Racism, culture and education.* In J. Donald and A. Rattansi (Eds.) 'Race', *Culture & Difference* (pp. 11–48). London: Sage Publications/Open University.

‘A House for Citizenship Education – Opening the European Youth Centre, Budapest’

In this piece by Magda Ferch, published in Magyar Nemzet, a Hungarian national circulation newspaper, on the 16 December 1995, Peter Lauritzen talks about the significance of the opening of the Second European Youth Centre in Budapest, the capital of a country of Central Eastern Europe, just six short years after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The article was originally published in Hungarian.

“... The fact that the European Youth Centre run by the Council of Europe (CoE) was opened in Budapest the day after an agreement was reached in Paris in order to make peace in the former Yugoslavia, has a symbolical meaning”, said László Kovács, minister of foreign affairs, on Friday, at the opening ceremony in the building previously known as *Hotel Ifjúság*¹, in the presence of the president of Hungary, several ministers, high ranking Council of Europe officials and heads of diplomatic services accredited in Budapest. The freshly refurbished building equipped with state-of-the-art technology is the property of the Ministry of Culture and Education, but the European Youth Centre it presently houses is operated by Council of Europe. The key to the building was handed over by Minister Gábor Fodor to Daniel Tarschys, Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

¹ In Hungarian, *Ifjúság* means ‘youth’. The building that houses the European Youth Centre Budapest was previously the guesthouse of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the international coordinating body of youth organizations aligned with the Soviet Union.

At the opening ceremony president Árpád Göncz recalled his talks with the then Secretary General Catherine Lalumière, in Strasbourg, in 1990. The main theme of those discussions was youth policy, and it was then, for the first time, that the idea of opening an institution similar to the European Youth Centre established in 1972 in Strasbourg, in a country of Central or Eastern Europe, emerged. The president called the new institution an important venue of **citizenship education** and a new Council of Europe meeting place, a place for free thought and exchange of visions. László Kovács reminded the audience that Hungary was the first country of the region to establish a relationship with Council of Europe, among the first to obtain guest status and the very first to become a fully-fledged member state of the international organization. The fact that this country has now become host to a major Council of Europe institution is evidence of the Council's attention to the emerging democracies, emphasized the minister, and will contribute to educating Eastern and Central European youth in European ideals.

Gábor Demszky, Mayor of Budapest, pointed out that the youth centre was the region's first institution to be fully managed by the Council of Europe. He pledged to see to it that the capital's schools seek agreements with the centre enabling its guests to be informed about and link up with local cultural events. Ole Lovig Simonsen, Danish Minister for Construction and Housing, of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), spoke of the youth centre's significance in building civil societies. Miguel Angel Martinez (PACE) underlined that by now Hungary had become the Council's important partner in constructing a united Europe. Mario Frasa, who chairs the Council of Europe's Intergovernmental Steering Committee on Youth (CDEJ) in session

in Budapest this week, referred to pluralism and respect for human rights as the guiding principles of the statutory bodies of the Council of Europe's youth sector and spoke of the distinguishing features of Council of Europe youth policy, such as partnership at several levels, continuous consultation and equal sharing of decision making between youth organizations and government representatives. Mikael Trinksjaer, who heads the Advisory Committee (the committee of non-governmental youth organizations that partners with the CDEJ in the co-management of the Council of Europe's youth sector), welcomed the new centre in the spirit of Christmas, that is, that of love and hope. Gábor Fodor, Minister of Culture and Education, who together with László Kovács is a member of the Hungarian delegation at the Council of Europe, pointed out that, regardless of political orientation, everybody in Hungary agreed that the country needed the youth centre. He called it the "... house of the future", a venue for new ideas and challenges which "... was to always remind us of the irreversibility of the Eastern and Central European transformations". "In taking this key, I pledge great responsibility," said Daniel Tarschys, "and I'll share it with those youth organizations who guide the work of now two international youth centres". At the international press conference, which followed the opening ceremony, Daniel Tarschys and László Kovács answered a question on the language act in Slovakia, a topic only distantly related to youth policies.

On the occasion of the opening ceremony we invited Peter Lauritzen, the (German) Director of the European Youth Centre in Budapest, who has been working for the Council of Europe for 23 years, serving in various positions within the youth sector, for a discussion. From its very inception, Peter Lauritzen fully supported the idea of a new centre and feels very well in Budapest.

Peter Lauritzen: When one works for an international organization, one maintains one's original nationality, but is not supposed to think along the lines of his or her country's interests only. We come to understand what Europe really is when we travel: diversity is its outstanding richness. We strive to get to know what transnational structures are, and we need to study topics such as ecology, or problems of war and peace. UNESCO's statute begins with the idea that wars are conceived in the minds of men and it is in the minds of men that wars must be ended. Construction of a new Europe, too, has to be launched in the minds of people. And this new centre will do its best to ensure that young people grow up in the above spirit.

Magda Ferch: How will it all look in practice?

PL: Any international centre can only be active if it has local partners. Otherwise it can only be a satellite of the organization that set it up. Therefore, we consistently seek relations with various youth organizations, the Ministry, and the cultural institutes of the embassies here in Budapest. The decision on what activities the centre is to run, as well as on what budget it will have, is to be taken by Council of Europe's statutory bodies in the field of youth. My job is to organize and manage everything to the best of my ability and that of my staff. And if there are questions, to give the best answer I possibly can. Our first major event will be in this coming January or February. It will be a conference to discuss the lessons of the 'All Different – All Equal' campaign. And then we will host study sessions, conferences, seminars and language courses.

MF: And how can Hungarian youth join in the centre's work?

PL: The forms of this participation are to be developed. We may, for instance, hold courses where one half of the participants are Hungarian, the others being of various other countries. I'd like to have a Hungarian language newsletter published, to provide information on what's going on in the centre. One of my plans is to open the ground floor – still vacant at present – as an information centre and cultural café for the Hungarian youth public. We have an offer from the Nordic countries to cover the expenses of furnishing it. There could be a readers' and music fans' corner, too. But these are only plans for now.

MF: What is the Director's biggest challenge or difficulty at the moment?

PL: Maybe it is to get others to understand that the fact that I'm not ordering people around is not a sign of weakness. I believe in the strength of democratic work management, whereby there's always multi-channel communication and everybody is aware of their own tasks and responsibilities. The time of intellectual casts is over. The world of today cannot function on authoritarian principles.

Unstructured Thoughts

Unstructured Thoughts

Every once in a while colleagues inside and outside the Council of Europe would receive a random piece of communication from Peter Lauritzen that was simply intended for their reflection. More often than not, these contained his thoughts on a given subject that he felt were important or challenging. Sometimes they were born of frustration or incomprehension at some development inside the Council of Europe, the youth sector or in European political and social development. Sometimes he was simply fascinated with something related to young people or Europe he had read in a newspaper or seen on the television and wanted to see what others thought. Quite often, though, Peter Lauritzen used these communications to call himself, his colleagues and friends to order and remind the community of practice that he was at the heart of that, from time to time, it was necessary to simply stop, take a step back and think about what is happening and being done.

Ever the educationalist, Peter Lauritzen knew that in order to teach others something, it is necessary first to learn something oneself. He applied the principles of 'life long learning' to himself and insisted on maintaining his own mental mobility. He demanded this from his colleagues and could become quite impatient if people did not demonstrate the same willingness to enter into processes of reflection. Working with Peter Lauritzen was, for his colleagues, as rewarding as it was challenging: he did not differentiate between work time and free time, rather between time spent usefully or spent uselessly, his brain never seemed to stop working and he could not understand that others might enjoy just talking about the weather for a little while, though his

great sense of humour would often bridge the gaps between expectations and reality.

Whatever their tone, and whatever his motivation for writing them, these communications, which have come to be known as the ‘unstructured thoughts’ after the title of one such from 1998, were Peter Lauritzen’s very individual and personal way of making sense of the world he lived and worked in. Maybe ironically, the unstructured thoughts were more often than not intended to provide structure to ongoing discussions, and he often wrote such pieces when he felt debate lacked direction. As the reader will quickly realize, Peter Lauritzen’s unstructured thoughts were in fact anything but unstructured.

In one such communication, he summed up the role that these written reflections and explorations played for him, as follows:

...These few lines here are then strictly private and it is at your own risk whether you read any further. They are an attempt for myself to understand better what is going on and to deal with my cognitive dissonance as an educationalist. In this quality, I am used to discursive communication styles, reciprocity in questions and answers, symmetry in the democratic process and the submission of human and financial resource management to political, cultural and social agendas set by legislative bodies, elected executives, and in the case of the Council of Europe, state representatives ...¹

Fittingly enough considering his penchant for the discursive, the unstructured thoughts often started out as conversations be-

¹ Extracts are from ‘Living Zero Growth – The Council of Europe under Pressure’ – undated unstructured thought, but probably 2005/6.

tween Peter Lauritzen and colleagues at the door of his office in one of the European Youth Centres. Some time later, he would sit down at his desk and write something. Before computers, colleagues would receive a photocopied page or two of type on their desks, by fax or even through the post accompanied by a handwritten note. The advent of information technology changed all that, and to an extent email made the unstructured thoughts more common. These were received by colleagues with curiosity and a measure of pleasure and they never failed to provoke debate in the corridors and offices of the European Youth Centres and even further afield.

In this section, therefore, the reader will find a series of short to medium length texts that (most often) were neither formally published nor spoken in public, but which were shared with others in an effort to further the discursive and reflexive tradition represented by the very existence of the European Youth Centres and their programmes of political education among the staff and external colleagues of the youth sector of the Council of Europe. They cover themes directly related to youth issues and the scope of action of the Council of Europe in relation to young people, as well as some broader reflections on the educational consequences of contemporary social and political developments in Europe and the world.

‘Defining Youth Work’

On occasion Peter Lauritzen would be asked to help a colleague out with defining some aspect of the work of the youth field in a way that would make it understandable for the outside world. This short piece on youth work was written in response to such a request and later circulated to some colleagues and friends active in the field, one of whom developed the non-formal education blog www.nonformality.org, where it was subsequently published on 12 June 2006.

The main objective of youth work is to provide opportunities for young people to shape their own futures.

Youth work is a summary expression for activities with and for young people of a social, cultural, educational or political nature. Increasingly, youth work activities also include sports and services for young people. Youth work belongs to the domain of ‘out-of-school’ education, most commonly referred to as either non-formal or informal learning.

The general aims of youth work are the integration and inclusion of young people in society. It may also aim towards the personal and social emancipation of young people from dependency and exploitation.

Youth Work belongs both to the social welfare and to the educational systems. In some countries it is regulated by law and administered by state civil servants, in particular at local level. However, there exists an important relation between these professional and

voluntary workers that is at times antagonistic, and at others, co-operative.

The definition of youth work is diverse. While it is recognized, promoted and financed by public authorities in many European countries, it has only a marginal status in others where it remains of an entirely voluntary nature. What is considered in one country to be the work of traditional 'youth workers' – be it professionals or volunteers – may be carried out by consultants in another, or by neighbourhoods and families in yet another country or, indeed, not at all in many places.

Today, the difficulty within state systems to ensure adequate global access to education and the labour market means that youth work increasingly deals with unemployment, educational failure, marginalization and social exclusion. Increasingly, youth work overlaps with the area of social services previously undertaken by the welfare state. It therefore includes work on aspects such as education, employment, assistance and guidance, housing, mobility, criminal justice and health, as well as the more traditional areas of participation, youth politics, cultural activities, scouting, leisure and sports. Youth work often seeks to reach out to particular groups of young people, such as disadvantaged youth in socially deprived neighbourhoods, or immigrant youth including refugees and asylum seekers. Youth work may at times be organized around a particular religious tradition.

‘Wir können nicht gleichzeitig weniger werden, älter und auch noch dümmer’

(‘We cannot simultaneously become fewer, older and, on top of all that, dumber’)

The title of this piece is in fact a quote from then Minister of Education and Research in Germany, Edelgard Bulmahn, speaking at the Congress on Innovation held by the German Chamber of Industry and Commerce in early 2005. Peter Lauritzen found reference to this statement in one of the many newspapers he read on a daily basis and felt compelled to share the thoughts it provoked in him. The piece was circulated to colleagues inside and outside the Directorate of Youth and Sport in February 2005.

Ms. Bulmahn has formulated, in a nutshell, what modern youth policies have to face as a challenge:

1. to become proactive in promoting policies in favour of a new relationship between generations with regard to burden-sharing and a new mix of childhood-, youth- and family policies, to create child- and youth-friendly environments both in education and leisure and to face the reality of shrinking populations through a whole range of opportunity-focused youth policies;

2. shrinking youth populations lead to a shift in policy delivery towards older people, soon the 60-years-plus ones, because these will be in the possession of considerable purchasing power and they decide elections. This is a serious risk to the innovation potential of a good many European societies; it leads them into getting stuck with dealing with increasing health costs and pension budgets and thus forgetting to concentrate on their own future and, in that, their children and young people.

3. OECD'S PISA studies (Programme for International Student Assessment) have shocked the public by showing how the learning potential of children, notoriously underestimated, effects positively or negatively their life cycle, their willingness to take initiatives and participate, their learning careers in school and university and the incitation to life long learning. Some governments are learning a lesson from this at least with regard to children; researchers say that this will bear fruit in some 25 years, apparently the time it takes to see results of radical educational reform. The enormous importance of non-formal education/learning, however, as provided by NGOs, faith communities, local community based initiatives and public libraries, liberal adult education, youth associations, youth workers and youth leaders to create motivation for learning and producing new cognitive, creative and social capacities is still only vaguely understood.

What has this to do with the Council of Europe's youth department as organized in the Directorate of Youth and Sport? Are the European Youth Centres not places where young people from youth organizations have a good time without really producing much? Where a lot of staff care for group-centred esoteric activities, mak-

ing people feel good for a while and get a positive idea about Strasbourg, Budapest and the Council of Europe, if all goes well?

Has this approach to working with young people not outlived itself? It may have had its justification during the 'youth-focused' '70s and '80s with political and social unrest, powerful social movements and high impact and influence of young people on decision making - but today, what is left of all this? Membership in youth organizations is permanently dropping; generational conflict has been replaced by inter-generational solidarity. Parents and kids fight together for security in schools and educational establishments, higher quality in education, access to the labour market, and so on. Young people come out as conventional, if not conservative – does the Council of Europe not run an outdated model with its youth department?

The answer is 'no'. What may be said or criticized represents an 'old' understanding of youth, not completely reflecting the issues in its present administrative, political and educational reality in the Council of Europe. First of all, the Council of Europe's youth field has always lived in and with its time and has radically changed from what it used to be, without losing its function as the home of democratic civil society associations and networks in Europe and well beyond. Secondly, the field has developed from competently providing European level non-formal educational youth programmes into a knowledge centre, a centre of excellence on evidence-based youth policies and the social conditions of young people's lives in the member countries. Thirdly, the field has learnt to become a Council of Europe activist and multiplier by providing a well-built and successful Human Rights Education Programme, innovative educational experiences on intercultural learning and conflict transformation both within

member countries directly and within European programmes at the Centres. It stands for a vast practice of involvement and participation of young people at municipal and local level and in national and European affairs, the co-management structure of the Directorate of Youth and Sport only being the most prominent example of this participation strand. The field can also be considered a champion of the discussion on quality development, assessment and validation both with regard to educational practice as well as to the analysis of governance in youth policy. Fourthly, the field, being probably the biggest youth service of its kind with any European or international organization and well known for its results, has engaged in partnership agreements with the European Union on training, research and EUROMED cooperation, it cooperates regularly with UNICEF and the OSCE, particularly in South Eastern Europe, enjoys cooperation with the World Bank on childhood and youth policy and youth research, with UNESCO on research, participation and youth policy, with the UNHCR on young refugees and with UNDP and the UN on population policies and development. The Council of Europe's youth field is also actively involved in regional youth cooperation in Europe, be it with the Barents' Sea youth cooperation, the Baltic Sea youth cooperation, the South Eastern European Youth Cooperation Process or the EUROMED cooperation (Barcelona process).

In its intergovernmental youth programme the youth field has a history of recommendations and related operational activity on items such as youth mobility, non-formal education/learning, voluntary service, youth information and participation. The forthcoming 7th European Conference of Youth Ministers 2005 in Budapest will deal with 'Youth policy responses to violence' and

conclude important work done in the youth field within the Integrated Project 'Violence in Everyday Life'.

An outstanding example of intergovernmental work is the programme of international youth policy reviews and youth policy advisory missions to member countries. These studies are meant to be of direct assistance to member countries on youth governance and administration, on coordination and on cooperation with research and the civil society. The international review on Norway will be presented to the Joint Council of Youth Questions in February; the reports on Cyprus and the Slovak Republic are under preparation. The youth policy advisory mission to the Czech Republic has been finalized, and missions to Bosnia & Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the UN administered region of the Kosovo will be undertaken in 2005.

The youth field is a non-formal education provider, a knowledge centre and a youth policy coordinator. Its products are diversified:

- high quality intercultural trainings for youth workers;
- study sessions on items related to European unity and young people's ideas about their active European citizenship;
- assistance and capacity building in South Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;
- youth policy studies and recommendations;
- common experiences, agreements and strategies between European and international organizations, agencies and the international civil society;
- cross-sectoral work projects within of the Council of Europe;
- hard-cover publications and web sites on youth;
- a database on youth and youth policy development (under construction);

- campaigns such as the youth contribution to the North-South campaign, the campaign against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance ('All Different – All Equal') and a forthcoming campaign on the culture of peace;
- large-scale youth weeks in Strasbourg (1985), Bratislava (1992), Strasbourg (1995), 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe in Budapest (1999) and the forthcoming globalization event (Strasbourg, 6 – 8 May 2004).

The specificity of the youth field is its operational philosophy – educational advisers and field workers, employed by the Council of Europe are themselves in charge of the bulk of activities; only a smaller part of the activities is outsourced. And even when outside trainers, researchers and experts are in charge of certain activities, they have been trained in the field and function like an extension and an amplification of DYS staff, working at a similar professional level and achieving the objectives as set by DYS staff. This approach has allowed us, over the years, to create identity with the field and a corporate identity within the Council of Europe. The existence of the Internet, easing trans-border association between young people, is an important additional dimension, adding the possibility of working through virtual communities to the face-to-face communication of the seminars and training courses in the Centres. Websites attract new publics and play an important role in the distribution of calls for activities and the dissemination of results.

As a result, the various elements making up the field are complementary to each other: the Youth Centres in Strasbourg and Budapest stand for residential activities, continuity, training expertise and identification with people, methods, contents, experiences,

community life, international work environments and a real learning organization in itself. The European Youth Foundation stands for flexibility in funding, decentralization, pilot projects, autonomy and variety of work form and formats. The intergovernmental cooperation and the research unit promote greater unity in youth policy approaches in Europe, which again can be backed up by the training capacities of the centres and the local, grassroots practice of the foundation. Networking, synergies, cross-sectoral work and innovation are natural offspring of this kind of inner machinery of the youth field.

Can things be improved or is this is perfect little biotope one had better leave alone?

Much can be improved:

- (1) youth policies are on the decline in many member countries. They are becoming subsections to education or welfare and are losing their specific holistic character. The promotion and reconstruction, in some countries even rehabilitation, of youth policies can benefit a lot from European cooperation, such as the White Paper process in the European Union and the international, indicator-based youth policy reviews of the Council of Europe.
- (2) the decline of youth organizations and associative life is a much-stated 'fact'. Is it true? It needs looking into. What happens is a transformation and modernization of old organizations into new forms, marked by individualism, use of new technologies and the absence of dominating ideologies. Instead, lifestyles and specific cultures are producing new forms of commitment and identification. As the social data chang-

es, so have established work practices and habits of cooperation. Still, where is the alternative to parties and associations to keep the democratic process healthy and alive? It will take time to move from national democracy to transnational democracy, from citizenship to European citizenship, from tolerating public life to actively participating in it – and it has to be learnt. This happens in the youth field of the Council of Europe and within the cooperation with the European Commission – but it needs to be spread and multiplied and in this domain much more needs to be done.

- (3) All this training and learning happening in the Centres and the Foundation is fine and needs to go on. But it is time to have this work recognized and to get a higher commitment out of public authorities in favour of non-formal education/learning. Work on quality, self-assessment, portfolios and validation is well under way, but more has to be done to come out of the ghetto of ‘youth work’ and enter the full debate on educational reform.
- (4) The youth department is united with sports within the Directorate of Youth and Sports. Friendly cohabitation is not enough. With the enormous importance of sports and physical activity for young people, items such as intercultural exchange and intercultural learning, participation, prevention of violence and social inclusion need to be looked at from an angle of sport and its organization in society, but also in view of joint projects. Some have already happened; more should be prepared.
- (5) Inequality, discrimination of minorities, persecution of religious groups and practices, gender inequality, insufficient integration of handicapped – all this goes on. So do racism and intolerance, ethnic arrogance and the refusal of immigrants

and refugees. Unemployment, poor quality vocational training (if it exists at all) and poor schooling results continue to divide society and also young people amongst themselves. How can we live that way, how can one create a positive attitude to life among kids and young people? None of these items, which the youth field has worked with in the past, is anywhere near a solution or a bearable social situation – which simply means that the work programme remains enormous.

Which means that the Human Rights Education Programme as the anchor of value education of the field needs to go on as much as the work on intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning. It means that conflict education and conflict transformation need to be high on the agenda together with items such as participation, employment and healthy lifestyles, and it also means that the political and educational vision of a fair and just Europe, open to the world and positively influencing globalization through its universal Human Rights message needs constantly to be further developed into the reality of a European Citizenship built on access and inclusion, the two basic concepts of youth work and youth policy in Europe.

‘On ‘Standards’ – Some Considerations following the Programme Conference’

This paper was presented to colleagues for reflection and debate in May 2004 in response to the discussions that took place during the Directorate of Youth and Sport (DYS) programme conference of the same year. The programme conference is organized once per year by the Directorate of Youth and Sport. It is the moment when the annual programme is discussed and planned in depth by the relevant members of staff and often begins with a more conceptual component regarding the nature of recent developments in the youth sector. This piece offers some alternative ideas concerning the very popular, but nevertheless tricky, notion of (quality) standards and its application to the youth field.

During the conference, participants constantly referred to ‘standards’ and often they did not make these explicit, but assumed a shared understanding of what was meant. Within a homogeneous group this is only normal to do, as such a group is practically defined by sharing the same ‘standards’.

Within a heterogeneous group this is another matter. Such a group will also work on standards, but these will apply to many different practices and without these constantly being contextualized, misunderstandings are programmed. Has this happened during the programme conference? According to my observations the answer

is 'yes'. When somebody speaks of the use of 'different standards', as this happens all the time, what is meant? Some having them, and some not? Some working 'below standard', some 'at or above' level? Or is this simply a reference to standards being different in administrative practice and management than in research, education and training and editing? Or, another understanding again, is it only a reference to the simple fact that different types of programmes demand different standards to be respected?

These questions should be easy to put straight, but they are not. There are too many '*non-dits*' (things unsaid) in the game and too many connections to benchmarks, quality assessment and validations made. Also, one can observe strong articulations of what proper management and a modern human resource policy should be like, but all this happens within a resource poor 'top-down' bureaucracy. High standards for not really much to manage, in a way. This is probably a very unhealthy cocktail. Maybe I can contribute to clarify some of this.

1. Standards grow out of practice. They are best practices becoming the norm. Within a professional, international environment such as the DYS they are professional standards, that is, after some agreed learning period such standards are expected to guide the work of staff. Standards refer to codes of conduct, performance and cohesion of the service and come out as both an individual and a service product. To have them and practise them is a prerequisite for corporate identity.

2. I do not want to get into considerations about general staff policy of the Council of Europe. This exists and sets out undisputed norms also for all DYS staff; application and control happens

within the appraisal procedure, promotion panels and during daily work. However, there is one derivate of this: all DYS staff have to correspond to the norms and standards as set out within the general staff policy; whatever their specialization maybe, if they do not conform with the overall idea of the European civil service, their specialization does not count for much, as it will represent disturbance to the service rather than increasing its performance. Hence there are a number of professional standards everybody has to meet; they are set out in the job description and they come to life within the objectives, tasks and mode of production of the service. To speak of 'non-standard' within this section means, actually, that somebody is a bad professional.

3. DYS means education and training, funding, management of committees and statutory bodies, research and knowledge production, editing, management of buildings and specific agreements, internal bureaucracy, finance and budgets, field work, capacity building, international and regional cooperation, intra-service cooperation, intergovernmental and civil society assistance. Different items demand different qualities of service, that is, different standards. Then our problem is simple: all that is needed is that every 'performance unit' makes its standards known, that everybody respects otherness and that's it.

4. I am afraid, that things are not so simple. I take an ambitious example, a Long Term Training Course (LTTC). This is one of our finest products, developed some 15 years ago by a small team, constantly further developed and adapted to different groups, a living open curriculum of intercultural learning. These courses last for six months and have high standards at all levels: professional backgrounds and capacities of the trainers, including the educa-

tional advisers/tutors, motivation and preparation of participants, quality of lodging and serving the course, cooperation with finance and administration throughout the course, particularly during the project phase, statutory reporting, evaluation, editing of results, and so on. In this case it is not enough to work with a patchwork approach and every contributor working with a professional attitude. It needs more. Why should a financial officer work hard on this course and assure the finance for this relatively expensive course format, if they are not themselves convinced of the course? Why should anybody help make this course a success, without understanding why we are doing this, what we expect and what the impact of this work will be? This means that the standards assuring success, or, when not met, risking failure of the activity, need to be shared and understood by all staff of the service involved.

5. This can be enlarged on – everything we do can be so important, successful and relevant to European unity and young people, when it is done well, in a considered and planned manner and carried out competently, and everything can be so insignificant, damaging and entirely irrelevant to European unity and young people, when it is done spontaneously, unplanned and unprofessionally on top. How do we know what is what? By defining quality standards, controlling them, evaluating our activities as well as our overall work on a regular basis, and by identifying failure and working to overcome it. This latter part stands for ‘transparency’. Where are the standards for our different programmes and how can we follow for each of the programmes how they are controlled and how the programmes improve?

6. During the programme conference we made some steps in this direction. Everybody was invited to present their programme, and

point out weaknesses and strengths in one procedure and challenges in others. Not everybody kept to the system. This is a first critical point: why should some work with transparent standards and even criticize their own work and others not? For the whole patchwork of programmes, work formats, agreements and the running of priorities, what is the rule – a comparable format of reporting or a very liberal, matter-of-fact type of reporting? As long as we have no clear practice with regard to this item some will feel unwell because what they do is not the rule and others will feel unwell, because they are, for a number of reasons, not able to follow the rules. Can these reasons be named?

7. They could, if there was trust. Ever since Max Weber's standard setting work on bureaucracy, trust has been understood as a key category to modern bureaucracies; to create trust is their job. So much for the theory. In practice, things look a little different and we might have a few problems. It was said in the list of weaknesses that DYS has a difficulty in absorbing and integrating newcomers; informally there is talk of a 'family', the family apparently being education and research staff and their administrators. Family is not necessarily a nice expression; it could mean 'mafia'. We are touching here on the very delicate position of trained educational staff in DYS, I mean people who do this for a living. To find such staff here cannot be surprising, the statutory purpose of the Centre in Strasbourg and Budapest being to serve as 'an educational establishment and a knowledge centre on youth' and of the Foundation being also fully inscribed in a logic of international non-formal education. However, staff with an educational profile have been weakened from as long ago as 1972 by time limits on the contracts of the tutors/advisers, whilst all other staff may stay indefinitely. There were and are good reasons to do this, but why

was the way into the Council of Europe so easy for some and so difficult, if not impossible, for others? Meanwhile, with the permanent programme administrators and the programme involvement of the Director of Budapest things look better, but the paradox has always been that a basically educational service has always been kept down on staff with a professional background in non-formal education, intercultural learning and youth worker experience. Never in the 32 years of existence of the field has a manager with a background in education or youth work been Director of the service, and whoever was staying on and wanted to make a career in the service was strongly advised to sharpen his administrators' or manager's profile if they wanted to get on. As a result colleagues in education have often had an oscillating position to the outside – somewhere between arrogance and underdog. They are envied because they travel, they create, they have contact with young people all the time, they write, they produce; their work is anything but boring and alienated. They are, on the other hand, often left out because they change, they are not always around, they have a distance to Council of Europe procedures outside the remit of their job, they are very independent and do not always conform to some of the desired and opportune attitudes of Council of Europe leadership, they may say 'Macedonia' and get away with it and they have a critical distance to many NGOs and trainers, because they know them only too well. No wonder they are perceived as an in-group.

8. Are they the only in-group? Are the colleagues in the field-oriented country programmes not also one? Is the EYF staff not also one? Is the DLP programme run by a 'one person' in-group? Not to speak of larger circles – Strasbourg/Budapest, the covenants, and so on. A completely honest and open analysis would

show that standard setting is not restricted to single programmes, but to complete work settings. I have, for example, no problem in recognizing a very high standard in performance in Budapest; why should I? I simply do not see why this is immediately seen ‘as a criticism of and a competition to Strasbourg’. EYCB standards are set out in numerous texts; they cover the services, the building, general staff, management, publications and educational and training provision. And all these elements play together, there are clearly established relationships between the various elements and ‘education’ is not pushed aside, but at the centre of what this whole big building and its staff are about. Again, in Strasbourg we do not find automatically the opposite (such as, for example, ‘education’ being pushed aside); far from it, but education and training have a much more difficult position to make themselves heard with their results, their needs and their ‘guest status’ in what has largely become an administrative building. Does this produce problems within the ‘family’? It does, but they should be analyzed with a cool head: in terms of standards we work at the same level and we mean the same; in terms of performance one can see a difference, which needs looking into.

9. To drive this a little further – what stops us from coming up with a complete register of all the 300 or so activities our service stands for? What stops us from doing this for us in the first place, not as another one of our numerous reporting schemes into bureaucratic nowhere-land? I imagine a simple listing of formats, objectives, aims, evaluation criteria, budget and staff needs and the required standard to carry the work out competently, which also has to include a clear idea as to when the aims and objectives cannot be reached, because the activities do not get what they require. This would allow us to separate discussions – quality criteria in

study sessions are one thing, in training courses another, in 'field activities' yet another, not to speak of research, publications, and so on. It could be done rather easily; if the right people sit around a table for one day, the text will be ready.

10. Engaging in such an exercise requires some groundwork to be done: (a) What are the minimum conditions which need to be met in every work format of DYS? (b) The intercultural constellation is a permanent feature, even inside DYS staff. When do we work professionally on and with this constellation, when do we ignore it, and when do we have to ignore it due to lack of staff and finance? How do we deal with the constant ambiguity about the intercultural item as a daily – subconscious – reality and a consciously tackled professional task? (c) What are our own professional profiles like? Can everybody, with a bit of effort, really do every job, as the official staff policy suggests, so that youth policy, intercultural learning, citizenship, human rights education and youth work practice may appear in any of our programmes and be dealt with 'somehow'? First we need to admit that it happens, then we have to find out how and whether it works, and then we need to establish some policy on this *polyvalence* ideology in our field. We used to know exactly what was required of a trainer, we used to know exactly what was required of a project adviser and we used to know exactly what was required to carry out a valid evaluation. Is this knowledge still there; is it applied?

11. The fact that answers to all of these questions sit in numerous evaluation reports and reports of consultative meetings, have been laid down in statutory reports and books and articles, does not help at this moment in time. The Life Long Learning agenda of the Bruges/Copenhagen process has kicked off a debate on

the validation of non-formal learning, Europass has already taken in the Council of Europe's portfolio on the teaching of modern languages, the European Transparency Forum is willing to move towards the recognition of non-formal education in the youth field and CEDEFOP has offered to work on the profile of a European youth/social worker. A large debate on quality in learning has taken off. The risks of formalization of the informal and the non-formal, the risks of bureaucratic control formats or of the introduction of competitive vocational training standards are well known. They are real; but they should not stop us from acting. We have now started to work very systematically on these items; the recent research seminar on non-formal education is only one example; others are the recommendation on non-formal education of the Committee of Ministers and the subsequent work on quality standards and a portfolio dedicated to international youth work practice. On this item we work in tune with the European Commission (c.f. my joint paper with Pierre Mairesse and Hans-Joachim Schild). It is time to move.

12. I have suggested anticipating, for some time, within the 2005 programme the elaboration of a catalogue of quality standards in our own work in connection with the register proposed in 9., always with regard to the outside world and the possibilities to generalize our work for others. We will probably come up with 80% completely established and applied standards; there will be something repetitive in this job. But we might come up with 20% new, we might revise some of our standards and we could, maybe, get some of the *non-dits* (things unsaid) out of the way. We could also work more on relationships of programme and work formats – which programme informs other programmes and how, and which programme speaks to whom, inside and outside the service? And

we should lay down more exactly what we require from a junior trainer, a senior trainer, an educational adviser, administrative staff working with this field and of senior management, who do, after all, live off all this and have the task to assure budgets, human resources, links and anchoring in Directorate General IV and the Council at large, and who should have a vision about where our service will be in 2010; this can be reasonably expected by DYS staff and users.

13. One thing should be said, and I am not *megalo* (megalomaniac) in doing so – we are the best equipped, best staffed, most diversified and most successful youth service within any European or international organization. There is nothing comparable in terms of training provision, research, youth policy development and capacity building in the youth field. And I refer to quality, not to numbers. Of course, ever since the European Commission got into the youth field they have had by far the larger programmes. They also have very qualified staff, agencies and networks; the talk of ‘us’ being the intellectual resource and ‘them’ being the paymaster is outdated nonsense. However, what makes our identity is our double character as an administration and an operational service, as an intergovernmental place and a forum for INGYOs, as a research coordinator and a youth policy advice system, as a European administration and a co-managed youth service – this mix is unique. It cannot be found in any UN organization, the Commonwealth youth programme, the bi-national youth offices or any cultural exchange service. This unique position is not easy to keep; it grew out of a strong conviction to do quality work a long time ago and has been consistently followed against sometimes very difficult circumstances, often even created by our own organization – now is the time to consolidate and to create space for innovation. Consolidation is validation, validation needs standards – the debate is on.

‘21 Items for the Beginning of the 21st Century in the Field of European Youth Policy and Education’

It is not clear if or where this short but highly insightful description of the challenges facing a structure such as the Directorate of Youth and Sport at the turn of a new millennium was published. The year it was authored is also not clear, although given the subject matter it is likely that Peter Lauritzen wrote it just before or after the beginning of the new millennium.

SEVEN ELEMENTS OF THE CORPORATE IDENTITY

- 1 Give young people their place as a resource to society in employment, education, cultural life and public affairs and focus youth policy on human resource policy.
- 2 Enhance participation of young people in state and society, economic and cultural affairs.
- 3 Build European Citizenship and educate the young for it.
- 4 Create specific children and youth rights as part of Human Rights.
- 5 Build a Europe of knowledge through the creation of a learning organization where the young learn from the old and the old learn from the young.
- 6 Promote transnational cooperation and networking of young people through projects and concrete experiences of shared life in non formal education and work.

- 7 Set European standards for the curricula of intercultural learning within the training of youth workers.

TWO BASIC ATTITUDES

- 8 Overcome bureaucratic barriers to the effective way of working with young people by the non-respect of established territories and by approaching them at the same time in school and out-of-school education, within university and in student organizations, in social and youth work and in their associations, in sports and cultural environments – none of these patterns of temporary life organization ‘possesses’ the young; they go where they like.
- 9 Continue to combat Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance and promote the cultural and political rights of minority youth.

SIX GRAND ORIENTATIONS

- 10 Enlarge pan-European cooperation through the creation of decentralized knowledge networks and educational centres.
- 11 Promote youth information and the effective use of new technologies in youth work.
- 12 Constantly develop and perfect indispensable instruments of youth policy development and education such as the European Youth Foundation, the European Youth Centres of Strasbourg and Budapest, the Steering Committee and its working groups, the statutory organs and the research and documentation unit.
- 13 Increase efforts to enable disadvantaged young people to participate in international youth projects.

- 14 Promote national youth studies and expose their results to a European discussion.
- 15 Develop a common understanding of youth policy between member countries, continue the exchange of examples of good practice and create greater unity amongst the member countries.

FOUR NEW WORK PRIORITIES

- 16 Focus existing resources on innovation of youth work practice in meetings, training courses and projects and set clear priorities when defining the political, educational and pragmatic objectives of the youth field.
- 17 Develop such educational objectives together with the progressing discussion of youth policy issues, create links and move towards a flexible system of using budgetary and staff resources accordingly.
- 18 From tuition towards educational consultancy – move towards ‘educational contracts’ between users and staff working in the youth field, ranging from more client-centred services to clearly established learning and training offers and participative curriculum construction.
- 19 Create a European training authority in cooperation with the European Commission.

TWO POINTS NOT TO FORGET

- 20 Remain accessible and reachable to young people, keep an openness to youth cultures and lifestyles, create attractive places and environments for multicultural creation and project work and, therefore, reduce hierarchies and bureaucracy to

the necessary minimum and leave a maximum of room for the freedom of expression.

- 21 Associate a high number of partners to this work, convince the general public of its value, gain a maximum of government support, become much better and ambitious in the publication and presentation of results of the work, and become a visible example of the European social organization of the future.

‘Some Unstructured Thoughts on the Future of the Youth Directorate’

In this extract from an internal email with the then Director of Youth, Peter Lauritzen presents his thoughts on the ways in which youth and attendant concepts are changing and the challenges that this dynamic development poses for the evolution of the youth sector of the Council of Europe, in general, and for the work programme of the Youth Directorate, in particular. This communication, which developed into something of a conversation, took place in 1998.

1. IMPACT OF THE PAST AND SOCIETAL CONSTRUCTION

We do our work to ‘give young people a hand in the building of Europe’, as was expressed already in 1972 in the statute of the EYC. Young people, not youth organizations. It is clear from that, that we are an instrument of participation and the co-management feature is institutional expression of this instrumental dedication.

There is no need, to repeat the discussions of the Menschaert Report¹. This report we possess, intellectually and institutionally.

¹ The ‘Report on Policies and Activities in the Youth Sector of the Council of Europe’, which later came to be known as the Menschaert Report (after its author, then Chairperson of the CDEJ, Daniel Menschaert, representative of Belgium) was commissioned to analyze the functioning of the co-managed youth sector and to propose potential reforms to the system of shared decision making. It was published on 15 September 1997.

For me some ideas should survive, next to the statutory conclusions, which are about to be brought to a good end:

- the co-management principle remains. It is, however, neither a religion nor a dominating view of society and nowhere related to the young. It is the specific feature for **programme planning**, which has, over the years, developed in the youth field. It will adapt in the composition of the decision makers through developments in the field of **new partners** and it will have to prove its efficiency against two big debates in the future:
- the **quality** of programmes and particularly **training**
- the inclusion of recognizable **policy priorities** as they belong to the implementation of action plans in the Council of Europe co-management does not govern staff and human resource management in the Directorate. This is the prerogative of the Secretary General and hence the Director and his staff.
- youth policies in the Youth Directorate usually come over as educational policies. This is no longer enough. They should now be understood as **human resource policies** and within that large orientation find a new relation between knowledge production, training, educational assistance and policy consultancy. Its particular 'big themes' should be seen as what they are and have always been: areas of application and implementation. I am speaking of mobility, information, participation, social exclusion, minorities and forms of youth representation. These areas have existed before us and will exist after us; we have neither determined them nor been particularly active in finding them – the social and political system we are working in expects a contribution and so we become active and make that contribution as best we can. But none of these areas is an **objective** and nobody becomes a better person by working in them.

At times one has to look at the **policy priorities**, the **human resources available** and the maintenance of **quality standards** and then revise the 'area commitments' accordingly. This is an unavoidable process. What happens then, is that 'owners of the territories = areas' will appear on the scene and get it all wrong, confuse the debates and – the usual technique – make it all a moral question. This is going on right now in the Youth Directorate.

- the world of 'assisted youth' has come to an end. There is no need for it to survive within a particular preservation camp of the 1960s, as a kind of Jurassic Park of international youth work. Having said that, something shines through from the 1960s into today and, as it belongs to us, it does not need revision;
- internationalism: today this is an important tradition for the building of transnational networks;
- structural reform: modern educational research and new findings on peer influence in psychology also confirm this: reforms work best with the involvement of those concerned by them. There are still all the reasons for the **inclusion of youth** on the table.
- social actors and multipliers: both concepts are in trouble; the 'long march through the institutions' is a march into system conformity, not into change. But still, within participative democracy, we have not given up believing in the multiplication of results into broader *reseaux* (networks) and into network- and association building around people and ideas. As long as this remains the **key** to the renewal of resources within a democracy, we have no right to change paradigm, but an **obligation** to make sure that the concepts remain in good health.
- this does not put youth organizations into trouble. Nevertheless, there has also been criticism of certain organizations for

what is perceived to be their **monopoly of representation**. To deal with these appearances is no attack on democracy, as some make us believe; it is the bit of fresh air that we are obliged to blast through the system permanently if we don't want to run a closed shop.

What we have to do is to find our place in the European construction of tomorrow. This construction cannot be seen outside globalization; Europe is not an island, but one of the producers of globalization. It cannot be seen outside modernity either. When I claim to recognize several modernities, this is for me an important scepticism to raise against the preachers of post-modernity in countries where people would be happy if they were allowed into the first modernity a bit more. And how can you speak about a change towards service societies in countries without free money for consumption. That's what I mean. Not a refusal of the Giddens / Beck approach for the understanding of the future of young people in Europe. More specifically, from a leading member of the Youth Directorate, department for intellectual production and guidance/education, I would expect a reasonably argued reflection on Europe, citizenship, the role and future of the young and the intercultural learning project. People don't have to be of my opinion, but if they cannot clearly articulate their position, then there is no discourse, no critical rationality and in the end, there is no democracy.

However, it is my impression that the relationship of the quality of argumentation as being part of generating discourse at all is currently little accepted among educational staff. My problem: how can I speak to them. How do you communicate with Savonarola and his groupies?

To get out of this *aperçu*: it is our right to insist on an intellectual climate where the construction of the world of future young people in Europe and globally is on the agenda as a permanent reference point. This goes before any educational reflection and it also precedes all policy orientations, as they come out of the system.

This is nothing much new in the history of the youth field. It all began before the creation of the EYC and the EYF in 1972, with a youth unit producing studies and research and holding a few NGO conferences. The famous ‘Kreutz Report’ has been under discussion, OECD and UNESCO reports on youth were regularly on the agenda, so has the ‘Not for Sale’ report of the Swedish government and the ‘Fricker Report’ on the social situation of young people in Europe. The EYC regularly produced articles on social movements and social unrest of young people, such as in the early 1980s in Switzerland and France. The bulletin of the EYC and EYF, ‘Youth of the 21’, was full of articles on various youth scenes, and each annual report was written under a different angle of social analysis. And the first ‘Conference on Intolerance’ in 1981? Was that an isolated event? Of course not; this was the beginning of a regular production of texts and materials on racism and intolerance. The work on the homeless, on voluntary service, on the North-South Campaign, on Nicaragua – each time a symposium with loads of texts and analysis. Between 1972 and 1985 the EYC was a forum of social analysis and political discussion, next to its classical role as an educational service.

All this comes to an end in the second half of the ‘80s. There are other priorities: youth mobility, legal questions, housing, drugs and prevention, and so on, – the whole catalogue of state-inter-

ventionist youth policy. The social construction of the young receives a little corner within the research committee, and can run – after all – one big symposium on youth research, and kind of lives a marginalized existence. There are three exceptions: the Vienna Conference with two youth research introductions, the study on associative life, and the symposium on youth and the information society.

Now and today, with a revitalization of the debate on the young, the Youth Directorate goes back to its roots – that is all. There is no artificial debate introduced from above and there is no revolution and there is no particular attack on anybody – we simply go back to work.

Biography



Peter Lauritzen, 2005

1942

Born in Flensburg, Federal Republic of Germany, on the border with Denmark, to parents Dorothea and Anton Lauritzen, local entrepreneurs in the delicatessen business on November 3.

1949

Attends primary education in Flensburg until 1953.

1953

Attends the Goethe-Gymnasium in Flensburg. Has several enlightened, democratic and liberal-minded teachers. Demonstrates an outspoken and

critical attitude to authority, and rhetorical talent early on. Soon elected to the position of school speaker, thereby becoming involved in school student politics. Interested in history, in politics and in philosophy. Actively studies English and French. Often visits the local British Cultural Institute, called *Die Brücke* (The Bridge), reads *The Times* of London and gains a taste for all things foreign. Discusses latest initiatives for European cooperation and integration. Gets involved in Young European Federalists (JEF) along with several close friends. Participates in school student exchanges to France. Divides his spare time between responsibilities as a student representative, the Flensburg branch of JEF and helping out in his parents' shop.

1962

Graduates from secondary education. Leaves Flensburg to attend the Ludwig-Maximilians University in Munich. Chooses to major in Political Science at the Geschwister-Scholl Institute. Meets and studies under prominent returnee political scientists and historians, among them Eric Vögelin. Continues student and political activism during this time, becoming active at the national level in the Young European Federalists (JEF) and the Europa Union (The European Movement) in Germany.

1964

Moves to Bonn for a brief time. Takes classes in philosophy at the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University in Bonn. Returns to the University of Munich for a further four years of history studies until 1968. During this time, travels regularly to lecture on European issues around Germany and to Austria and Switzerland, thereby meeting important European figures of the time.

1965

Interviewed by the press for the first time about the thoughts of students and young European federalists on European issues. Quoted as comparing the European Community of the time to "six eggs in a frying pan" – once in the pan, they cannot be separated any longer. Interview published with picture in the Bad Lauterberger Tageblatt in March.

1968

Moves to Hamburg. Runs the office of the Europa Union and manages its monthly newspaper by the same name, holding the position of Secretary General at the same time as continuing to study. Along with other student colleagues, is increasingly cast in opposition to the conservative approach of the adult leadership of the European Movement as the left-wingers. Gets involved on the fringes of the May 1968 student revolution.

1969

Engaged first as a speechwriter and later as a *Studienleiter* at the *Europäische Akademie Otzenhausen* in Germany (at that time a member of the *Fédération Internationale des Maisons de l'Europe* or FIME). Responsible for preparing and organizing political education seminars with different target groups in the field of adult education, including teachers, multipliers and trade union representatives, focusing on themes with a clear European dimension. Activities are bi- or multilateral. Becomes active in research activities, including a large-scale project in cooperation with (among others) colleagues at that time at the *Gustav-Stresemann-Institut*, on the barriers to international youth work called the 'Breitenbach Study'.

Early 1970s

Regularly organizes visits to Strasbourg and the Council of Europe institutions including lectures and seminars on European themes for the participants of his activities as part of his work as a *Studienleiter* at the *Europäische Akademie Otzenhausen*. As a result comes into regular contact with the Council of Europe, and the department dealing at that time with Adult Education.

1972

Recruited to the Council of Europe of 17 member states as "Tutor" and moves to Strasbourg in France to become the first member of educational staff of the soon to be opened European Youth Centre. Works as part of the small and pioneering EYC team, under its first (Norwegian) Director, Ragnar Sem. Responsible for the preparation, running

and evaluation of the study sessions – week-long educational seminars on topics determined by international non-governmental youth organizations as relevant for their ongoing work. With other colleagues, involved in the implementation of the co-management system, working for the full inclusion of the non-governmental youth stakeholders in decision making concerning budgets and programmes of the Council of Europe for youth.

1976

Confirmed as a permanent staff member of the Council of Europe with a promotion. Active in broadening the programme of the European Youth Centre to include new types of activity, more organizations and a wider range of themes inspired by current European events, including the collapse of the dictatorships in Spain, Portugal and Greece, the position of Europe on wars taking place around the world at the time, the Cold War (at its height), nuclear disarmament and human rights.

1978

Promoted to Head of Section for Tuition, Documentation and Research, with responsibility for the overseeing of the implementation of the increasingly diverse programme of activities of the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg.

1980

With colleagues from the youth and other Council of Europe sectors, is instrumental in the organization of the first Council of Europe Conference on 'Intolerance', in the aftermath of several worryingly violent racist attacks in European cities against immigrants and refugees and violence in Zurich, Switzerland, in response. Dominant debates focus in discrimination, antiracism, minority rights and protection.

Mid-1980s

Instrumental in the development of the Training Programme of the European Youth Centre. Organization of the first training courses on Organizing International Youth Activities and on Working in International Youth Structures.

1985

Becomes Deputy to the Director of the European Youth Centre. In this capacity, is responsible for the running and overseeing the annual programme, comprising study sessions, language courses, training courses, symposia and consultative meetings. The organizations using the European Youth Centre are, at this time, by and large, the youth wings of the political parties, the trade unions and single issue youth movements, dedicated to European cooperation, peace and global solidarity, poverty. Also responsible for overseeing the development of the EYC library, the production of documentation, the initiation of educational research, the production of the Bulletin of the EYC/EYF 'Youth of the 23', the programme for visiting groups and the integration of trainees. Acts as Secretary to the CDEJ – European Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Cooperation in the Youth Field – and to its committees of experts on selected items of youth policy, youth research and documentation, promotion of youth mobility and local youth policy. Heads up the organization of the first European Youth Week in Strasbourg, which takes place in parallel to the 1st European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth. Both events are a contribution to the International Youth Year, declared by the United Nations.

1987

Participates actively in the preparation and implementation of the 2nd European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, Oslo, Norway.

1988

With other colleagues, prepares the decision to implement a new training course model, called the 'Long Term Training Course', an intensive nine-month training programme for youth workers and leaders involving two residential seminars and a project implementation phase.

1989

Initial discussions on the development of an 'assistance programme' for the youth sectors of observer and candidates to the Council of Europe among the newly democratizing states of Central and Eastern Europe. The Council of Europe has 23 member states.

Instrumental in the preparation and implementation of the Second Council of Europe Conference on 'Intolerance'.

1990

Secretary to the 3rd European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, Lisbon, Portugal, while the Eastward enlargement of the Council of Europe begins with the accession of Hungary.

Heads up the organization of the first Symposium on Youth Research in the context of the Council of Europe youth sector. Heads up the team that implements the first Long Term Training Course for Youth Leaders and Youth Workers.

1991

Becomes responsible from the side of the Youth Directorate for the project to establish a Second European Youth Centre. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe creates an audit commission to assess which of the candidate cities' (Bratislava, Budapest or Krakow) offer is most suitable for the establishment of a Second European Youth Centre in a country of Central or Eastern Europe.

1992

Heads up the organization of the Second European Youth Week in Bratislava. Initiation of the 'Assistance Programme' to the youth sectors of new member states. Organization of the first training courses for youth leaders in new member states and candidate states signatory to the European Cultural Convention. Training courses within the Assistance Programme focus on becoming familiar with the international and European youth scene and on understanding key priorities for the youth sectors of the new member states. The Committee of Ministers decides to establish a Second European Youth Centre in a country of Central or Eastern Europe for a pilot phase of three years.

1993

Secretary to the 4th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, Vienna, Austria.

Follows up on the Committee of Ministers' decision to accept the offer of Hungary to host the Second European Youth Centre. The site offered, known as *Hotel Ifjúság*, was formerly the international meeting place for communist youth organizations. Faces challenges related to the implementation of the project to create the Second European Youth Centre, including legal conflicts over the ownership of the site offered by the Hungarian authorities for the new centre, and the cost of establishing a fully functional residential educational centre on the model of the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg.

Becomes responsible, along with other colleagues in the Youth Directorate, for the planning and implementation of a European Youth Campaign Against Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance, 'All Different – All Equal', which became one of the best known Council of Europe brands to date, in anticipation of the creation of the Campaign Secretariat.

1994

Implementation of another new training course model called 'Training for Trainers' in response to the clear need of the sector for more and better quality educators and facilitators of international and national training and educational activities for youth leaders and youth workers. In parallel, discussions on how to staff the increasingly diverse and large number of training activities being offered by the Youth Directorate, lead to the creation of the 'Trainer's Pool', a pool of experts working in the European Youth Sector with a variety skills who could be contracted in on a case-by-case basis to act as educational team members for specific training courses.

Supervises the programme of the Second European Youth Centre (European Youth Centre Budapest), which begins with a limited number of activities at a temporary venue in Budapest – the Csillebérc Youth and Leisure Centre.

1995

Participates actively in the organization and implementation of the European Youth Train Event and the Third European Youth Week (on Racism) in July.

Becomes Resident Acting Executive Director of the European Youth Centre in Budapest, moving into the barely finished, but nevertheless newly-opened building overlooking the Danube and the Hungarian Parliament in November, upon conclusion of the draft seat agreement between the Council of Europe and the Hungarian authorities. In the same month, the first test activity – Training for Trainers in International Youth Activities – takes place in the European Youth Centre Budapest and work continues to complete the reconstruction work on the building. Main themes of the time include post-modernism, deconstructionism, risk, Internet and new information technologies, youth cultures. Organises and participates in the official inauguration of the European Youth Centre Budapest on 15 December in the presence of a variety of dignitaries including the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Daniel Tarschys and the President of the Republic of Hungary, Arpad Göncz.

1998

Secretary to the 5th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, “Youth in the greater Europe”, Bucharest, Romania.

Deeply involved in the negotiation of the formalization and establishment of a first Partnership Agreement between the Council of Europe and the European Union in the field of Youth with an initial focus on youth worker training.

1999

Instrumental in the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe with a month of activities on the theme ‘Europe – Youth – Human Rights’, including a Human Rights Week and the first ever Open Door Day at the European Youth Centre Budapest.

Returns to Strasbourg and to his functions as Head of Division at the Directorate of Youth and Sport in Strasbourg after the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe decides to confirm the EYCB as a permanent service of the Council of Europe.

2000

Focuses increasingly on four main areas: youth policy, youth research, cooperation with the European Union and youth in South Eastern Europe. Sets about establishing a system for international youth policy reviews. Prioritizes the area of youth research and associates talented young researchers to the Council of Europe. Chairs the Working Group on Youth of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe with the aim of consolidating investments in youth by all institutions with youth-related programming in the region.

2001

Promoted to the position of Head of Department for Education, Training, Research and Communication.

2002

Participates in the preparation and implementation of the 6th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth in Thessaloniki at which thematic priorities are formulated for the Council of Europe's Youth Sector – Peace and Intercultural Dialogue, Human Rights Education and Social Cohesion, Participation and Citizenship, Youth Policy Development and Research. Youth sector of the Council of Europe has the largest programme volume ever and has established new work formats, including a standard-setting partnership agreement with the European Union.

2003

Along with other colleagues, negotiates the expansion of the Partnership Agreement between the Council of Europe and the European Union in the field of youth to include two new pillars: Youth Research and Euro-Mediterranean Cooperation.

2004

Nominated Head of the Youth Department within the reorganised Directorate of Youth and Sport as part of the newly established Directorate General IV: Education, Culture, Heritage, Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe. Is responsible for the overseeing of the entire youth

sector, from the statutory bodies to youth centres, deputizing to the Director of Youth and Sport.

2005

Participates in the 7th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth in Budapest, Hungary.

Travels even more extensively to provide assistance to member states in the development of national youth policies.

2006

Involved in the preparation of the 8th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for youth, to take place in 2008 in Kiev, Ukraine. The Council of Europe has 46 member states.

Takes leave of absence for health reasons.

2007

Succumbs to struggle with cancer on 29 May.

Bibliography

Bibliography

Carfax. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, Vol. 9, Supplement*. London: Carfax Publishing.

Circle for Youth Research Cooperation in Europe (CYRCE). (Ed.) (1999). *The European Yearbook on Youth Research and Policy: Intercultural Reconstruction – Trends and Challenges, Vol. 2*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Circle for Youth Research Cooperation in Europe (CYRCE). (Ed.) (1995). *European Yearbook on Youth Research and Policy, Vol. 1*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Council of Europe. (2005). *Opening Conference for the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention (Ossolineum National Institute, Wrocław, Poland)*: Proceedings. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. (1981). *Forum 21*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe. Ohana, Yael. (Ed.) (2006). *Young People at the Heart of Europe – 10 Years of the European Youth Centre Budapest*. Budapest: Council of Europe.

Europa Union. (1968-70). *Europa Union*. Bonn: Europa Union Verlag.

European Youth Centre Strasbourg. (1980-83). *European Youth Centre Bulletin*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Grupa Hajde Da! (2005). *Non-Formal Education in Europe – A Step Towards Recognition of Non-Formal Education in Serbia and Montenegro*. Belgrade: Grupa Hajde Da!

Jacobs Francine, Lerner Richard M., Wertlieb Donald. (Eds.) (2003). *The Handbook of Developmental Sciences, Vol. 3, Promoting Positive Youth and Family*

Development, Community Systems, Citizenship and Civil Society. United States: Sage Publications Inc. Books.

Hartmann-Fritsch C., Yaramenko A., (Ed.) (1994). *Youth exchanges between East and West: reports, facts, opinions, a reader*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Karsten, Andreas. (Ed.) (2005). *Intercultural Learning and Transnational Dialogue Project on Human Rights Education, Preventing Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance (RAXI), Youth Participation*. Berlin: Centre Français de Berlin (CFB).

Lentin, Alana. (Ed.) (2002). *Learning from Violence – The Youth Dimension*. Budapest and Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Magyar Nemzet. (1995). *A House for Citizenship Education – Opening the European Youth Centre, Budapest*, Interview with Peter Lauritzen on the occasion of the opening of the EYCB. Budapest: Magyar Nemzet.

Ohana, Yael. (Ed.) (1999). *Human Rights Week Report*. Brussels: European Youth Forum.

Partnership on Youth between the Council of Europe and the European Union. (2002). *Coyote, Issue 6*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Polish National Agency of the YOUTH Programme. (2004). *Living Learning – Conference Materials from the Conference on Non-Formal Education*. Warsaw: Polish National Agency of the YOUTH Programme.

Schmuck, O. (Ed.). (1990). *Vierzig Jahre Europarat: Renaissance in gesamt-europäischer Perspektive?* Bonn: Europa Union Verlag.

Sales agents for publications of the Council of Europe Agents de vente des publications du Conseil de l'Europe

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE
Hunter Publications, 58A, Gipps Street
AUS-3066 COLLINGWOOD, Victoria
Tel.: (61) 3 9417 5361
Fax: (61) 3 9419 7154
E-mail: Sales@hunter-pubs.com.au
http://www.hunter-pubs.com.au

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE
Gerold und Co., Weihburggasse 26
A-1010 WIEN
Tel.: (43) 1 533 5014
Fax: (43) 1 533 5014 18
E-mail: buch@gerold.telecom.at
http://www.gerold.at

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE
La Librairie européenne SA
50, avenue A. Jonnart
B-1200 BRUXELLES 20
Tel.: (32) 2 734 0281
Fax: (32) 2 735 0860
E-mail: info@libeurop.be
http://www.libeurop.be

Jean de Lannoy
202, avenue du Roi
B-1190 BRUXELLES
Tel.: (32) 2 538 4308
Fax: (32) 2 538 0841
E-mail: jean.de.lannoy@euronet.be
http://www.jean-de-lannoy.be

CANADA
Renouf Publishing Company Limited
5369 Chemin Canotek Road
CDN-OTTAWA, Ontario, K1J 9J3
Tel.: (1) 613 745 2665
Fax: (1) 613 745 7660
E-mail: order.dept@renoufbooks.com
http://www.renoufbooks.com

**CZECH REPUBLIC/
RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE**
Suweco Cz Dovož Tisku Praha
Ceskomoravská 21
CZ-18021 PRAHA 9
Tel.: (420) 2 660 35 364
Fax: (420) 2 683 30 42
E-mail: import@suweco.cz

DENMARK/DANEMARK
Swets Blackwell A/S
Jagtvej 169 B, 2 Sal
DK-2100 KOBENHAVN O
Tel.: (45) 39 15 79 15
Fax: (45) 39 15 79 10
E-mail: info@dk.swetsblackwell.com

FINLAND/FINLANDE
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Keskuskatu 1, PO Box 218
FIN-00381 HELSINKI
Tel.: (358) 9 121 41
Fax: (358) 9 121 4450
E-mail: akatilaus@stockmann.fi
http://www.akatilaus.akateeminen.com

FRANCE
La Documentation française
(Diffusion/Vente France entière)
124 rue H. Barbusse
F-93308 Aubervilliers Cedex
Tel.: (33) 01 40 15 70 00
Fax: (33) 01 40 15 68 00
E-mail: commandes.vel@ladocfrancaise.gouv.fr
http://www.ladocfrancaise.gouv.fr

Librairie Kléber (Vente Strasbourg)
Palais de l'Europe
F-67075 STRASBOURG Cedex
Fax: (33) 03 88 52 91 21
E-mail: librairie.kleber@coe.int

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE
UNO Verlag
Am Hofgarten 10
D-53113 BONN
Tel.: (49) 2 28 94 90 20
Fax: (49) 2 28 94 90 222
E-mail: bestellung@uno-verlag.de
http://www.uno-verlag.de

GREECE/GRÈCE
Librairie Kauffmann
Mavrokordatou 9
GR-ATHINAI 106 78
Tel.: (30) 1 38 29 283
Fax: (30) 1 38 33 967
E-mail: ord@otenet.gr

HUNGARY/HONGRIE
Euro Info Service
Hungexpo Europa Kozpont ter 1
H-1101 BUDAPEST
Tel.: (361) 264 8270
Fax: (361) 264 8271
E-mail: euroinfo@euroinfo.hu
http://www.euroinfo.hu

ITALY/ITALIE
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni
Via Duca di Calabria 1/1, CP 552
I-50125 FIRENZE
Tel.: (39) 556 4831
Fax: (39) 556 41257
E-mail: licosa@licosa.com
http://www.licosa.com

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS
De Lindeboom Internationale Publikaties
PO Box 202, MA de Ruyterstraat 20 A
NL-7480 AE HAAKSBERGEN
Tel.: (31) 53 574 0004
Fax: (31) 53 572 9296
E-mail: lindeboo@worldonline.nl
http://home-1-worldonline.nl/~lindeboo/

NORWAY/NORVÈGE
Akademika, A/S Universitetsbokhandel
PO Box 84, Blindern
N-0314 OSLO
Tel.: (47) 22 85 30 30
Fax: (47) 23 12 24 20

POLAND/POLOGNE
G/lowna Ksi, egarnia Naukowa
im. B. Prusa
Krakowskie Przedmiescie 7
PL-00-068 WARSZAWA
Tel.: (48) 29 22 66
Fax: (48) 22 26 64 49
E-mail: inter@internews.com.pl
http://www.internews.com.pl

PORTUGAL
Livraria Portugal
Rua do Carmo, 70
P-1200 LISBOA
Tel.: (351) 13 47 49 82
Fax: (351) 13 47 02 64
E-mail: liv.portugal@mail.telepac.pt

SPAIN/ESPAGNE
Mundi-Prensa Libros SA
Castelló 37
E-28001 MADRID
Tel.: (34) 914 36 37 00
Fax: (34) 915 75 39 98
E-mail: libreria@mundiprensa.es
http://www.mundiprensa.com

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE
BERSY
Route de Monteller
CH-1965 SAVIESE
Tel.: (41) 27 395 53 33
Fax: (41) 27 395 53 34
E-mail: jprausis@netplus.ch

Adeco - Van Diermen
Chemin du Lacuz 41
CH-1807 BLONAY
Tel.: (41) 21 943 26 73
Fax: (41) 21 943 36 06
E-mail: mvandier@worldcom.ch

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI
TSO (formerly HMSO)
51 Nine Elms Lane
GB-LONDON SW8 5DR
Tel.: (44) 207 873 8372
Fax: (44) 207 873 8200
E-mail: customer.services@theso.co.uk
http://www.the-stationery-office.co.uk
http://www.itsofficial.net

**UNITED STATES and CANADA/
ÉTATS-UNIS et CANADA**
Manhattan Publishing Company
468 Albany Post Road, PO Box 850
CROTON-ON-HUDSON,
NY 10520, USA
Tel.: (1) 914 271 5194
Fax: (1) 914 271 5856
E-mail: Info@manhattanpublishing.com
http://www.manhattanpublishing.com

Council of Europe Publishing/Editions du Conseil de l'Europe
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
Tel.: (33) 03 88 41 25 81 – Fax: (33) 03 88 41 39 10
E-mail: publishing@coe.int – Website: <http://book.coe.int>

'Eggs in a pan' is an exceptional journey through several decades of social and political development in Europe, as seen through the eyes of Peter Lauritzen, a sensitive communicator and well-informed analyst. In this collection of his written production, he reflects on a wide range of themes relevant to youth policy, youth work and youth research.

Peter Lauritzen was one of the longest serving civil servants in the youth sector of the Council of Europe. People that knew him well will attest to the fact that he was a 'wordsmith' in the true sense of the phrase. This collection of Peter Lauritzen's work brings together writings, interviews and speeches from all stages of his professional career as an international civil servant at the Council of Europe, as well as from his activity in the youth and adult education fields from before he joined the institution in 1972.

'Eggs in a pan' is intended both as a tribute to the professional and as a lasting document of over thirty-five years of development and growth in the youth sector of the Council of Europe, all of which Peter Lauritzen accompanied, and for which he was so instrumental.



ISBN 978-92-871-0014-4
Price: 18,00€

