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1. Introduction

Citizenship education is under discussion, debate, research and policy-curriculum change in a number of countries at the moment around the world as it has become a priority for national governments, the European Union, the Council of Europe, older and emerging democracies in Eastern Europe, Latin America and Asia, international organizations and institutions (Sears, Hughes 2005). Part of this momentum has been attributed to globalisation and intense international migration, which, to some extent, question the traditional notion of the nation-state and redefine its role. Other factors have been increasing European integration as well as the emergence of new states. For example, in Europe there is evidence of simultaneous dissolution forces (e.g. dismembering of the former Yugoslavia, fall of Communism in Eastern Europe), which create new nation-states, and integration forces, which form supra-national entities like the EU (Byram, Risager 1999). The declining support of political institutions by EU citizens along with tensions created with large immigrant populations in European countries are other factors problematising citizenship (c.f. Birzea, Losito, Veldhuis 2005). Finally, international concern with democracy, social justice, human rights issues and the broader context “of the diversity of a liberal pluralist democracy” (McLaughlin 1992, 245) have further prompted discussion and debate over the meaning of citizenship, and, by extent, citizenship education, since there is growing recognition that democracy and education are interlinked, that “democracy is essentially fragile and that it depends on the active engagement of citizens, not just in voting, but in developing and participating in sustainable and cohesive communities. This, in turn, implies education for democratic citizenship” (Osler, Starkey 2005, 4).

There are numerous examples of the political saliency that citizenship education has acquired during the last decade. The Council of Europe initiated a European Year of Citizenship through Education 2005, which put citizenship education in the spotlight, and the European Commission included “interpersonal, intercultural and social competences, civic competence” as the sixth out of eight competences in its Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on key competences for lifelong learning (2005). Eurydice (2004) has been commissioned to survey the way primary and secondary schools in the different EU Member States have addressed citizenship in general and the European dimension in particular and one of the largest, recent projects conducted by the International Evaluation Association (IEA) was the Civic Education Study in which approximately 30 countries participated and which (during its second phase) explored ‘14-year-olds’ knowledge and views on democracy; democratic institutions and citizenship; national identity; and social cohesion and diversity (Torney-Purta 2002b). The study indicated positive relations between civic knowledge and participation in democratic life, as well as between democratic school practices and civic knowledge and engagement (Torney-Purta et al. 2001), findings which have fuelled further (national, European, international) curricular innovations and research in the field.

Part of the prominence of the terms “identity” and “citizenship” in political and academic discussions can be attributed to their contested meanings and complex educational implications, particularly when they are addressed at the European rather than just at the national level. For example, Lewicka and McLaughlin (2002) pointed to the need to philosophically disentangle the meanings of “European identity” and “citizenship”, so as to critically determine their educational implications, since, they argue, the two terms have not been sufficiently problematised. The meaning of “Europe”, a concept geographical, political, economic, cultural and theoretical that has been constantly “re-invented” to exclude various “Others” (Delanty 1995), may continue to be used in divisive ways, thereby construing a narrow sense of Europeanness. For others, the European Union is an example of institutionalisation of supranational citizenship, an identity-based construction which can become as efficient as the nation and the national state were in their time (Birzea 2005), since it can provide the ground wherein identities may be ‘postmodernised’ and, in the case of Cyprus, resolved (Diez 2002b). Cyprus, a country at the margins of (traditional
geographical definitions of) Europe, where historically “East” and “West”, Islam and Christianity have met, interacted and opposed each other and characterised by extreme nationalisms that have long divided its society, must now respond to demands of revisiting its meanings of citizenship as a condition of its EU membership. Could the concept of “Europe” be used as a tool to revisit constructions of national identity and citizenship in Greek-Cypriot education? And if so, how could or should “Europe” be defined, so that it provides a useful educational framework?

2. European and national citizenship: can they co-exist?

Discussions over citizenship issues have been very frequent in Europe, as developing a sense of European identity and citizenship among young people became a key aim of the EU educational policy over the last three decades (Brine 1995). The EU has been attentive to its “democratic deficit”, has created symbolic and legal markers of European citizenship such as common passports, a flag, an anthem, the euro and, most recently, a constitution and is now faced also with dilemmas concerning the simultaneous “deepening” and “broadening” efforts for EU, two processes which for some EU citizens cannot happen simultaneously (Karp, Bowler 2006). In response to these political developments, academics have been discussing the impact of globalization and Europe on polity-formation, democracy, the nation-state, citizenship and education and have been trying to define national and European citizenship by providing various categorisations of their meanings (see, for example, Cederman 2001; Habermas 1994; 1996; Davies, Sobisch 1997; Osler, Rathenow, Starkey 1995). For example, Birzea (2005) provides a useful distinction between citizenship as legal and political status (rights and responsibilities granted by a state to its citizens) and as identity and social role (citizenship as one of a set of individual identities which exceeds the legal space of membership or territory and which instead carries cultural and psychological contents). The implications for European citizenship of this distinction is that in the former case it is restricted to the four supranational rights introduced by the Maastricht Treaty and is granted only to existing citizens of an EU state; access to human rights depends on the citizen status rather than being an individual. In the latter case (of citizenship as identity and social role), an individual may have a number of such identities which are contextualised, are related to cultural and historical space, and exceed geographical or other boundaries; for example even people living outside Europe may assume a European identity.

Citizenship for nation-states has had geographical, legal, political, cultural and social aspects and has been understood as a socio-psychological or affective state (e.g. national identity), as a set of legal rights and responsibilities, as guidelines of conduct, and as a means of participation (Heater 1990). Habermas (1994) notes that the legal definition of citizenship consisted only of political membership, membership to a state. In the case of the socio-psychological or affective state, national identity or citizenship is derived from self-identification with a particular national group and is used to denote identities associated with nation-states (and not just states). Historically the formation of nation-states has been based on an exclusive or ethno-cultural model of community formation (Habermas 1996), a model which sought to draw a direct, causal link between culture and an ethnic (see Cederman 2001), and which, as social constructivists have argued, mobilized education – along with the media and other state mechanisms – to construct nation-states and to create shared national myths, heroes, symbols, ideals and historical narratives (see, for example, Anderson 1991; Hobsbawm 1994). Consequently, nation-states excluded or sought to assimilate minorities and non-citizens who do not share characteristics of “the nation”. The notion of “citizenship” has thus been historically associated with the modernist creation of nation-states and their efforts to define who “belonged” as “members of” their legal jurisdiction by defining not only their political, but also their cultural and social citizenship, thereby conflating the two types of citizenship that Birzea (2005) describes.

Similar arguments have been formulated to criticize the discourse with which the EU seeks to construct the notions of European citizenship and identity in education. A key EU document, the 1988 Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on the European dimension in Education, clearly linked education with a European identity for the first time. Notably, the first objective of the 1988 Resolution was: “to strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European civilization and of the foundations on which the European peoples intend to base their development today...the principles of democracy, social justice and respect for human rights” (Council of the European Communities 1990, 19) (emphasis added). Hansen (1998) argues that behind the 1988 Resolution and the 1993 Green Paper1 lies the purpose to generate ‘a greater sense of identification with European culture, which...gets construed as something palpable, seemingly fixed, exemplary and simply ‘out there’

1 A Green paper released by the European Commission is a discussion document intended to stimulate debate and launch a process of consultation, at European level, on a particular topic. A Green paper usually presents a range of ideas and is meant to invite interested individuals or organizations to contribute views and information. It may be followed by a White paper, an official set of proposals that is used as a vehicle for their development into law.
for people to discover and add on to their similarly construed national and regional cultural identities” (p. 14). In the 1995 White Paper, this essentialist model of European identity again comes to the fore, where culture, heritage and civilization are called upon to justify the need for teaching the history of European civilization, “the legacy of a tradition which made Europe the first to bring about a technical and industrial revolution and thus change the world.... Being European is to have the advantage of a cultural background of unparalleled variety and depth” (Commission of the European Communities 1995: cit. Hansen 1998, 14). Hansen (1998) thus concluded that the way “culture” was defined by EU educational discourse was nationalist, and sought to invoke an identity among Europeans on ethno-cultural grounds. Thus, those non-white pupils who do not share the historical roots, the cultural tradition and the Christian civilization of the European identity are excluded. Arguably, European citizenship (as defined in EU centres like Maastricht and Amsterdam) only included economically active citizens and nationals of member-states, while it excluded immigrants (for example, Turks and Muslims), third country nationals, refugees and asylum-seekers, non-Europeans and ethnic-minority communities (Lewicka-Grisdale, McLaughlin 2002; Ritchie 1997; Hansen 1998).

Subsequent EU rhetoric seems to be more inclusive while adhering to the 2010 Lisbon goals. As the examples shown below indicate, education in general and citizenship education in particular, are construed as tools towards reaching the Lisbon goals while balancing social cohesion and economic advancement. In Education for citizenship: report on the broader role of education and its cultural aspects the Council of the EU (2004) “commits itself to strengthening citizenship and social integration through education as an extra effort in reaching the Lisbon goals” (p. 3); these goals include realising the most advanced knowledge economy in the world while strengthening social cohesion, creating more and better jobs and guaranteeing sustainable growth. The report states the vital role of the education system “in preparing people (first, but not foremost, young people) for their role as active members of society at all levels” (p. 4); citizenship education in particular is seen as a “powerful way of strengthening social cohesion” (p. 6). In Stockholm 2001 “the promotion of active citizenship and employability are to be seen as complementary” (p. 7). In Barcelona 2002 the Education Council stated that “while education and training systems need to change in view of the challenges of the knowledge society and globalisation, they pursue broader goals and have broader responsibilities to society. They play an important role in building up social cohesion, in preventing discrimination, exclusion, racism and xenophobia and hence in promoting tolerance and respect for human rights” (p. 7). The Constitutional Treaty underlined the importance “of the fundamental values of respect for human dignity, respect between men and women, liberty democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. Thus the proposed Treaty would provide guidance for formulating shared educational objectives for citizenship education” (p. 8). The report suggests that the European dimension is a broadening factor to citizenship: “citizenship education has or should have a European dimension too. Within the Union, citizenship education may no longer be defined solely through its national (or regional) context. Active citizenship should also be based on European awareness, on consciousness of shared history, values, chances and ambitions within a Europe which, at the same time, maintains its social and cultural diversity as a cherished heritage and a rich potential” (p. 10). The EU is attempting to re-define Europe in broader terms, at least in comparison to the 1988 Resolution. However it remains to be seen how these policies are to be implemented while ensuring participation, access, equity and social cohesion for old and new Europeans; it remains to be seen whether legal and political citizenship will be held hostage to cultural and social citizenship (to return to Birzea’s (2005) distinction) or not i.e. whether only those with “European” cultural and social identities may be granted also European legal and political citizenship.

Academic discussions on citizenship education have included critical analyses of political documents such as the above, trying to describe their implications for education. For example, discussions on the role of education in identity formation suggest that European citizenship needs to be understood as co-existing with other, multiple citizenships (see for example Heater 1997). Such discussions also attempt to draw distinctions between various models of citizenship education such as “civics” and “citizenship” education. McLaughlin (1992) understands civics as the “minimal” definition of education for citizenship, a conception which restricts “education for citizenship” into the provision of information, “the development of virtues of local and immediate focus” (p. 237), and the development of “unreflective socialisation into the political and social status quo”(p. 238). He proposes the expansion of citizenship into a “maximal” version for education, which entails “the development of a broad critical understanding and a much more extensive range of dispositions and virtues...It also requires the consideration of a more explicit egalitarian thrust" (p. 238). Such virtues include citizens’ responsibility “to actively question and extend their local and immediate horizons in the light of more general and universal considerations such as those of justice, and to work for the sort of social conditions that will lead to the empowerment of all citizens” (pp. 236-237). Lewicka-Grisdale and McLaughlin (2002) similarly argue that “any adequate form of education in 'European identity' must encourage and develop appropriate forms of critical reflection and assessment. Education which is worthy of the name is as likely to problematise the notion of a 'European identity' as it is to encourage and promote it” (p. 63). How can this be accommodated by citizenship education? Can nation-states “afford” to encourage
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critical reflection over European and national identities? And how are these issues, in a sensitive context such as the Cypriot one, tackled through citizenship education? To address these questions, the Cypriot historical and political context is discussed below as a necessary background against which citizenship education and national identity are explored in the fourth part of the paper.

3. Nation, state and identity in Cyprus: issues in focus

Identity and the politics of recognition are the cornerstones of the Cyprus problem. Evidence of human presence in Cyprus date back to 9000BC. The official historical narrative of the Greek-Cypriots commences with the arrival of the Greek Mycenaeans in 1400 BC, while the Turkish-Cypriots identify with the beginning of Ottoman rule over Cyprus in 1571 AD. Both versions of the past are saying that “historically Cyprus has been ours”, and thereby illustrate the nationalism of each community (Papadakis 1995). Greece gained independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1829 and after 1878, when Cyprus was passed over to the British by the Ottomans, the Greek-Cypriot community gradually aspired to the unification (Enosis) of the island with Greece, a policy which also held strong anticolonial elements. In fear of Greek domination, the Turkish-Cypriot community developed a respective policy of partition (Taxim) of the island between the two communities. Cyprus gained independence in 1960, with the signing of the Zurich-London agreements, which assigned Greece, Turkey and Britain as guarantee powers of the island and provided for Britain to keep two military bases on their former colony. The Constitution soon proved unable to balance the two communities’ nationalisms and protect minorities. In this case, Danopoulos (2004) argues, democracy was threatened, since “democracy lacks quality unless it is able to produce a constitution that provides for fundamental liberties, minority rights, and a set of institutions and checks and balances that limit state power and ensure accountability” (p. 42). Thus, the post-independence period was characterised by “ethno-nationalism, inter- and intra-communal conflict, and eventually war” (Koyzis 1997, 31). The educational systems were left separate and were used as the cornerstone of both nationalist ideologies by Greece and Turkey to increase their influence, and thus widen the gap between the communities (Kızıl dürük, Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis 1997). A coup organised by the dictatorial government of Greece against the government of Cyprus led to a Turkish military intervention in 1974, which divided Cyprus into two parts separated by a demilitarized zone called “the Green Line,” and guarded by UN peacekeepers until today; however, after an easing of travel restrictions by the Turkish-Cypriot authorities in April 2003, there has been unprecedented mobility between the two communities. The UN General Assembly have requested the withdrawal of foreign troops and the restoration of human rights in Cyprus and has coordinated a number of unsuccessful negotiation talks, of which the most recent, UN Secretary General Annan’s Plan, was rejected by 75% of the Greek-Cypriots in an April 2004 referendum.

The 1960 Constitution defined citizenship clearly in terms of ethnic origin, language, culture and religion:

1. the Greek Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Greek origin and whose mother tongue is Greek or who share the Greek cultural traditions or who are members of the Greek-Orthodox Church;

2. the Turkish Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Turkish origin and whose mother tongue is Turkish or who share the Turkish cultural traditions or who are Moslems;

3. citizens of the Republic who do not come within the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this Article shall, within three months of the date of the coming into operation of this Constitution, opt to belong to either the Greek or the Turkish Community as individuals, but, if they belong to a religious group, shall so opt as a religious group and upon such option they shall be deemed to be members of such Community: (Appendix D: Part 1 – General Provisions of Constitution, Article 2)

These provisions drew quite distinct categories of Cypriot citizens, “cypriotsness” being restricted to a state-identity which was not as emotionally appealing as ethno-communal identities were. However, concepts of the Greek nation, nationalism and Enosis began to be discredited (but not extinguished) amongst Greek-Cypriots after 1974 (Koutselini-Ioannidou 1997). This stemmed from the need to form political dialogue within the international community on the basis of Cyprus’s independence and the violation of statehood in 1974. Greek-Cypriot society and education were turned into arenas of conflict between two ideologies or discourses of identity: Hellenocentrism, which emphasised the Greekness of Greek-Cypriots and has been supported primarily by the political right, and Cypriotocentrism, which emphasised the Cypriot identity-citizenship which all communities in Cyprus share and has been mainly supported by the political left (Spyrou 2001). To this end, the terminology in Greek changed: Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots begun to be used as labels for identity (Gregoriou 2004) rather than Greeks and Turks used in the Constitution and during British rule. More recently, discussions over the possibility of a new constitution and form of state (bi-zonal, bi-communal federation) before and after the Annan Plan Referendum; increase of
immigrants and asylum seekers; the increased request of Cypriot passports and identity cards by Turkish-Cypriots from the Republic of Cyprus; the balance of power between the state and EU have encouraged debates about the meanings of nationality, national identity and citizenship and how old and recent communities and minorities can feel a sense of belonging to various nations and the Cypriot state at the same time. However, these local, European and international debates and discussions, seem not to have so far influenced curricula and textbooks used in Greek Cypriot schools; this argument is exemplified through the discussion of citizenship education in Cyprus below.

4. Citizenship Education in a Divided Country: Worlds apart?

Despite the rise of Cypriocentrism after 1974, “the curriculum continues to preserve its national humanistic character and supports the perversiveness of a supremacist national ideology” (Koutselini-loanidou 1997, 407). However, shortly before EU accession and due to increasing immigration in the 1990s, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Cyprus for the first time used the rhetoric of multicultural education in a Memorandum at the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year to acknowledge that Cypriot society was “becoming multicultural”; yet this formal recognition of multiculturalism as a new (rather than old) phenomenon prevents reflection about the Cyprus problem from acknowledging ethnic violence and national anxiety that has historically marked difference in Cyprus (Gregoriou, forthcoming). This approach leaves the traditional ethnocentrism of the curriculum untouched. It also leaves the potential of a European identity or citizenship as a way of shifting existing nationalistic tensions and exclusion of “Others” (communities, immigrants, minorities etc.) unexploited, as argued below.

The political situation and perseverance of Hellenocentrism has influenced constructions of Europe in education. Persiansis (1998) has diagnosed a resistance to European cultural space, due to the traditional role of Greek-Cypriot education to inculcate the Greek national identity. Nonetheless, EU-membership was a broadly acceptable “ideal” to the public and political worlds in Cyprus (Office of the Chief-Cyprus-EU Negotiator 1999), and the Ministry of Education and Culture (1996) included the need to prepare children for the “European orientations” (p 13) of Cyprus in its main aims for primary education. A closer investigation, however, of how the Ministry has construed the European dimension indicates that “Europe” has been identified with the EU; that the European dimension has been mainly associated with technological and economic development so that perceived EU standards in these fields are reached; and that it has been confined to the addition of EU languages or the participation in exchange programs (Philippou 2004). This marginal inclusion of “European” discourse is also illustrated by an overview of the Ministry of Education (Primary Education Department) circulars between September 2003 and May 2006; out of 925 circulars, only 40 refer to topics of European nature or citizenship; the majority of these circulars refer to the Schools of Europe Annual Contest (17) and to seminars organized by the Council of Europe for teachers (14); the Contest and seminars sometimes include citizenship topics. The remaining few refer to the celebration of Europe Day (6) and Europe Spring Day (2). One circular entitled “Education for Democratic and Open European citizenship” (dated 2 January 2004) attempts to define education for Democratic Citizenship as comprising of 5 factors: Citizenship Education, Intercultural Education, Global Education, Education for Peace and Human Rights Education by reviewing recent attendant developments in the field; European citizenship is remarkably absent from these factors. Participation created by the title of the document. References to Europe or European citizenship are thus occasional provided within the context of the aforementioned factors. The circular requests all school principals to inform teachers about it during a special staff-meeting. Further actions towards implementing democratic citizenship are largely construed as the responsibility of the teacher.

These issues have also been identified in civic and citizenship education curricula. In the Eurydice survey (2004) of Citizenship Education in Schools in Europe the meaning of “citizenship” in the Greek-Cypriot curriculum is associated to the etymology of the term: polititota or polititita in Greek, which is derived “from the Greek word ‘Politeia’=state and civitas from the word Polis=city” (p 10). During primary education, teachers can use two textbooks titled “Becoming a Good Citizen” in the 5th and 6th grades (with 10-12-year-old pupils)². Teachers can occasionally choose topics from these textbooks according to time they have available cross-curricularly, since there are no fixed teaching periods for civics and citizenship education in the syllabus. Given the large volume of the subject-matter in all subject areas and the lack of institutional support that cross-curricular themes usually suffer from (Navai, Print, Iriarte 2003), time for civic education is in practice very limited. Indeed a study amongst principals and teachers in primary education in 1992 showed that

² A single-textbook policy applies in all subjects and grades in Cyprus, an indication of the centralisation of the educational system. Approximately half of the textbooks used in Greek-Cypriot schools are imported from Greece. Several textbooks and materials are produced by the Curriculum Development Service of the Ministry of Education of Cyprus to replace or supplement those from Greece; the two civic education textbooks are published in Cyprus.
perceptions about what constituted civic and social education were quite diverse and ranged from formal to informal, curricular to extra-curricular contents (Persianis 1996). A content analysis of the two civics textbooks has shown that emphasis is given to theoretical knowledge of political institutions and the rights and responsibilities of citizens rather than to the actual practice of citizenship through pupils’ democratic participation in decision-making, organization and management. It was also found that “the civic education curriculum has focused on issues underlying the roots of the national problem and consciously resists any alteration to the situation and opposes conflict resolution without prior restoration of human rights” (Koutselini, Panapastasiou 1997, 113). Consequently, the citizens portrayed in these textbooks have no active role beyond remembering the occupied areas and wishing to return there, an aim also pursued with the curricular area entitled “I know, I don’t forget and I struggle” (Ministry of Education 1996). It is also important to note that “old” minority groups protected by the Constitution (Maronites, Armenians and Latins), do not constitute a special topic in these textbooks (Koutselini, Panapastasiou 1997).

In the third year of secondary school (14-15-year-olds) citizenship education is taught as a separate, obligatory subject in one trimester titled “Social and Political Education” for one teaching period (45 minutes) per week; it includes basic knowledge about institutions, the structure of the government and citizens’ rights and responsibilities. “Political Education” re-appears as a subject during the 5th year of secondary school for one trimester for one teaching period (45 minutes) per week. Even though citizenship education is seen by secondary education principals to be taught in all other subjects (mainly humanities) and extra-curricular activities3, Persianis (2003) has found that the emphasis is paid to developing good Human Beings, rather than Citizens, the assumption being that a good person will also be a good citizen. Consequently the emphasis is on the development of virtues that need to characterize Humans, and the means by which this aim is pursued “are the traditional methods of providing knowledge, emphasizing the preparation of school events, referring to noble historical examples, making appeals, sermons and giving advice, as well as insisting on the implementation of school regulations” (p. 133). These traditional strategies and approaches, Persianis (2003) points out, stem historically from cultural epistemological traditions. They have not been adjusted to the many social, political and cultural changes in Cyprus, and therefore leave many students uninterested. To conclude, Panapastasiou and Koutselini-loannidou (1999) have found that democracy, rights and political institutions seem to prevail in the goals and objectives of civic education as well as general primary and secondary education syllabi. The meaning attributed to Cypriot citizenship thus comprises of a theoretical knowledge of legal-political rights and responsibilities, which are not to be practiced to solve the political problem, at least until Greek-Cypriots’ human rights are restored.

The impact of citizenship education and schooling, as described above, has been recorded in various ways by research. For example, Panapastasiou, Koutselini and Panapastasiou (2003) have shown how the factors of school climate as well as home background defined political interest, political participation and social participation, which, in turn, determined democratic values amongst the 14-year-old Cypriot (and German) participants of the IEA civic education study. In the latter study, Cyprus was one of the countries where both learning in school and the political culture outside the school appeared to foster conventional political activity and the potential for protest activity; there also appeared a relationship between learning about cooperation and diversity in school and the expectation of volunteer or charity participation in the community, on both of which Cyprus scored high (Torney-Purta, Barber 2005). Cyprus also scored above the international mean in civic knowledge, civic engagement (conventional citizenship and expected participation in political activities), and civic attitudes (trust in government-related institutions, positive attitudes towards immigrants and support for women’s political rights) (Torney-Purta 2002b); however, together with Greece, Cyprus had the strongest national feelings and the greatest belief in the importance of military service (Torney-Purta 2002a). A study conducted amongst European youth for the needs of the Eurobarometer (Konstantinou 2003) indicated that 79% of Cypriot young people state that there are “too many foreigners” in Cyprus, whereas the countries approaching accession had a mean of just 17% (for comparison, the second highest, Malta, reached just 34%). Accordingly, Cypriot youth were the least likely in Europe to agree that foreigners and locals have equal rights: Only 25% agreed, while the mean in the 13 accession countries is 51%. Finally, an even smaller percentage stated that they were “happy that foreigners live in my country”. The 13 countries’ mean is 45%, while only eight in every hundred Cypriot young people feel happy about this.4 Other studies among Greek-Cypriot children have identified primarily negative

---

3 See also Naval, Print and Iriarte (2003) on a distinction on how civic education can be pursued within the formal, informal and hidden curriculum. The Eurydice survey (2004) also showed that active citizenship is pursued cross-curricularly as well as through the encouragement of active participation in school life in a number of participant countries.

4 A study amongst undergraduate students in the USA attempting to link patriotism with citizenship has found that certain civic indicators such as political involvement, political efficacy, interest, knowledge, and behavior were positively associated with constructive patriotism, whereas blind patriotism was positively associated with political disengagement, nationalism, perceptions of foreign threat and perceived importance of symbolic behaviors. Blind patriotism is defined as an attachment to country characterized by unquestioning, positive evaluation, staunch allegiance, and intolerance of criticism; constructive patriotism is defined as an
understandings and views towards a number of national out-groups, including migrant minorities such as the Pontoi [people of Greek Descent from the Black Sea Region] (Koutseli and Gypsies, Bulgarians and Russians (Philippou 2004). Finally, a study at a secondary school among 644 pupils revealed quite xenophobic attitudes towards recent immigrants, as well as towards peoples of different nationalities and religions in Cyprus. Specifically, 46.9% of the pupils thought that foreign workers cause social problems and 62% that they increase crime. In addition, 44.9% and 68.5% of the pupils agreed that the Greek nation and the Christian Orthodox religion are respectively the most superior nation and religion in the world (Kyriakidou 2005). These xenophobic and racist attitudes however, have been noted in its third report recently released (May 2006) by the European Commission on Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) which states that despite inclusion of “Multicultural united Europe and difference” as one of the main aims of the whole education system for 2004-05 by the Ministry of Education, “these aims contain general guidelines and […] are only marginally translated into concrete long-term initiatives” (p. 15); the Report therefore recommends that the Cypriot authorities need to intensify their efforts “to carry out extra-curricular activities aimed at educating children in human rights with a particular emphasis on non-discrimination and the need to respect differences […] and to strengthen the human rights dimension of civic education courses” (p. 16).

Part of the difficulty for the educational system in general and citizenship education in particular to address challenges such as xenophobia, racism, and human rights needs to be located to the political problem and the narratives of identity that have prevailed during the last century. Psychological, sociological and anthropological studies have indicated the impact of the Cyprus problem amongst its Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities and have identified the degree, depth and content of the largely nationalistic, stereotypical and hostile ways in which the two (adult) communities construct each other (see, for example, Papadakis, 1995; Mack 1979; Kizilyurek, Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis 1997; Constantinou, Papadakis 2001). The few studies available amongst children have shown that Greek-Cypriot children construct the Turks as ‘Others=Enemies’ (Spyrou 2001; Ioaniddou 2004; Philippou 2004) and that they variably draw from both Hellenocentrism and Cypriocentrism as discourses of identity. In the classroom and at school the discourse appears to be a nationalistic-Hellenocentric one, which essentialises identity through an emphasis on shared attributes like the Greek language, religion, and history, and erects a firm symbolic boundary which keeps “us” (the Greeks) separate from “them” (the Turks) (Spyrou 2001; 2002). Ioaniddou (2004) and Makiyiani (2004) record the saliency of Cypriot identity (as compared to the ‘Greek-Cypriot’ and ‘Greek’ identities) amongst pupils. But the cultural content of the “Cypriot” label seems to include only “Greek” characteristics for children: language, cultural, history, religion, traditions, customs, ideas, blood (Philippou 2005). Argyrou (1996) has shown how “Europe” has been used as a discursive tool to justify Cyprus’s place in the EU and that its Greekness has been put forward to justify its Europeanness. Cyprus has thus been construed as Greek by Greek-Cypriots, an argument still found amongst 10-year-old children and which renders Cyprus Greek and monocular thereby excluding both old and new communities (Philippou 2005).

These complex political and ethnocentric educational contexts, together with Cypriot pupils’ extreme views and the current political will to include the concept of citizenship in education, have led to the key question of this article: How could “Europe” be used to broaden pupils’ constructions of citizenship in democratic ways to include old and new communities in Cyprus, to acknowledge “own” and “others’” human rights? The suggestions discussed below aim to provide a standpoint from which we may begin to address this question.

5. Discussing the way forward

In discussing potential ways forward for Greek-Cypriot citizenship education, I will first return to Birzea’s (2005) distinction between legal-political citizenship and social-cultural identity as citizenship. Oslor and Starkey (2005) argue that citizenship education should develop both: “citizenship is more than legal status. It is more than political activity or advocacy. It is also a sense of belonging, which means that any education programme has also to engage with learners’ cultural and personal identities or feelings” (p. 14). Could this be an option for Cyprus, when historically such identities and feelings have tended to fuel national identities and identification with “motherlands”? Could cultural, ethnic, national, religious, linguistic elements be bridged under a civic identity, when historically these elements have been mobilised to segregate Cypriots? What kind of citizenship, and by extent citizenship education, do Cypriots need? The existing curriculum argues that national identities (Greek, Turkish etc) and state citizenship (Cypriot) can exist in parallel. But how can Cypriot citizenship be understood as inclusive, when old and new communities are absent from the Greek-Cypriot civics textbooks? What citizens can Greek-Cypriot...
curricula develop of which the philosophy is officially described as “democratic, combative, and humanistic in content, inspires love of the mother country, strengthens the will and determination to liberate our occupied territory, safeguards our national, religious and cultural tradition” (Ministry of Education 1994, 17, emphases added)?

A tool to move away from such exclusive constructions of citizenship could be to move towards non-territorial forms of membership such as constitutional patriotism (whereby “the unity of individuals results from attachment to a political community (‘Euro-polity’) without necessarily requiring any cultural unity” and cosmopolitan citizenship (which results from the emergence of numerous centres of authority at subnational and transnational levels) (Birzea 2005). The territorial aspect might be necessary still in the Cypriot case, since the island is what both communities share, as the political argument goes; indeed 10-year-old Greek-Cypriot children argue that their sense of place, of their country is one of the elements of their Cypriot identity (along with other empirical elements such as their families, friends, neighbourhoods etc) (Philippou 2005). However, territoriality would need to be dis-connected in attendant curricula from its ethno-cultural content, if the latter is viewed as divisive of the two communities. Or perhaps Cypriot citizenship, which has so far denoted constitutional, legal and political rights and responsibilities, should also acquire social and cultural content if it is to be a unifying, shared identity; this would implicate re-narrating Cypriot histories away from the Greek and Turkish grand narratives which have historically been dividing Cypriot society by claiming opposing national identities.

My second suggestion therefore is that any change in citizenship education in Cyprus also addressed the grand ethnocentric historical narrative present in the rest of the formal and informal curriculum, since it is often found in social studies textbooks (e.g. Frangoudaki, Dragona 1997) and amongst pupils (Philippou 2005). For example, the aim of the subject of History in the primary school national curriculum is to “help pupils learn and appreciate the historical life and cultural heritage of Cyprus and Greece and develop a national consciousness as members of the Greek nation and inhabitants of semi-occupied Cyprus” (Ministry of Education 1994, p 133, emphasis added). In History, national (Greek) identity is constructed in opposition to ‘Others’ (Turks); the content of Cypriot citizenship is marginalized to a mere matter of inhabiting, living in Cyprus. This is not, however, the only option. Levstik and Groth (2005) have found that in Ghana (a country outside “Europe” but with a colonial past like Cyprus) “rather than build a history that excludes or marginalizes one ethnic group or another, the curricular mandate is to create a history that declares diversity a strength, mandates attention to cross-ethnic histories (…), mandates local history, and focuses on what unites Ghanaians across these differences” (p. 581). This national story “prepares students to think about themselves as citizens in a pluralist democracy. In this regard, a national story of subjugation, struggle, and sacrifice that both establishes the need for unity (and the consequences of disunity) and the value of diversity (and the consequences of interethenic conflict) inclines students to honor multiple identities, search for unifying elements that might be carried into the present and future and perceive their conational as capable of bravery, persistence and self-rule” (p. 582). This example is rather different to the Greek-Cypriot case, where communities and minorities are not mentioned in the citizenship curriculum and where civic education is inextricably interwoven with national (Greek) identity (see Papanastasiou, Koutselini-Ioannidou 1999). There is a need therefore to look ‘outside’ Cyprus to learn about how other recent democracies and independent states with a colonial past addressed issues of national identities and citizenship, particularly in cases where the former were used to strengthen the latter; this is important because in the Cypriot political context national identity and state citizenship have often been construed as antagonistic and mutually exclusive rather then as co-existing or dual (as evidenced by the Hellenocentrism vs Cypriocentrism debate). Consequently, there is also a need to look ‘inside’ Cyprus and its histories, to re-claim Cypriot history as a history of communities living together in peace and collaboration, in social solidarity and cultural creation, rather than of communities in eternal conflict. Such a re-writing of history would also implicate the recognition of own responsibilities and Other’s pain in the model of constructive rather than blind patriotism.

How could the EU support such processes? The EU as an actor has had an ambiguous impact on the Cyprus conflict; but as a framework it provides the potential to act as a catalyst for a lasting transformation of the Cyprus conflict through a process of ‘postmodernization’ (Diez 2002a). For example, EU membership has already provided an impetus for the Ministry of Education and Culture to (at least) proceed to policies and formal recognition of the need for open and democratic citizenship and multiculturalism in Greek-Cypriot education. As has been argued earlier in the paper, these are of course only the first, and relatively pointless steps, of what should be a long, painful process of shifting from policy to practice, citizenship education being, in my view, one of the first tools to be mobilised. Addressing European citizenship tools, which is now largely absent from Ministry discourse, could be one of these next steps. But if introduced, what meaning should European citizenship take? European citizenship can be viewed as one of the post-national forms of membership, based on the attachment to European values and institutions where the demos prevails over the ethnus and belonging to a given territory (Birzea 2005). If therefore European citizenship is understood in its legal-political form, then it is in theory uniting Cypriots (Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots who, as citizens of the Republic of Cyprus, are also citizens of the EU. The reality of the division of the island complicates this form of membership (see Diez 2002a),
it remains however a useful pedagogic tool to discuss how European citizenship can be shared amongst citizens all over Europe, despite national identities, despite cultural and social differences. Such problematisation of the multiple meanings of citizenship and identity at national and EU levels could render citizenship education a forum for dialogue and debate in citizenship education classes; this brings us to issues of pedagogy, to which I turn below.

Cyprus has now an increased ability, as a result of EU membership, to participate in European and international projects for educational reform in general and citizenship education in particular; Sears and Hughes (2005) suggest that in such projects pedagogy should be such that “places students and their teachers in the position of wrestling with the precepts of democracy in the context of their own socio-historical situations” (p.19) and caution against the uncritical “transfer” and “borrowing” of successful programs elsewhere. Indeed citizenship’s problematic nature should not be an obstacle to bringing it into the classroom; controversy and debate could actually be rich pedagogical resources. One of the critiques, for example, against the Crick report in the UK has been that it presented “citizenship within a historical vacuum, implying that the project of citizenship is complete, rather than ongoing. Thus the differential ways in which citizenship is experienced, according to gender, class or ethnicity, are ignored in the report, as are the on-going struggles to claim equal citizenship rights” (Osler, 2000 cit. in Osler, Starkey 2005). Similarly, controversy and debate to discuss citizenship’s problematic and emerging meanings are important resources to mobilise against the traditional methods Persianis (2003) has identified in Greek-Cypriot citizenship education. There is a scarcity of research in Cyprus focusing on how teaching practices or school organization or curriculum structure and delivery are versed and how these might relate with student achievement in and attitudes to civics and citizenship, a gap that, for example, the upcoming IEA study on Civics and Citizenship Education is anticipated to address (Malak-Minkiewicz 2005). Future research can thus include careful analyses not only of official policy and curricula, but also of students’ and teachers’ narratives, as well as of the ways in which these are ‘performed’ in school and classroom contexts. Gilborn (2006) has argued that citizenship education has been used as a placebo by the British Government over the last 10 years, meant to placate concerns over racism, but making no actual attempt to address the central problem of institutional racism; his arguments against a “sanitised” version of citizenship, which emphasises citizens’ duties and responsibilities rather than their critical thinking, may be useful in exploring whether or how this also occurs with EU and Cypriot citizenship education discourse at both policy and practice levels.

Another suggestion for moving citizenship education in Cyprus forward may stem from the growing consensus that human rights underpin education for citizenship in multicultural democracies (Osler, Starkey 2005). Soysal (1994) has found that broad, transnational definitions of human rights (e.g. within the EU) have eroded the power of various European states to exclude non-citizens from social benefits and civil rights. There is also evidence of how Europe and various supranational changes (including human rights discourse) have lead to various changes over the last 50 years in the history, geography and social sciences curricula in various countries of Europe (Schissler, Soysal 2005). The discourse of human rights is quite salient in the Greek-Cypriot civics and citizenship education textbooks and syllabi; however it is mobilized in monologic ways i.e. to describe the Cyprus problem and the violation of the Greek-Cypriots’ human rights and does not refer to Turkish-Cypriots’ or other communities’ and minorities’ rights. A study of a curricular intervention amongst Greek-Cypriot 10-year-old pupils indicated that pupils were able to accommodate the human rights and democracy discourse to shift their views of immigrants (Philippou forthcoming 2006). A post-national citizenship model developed to accommodate human rights could thus be used to broaden curricular constructions of Cypriot citizenship by exploring human rights of different groups of people within and outside EU states (including Cyprus).

But Europe is not ‘just’ the EU; if we are to fully examine how Europe could be used as an educational framework, we need to broaden our focus from the EU to ‘Europe’ and we therefore step into the multiple definitions that have been given to Europe which problematize its borders (see, for example, Shennan 1991). How could the concept of “Europe” be used as a tool to revisit ethnocentric constructions of national identity and citizenship in Greek-Cypriot education, in a country lying at Europe’s traditional geographical borders? Delanty (1995) has argued that there is need for Europe to be linked to a new politics of collective responsibility based on post-national citizenship and judged by how it treats its minorities and not by reference to ambivalent notions of cultural or other unity. Indeed, “ethnocultural” definitions of Europe, which often come through several EU documents as has been shown earlier in this article, could only encourage divisions within Europe in general and in Cyprus in particular, where, as we have seen, “Europeaness” has often been equated with “Greekness”. However, Europe could be defined in other terms too: if Europe’s multicultural and hybrid, both “western” and “eastern” cultural foundations, are acknowledged, as postmodernists have argued (Coulby, Jones 1995), then we move away from exclusive definitions-constructions of Europe; perhaps then such divisions within Cyprus may also be shown to be constructed. European and Cypriot citizenship, as cultural-social identities rather than merely political-legal ones, could then be uniting rather than divisive forces, as both can be viewed as examples of hybridity and multiplicity. This is perhaps one of the greatest challenges yet to be undertaken by citizenship education not only in Cyprus but in Europe as well.
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