Education, migration and citizenship in Europe: untangling policy initiatives for human rights and racial justice

Audrey Osler

Published online: 11 Sep 2020.

Submit your article to this journal ↗

Article views: 1011

View related articles ↗

View Crossmark data ↗

Citing articles: 2 View citing articles ↗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Education, migration and citizenship in Europe: untangling policy initiatives for human rights and racial justice

Audrey Osler

Department of Culture, Religion and Social Studies, University of South-Eastern Norway, Notodden, Norway; School of Education, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

ABSTRACT

The 21st century has seen changes in migration patterns in Europe with implications for schooling and civic education: movement from eastern and central European Union member states to western Europe; increased movement between member states for study or work; and growth in the numbers of migrants and refugees seeking asylum in Europe as a result of regional conflicts and global inequalities. This article reviews European standards and policy frameworks on education and migration and considers whether they translate into policy and practice at national and sub-national levels. It identifies tensions between European standard-setting in the field of human rights and democracy, and the responsibilities of national governments in the field of migration and education, specifically education for citizenship. While European rhetoric emphasises democracy and human rights, national education policies stress language acquisition and national values in the integration of newcomers. Less attention is given to educating mainstream populations in human rights and social justice, or in enabling students to recognise and critically examine populist and anti-democratic discourses. National and European education policies that purportedly promote justice may fail to realise inclusive and cohesive citizenship if they acknowledge changing demographics but neglect everyday injustices and European histories of racialisation and racism.

Introduction

The first two decades of the 21st century have seen changes in European migration patterns: first, there has been economic migration within the European Union (EU) from newer member states in eastern and central Europe to member states in western Europe (Favell 2018); second, EU citizens have taken advantage of freedom of movement to move to another member state to study, work, or retire (Roos and Westerveen 2020); and third, the

---

CONTACT Audrey Osler ✉ a.h.osler@leeds.ac.uk

continent has seen an increase in the number of migrants and asylum seekers as a result of global North-South inequalities and regional conflicts, notably the Syrian civil war (Hatton 2017). While the total number of asylum seekers in Europe is low, compared to numbers seeking asylum closer to home, they have had a significant impact on certain countries and communities, notably Greece and specific Greek islands (Jauhiainen 2017). Each element of this migration pattern has had an impact on educational provision in EU member states and, as I will argue, has implications for the type of civic education provided.

This article reviews European standards and policy frameworks on education and migration and considers whether they can translate into effective policy at national and sub-national levels. It considers tensions between European standard-setting in the field of human rights and democracy, and the initiatives of national governments that are the responsible authorities for policy making in the field of migration and for education, including education for citizenship.[1]

I discuss the focus of national education policies relating to the schooling of children and young people, noting the emphasis on the concept of *integration* and *national values*. National and sub-national education authorities have tended to emphasise language acquisition in the integration of newcomers (Rodríguez-Izquierdo and Darmody 2019) rather than civic education. Processes of naturalisation frequently require adult candidates to pass a citizenship test, focusing on language skills, knowledge about the new country, and understanding of supposedly national values (Osler 2009a; Stone 2020). For children and youth, processes are somewhat different. While education authorities have sometimes provided specialist and differentiated schooling for refugees[2] and language support for migrants, children with migrant backgrounds are generally absorbed into mainstream schools, where the curriculum is broadly similar for all (Harte, Herrera, and Stepanek 2016).

Generally speaking, education policies addressing migrants focus on the integration of newcomers, specifically on the need to integrate students whose family heritage is from outside Europe. The primary emphasis is on language acquisition for newcomers. National policies emphasise the importance of adopting national values and may assume this is a more complex process for students whose parents were not educated in their country of residence. Often the policy focus is on the needs of children whose families have migrated to Europe from outside the region.

In response to migration and changing demographics, the predominant educational policy focus across European nation-states is *integration*. This focus is reflected in the European academic literature: I found the word 'integration' used in 46% (375 of 820 papers) of papers published between January 2000 and March 2020 in the traditionally European-based journal *Intercultural Education.*[3] For five per cent (n 42) of papers published integration was the main subject focus (included in the title or keywords). While the term integration clearly indicates somewhat different things in different national

contexts across Europe, it is generally understood to be a one-way rather than two-way process as, for example, in the citizenship curriculum for England, where minorities are required to learn 'our way of life' (Osler 2009b, 2017) and study British values and culture.

Europe, like other global regions, has in the 21st century been subject to populist and nationalist discourses in which both globalisation and migrants are presented as threats and in which racism and intolerance flourish within sectors of the population (Osler and Starkey 2018). These discourses impact negatively on the everyday experiences of migrants and asylum seekers. Early in 2020, the coronavirus pandemic provided opportunities for authoritarian European governments to consolidate their power, promote ethnonationalism, and undermine democratic processes, with Poland and Hungary providing key examples.[4]

Within education systems, relatively little attention is given to the education of mainstream populations, or to education for inclusive citizenship and the everyday microaggressions that newly-arrived students face. Education policies and initiatives that address issues such as racism or hate speech tend to occur in the context of bullying and interpersonal student-on-student violence, either physical or verbal. Such initiatives are generally project-based and time-limited rather than integrated into educational structures. I argue that policies that do not adequately acknowledge experiences of racialisation and prepare mainstream populations to recognise experiences by students of colour (whether migrant or non-migrant) are unlikely to be effective.

European policy frameworks and patterns of migration

Immigration and asylum are key political issues within the EU and within individual member states. The EU aims to develop a common policy on asylum, and provision of temporary protection to third country nationals in line with the provisions of the 1993 Treaty of Maastricht, revisions made under the subsequent 1999 Treaty of Amsterdam, and the 2009 Treaty of Lisbon and further developed through the Common European Asylum system.[5]

A briefing paper for the European parliament reminds readers that while the EU strives for common standards across member states through a series of regulations and directives, designed among other things to address 'migrant smuggling, the protection of EU's external borders, [and] the creation of legal pathways for those who are in need of international protection', responsibility for both asylum and migration policy lies with the member states, 'who must ensure that their national legislation is compliant with both EU law and international agreements' (Apap, Radjenovic, and Dobreva 2019, 2–3). EU policies are designed to improve the management of external migration into the EU and the management of asylum procedures by addressing the root causes of migration, including national and internal conflicts, climate change

and global poverty, especially global North-South inequalities (Castles, Loughna, and Crawley 2003).

While the main focus of EU cooperation has been preventing undocumented migration, Castles (2004, 3) observes 'a gap between rhetoric and action in EU policies in this area'. One challenge facing EU policy-makers is the tension in meeting these goals and the management of public opinion in member states where, as Castles (2004, following Sciortino, 2000) notes, there has been a shift since 1992, from viewing migration as an economic issue to one of national identity. Consequently, for a substantial number of people in member states, the presence of migrants may be seen less as an immediate threat to jobs and more as a threat to their established way of life and to national traditions and values.

As Castles (2004) observes, migration policy discourse constantly shifts in response to events. Policy makers are responding to immediate issues and managing short-term political objectives, whereas migration is an ongoing process that generally requires longer-term responses. In 2015, Europe experienced what is commonly referred to as a migrant and asylum crisis, but which might equally be characterised as a human rights or political crisis, since it set Europe's rhetoric of human rights in sharp contrast to the reality experienced by asylum seekers, so desperate to reach Europe that they put their lives in the hands of people-traffickers who transported them across the Mediterranean Sea, generally in overcrowded and unseaworthy vessels. The International Organization for Migration (2015) recorded 3,771 deaths in 2015 for migrants and refugees crossing the Mediterranean trying to reach Europe. The total recorded crossing the Mediterranean to Europe in 2015 was 1,004,356, almost five times the previous year's total. Three-quarters crossed the central Mediterranean from Libya to Italy, but the deadliest route was the narrower crossing between Turkey and Greece. The European public received daily news bulletins on these figures at the height of the crisis, but despite an appeal from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for European countries to restore a 'robust' rescue-at-sea operation in April 2015 (United Nations High Commission for Refugees. (UNHCR) 2015), EU member states failed to ensure a coordinated response. Greece and Italy faced the immediate challenge of offering humanitarian aid, and Germany provided accommodation and services for approximately one million new arrivals in 2015 alone, as other EU countries tightened their asylum processes. While many German citizens showed solidarity and acts of kindness to new arrivals, there was concern expressed within the ruling party to Chancellor Angela Merkel's asylum policy, practical challenges in some over-stretched municipalities, and signs of a far-right backlash (Connolly 2015).

In public debates about migration, integration, and multiculturalism in Europe, Islam is represented as the limiting case for multiculturalism and in tension with European and national values (Osler 2009b; Osler and Starkey

2018). Such debates, frequently fuelled by far-right political movements may, in turn, have an impact on education policies, as can be seen by the securitisation of policy in Europe (Cesari 2009), meaning that the focus switches from enabling efforts to ensure equal education outcomes for a specific community (for example, Bangladeshi heritage children in London), to crude and often ill-informed monitoring of children's behaviour or conversation at preschool or school to see if they are exhibiting signs of radicalisation (Osler and Starkey 2018). Similarly, the way that mainstream media portray migrants is likely to influence public attitudes and ultimately education policy. The 2015 'refugee crisis' in Austria provides an interesting illustration.

Austria lies on a land route into Europe from the Balkans for migrants hoping to reach Germany or Sweden. In 2015, a number of the country's federal provinces were reluctant to offer temporary accommodation or find permanent residential solutions for them, in line with a proposed EU quota system, partly due to citizens' expressed security concerns about the new arrivals (Greussing and Boomgaarden 2017), concerns that related in large part to the Islamophobia which had gained hold across parts of the European public. In late summer, in a shocking development for both Austria and Europe as a whole, Austrian police found 71 refugees dead in a trafficker's lorry on a motorway, close to the country's eastern border. As the Hungarian government reinforced its harsh asylum policies in September 2015 there was a short-lived shift among sections of the Austrian public towards solidarity with the refugees, but this lasted no more than a matter of weeks (Greussing and Boomgaarden 2017, pp.1753–54).

Greussing and Boomgaarden (2017) analysed 10,606 newspaper articles, representing the public discourse on refugee and asylum issues in six Austrian newspapers, both quality and tabloid, during 2015. They found that the two most prominent narratives were those of security threat and economisation (draining of public resources that would otherwise go to Austrian citizens). Throughout the year, humanitarian frames of reference were less to the fore, and at the most intense points in the crisis differences between the newspapers shrank, with language and metaphor tending to depict the refugees in an anonymous, dehumanising way. The study reveals the close relationship between public discourse, journalism, and political decision-making in relation to migrants.

For me, it also raises the question of whether and how human rights education (HRE), both for journalists and the public, might disrupt this self-reinforcing discourse. Such education might raise awareness among professionals of the international human rights standards that form part of formally agreed national and European values. It might also strengthen feelings of human compassion, the initial response engendered in the Austrian public, by stressing our human interdependence and shared vulnerability, potentially enabling political action

based on recognition and solidarity (Osler 2016), thereby closing the gap between abstract European ideals and political realities.

Education and European standard setting in human rights and democracy

The role of international legal norms in improving migrant rights is critical (Soysal 1994). However, for legal norms to become embedded in a culture of rights requires education. There are two key international bodies involved in standard setting on human rights and democracy in Europe: the Council of Europe (COE) and the European Union (EU). While each operates independently of the other, within the field of education, and specifically education for citizenship and human rights, there is significant cooperation between the two.

The EU is a political and economic union which, following the United Kingdom's withdrawal on 31 January 2020, comprises 27 member states. The COE, founded in 1949, and working in the field of human rights, democracy and the rule of law, comprises 47 member states.[6] By supporting COE activities within the broad fields of education for democratic citizenship and human rights education, the EU, which commands a much larger budget than the COE, can be seen to be fulfiling its policy objective of strengthening democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in the wider Europe and in bordering states, thus increasing regional stability and potentially reducing the pressure of migration into the EU.

All citizens of member states are automatically EU citizens, a status that confers a range of specific rights and responsibilities, including the right to live and work within the EU without discrimination on grounds of nationality. EU citizens can set up home in any EU country if they meet certain conditions. The right to live, work, and study across the bloc has enabled migration between nations, with some citizens living transnational lives, resident in one country but crossing borders to work. While some workers move seasonally, responding to labour market demands, for example, in farming and tourism, generally, those who migrate do so for longer periods. They draw on a wider range of public services in their new country of residence than seasonal workers, including schooling. Freedom of movement has meant that schools, particularly in western Europe, have had to adapt to changing demographics. Schools are serving the educational needs of significant numbers of students who are not citizens of the country in which they are being educated and may not aspire to citizenship, since their existing national and EU citizenship meets their needs.

For citizens who migrate within the EU, there is no automatic entitlement to language support. Polish children, for example, will not generally be entitled to language support in English schools. Child asylum seekers who arrive in one EU member-state and are eventually granted citizenship may not access specialist support if they subsequently move to another member state. The children of

Somali heritage families who arrived as asylum seekers in the Netherlands and acquired Dutch citizenship but subsequently moved to the United Kingdom or to Norway[7] will not receive the same language learning entitlements as those from families who came directly as refugees from Somalia to the UK or Norway. This differential treatment may influence opportunities for future civic and political engagement.

All EU citizens are entitled to participate in the EU's political life, including voting and standing in local and European elections in their country of residence, under the same conditions as nationals. Since 1962, there has been a directly elected European parliament, consisting in 2020 of 705 representatives, or MEPs. Among the other key EU institutions is the European Council (not to be confused with the COE), which defines the general EU political direction and priorities and is made up of heads of state or governments, a president, and the president of the European Commission (EC). The EC is the administrative body that represents the overall interests of the EU.[8]

All COE member states are signatories to the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe 1950). The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in Strasbourg oversees the implementation of the Convention, designed to protect all living in the wider Europe, regardless of citizenship status, and covering the rights of stateless persons, including stateless residents. It places an obligation on member states to avoid statelessness (Vlieks 2014). Under the Convention, individuals and groups have the right to petition the ECtHR once they have exhausted all available legal remedies through local and national courts.[9]

The COE has long recognised the importance of education in strengthening democracy and human rights across member states, and in preventing human rights abuses. Within COE policy initiatives, particularly in the first two decades of the 21st century, education and training are increasingly seen as a defence against the rise of violence, racism, extremism, xenophobia, discrimination, and intolerance.[10]

The increased awareness of the role of education in tackling anti-democratic forces is reflected in the adoption of the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and Human Rights Education (HRE) by the organisation's 47 member states within in the framework of Recommendation CM/Rec(Council of Europe 2010)7 (Council of Europe 2010). While the Recommendation and the Charter's provisions are not binding, they provide an important standard and catalyst for action. Some member states have re-emphasised the importance of EDC and HRE in keeping with the Charter, as did Norway, for example, following the 2011 far-right terrorist attack in Oslo and Utøya (Osler and Solhaug 2018).[11] Teachers and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) can also use the Charter as a reference point in developing activities in HRE and EDC. The EU has provided resources specifically for transnational projects developed in the

framework of CM/Rec (Council of Europe 2010)7 and in line with the provisions of the Charter.[12]

The COE is active in supporting a range of transnational initiatives to promote justice and equality, such as in its No Hate Speech Movement, 2013–2017, a youth campaign (Council of Europe n.d.). The COE's political bodies, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities,[13] and the Committee of Ministers, have adopted charters and recommendations setting human rights standards and providing guidelines to help member states address hate speech and support victims. The Committee of Ministers Recommendation R (97) 20 marks the COE as the only international intergovernmental organisation to have adopted a definition of hate speech (Council of Europe 1997). Projects such as the COE's No Hate Speech Campaign are important but rely on bodies within and across member states to implement activities. This is their strength but also their weakness because they often depend on NGOs' activities, and initiatives are infrequently built into national or sub-national education policies or adopted on a consistent basis by schools.

European ideals and social and educational realities

There are tensions in teaching about the 'European ideals' of democracy, inclusion, justice and equality, not least of which is a gap, in the experience of many learners, between these ideals and their day-to-day realities. In the UK, for example, 4.1 million children were living in poverty in 2017/18. This represents more than 30% of the total child population, with certain regions and communities experiencing more acute levels of deprivation than others (Francis-Devine, Booth, and McGuinness 2019). This means that, on average, nine children in any class of 30 or 31 will experience multiple deprivations, with the figures much higher for certain schools and regions. It seems likely that this figure will rise exponentially, with recession and widespread unemployment expected to follow the coronavirus pandemic in many nations.

Lessons about equality and justice may be difficult to reconcile with experiences of poverty and deprivation. One UK report proposes a range of urgent measures needed to minimise the educational impact of the pandemic on children and youth, including widening access to private and online tuition to minimise the attainment gap; ensuring access to technology and online resources for low-income students while schools are closed; reviewing the 2020 admissions process to higher education to ensure it does not impact negatively on such students; and protecting apprenticeships (Montacute 2020). Regretfully, this report does not give specific attention to the needs of students of colour, or refugees and asylum seekers, who are likely to be among the most vulnerable to negative impacts.

In a small-scale qualitative study which formed part of a EU-funded transnational project, focusing on teachers responsible for citizenship education in the north of England, the teachers reported that students from across the social spectrum were frequently hostile to the EU, while generally knowing little about it. Although teachers from the research schools reported ethno-nationalist, xenophobic, and racist attitudes among students, those who worked in a school serving a former mining town with high levels of poverty and deprivation reported more extreme expressions of racism and xenophobia, a factor they explained in terms of social deprivation. While the target of this racism was generally Black and Asian communities, the teachers reported that the focus of students' hostility was shifting to eastern and central Europeans, as migrants from the region settled in the area. Where teachers sought to teach for justice and equality, they elected to address these ideals within a global, rather than European framework (Osler 2011).

Education and national values

Across Europe, while 'diversity' may be celebrated in education policy, policy processes require migrants and refugees to adapt to the values of the mainstream. While education has played a key role in nation-building since the 19th century, the promotion of national values has been re-emphasised as globalisation makes nations more interconnected than ever. As European publics have come to see migration as a threat to national values (Castles 2004), citizenship education policies are reframed in terms of national values. The additional focus on national values in an age that has seen a growth in ethnonationalism is itself problematic as it threatens to redefine who belongs to the nation in an exclusionary way.

There is a new emphasis on the distinctiveness of each nation, so that in Norway, for example, while the government may caution against exclusionary discourses and underline that minorities are an equal part of Norwegian society, the teaching of democratic practices becomes more emphasised. The underlying assumption is that migrants are lacking strong (Norwegian) democratic traditions and therefore in greater need of absorbing them through schooling (Osler and Lybæk 2014). In neighbouring England, the government has introduced the teaching of 'fundamental British values' to inoculate students, including pre-schoolers, against extremism (Maylor 2016). Under the UK 2015 Counter-Terrorism and Security Act, students may be referred to police authorities if teachers judge them to be 'vulnerable to extremism'. While extremism is defined as including right-wing extremism, popular Islamophobic discourses and unconscious bias may cause students of Muslim heritage to be referred more frequently than other students (Osler and Starkey 2018).

As populist rhetoric and politics impact on both migrant students and their longer-established peers, such a focus in citizenship education may have

unintended consequences. Rather than strengthen democracy, it may undermine the ideals of justice that democracy seeks to guarantee. In schooling systems where many students are not nationals of the country in which they live, to link democracy, human rights, or equality too tightly to the nation is to exclude such students and place them as the 'other'. For example, if France or Denmark argues that it is the home of human rights, or that human rights are part of the fabric of what it means to be French, or Danish, then those who are not French, or whose family heritage lies outside the borders of Denmark, may be made to feel that they are not part of the project. It may also lead teachers to teach about human rights abuses in distant places, believing that human rights abuses at home are 'peanuts'[14] (Osler 2016; Vesterdal 2019).

National education policies addressing migrants and refugees are generally silent on Europe's history of racism and racialisation. This policy silence is reflected in the European literature: a search for the term race* (with * placed to include words with the same root: racial, raced, racism or racialisation) in *Intercultural Education* from January 2000 to March 2020 identified just 10 papers in *Intercultural Education*. Of these, just four (less than 0.5% of the total papers published), addressed European contexts. I contend that national education policies that purportedly promote justice are unlikely to succeed in realising inclusive and cohesive citizenship if they acknowledge changing demographics but neglect everyday injustices and European histories of racialisation and racism.

A further complication is potential discordance between European and national policies in this field. There is a risk that national and international bodies may promote contradictory goals. In a study that sought to understand why and how national educational discourses are shaped by European guidelines and recommendations, the researchers concluded that 'European discourses often run counter to national policies and that EU officials are deeply engaged in promoting intercultural educational philosophies' and in efforts to close attainment gaps between migrant and mainstream populations (Hadjisoteriou, Faas, and Angelides 2015, 227). The researchers noted that the EU officials in their study emphasised the importance of harmonising policy to realise the goal of social justice. The study suggests that even when countries are slow to address social justice within education policy, EU officials could promote this goal through research initiatives and other interventions.

European history of racialisation and racism

Everyday racism (Essed 1991) encountered by learners operates to undermine European ideals, as Hirsch (2019) found in her study of the adult British-born children of Vietnamese, Sri Lanka Tamil, and Kurdish refugees from Turkey who grew up in London during the 1990s. While some of her interviewees initially claimed they had not experienced racism, it became apparent that this was

because they were comparing their own experiences of racist epithets and feelings of discomfort with severe racism experienced by their parents at the hands of the state, in the processes of asylum, and in the labour market. Hirsch illustrates how racism and exclusion have been 'intimately connected to the asylum system and the strengthening of borders' over several decades. Following Les Back (Solomos and Back 1996, p. 213; Meer and Nayak 2015), Hirsch identifies racism as a 'scavenger ideology' which draws on a past, present, and imagined future in relation to migration to reinforce new forms of popular racism (Hirsch 2019, 90). Even the words asylum seeker and refugee may be used as racist epithets to attack individuals and groups. Migration and race become interlinked, as in France where the children and grandchildren of migrants from North Africa are labelled 'second generation' or 'third generation' `immigrés' [immigrants] even when they are citizens born in France (Osler and Starkey 2000). Effectively, in this discourse, to be French is to be White.

Each of these examples begs the question, for whom are European ideals intended? Musing on this, Nikolaidis (2013) discusses the EU as a region of ideals, to which migrants come in search of humanism and hope. Writing two years before the height of Europe's 'refugee crisis', he observes how those from the periphery aspire to EU citizenship, risking their lives to reach Europe from North Africa, while others die for these same ideals in Ukraine. Yet a populist rhetoric builds on a history of racism and racialisation in Europe, causing some to reject the European ideal, embrace xenophobia, and undermine the very foundations on which Europe's institutions are built. Far from being universal, in practice they may be reserved for Europeans. Yet, it is important to note that those that appear to reject the European ideals now form a substantial minority in parts of Europe, represented by Brexiteers in the UK and by Marine Le Pen, President of the *Rassemblement national* (RN) [National Rally] party in France, rejecting not just European values but the very concept of Europe.

The future of education for citizenship and human rights

Twenty-first century migration patterns have caused both national authorities on the one hand, and European international bodies on the other, to review their approaches to education for democratic citizenship and human rights. There appears to be an uneasy tension between the focus of the COE and the EU and that of national and sub-national education authorities. The former persist in promoting the European ideals of justice, equality, and human rights through standard setting and projects, while education policy in many member states veers towards nationalism and a re-statement of 'national' values. At the same time national education authorities continue to assert that their policies are designed to ensure equality and inclusion. This tension is further complicated by the need for international bodies to maintain the legitimacy of their

standard-setting by securing the support of national governments for key texts and recommendations.

Both the EU and COE are heavily reliant on national bodies for the dissemination of their policies at the national level and in formal education. They recognise the need to work to reach other constituencies by collaborating with NGOs, youth organisations, and local authorities, utilising an alternative channel through which they can promote Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and Human Rights Education (HRE). The EU is also able to influence intercultural citizenship learning through its funding mechanisms for teacher and student international exchange visits.

In an age of increased authoritarianism and xenophobic populist rhetoric, both the COE and EU operate as a constraint on anti-democratic politics that demonise migrants and asylum seekers. However, the 2015 'migrant crisis' highlighted a real crisis of human rights across the continent, in which EU member states were unable to unite effectively to show solidarity to the vulnerable. A chasm opened between European ideals and the decisions of those political leaders more concerned about their 'own' people than the human rights of those fleeing terror, war, and destitution. Individual member-states, local authorities and civil society stepped in to bridge the gap between ideals and reality, demonstrating a practical commitment to humanitarian needs.

The crisis raises the question of whether and how Human Rights Education (HRE), both for journalists and for the public, might disrupt a self-reinforcing discourse of racism and antagonism to migrants. The challenge remains of how an initial emotional response of horror at the death of vulnerable people might be transformed into a longer-term practical commitment within a populace to support their fellow humanity. An area for further investigation is how HRE might engage more effectively with the emotional as well as the rational.[15]

There remains an even greater challenge in reconciling European ideals with effective Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC). I have sought to illustrate in this article how at all scales, education policies that purportedly promote justice are unlikely to succeed in realising inclusive and cohesive citizenship if they acknowledge changing demographics but neglect everyday injustices and European histories of racialisation and racism. Education structures, policy making, and schooling are set within a broader context in which a European history of racialisation and racism is consistently overlooked. Likewise, education for citizenship and human rights frequently overlooks this societal context, effectively undermining its stated goal of enabling democracy and social justice.

For this challenge to be addressed will require policy makers at all levels to engage with Europe's difficult past and with the uncomfortable realties of injustice experienced by both by migrants and by Europeans of colour. The quest for human rights and equal citizenship is ongoing. Perhaps one starting point is for policy makers to understand and engage with the aphorism: 'We are

here because you were there', coined by Ambalavaner Sivanandan in the 1970 s, making the link explicit between 20th century immigration and colonialism (Sivanandan 2008). He challenged a commonplace assumption, that the presence of Black people in Britain caused racism. The shape and expression of racism and xenophobia change. In 2020, in Europe and elsewhere, we have seen Chinese and other East Asians increasingly become the victims of hate crime as certain political leaders and fellow citizens blame them for coronavirus.[16] European and national policy on education for democratic citizenship needs to engage with the struggles endured by people of colour in Europe and globally, and with Europe's imperial past as well with the 'newer' present-day targets of hate, if it is to realise its aim of creating a just European society in keeping with Europe's ideals.

Notes

1. While in some nation-states, such as France, education policy is centralised, in others such as Germany, Spain and the UK, it is devolved to regional authorities.
2. There are programmes designed to enable refugees to return to their home countries once peace and stability is achieved.
3. Published for the International Association for Intercultural Education.
4. In Poland, the right-wing governing party sought to consolidate power at the presidential election due on 10 June 2020, by pressing ahead with an ill-conceived all-postal vote, which lacked guarantes of a secret ballot. Following vigorous opposition, voters go to the polls and can opt to cast their vote in person on 28 June 2020. https://www.newstatesman.com/world/europe/2020/05/poland-president-Andrzej-Duda-elections-pis-ruling-party-democracy https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/07/world/europe/poland-presidential-election-coronavirus.html In Hungary, parliament gave prime minister, Viktor Orbán the right to rule by decree indefinitely as part of emergency measures aimed at fighting coronavirus
5. Further information can be found about these and other aspects of the legal framework for asylum here: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/151/asylum-policy
6. These include the 27 that are also EU member states The UK remains a COE member state.
7. Norway is not an EU member state but generally applies EU standards.
8. Further information about the EU can be found on its official websites: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en. Formal cooperation between member states began in 1950, shortly after World War Two and the European Economic Community (EEC) was established in 1957. All EU official pages are in the domain europa.eu
9. ECtHR rulings are binding on national governments.
10. The COE European Youth Centres in Strasbourg and Budapest offer training for young people in democracy and human rights.
11. Osler and Solhaug (2018) discuss earlier standard setting in EDC/HRE by the COE.
12. Such projects may, for example, link educators and/or youth in eastern and central Europe with those in western Europe with the aim of disseminating good practice and learning from each other's contexts.

13. Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (representing elected members in local authorities across member states) The Congress represents elected members in local authorities across member states.
14. Meaning insignificant.
15. Here the work of Betty Reardon and Michalinos Zembylas is instructive.
16. The Guardian 8 May 2020. Global report: virus has unleashed a 'tsunami of hate' across world, says UN chief https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/08/global-report-china-open-to-cooperate-with-who-on-virus-origin-as-trump-repeats-lab-claim   Sky News 5 May 2020. Coronavirus: How many COVID-19 hate crimes are in your area https://news.sky.com/story/coronavirus-how-many-covid-19-hate-crimes-are-in-your-area-11979427

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Audrey Osler has written extensively on human rights and racial justice in education. Her most recent book is *Human Rights and Schooling: An Ethical Framework for Teaching for Social Justice* (Teachers College Press). Her new book, *Where Are You From? No, Where Are You Really From?* (Virago Press) examines empire and migration, drawing on historical narrative and memoir.

ORCID

Audrey Osler   http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8462-0749

References

Apap, J., A. Radjenovic, and A. Dobreva. 2019. *Migration Issue: Briefing Paper PE635.542 March. EPRS Members' Research Service*. Brussels: European Parliament.
Castles, S. 2004. "Why Migration Policies Fail." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 27(2):205–227.
Castles, S., S. Loughna, and H. Crawley. 2003. *States of Conflict: Causes and Patterns of Forced Migration to the EU and Policy Responses*. London, England: Institute of Public Policy Research.
Cesari, J. 2009. *Muslims in the West after 9/11: Religion, Politics and Law*. London, England: Routledge.
Connolly, K. (2015, October 8). "Refugee Crisis: Germany Creaks under Strain of Open Door Policy." *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/oct/08/refugee-crisis-germany-creaks-under-strain-of-open-door-policy
Council of Europe. 1950. *Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Rome, 4.XI*. Strasbourg, France: Author.
Council of Europe. 1997. *Recommendation R(97)20 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on "Hate Speech". Adopted by the Committee of Ministers 30 October at the 607th Meeting of the Ministers' Deputies*. Strasbourg, France: Author.

Council of Europe. 2010. *Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education. Adopted on 11 May at the 120th Session*. Strasbourg, France: Author.

Council of Europe. n.d. "*Council of Europe's Work on Hate Speech*." https://www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign/coe-work-on-hate-speech

Essed, P. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Vol. 2. London, England: Sage.

Favell, A. 2018. "The New European Migration Laboratory: East Europeans in West European Cities." In P. Scholten and M. van Ostaijen, edited by. *Between Mobility and Migration: The Multi-level Governance of intra-European Movement*. New York, NY: Springer; p. 263–346.

Francis-Devine, B., L. Booth, and F. McGuinness. 2019. *Poverty in the UK: Statistics. Briefing Paper 7096. 5 September*. London, England: House of Commons Library.

Greussing, E., and H. G. Boomgaarden. 2017. "Shifting the Refugee Narrative? an Automated Frame Analysis of Europe's 2015 Refugee Crisis." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 43 (11):1749–1774.

Hadjisoteriou, C., D. Faas, and P. Angelides. 2015. "The Europeanisation of Intercultural Education? Responses from EU Policy-makers." *Educational Review*. 67(2):218–235.

Harte, E., F. Herrera, and M. Stepanek. 2016. *Education of EU Migrant Students in EU Member States*. Cambridge, England: RAND Europe.

Hatton, T. J. 2017. "Refugees and Asylum Seekers, the Crisis in Europe and the Future of Policy." *Economic Policy*. 32(91):447–496.

Hirsch, S. 2019. "Racism, 'Second Generation' Refugees and the Asylum System." *Identities*. 26 (1):88–106.

International Organization for Migration (2015, December 22). "Irregular Migrant, Refugee Arrivals in Europe Top One Million in 2015." https://www.iom.int/news/irregular-migrant-refugee-arrivals-europe-top-one-million-2015-iom

Jauhiainen, J. S. 2017. *Asylum Seekers in Lesvos, Greece, 2016–2017*. Turku, Finland: University of Turku.

Maylor, U. 2016. "'I'd Worry about How to Teach It': British Values in English Classrooms." *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 42(3):314–328.

Meer, N., and A. Nayak. 2015. "Race Ends Where? Race, Racism and Contemporary Sociology." *Sociology*. 49(6):NP3–NP20.

Montacute, R. 2020. *Social Mobility and Covid-19: Implications of the Covid-19 Crisis for Social Mobility*. London, England: Sutton Trust.

Nikolaidis, A. (2013, May 13). "Europe's Ideals and Values Seem Lost on Its Own Citizens." *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/may/13/europes-ideals-values-eu-lost-on-its-citizens

Osler, A. 2009a. "Testing Citizenship and Allegiance: Policy, Politics and the Education of Adult Migrants in the UK." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 4(1):63–79.

Osler, A. 2009b. "Patriotism, Multiculturalism and Belonging: Political Discourse and the Teaching of History." *Educational Review*. 61(1):85–100.

Osler, A. 2011. "Teacher Interpretations of Citizenship Education: National Identity, Cosmopolitan Ideals, and Political Realities." *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 43(1):1–24.

Osler, A. 2016. *Human Rights and Schooling: An Ethical Framework for Teaching for Social Justice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Osler, A. 2017. "Citizenship Education, Inclusion and Belonging in Europe: Rhetoric and Reality in England and Norway." In J. A. Banks, edited by. *Global Migration, Structural Inclusion, and*

Citizenship Education across Nations. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association; p. 133–160.

Osler, A., and L. Lybæk. 2014. "Educating 'The New Norwegian We': An Examination of National and Cosmopolitan Education Policy Discourses in the Context of Extremism and Islamophobia." *Oxford Review of Education*. 40(5):543–566.

Osler, A., and T. Solhaug. 2018. "Children's Human Rights and Diversity in Schools: Framing and Measuring." *Research in Comparative & International Education.* 13(2):276–298.

Osler, A., and H. Starkey. 2000. "Intercultural Education and Foreign Language Learning: Issues of Racism, Identity and Modernity." *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 3(2):207–221.

Osler, A., and H. Starkey. 2018. "Extending the Theory and Practice of Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship." *Educational Review*. 70(1):31–40.

Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M., and M. Darmody. 2019. "Policy and Practice in Language Support for Newly Arrived Migrant Children in Ireland and Spain." *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 67(1):41–57.

Roos, C., and L. Westerveen. 2020. "The Conditionality of EU Freedom of Movement: Normative Change in the Discourse of EU Institutions." *Journal of European Social Policy*. 30(1):63–78.

Sciortino, G. 2000. "Towards a Political Sociology of Entry Policies: Conceptual Problems and Theoretical Proposals." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 26(2):213–228.

Sivanandan, A. (2008, November 1). "Catching History on the Wing." Speech to Institute for Race Relations 50th Celebration Conference, London, UK. http://www.irr.org.uk/news/catching-history-on-the-wing/

Solomos, J., and L. Back. 1996. *Racism and Society*. London: Palgrave.

Soysal, Y. N. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Stone, N. 2020. "Learning to Belong? an Analysis of Germany's Migrant Orientation Programme from an HRE Perspective." *Human Rights Education Review*. 3(1):1–18.

United Nations High Commission for Refugees. (UNHCR). (2015, December 5). "The Year of Europe's Refugee Crisis." https://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/stories/2015/12/56ec1ebde/2015-year-europes-refugee-crisis.html

Vesterdal, K. 2019. "Championing Human Rights Close to Home and Far Away: Human Rights Education in Light of National Identity Construction and Foreign Policy in Norway." *Human Rights Education Review*. 2(1):05–24.

Vlieks, C. (2014). "Strategic Litigation: An Obligation for Statelessness Determination under the European Convention on Human Rights?" Discussion Paper 09/14, European Network on Statelessness. https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/582326c34.pdf