

European Manifesto for Multiple Cultural Affiliation

Foreword

The European Manifesto for Multiple Cultural Affiliation was one of the results of the Project on “Cultural identities, shared values and citizenship” carried out following the 3rd Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe’s Member States in 2006-2007. The Manifesto was presented at the end-of-Project Forum on “Cultural values for Europe” which took place in Strasbourg on Monday 3 December 2007.

The Manifesto goes beyond the approach related to fixed cultural identities and the discussion of recognition for minorities. It sets out to show how the feeling, on the part of certain individuals or groups, of belonging to several cultural traditions at the same time can be reconciled with a European citizenship now in the making, based on mutual recognition of different cultures and an attachment to shared values.

It highlights the mass of exchanges and the intermingling that has forged Europe’s culture and throws light on the potential that multiple cultural affiliation represents for human development and

mutual understanding as a means of fostering peace and stability in Europe.

It leads to a vision of a peoples' Europe that puts the individual back at the heart of a multicultural society that respects not only fundamental rights and freedoms but the cultural and social identity of individuals. The work is in keeping with the definitions of culture and heritage previously accepted by the Council of Europe and UNESCO:

“Cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time” (Council of Europe, Framework Convention on the value of cultural heritage for society, opened for signature in Faro on 27 October 2005).

“In its widest sense, culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs” (UNESCO, World Conference on Cultural Policies, 1982).

The Manifesto was drawn up by a group of experts from different parts of Europe and is available with a “Guide to the Manifesto” explaining the reasons behind this work and facilitating understanding of the text.

European Manifesto for Multiple Cultural Affiliation

Since the end of the Second World War, the Council of Europe and other international institutions and organisations have unceasingly promoted human rights and democracy. Their efforts in this direction must be maintained in order to combat not only extremism and totalitarianism, but also the rise of obscurantism, ostracism and xenophobia, which are fuelled by ignorance, the refusal to accept difference and the rejection of other people.

Considering it more important than ever, at a time of conflict and change, to intensify all efforts to achieve genuine democratic citizenship, the present Manifesto asserts that:

1. There can be no ambitious European social project unless individuals and communities share the values promoted by the Council of Europe and other institutions – human rights, the rule of law and democracy.
2. In order to ensure the respect of these values, the essential role of people in making democracy work must be fully acknowledged.

This means giving everyone access to a culture which enables them to exercise their basic rights and freedoms effectively, but also makes them aware of their responsibilities as citizens.

3. Peaceful democratic ideals cannot be achieved, nor can people lead truly meaningful and satisfying lives, unless we develop a general culture open to everyone, stimulating mutual awareness and participation and providing a common basis of shared values and knowledge. Such a culture should be non-doctrinal, is not a passing trend and cannot be dictated by the state, a private entity, group or institution. It is the life blood of every person, both multifaceted and diverse, combining thought, knowledge and action. It should put the individual in a position to develop multiple cultural affiliations if he or she so wishes.
4. Freedom to choose one's own cultural reference system is a central element in human rights and fundamental freedoms. At a given time or at different stages in their lives, people may adhere to different cultural affiliations. No one should be prisoner in a particular group, community, thought-system or

world-view, but should be free to renounce past choices and make new ones – as long as they are consistent with the universal values promoted by the Council of Europe.

5. Mutual openness and sharing are dual aspects of multiple cultural affiliation. They are the basis of coexistence for individuals and groups, who are free to practise the culture of their choice, subject only to respect for others.
6. Only a carefully thought out relationship of States and peoples with their shared history and their ability to transcend the conflicts of the past will allow peaceful coexistence. This offers the best hope of reconciliation between yesterday's enemies, and is the best way of preventing their descendants from becoming embroiled in new conflicts.
7. The desire for a shared future among those living in Europe is not compatible with collective amnesia – synonymous with ignorance of history or the denial of crimes committed in the past. To know one's own history means understanding the history of others and incorporating that history in one's own

without a desire for revenge, strong feelings of guilt or excessive regrets.

8. A European culture which is the fruit of exchanges should be welcoming to other cultures and peoples in the world. Europe risks losing its soul if it turns in on itself.
9. Multiple cultural affiliation comes from voluntary or forced migrations throughout history, whether within Europe or between Europe and the rest of the world. It also means mutual recognition between peoples and encourages new social ties insofar as decent living conditions allowing access to culture exist.
10. European States, which have developed and promoted the ideal of human rights, should consider diversity as an asset. Those characteristics that make every person unique – social and ethnic origin, age, marital or parental status, political, philosophical or religious beliefs, sex and sexual orientation, disability – should be respected. Discrimination on any of these grounds can never be tolerated or justified.

It must be forcefully repeated that any doctrine which advocates hatred, crime, deception,

community isolationism and rejection of others is incompatible with the European project for a peaceful and democratic society.

* * *

For the implementation of the Manifesto:

Multiple cultural affiliation is a reality in European societies. It is therefore important for public authorities and civil society to reinforce its role as a factor in developing democratic citizenship it being understood that multiple cultural affiliation must not prevent people from fulfilling their obligations as citizens. To this end, provision should be made to :

- i. enable everyone, in accordance with human rights and fundamental freedoms, to exercise their right to participate in cultural life, according to their background and lifestyle, while respecting their choice and the rights of others;
- ii. develop cultural policies which support diversity, drawing on the experience of research involving public and private sectors and civil society, since market forces alone cannot

- respond to all the needs of cultural diversity;
- iii. give everyone the possibility of access, through basic and lifelong education, to a form of open culture allowing them to discharge their civic responsibilities in a democratic society, integrate fully in their working life and achieve personal fulfilment;
 - iv. ensure that education systems follow this approach and encourage multiperspectivity in history teaching as well as in citizenship education and geography; provide sufficient information on religions using a multiperspective approach to past and present-day reality and also ensure that language education policies enable learners to become plurilingual and intercultural citizens, whilst at the same time respecting the languages of others and linguistic diversity;
 - v. promote intercultural initiatives in cities and regions which encourage dialogue between communities of different origins, and foster people's shared creativity and mutual enrichment;
 - vi. develop heritage education and interpretation highlighting past exchanges and mutual

influences which exemplify Europe's multicultural reality and its relations with other regions of the world;

- vii. exploit the powerful potential of the information and communication technologies in order to reinforce multicultural exchanges and knowledge-sharing, while placing greater importance on the quality of contents when faced with the dangers of commercial, technological and other forms of misuse.

Guide to the Manifesto

Contents

	Page
Preliminary remarks	17
Introduction: a plural Europe	19
Old and new aspects of cultural diversity	22
• Migration and political change: the European palimpsest	22
• Shared heritages: here and elsewhere	28
• Towards a positive recognition of differences?	31
Conflicting pressures in Europe: the individual and the group, diversity and the universal	34
• Tension between the singular and the collective	35
• Tension between the plural and the global	37

• The urgent need to transcend past conflicts	40
Living together and citizenship	42
• Shared cultural values and Europe's 1949 "founding prohibitions"	43
• The rules of shared citizenship: rights and responsibilities in society	46
• A European civic sense: reasons for living together in harmony	51

Preliminary remarks

In the current context of a Europe wracked by doubts, if not crisis, it is common practice to contrast different “types” of Europe. For simplicity’s sake, distinctions are drawn between the Europe of States and of nations, regions and major territorial areas, north and south, western Europe and the paired central and eastern Europe, and so on. But alongside the nations, peoples and communities and Europe’s cardinal points, there is another Europe that is too often ignored, that of the 800 million citizens living in the 49 member States of the Council of Europe’s European Cultural Convention.

This Europe of individuals is more than just a generic term, a mere rhetorical device. Acknowledging it is certainly not neutral because it is synonymous with recognition of cultural diversity, entailing respect both for the rights of other European citizens and the Council of Europe’s values, as embodied, *inter alia*, in the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights.

Experts from different parts of Europe met under the auspices of the Council of Europe. Having each worked in one guise or another in the cultural field, they wished to issue a firm, uncompromising statement of their commitment to cultural diversity and to emphasise that it is no longer possible to consider questions of identity in Europe without focusing on a new key factor – multiple cultural affiliation.

Through the prism of this complex notion, the experts addressed such fundamental challenges as the relationship between remembrance and reconciliation, the individual and the group and the plural and the singular. In the belief that no one should be confined, against his or her wishes, within a particular group and that every European should be free to renounce past choices and adopt new ones, they sought to place their ideas in the context of the Council of Europe's prime objective: defence of all human rights by treating diversity as a source of enrichment and a major asset, making it possible to envisage with equanimity the concept of a plural Europe founded on dialogue.

To this end, they drew up the "European Manifesto for Multiple Cultural Affiliation" highlighting the key role played by multiple cultural affiliation in

developing the democratic citizenship promoted by the Council of Europe.

This text is intended for large-scale publication in the media, so as to promote the Council of Europe's values.

Introduction: a plural Europe*

1. There is not just one Europe. "Europe" covers very different concepts and has been shaped by

* This document is designed to cast further light on the European Manifesto for multiple cultural affiliation. It deliberately avoids any quotations or references while summing up the work done in the context of the Council of Europe project "Cultural identities, shared values and citizenship" by the following experts: Zofia Halina Archibald, Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper, Tatiana Fedorova, Abdelhafid Hamdi-Cherif, Dorota Ilczuk, Chin Lin Pang, Patrice Meyer-Bisch, Carsten Paludan-Müller, Jean Petaux, Kevin Robins, Christopher Rowe, Calin Rus and Robert Stradling. It is also based on the proceedings of two seminars organised by the Council of Europe on "Identity, citizenship and cohesion" (Bucharest, 4-5 May 2006) and "Central and Eastern European aspects of cultural identities, shared values and citizenship in present-day Europe" (Budapest, 14-15 December 2006). The Manifesto also draws on the work of Ulrich Beck, Emmanuel Levinas, Paul Ricœur, Amartya Sen and Amin Maalouf.

shifting forces of history, geography and culture. There is a rural Europe and an urban Europe. There is a “new Europe” and an “old Europe”.

2. Geographically, Europe is very disparate. In Southern Europe, cities like Marseilles, Venice, Thessaloniki and Istanbul reflect a Mediterranean world, closely linked to the Middle East and North Africa. In Eastern Europe, cities like Moscow and Vladivostok sometimes look west towards Europe and sometimes east towards Asia. In the north, Stockholm, Riga and Turku exemplify a Baltic and Nordic world, shaped in no small part by the trading organisation of the Hanseatic League. In Central Europe, Prague, Vienna and Budapest embody the idea of “Mitteleuropa” and maintain contact with close neighbours along great rivers such as the Danube. On the fringes of Western Europe, cities like Lisbon, Dublin and Bergen typify an Atlantic world facing outwards to empires and trading partners overseas.

3. Europe has changed greatly both in area and over time. In the second half of the 20th Century, the conditions of the Cold War caused an artificial division between “east” and “west”, splitting Central Europe in two. This situation was exceptional. Before the upheavals caused by the First World

War, large parts of Europe were grouped together in multi-national empires such as Tsarist Russia, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the Ottoman empire. Since 1989, there have been two major trends, first, a renewed sense of national belonging and the reappearance of many nation-states, and second, recognition of the limits of national identities in the narrow sense and the desire to give European co-operation a wider meaning.

4. Over the course of history, Europe has been constantly divided, subjected to external influences and dominated by internal conquerors, which transformed it more often into a battlefield than into fertile lands. However, through the same historical momentum, in the midst of these conflicts and wars, Europe has seen the development of refined and open cultures encompassing the most advanced knowledge and the finest traditions.

5. Europe is both multi-faceted and full of tensions. However, during its history and the present day, the traces of a constantly renewed and enriched cultural diversity can be found. It also shows how the individual in Europe has always had to contend with groups and how relationships have been forged between diversity and universality.

6. These two sides of the equation – plurality and tension – constitute the background to the contemporary issue of coexistence in Europe, which in turn raises the question of democratic citizenship.¹

Old and new aspects of cultural diversity

7. The population movements that Europe has experienced throughout its history, its shared heritages and the appearance of a novel form of cosmopolitanism are at the origin of a plural Europe, principally characterised by its cultural diversity.

Migration and political change: the European palimpsest

8. Europe is still evolving as an ethnic, cultural and geographical concept. It has never been a perfectly defined entity detached from world developments. Within what may be regarded as its territory (subject to the necessary reservations, as just mentioned), the peoples of Europe have never been internally organised into distinct, clearly defined and mutually exclusive entities with inalterable borders. The history of Europe has

long been one of constant major or minor movements. It has gone through periods of sometimes slow, sometimes rapid development shaped by the pace of technical innovation and the intensity of conflicts. The 18th Century industrialisation of Europe thus led to extensive rural depopulation, drastically changing many of Europe's civil societies. Not until the mid-20th Century, however, did the majority of the population of most European countries live in urban areas. People drawn to the rapidly expanding towns and cities tended to stick with others of the same affinities and origins, striving to maintain their specific identity as they sought to adapt collectively to modern life, which they saw as something that destroyed traditional values and their original culture.

9. Other kinds of population movements took place at the initiative of leaders wishing to attract or deter certain groups with specific potential, for instance with a view to economic development or military defence. Diasporas represent a particular kind of population transfer.

10. Generally speaking, the variety of ethnic groups and the wide range of cultural expressions that have emerged in the western part of the

Eurasian continent are one of the most characteristic features of European societies.

11. All this goes to show that, throughout its history, Europe has always resembled a palimpsest on which its ethnic and cultural diversity has been constantly rewritten. This dimension, which has played a particular part in structuring European history, will not disappear in the years ahead.

12. When the Thirty Years War came to an end in 1648 with the signing of the Treaties of Westphalia, the sovereign state became the new form of geopolitical order. With the French Revolution of 1789 and the many popular revolutions of the 19th Century, national identity in turn became the element that underpinned states' sovereignty. At the same time, where not protected by recognised, defended borders, numerous forms of cultural expression, even national ones, were opposed and eradicated by states themselves, as was the case of regional or minority languages such as Gaelic in France or the United Kingdom and the languages of the Sami in Norway and Sweden.

13. At the end of the First World War, the multi-cultural tsarist empire collapsed. The series of

treaties intended to eradicate the causes of the war dismantled the two remaining multi-cultural empires, the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and, in their place, the principle of the sovereign nation-state was perceived as the ideal model for reducing the risk of future conflict. The outbreak of the Second World War showed that this was a false assumption. The division of Europe into separate entities following the 1945 Yalta and Potsdam agreements had two main effects: intra-European conflict became impossible, as its consequences would immediately have escaped the control of the two superpowers, while each side imposed a dominant political and cultural model, to which the peoples concerned subscribed with varying commitment.

14. Over the years following the end of the Second World War, the vast European colonial empires disappeared (those of the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Belgium and, later, Portugal). Whereas, for a number of centuries, certain European powers had reaped the benefits of their many colonies, in particular through slavery, and had, from the 19th Century on, made imperialism the dominant system, the exploited peoples of the colonies, who had played

a significant role in the fight against Nazism in Europe, claimed their independence and freedom. In the long run, they were successful but not without causing a number of wars of such intensity and violence as to lastingly affect relations between certain European states and their former colonies. At the same time, there was an increase in mass migration of people originating from these ex-colonies to the former colonial mother countries due to the dual impact of what has been termed neo-imperialism and the growing poverty of entire regions of the world, such as was the case in Africa. This whole area of colonial and post-colonial history, which concerns both the European colonisers and those who were colonised, remains a vast subject of study and debate and has also had a far-reaching impact on cultures and attitudes. Modern globalisation is unquestionably also part of these historical developments and would doubtless not be what it is today if European imperialism had not existed.

15. When the division of Europe into two distinct parts came to an end in 1989, history and the weight of the past again made themselves felt. Ethnic disputes that were thought to have died out were reactivated and brought back to life.

Borders that were regarded as unalterable were found not to be so, and it became clear that a significant proportion of the national conflicts of the late 19th and first half of the 20th Centuries were likely to restart in an even fiercer form. None of these potential conflicts are merely the fruit of chance; they are reappearing in European countries in the midst of social and economic transition, whose civil societies are largely anomic and lacking in unity. In such cases, cultural diversity becomes more a cause of conflict than an asset and an aspiration. Simplistic solutions based on radical exclusion of other cultural and ethnic groups gain ever more grassroots support, and exacerbated forms of racism and ostracism appear to offer completely new ways of solving crises.

16. This is one of the main issues facing the Europe of tomorrow, namely will it be able to deal with these tensions, which undermine the very principle of cultural diversity? Europe's future as a democratic, peaceful, prosperous part of the world depends on its ability to adapt to a heritage of an increasingly complex set of identities, and even to take advantage of it. This will only be possible if the same concept of rights and responsibilities is shared by all.

Shared heritages: here and elsewhere

17. Generations of Europeans down the ages are still present today in the continent's statues and monuments, showing its inhabitants' obsessions and improbable ambitions. Europe's heritage exists only to the extent that it is first and foremost, and possibly exclusively, a wide range of different components of all kinds.

18. Borders offer living and tangible evidence of this. The imprints left by border histories on architecture and landscapes, the fortifications and openings, the means of control or of interaction, the elements of co-operation and of reclusiveness, form a precious heritage for the popular memory. "Places of discord", complementing "places of remembrance", are not necessarily viewed in the same way on different sides of the border. They are physical representations of cultural identities² and different cultures, apparently antithetical and rival, but in reality often very close, and even mimetic.

19. It is not only states, however, that are separated by borders, because there can also be boundaries between different neighbourhoods in a town or between the towns of a country, giving

rise to ethno-cultural or social landscapes that exist side by side or in contrast with one another. They may constitute a virtual remnant of a former geopolitical reality, continuing to have a dividing effect long after they have been taken off the map. They may also be signs of a changing sociological context, when a specific ethnic community which has recently settled starts to supplant its older counterparts, prior to easing or forcing them out.

20. Although borders determine points of contact with others, they also delimit “home” areas, and thus contribute directly to creating a greater or lesser sense of belonging, or affiliation.³ It is hardly surprising then that fluid borders directly pose the question of affiliation. “Home”, the seat of personal and collective identity, exists within different confines and on different scales, ranging from the private to the public and from the home community to the home country

21. Europe’s cultural heritage is by definition both multiple and shared. It is the complex product of contradictory, even mutually hostile, influences. Over the years, as history has unfolded, the same groups may have come to defend and regard as sacrosanct certain parts of their heritage which

they had previously attacked and profaned. While everything depends on interpretation and ideology, the fact nonetheless remains that European cultural heritage is never singular in nature, it constantly encompasses the plurality of both “here” and “elsewhere”. It is simply “there”, and yet at the same time is heir to numerous influences, whether European or not. Its richness lies in both its diversity and its extraordinary plasticity, so that it is incapable of setting and becoming fixed. The Council of Europe made this clear in the Faro Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society which defines “cultural heritage [as] a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time”.

22. It is therefore possible to list what is included in Europe’s common heritage, as Article 3 of the Faro Convention sets out to do in the following terms: “all forms of cultural heritage in Europe which together constitute a shared source of remembrance, understanding, identity, cohesion

and creativity”, and “the ideals, principles and values, derived from the experience gained through progress and past conflicts, which foster the development of a peaceful and stable society, founded on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law”.

23. A central focus of discussions on the sharing of heritages is the question of transcultural diversity. A real diversity of skills and a multiplicity of heritage traditions exist that call for a genuine heritage education.⁴ However, some people assert that the apparent standardisation of cultural practices and fashions caused by globalisation has given rise to a form of “cultural syncretism” fuelled by many different influences and transcending the various cultures. Does this mean the end of customs and traditions that offer tangible proof of the multiplicity of cultures?

Towards a positive recognition of differences?

24. Does cosmopolitanism⁵ really exist or is it just an aspiration? Is it the dream of a world in which people of different origins living in the same place agree on the fundamental values of a certain culture, practise mutual tolerance and do not attempt

to impose their respective values and customs on others? Is it a concept reserved for privileged persons who have no problems travelling around Europe because they can afford it? Can the cosmopolitan discourse, deliberately designed to break with nationalist attitudes and local attachments in favour of a modular, flexible form of citizenship, become a European discourse? Can cosmopolitanism be accepted as having heritage value in the construction of a collective European imagination?

25. Some would reply that one of the consequences of our risk society – in other words the modern world – is a growing awareness of a common destiny that now links every part of a world that shares the same risks. In this sense, this new cosmopolitanism, or cosmopolitanisation, is not a concept imposed in a top-down manner by an international institution or jurisdiction, but rather corresponds to a far-reaching bottom-up movement fuelled by the realisation of civil societies that their futures are inextricably linked. More and more people are becoming aware that risks also extend to other countries, that huge areas of the Earth – or even the entire planet – may be affected by certain events, and that we are now all in the

same boat, united by ties that transcend religion, culture and borders.

26. The cosmopolitan model, unlike its universalist counterpart, lays emphasis on the recognition of differences. The universalist model posits universal standards within the national framework, but overlooks differences and inevitably excludes anyone outside nation-states. The new cosmopolitanism does not however conflict with universalism since it presupposes the existence of universal standards, without which there are no stable relations with others. It also presupposes a tempered form of nationalism insofar as the nation still produces a wide-ranging community of destiny and life. By not excluding others just because they are others and do not correspond to certain European archetypes, the cosmopolitanisation process helps to reconcile the nation and Europe, and Europe and the rest of the world. In this way, this new cosmopolitanism doubtless makes it easier to grasp plural allegiances.

27. As can be seen, multiple cultural affiliation⁶ is becoming the central pillar of an emerging European citizenship. It makes it possible both to conceive and to experience the complex, differentiated development of cultural identity in

mature democratic societies. It firstly recognises communities which bring with them different references in terms of identity, and secondly allows each individual to have a number of specific identities expressed through belonging to various cultures. This definition may be fleshed out by adding that multiple belonging is perceived as the possibility for everyone, either individually or in a group, to feel simultaneous or successive affiliation with a set of values or cultural references shared by several groups or communities of beliefs or interests.

Conflicting pressures in Europe: the individual and the group, diversity and the universal

28. Europe is caught up in a web of imbricated tensions and faces a double contradiction: how to reconcile the singular and the collective, and the plural and the general? The background to these questions is Europe's pressing need to transcend the conflicts that have left their mark on its history.

Tension between the singular and the collective

29. The greater the pace of globalisation, the stronger the need for roots. This is why multiple affiliation may legitimately be regarded as a given. The search for roots inevitably involves reconstruction of the individual with reference to a group or community. Basically, it is recognition that is desired. This generates a particular form of interaction between individuals and others. The resulting social and cultural tension is clearly central to the issue of social choice and to human development. It can for instance be argued that democracy is the best safeguard, since democratically elected leaders necessarily listen to their citizens. In this context, the collective affords protection to the individual, and the group, with its rules, its laws and its strength, guarantees to all its members better living conditions and a set of inviolable fundamental rights.

30. For over 40 years, the collective prevailed over individual rights in part of Europe. Private property was not allowed, because it was regarded as synonymous with the domination of society by a few individuals. Apart from this prohibition, individual rights, such as freedom of expression and

of movement, were curtailed, and even eliminated, for the sake of a collective ideal standing for uniform, egalitarian progress. The intention was for the individual to merge with the group in a perfect synthesis that would enable each individual member to satisfy his or her needs. For various complex, and even contradictory, reasons this collective project could not be fully realised and the individual was negated to the point of being denied even the most fundamental rights. The collapse of this political programme centred on the collective was followed by a resurgence of individualism, which was all the stronger for having been frustrated for several generations. Tensions have inevitably arisen between this push towards individualism in the part of Europe formerly subjected to the reign of the collective and the intrinsic individualism of modern capitalism in the rest of Europe.

31. In developed societies, an individual's own freedom is constantly checked by that of others, even where it is not itself in contradiction with the public interest. In the transition from a state of nature to a state of culture, human beings agreed to sacrifice part of their individual freedom, as did their neighbours, but it was a beneficial sacrifice,

bringing greater security, greater capabilities and, ultimately, greater freedom. In the modern world, however, the individual's status vis-à-vis the group is a subject of increasing concern. Public debate is more and more influenced by the NIMBY syndrome,⁷ which raises, in a radical fashion, the question of how the recognised rights of individuals are treated by society.

32. By extension, relations between Europe and the rest of the world may be considered to raise the same issues as relations between individuals and their community. Europe, for instance, is cultivating – all too often jealously, with growing awareness that it is wrong to do so but in most cases disregarding the consequences – a form of isolationism that is distancing it from other parts of the world, a withdrawal into its own “backyard”, all too often leaving it behind the locked gates of its fortress. This tendency, this “keep ourselves to ourselves” syndrome, the very opposite of openness and hospitality, needs to be combated.

Tension between the plural and the global

33. The rebuilding of social links partly depends on the relationship between cultural affiliation to

a specific group and globalised society. Diversity is becoming ever more marked, and is leading almost inevitably to communitarianism, while, at the same time, globalisation can be seen to have a destructive impact on the fragile links vital to the forging of identity. All the components of a social and cultural crisis are therefore present. Individuals are seeking reference points and calling for symbolic identification codes, but other groups immediately regard these as forms of withdrawal and as obstacles to a universalism that is more idealised than real, more imposed than accepted.

34. Multiple cultural affiliation is one way of recognising the place of plurality in the face of globalism. Today's world is fragmented and pluralist, and modern human beings live in different groups, on different levels, and with affiliations of different degrees of intensity, making every social group heterogeneous. Today's European may be conceived in Venice, spend his or her teenage years in Paris, study in Coimbra, get married in Berlin and divorce in London. Where will he or she be buried? Cultural reference systems,⁸ that were once fixed and inviolable are now inevitably

bound to change in far-reaching ways. Is this to be regretted?

35. Social and cultural heterogeneity not only means that groups each belonging to a particular culture co-exist in the same society, but also refers to numerous cultural allegiances in one and the same individual. This situation is widely recognised but can discredit them in their own or in society's eyes and may tear people apart and cause them to suffer identity problems or psychological disorders. This is a complex process; it is the outcome of an incapacity to think in terms of mixing cultures and having multiple allegiances. It also reflects globalisation and the desire for homogeneous identity. At the same time, this is not just in the mind because there are indeed forms of acculturation that plunge individuals into states of unease because they are uprooted.

36. Uprooting entails removal, the loss of part of oneself, of one's origins and of one's reference points in terms of culture, family, social intercourse and customs. People have to live with this loss, which cannot easily be compensated for or made good. This is especially the case when society as a whole is, at the same time, denying the heterogeneous nature of identities, ignoring each

individual's multiple cultural affiliations and preventing them from returning to their sources.

37. By order of importance, the chief problem here is indeed "disaffiliation" from society. Culture can no longer be considered as being detached from its social meaning or separate from its societal dimension, especially as another manifestation of social ties is every individual's right to participate in cultural life. The looser the social links, the greater society's descent into anomie and a situation where there are neither rules nor projects, and the greater the threat to culture, which will ultimately disappear. This disappearance will sound the death knell of the civilised dimension of society, with a return to the natural state synonymous with barbarism. Culture must be both plural and diverse – what the French would call a real general culture.⁹ It is vital for social links to be interwoven with cultural ones, so that they can both last and withstand the homogenising effects of globalisation.

The urgent need to transcend past conflicts

38. The conflicts that have succeeded one another over the course of history, both within Europe and

beyond, whether or not they have had repercussions for those living in Europe or for their descendants, raise questions about the relationship between societies, groups, individuals and their social history, their collective memory and their own heritage. The sometimes systematic recourse to amnesties by those in power is in many cases tantamount to a form of amnesia which is an abuse of the power to forget. Indeed, it is a form of institutional forgetfulness, since it reflects decisions taken by the state itself, determined by dominant ideologies at a given point in history. Offering an amnesty means encouraging people to forget by expunging what happened, thereby preventing them from forgiving which becomes impossible once the crime disappears.

39. At this stage, both the individual and the collective memory are deprived of that salutary crisis of identity that enables the past and its traumatic burden to be consciously and clear-headedly reappropriated. This is the whole point of transcending – in the dialectic sense of breaking away from – the conflicts of the past. It is still possible to retain one's integrity at the frontier between amnesia and amnesty, thanks to memory and mourning, guided by the spirit of forgiveness.

40. History teaching is as vital for European societies, as for all societies. Knowledge of history, all too often exploited and misappropriated to serve prevailing ideological goals, must, quite the opposite, be a tool of peace and reconciliation. The numerous projects carried out in this area have developed a multiperspective approach to history¹⁰ which is the history not just of the victors but of plurality, one that is heterogeneous because it does not belong to any particular camp but is conceived from a whole range of perspectives. This is neither revisionism nor negationism, which are abject forms of falsification of the facts and misuse of science. There is a need, instead, for collective studies which bring together different, even contradictory, documentary sources, for attention to be drawn to the complexity of past events, for their causes to be grasped, and for their sociological consequences and effects right up to the present day to be understood, in an effort to ensure that the tragedies of the past do not recur.

Living together and citizenship

41. The Council of Europe, an intergovernmental organisation representing 800 million individuals, is the only institution of its kind in the world. The

political, social and cultural model that it champions is not one among many, but stands alone as the one that does the most to safeguard individual freedom, human rights, the rule of law and democracy. The Council's political role rests on several pillars, one of which is certainly that of culture. This pillar encompasses both the fundamental values necessary to create the conditions for true community life within the Council of Europe's member states and the standards and rules for shared citizenship to enable European societies to project to the world, not the nervous face of inward-looking affluence, but the generous hospitality extended by the haves to the have-nots.

Shared cultural values and Europe's 1949 "founding prohibitions"¹¹

42. In its Faro Convention (Article 7), the Council of Europe argues that the cultural heritage reinforces human development insofar as it is a fundamental element of the dialogue between groups and between European societies:

"The Parties undertake [...] to [...] encourage reflection on the ethics and methods of presentation of the cultural heritage, as well as respect for diversity of interpretations; [...] establish processes

for conciliation to deal equitably with situations where contradictory values are placed on the same cultural heritage by different communities; [...] develop knowledge of cultural heritage as a resource to facilitate peaceful coexistence by promoting trust and mutual understanding with a view to resolution and prevention of conflicts; [and] integrate these approaches into all aspects of lifelong education and training”.

43. The cultural values shared by the Council of Europe’s member states are principally set out in the Organisation’s fundamental texts – the European Convention on Human Rights, the European Cultural Convention and the European Social Charter. Together, these form a body of standards and values, supplemented, inter alia, by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, and confer on contemporary “European culture” (in its broadest – anthropological and political – sense) its highly specific, distinctive nature.

44. As well as thus laying down a number of laws, the Council of Europe, as an intergovernmental-body for political co-operation, has identified a set of fundamental prohibitions corresponding to fundamental civil rights, not only in the strict

context of “human rights”, but also under the heading of social and cultural rights, etc. The best-known of these is the prohibition of capital punishment throughout Europe in all circumstances, even in wartime.

45. While not all the Council of Europe’s member states have yet ratified Protocol No. 13 to the European Convention on Human Rights on the prohibition of capital punishment, they have all taken steps to ensure that judicial executions are no longer carried out anywhere in Europe. Other founding prohibitions are less prominent but carry just as much force. Starving people is not allowed; nor is slavery or the trafficking of human beings; human beings may not be mutilated even as a matter of custom or tradition; children may not be forced to work; and no discrimination of any kind is allowed on the basis of ethnic origin, gender, sexual behaviour, belief, etc.

46. These fundamental prohibitions are of course binding on states, but it would be taking too narrow a view to consider that the fundamental prohibitions attaching to European citizenship apply solely to governments. In practice, individuals all have a duty to comply with these fundamental prohibitions, regardless of their multiple

cultural affiliations, which cannot be used to justify anything and everything. Europe has certain prohibitions that take precedence over community laws and customs, and asserting the former's pre-eminence does not erode the latter.

The rules of shared citizenship: rights and responsibilities in society

47. As in the case of "identity", "citizenship" is a catch-all term that does not have the same meaning or resonance in every European society. It depends on the state's relations with civil society in the country concerned, may be based on its history and the political regime in place. It is therefore necessary to specify what is meant by the term.

48. In the present context, citizenship means belonging to a single political community based on universal principles. Citizens are not merely private persons with political rights relating to participation in political life and the right to apply or stand for any public post, but are also vested with a share of political sovereignty. For example, it is the body of citizens, in the form of a political community or a "community of citizens", that selects

its leaders through the electoral system. The body of citizens is the source of power and gives force to decisions taken by governments. It is citizens as a body who monitor and sanction the acts of their elected leaders. They acknowledge their duty to obey their governments' orders, as they themselves elected those governments, which remain subject to their control. But citizenship goes beyond the principle of political legitimacy. It is also a source of social relationships. In modern democratic and pluralist European societies, people are no longer linked by religion or dynastic loyalties – although religion and support for a monarch can in certain circumstances appear to bind societies together – and social ties are essentially political in nature. Community life in present-day societies thus no longer means sharing the same religion, being subjects of a single monarch or coming under one and the same authority: it means being a citizen of the same political entity and sharing in the ensuing rights and duties.

49. This is how civic legitimacy is created. Individuals/citizens have both general and individual rights, to the extent that Europeans, partly as a result of the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, are endowed with a legal

personality that is less and less determined by ethnic origins and kinship. They are increasingly concerned with expressing their opinions and preferences and lay claim to the power to act and shoulder their responsibilities.

50. At the same time, as a result of population movements and the opening up of borders, European nation-states now have a steadily growing proportion of individuals who, even though they are full members of the national community, do not enjoy citizen status, from which they find themselves excluded by a strict legal definition of the concept. This is because modern democracies recreate the model of Ancient Greece, where metics, slaves and women were excluded by law from citizenship and were therefore unable to participate in the democratic process.

51. At the same time, previously unknown demands have begun to emerge concerning entitlement to the free exercise of certain specific and unique cultural rights, with a view to obtaining recognition of forms of expression, attitudes and beliefs hitherto strictly confined to the private sphere, which some groups and communities now wish to exercise openly.

52. We see here the major issue for European individuals in the years ahead, namely their citizenship in all its different dimensions. Reference to the indivisibility of human rights links political citizenship to its civil, cultural, ecological, economic and social founding aspects and also to the dignity of human beings in all its dimensions. It is thus possible to speak of various citizenships, or better still, of the cultural, ecological, economic, social and, of course, political dimensions of citizenship.

53. Citizenship involves a single loyalty, leaving no room for a “dual allegiance” which would be both the cultural and the political spheres. The loyalty of political citizenship requires respect for, and a commitment to, a legal link between the members of a political community, based on universal values. These are by no means abstract. Those concerned must accept certain rules governing access to, and acceptance of, these values. This is why corruption, the hijacking of democratic rules, impunity that exempts lawbreakers from conviction and sentence, misuse of influence or connections and abuses of dominant positions all undermine democratic legitimacy, creating an unbridgeable gap between citizens and their chosen representatives.

54. A society will be cohesive only if its leaders can truly be held liable for their acts to the same extent as its citizens. However, if an excessive tendency to bring political affairs before the courts results in constant challenges to political leaders, leaving only the mediocre or the cleverest cynics clinging to power, the blind application of an omnipotent justice will soon start to work against the principles that it is supposed to uphold.

55. The answer is doubtless the same here as elsewhere: citizens and leaders have to agree on their shared duty to abide by the laws governing their lives. It is easier to secure compliance with the law if it is the same for everyone. But doing so will be of still more social value if all individual members of a society have identical and comparable rights, giving them all the same citizen status and legitimacy with the same obligations and duties. Again, it must be said that this initial, vital consensus is necessary, but is not sufficient in itself. There can be no cohesive society if certain individuals, albeit granted full legal citizenship, are nevertheless regarded as second-class citizens because of their ethnic origin, religion, dress or lifestyle and cannot fully enjoy their social, cultural and civil rights.

A European civic sense: reasons for living together in harmony

56. Europe's welcoming face must be shown, and its welcome must be firm and vigorous. But Europe is not showing that face everywhere. Sometimes, on the contrary, it tends to hide this face of welcome to the world, to the poorest people, to the most disadvantaged, in short, to foreigners. Europe is no longer in a position to take in strangers, because it no longer knows itself what place it can give them. Lacking a project, and lacking resources, in the face of a cultural crisis comparable to those that it has experienced in the past, Europe feels threatened from all quarters and regards any additions from elsewhere as intolerable assaults.

57. This situation is by no means unprecedented, for many conflicting influences have run through European history, which has experienced periods of expansion and periods of stagnation, and has seen various cultural, political and ideological models called into question.

58. The crisis is occurring in peacetime in a reunited Europe, almost all of which shares the same democratic values. It is not only social and economic, in the form of widely differing living

standards among Europeans, both between and within countries. It is also cultural, in that it reveals a deep divide between those who subscribe to the values of all European states, described as universal, and those who question these shared values and subscribe to other moral, cultural and social value systems. The crisis is in fact part of a genuinely novel process, that of accelerated globalisation, with new sources of power appearing worldwide and giving rise to new, and previously unknown, risks in the areas of ecology, energy and population.

59. When facing such uncertainties about its future, Europe has to choose between autarchic withdrawal, offering what would inevitably be only short-lived protection, and a genuinely cultural response consisting in presenting another face to the world, showing an attitude of civic sense and hospitality. To this end, it must give full recognition to its qualities. The more value a cultural system attaches to diversity, and thus to the identity of its component parts, the richer, more remarkable and more evident its own identity, and the greater the range of its multiple affiliations.

60. Development would certainly not have been possible in the past in Europe if it had not constantly been hospitality present. When people

were expelled in various circumstances, others responded by offering hospitality, with the roles being reversed in different political or other conditions, although it was often the same groups that suffered from the unwelcoming attitudes of successive governments.

61. However, if societies with a high cultural capacity attach great importance to hospitality, extending a welcome to travellers, to strangers, and to those bringing information or innovations from elsewhere, and regarding the unconventional as something to be treasured, it should be acknowledged that European society, in its diversity, has turned its back on hospitality. In the faces of strangers, it sees little but the fear that has been instilled in them and anxiety about what the future holds.

62. The Council of Europe was not set up by chance in the immediate post-war euphoria. It emerged because it was urgently needed. It was created because representatives of a number of European countries had suffered personally from the consequences of conflict on an unprecedented scale, the setting for unimaginable horrors that raised fundamental questions about the modern human condition, and because the statesmen

concerned did not want the division of Europe into two antagonistic blocs to lead once again to a new European civil war.

63. This inheritance now entitles the Council of Europe once more to draw its member states' attention to Europe's crisis of citizenship, one of the reasons for Europe's malaise. It is first and foremost a cultural malaise, with a Europe that no longer has a sense of direction and risks bringing about its own demise by forgetting its own fundamental values, those of human rights, recognition of diversity and multiple cultural affiliation, welcoming others and of sharing as well as protecting the weakest and most disadvantaged.

The Manifesto sets out boldly to challenge this perverse trend, which is in no way inevitable.

Notes

1. Democratic citizenship

The concept of democratic citizenship referred to here is based on the one developed in the course of the Council of Europe's work in education. It goes beyond the narrow legal definition of citizenship in the sense of the rights and duties of nationals of a given state. However, that does not mean that the idea of being a citizen of a particular state is no longer relevant or applicable. The standpoint adopted is nonetheless different and broader. The concept of democratic citizenship concerns the gradual development of a new model for community life and the many ways in which individuals are involved in it, at the local, national, regional and international levels. This approach to citizenship implies that the conditions are right for the proper exercise of such responsibilities. It also implies a positive commitment on the part of the members of a society to subscribe to and apply democratic principles.

2. Cultural identity

All cultural references by which individuals, alone or with others, define themselves, shape their own

beings, communicate and wish to be recognised in their dignity. Cultural identity may also be viewed as a form of social and collective identity reflecting the relatively stable identification of an individual or a group with a cultural structure defined by a body of ideas, beliefs, opinions, customs and traditions, and reflecting adherence to a set of standards based on certain ethical values.

3. Affiliation

The state of a person who is a member of a group or community. Belonging is defined as the capacity of individuals, alone or with others, to recognise their own attachment to a community and to respect their heritage. By human communities, we mean groups of persons sharing references which make up single cultural identities that they intend to preserve and develop. Affiliation is viewed in terms of the link between each subject and a set of cultural values or references mutually shared by all members of the group. It is an element of identification encompassing not only adherence, conduct and appearance, but also a form of allegiance. As a construct, affiliation is thus a form of narrative. This narrative acts as a unifying factor, by incorporating a number of elements. A conventional distinction is made between groups of affiliation and reference groups. The former

are groups of which individuals are physically and directly members at a particular stage of their life; the latter are groups of which they may or may not currently be members, but from which they derive – consciously or otherwise – opinions, values and goals. One of the special features of contemporary society, given its openness, potential for mobility and technical and material scope, is the way in which one and the same individual may simultaneously belong to several groups, thus experiencing a situation of multiple belonging or affiliation.

4. Heritage education

Heritage education is understood here to mean a body of initiatives to encourage the understanding and decoding of various elements of tangible and intangible cultural heritage through educational and cultural institutions. The dual aim is to provide a common basis for citizens to recognise the heterogeneity and the diversity of Europe's heritage and to preclude the use of parts of that heritage to exclude certain identities.

5. Cosmopolitanism

Understood purely in the sense given by Ulrich Beck, meaning an attitude that tries to take account of differences in the context of globalisation.

6. Multiple cultural affiliation

Multiple cultural affiliation is understood here to refer to the fact that individuals all share identity bonds with a group of other individuals but, at the same time, each individual's own specific mixture of such bonds – whether family, linguistic, religious, national, ethnic, sexual or professional – is unique. No human being can therefore be reduced to a single identity. Given the great cultural diversity that typifies modern societies, cultures must take this principle into account to prosper. Multiple cultural affiliation acknowledges communities that offer different references in terms of identity, and allows each individual to express a number of multi-faceted identities through several cultural affiliations.

7. NIMBY (Not in my backyard)

The refusal by an individual or group to accept any change in their immediate environment, meaning that individual interests take precedence over the general interest or welfare.

8. Cultural reference system

Each individual is part of a complex interacting system. Consciously or unconsciously, he/she incorporates one or more cultural reference frames, forming

numerous matrices and links that vary in strength and whose impact may also vary according to the individual's personal choices and changes in his/her environment. This cultural sphere is thus structurally variable and specific to each individual. It may be transmitted through socialisation, but there must be no coercion because one of the rights safeguarded by the European Convention on Human Rights is the freedom to choose one's cultural reference frame.

9. General culture

General culture has no prescriptive content here. It is not the sum of minimum obligatory knowledge which every individual should possess since such knowledge could only stem from an official culture which would therefore inevitably be synonymous with a totalitarian culture. General culture, founded on the principle of freedom, comprises all the cognitive elements available to every individual which give him/her the ability to understand his/her environment, to interact with others and to make choices. General culture enables all human beings to assume their humanity and experience it more consciously. The French term "culture générale" cannot easily be translated into other languages. In each case, an attempt will be made to take account of linguistic and cultural diversity and use a translation that does

justice to the content rather than the letter of the term.

10. Multiperspective approach to history teaching

See the guide to “Multiperspectivity in History Teaching”, prepared by Dr Robert Stradling for the Council of Europe.

11. Fundamental prohibitions

A set of norms and values constituting the absolute limits which a group of states, societies or individuals decides to set itself upon its inception or to ensure its continued existence or its development. These prohibitions are not merely absolute, inviolable, moral or legal boundaries – they are also structuring elements on which a system or organisation can be based. Hence, any transgression is not only an offence in relation to a particular law establishing a prohibition, but a radical questioning of the foundations upon which the institution is built. Examples include the prohibition of capital punishment and torture or the ban on arbitrary detention, recognised as fundamental prohibitions by the Council

of Europe's member states. Any departure from these rules is a serious violation of the Organisation's fundamental principles and is tantamount to calling the Organisation itself into question.

