

INTRODUCTION	1
THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SUMMER UNIVERSITY	2
DAY 1, 29 AUGUST.....	2
OPENING PLENARY SESSION:	2
BREXIT: PUBLIC DEBATE “BREXIT AND WHAT FUTURE FOR EUROPEAN FOR EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP”	4
DAY 2, 30 AUGUST.....	7
SESSION “RIGHTS”	7
SESSION “INVOLVEMENT”	12
SESSION “TRUST”	15
DAY 3, 31 AUGUST.....	17
FINAL BRAINSTORMING SESSION: QUO VADIS? “CIVIS EUROPEAUS SUM” AFTER ALL AND FOR ALL!	17
WHAT SHOULD WE DO? STEPS TO BE TAKEN AFTER THE SUMMER UNIVERSITY	18

Introduction

On 29-31 August, members of civil society groups, academics, and EU officials met at Maison des Associations Internationales at the first University on European Citizenship organised by the ECIT Foundation (European Citizens’ rights, Involvement and Trust). The revolved around the three key themes: rights, involvement and trust. The three day event attracted around 40 participants whilst 200 people attended the public debate in the evening of 29 August 2016. The programme of the SU can be found in the annex attached to this document.

The Objectives of the Summer University

The main objective of the SU was to bring together researchers, civil society representatives and officials engaged in the study and policy making to discuss the future directions of European citizenship in the context of the multiple crises facing Europe. The Summer University not only raised significant questions about the state of art, but also proposed ideas about how to piece together and reconfigure the scattered European citizenship.

DAY 1, 29 August

Opening Plenary Session:

The first introductory session consisted of presentations by Sybe de Vries (Coordinator of bEUCitizen) and Roger Casale (Founder and CEO of the New Europeans), moderated by Dora Kostakopoulou (Professor of Law from the University of Warwick).

The presentation by Sybe de Vries focused on the barriers to the exercise of European rights and on the concept of European citizenship. As discussed in this session, there are still many obstacles preventing EU citizens from fully enjoying their economic, social and political rights, and they include:

- lack of recognition of diplomas and linguistic differences throughout the EU,
- differences between social rights and welfare regimes between Member States,
- overlap of different legal regimes for civil rights barriers and inequality,
- members of minority groups often enjoy less rights.

The groups which are most vulnerable are women, especially migrant women, and the Roma community. One of the biggest challenges to European citizenship is a differential inclusion, a problem which needs to be addressed.

In this session the multiple concepts of European citizenship and the resurgence of nationalism were discussed. There has been a consensus that the main difficulty with European citizenship is that it is defined in many different ways, based on different conceptions and elements, largely depending on historical developments. Moreover, there is also a disagreement about what European citizenship should become in the future. Multiple narratives on European citizenship exist:

- *Lack of a common, shared identity* - focus on local citizenship and on sub-state actors to overcome a lack of distrust and on strengthening EU citizenship (balance between liberal and republican concepts).
- *Social inequality* – need for a more inclusive citizenship focused on the economic status and entitlement to social rights in the country of origin. One of the ideas is to introduce a minimum standard of social protection throughout the EU.
- *A gap between generations* – focused on protection of citizens searching for work and promoting broader conception of work, for example, including immigrant women.
- *A problem of legitimacy* – focused on strengthening political rights, for example through the use of referenda and ECIs. It also promotes the protection of diversity by securitizing national and local identities and work against welfare imbalance.

The participants raised a point that new narratives on European citizenship should be developed, making European citizenship more coherent and inclusive. As pointed out by Roger Casale, there is a gap between the theory of European citizenship and its fine principles and the actual practice, a problem which needs to be taken seriously. This was discussed in greater depth in the session on “Rights” the following day.

Dora Kostakopoulou concluded that the EU citizenship space is a social and political space within which particularistic identities can simultaneously coexist and merge into wider moralities that do not tolerate discrimination on the ground of nationality. In this enlarged communal space, our conceptions of community, membership and democracy are reconfigured, and the lives of ‘others’ (i.e., non-national EU citizens) and their claims to equal treatment, equal opportunity and fair play become part of ‘our realities’ and of a shared moral code. For as, Dewey has observed, ‘everything which bars freedom and the fullness of communication sets up barriers that divide human beings into sets and cliques, into antagonistic sects and factions, and thereby undermines the democratic way of life’.¹ And further, ‘to cooperate by giving differences a chance to show themselves because of the belief that the expression of difference is not only a right of the other persons but is a means of enriching one’s own life-experience, is inherent in the democratic personal way of life’.² European Union citizenship has enabled EU citizens to escape the closure of territorial democracy and to enjoy a wide range of associative relations with others across national boundaries. It has thus enriched our thinking and political imagination by making another world visible; namely a notion of community anchored on the values of diversity, non-discrimination on the ground of nationality and human cooperation.

¹ Dewey’s address in New York City on 20 October 1939, entitled ‘Creative Democracy: The Task Before Us’, p. 4; reprinted in *The Later Works*, Vol. 14.

² Ibid.

Brexit: Public Debate

“BREXIT and what future for European for European citizenship”

The public debate held in the evening on Monday, 29 August was led by four panelists: Andrew Duff (Visiting Fellow at European Policy Centre), Philippe Cayla (President of Européens sans frontières) and Monica Frassoni (Co-chair of the European Green Party). The debate was moderated by Delphine Bourgeois (President of the Consultative Council on European Affairs of Ixelles).

The main aim of this event was to discuss the immediate impact of BREXIT on the rights of British citizens living in Belgium. As more UK citizens are going to their Commune to apply for dual citizenship, there is a growing uncertainty among British citizens about how to plan their own and their children’s future. Should the EU and the UK be providing more answers? And what about the future for European citizenship? Could its further development be a remedy to Europe’s crises? BREXIT is another warning that the EU Institutions must embark on ambitious reforms to enhance citizens’ engagement and civic participation, as well as to include them more in the agenda-setting process and European election campaigns.

The debate started with opening remarks by Delphine Bourgeois who introduced the topic and the panelists. She focused on the impact of BREXIT on British people living in the Commune of Ixelles. The municipality is very multicultural and a home to many European citizens, many of whom have been working in the EU Institutions. This part of Brussels is a host to 1,535 British people, which is the highest concentration of UK citizens in Belgium.

Delphine Bourgeois also noted that there has been an overwhelming feeling of uncertainty among the British citizens living in her Commune in the aftermath of the UK referendum held on 23 June 2016. This has led to a surge of requests for Belgian nationality: around 300 applications for naturalization have already been submitted and many more are expected in the near future.

There has been consensus among the panelists that the result of the referendum is sobering and worrying at the same time. As it has been repeated throughout the debate, the vote to withdraw from the EU confirmed the potency of populist national politics. It also highlighted the weakness of the EU elites and the “Stay” campaigners to effectively counter the populist arguments of the “Leave” campaign. Moreover, the vote to leave signaled the growing dissatisfaction of the Europeans with the inability of the EU to deal with current crises and with the undemocratic structures of the EU system. It was a vote against the establishment, both on the national, and the EU levels. Politics in Europe is being restructured due to populist forces on both sides of the old political spectrum. Although ideas of left and right populism differ, they both feed on the

same anti-establishment sentiments.

The UK citizens lost trust in the political elites in London and Brussels. They did not believe that they could effectively deal with the economic and migration crises. This has made a very fertile ground for populist, anti-immigration propaganda presenting migrants as a growing threat to the British livelihood - migrants taking away “their” jobs, “their” social security provisions, and “their” established way of living. Various studies have shown that the campaign was based on lies and fabrications, thus the British people were to a large extent convinced not by sound, informative arguments, but rather by anti-immigration rhetoric and the longstanding anti-EU sentiments.

In the aftermath of the UK referendum Andrew Duff stated that there was first a need to accept the decision of the polls, in line with the words of the British Prime Minister: “BREXIT means BREXIT”. Despite the lies and distortions throughout the campaign, there have been no technical problems or fraud during the referendum and the result is clear. Now it is in the hands of Prime Minister Theresa May to invoke the Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union. The decision should be taken by March next year.

Andrew Duff also stated that it is rather unlikely that the UK will stay inside the single market. If it will remain in the single market, it will have to accept the freedom of movement and continue contributing to the budget – the two most controversial issues and main arguments against the EU used during the campaign. At the same time, the freedom of services is of crucial importance to the UK, but this requires free movement of people.

In his presentation, Andrew Duff also raised the issue of the practical problems many British people residing in the EU will face in the near future. One of them is the situation of British EU civil servants and pension rights of former MEPs. It is relatively easy to compile a list of things to negotiate but it is not just a withdrawal agreement but a negotiation process with 27 Member States, all of which have their vested interests. The EU wants to make sure that its unity in the EU is maintained, despite BREXIT. Everyone will therefore have to compromise on something. Andrew Duff also stressed that it is important that the process is concluded in the next two years.

The next panelist, Philippe Cayla began his speech showing two funny videos: “[Europeman, help!](#)” and “[The gloomy aftermath of BREXIT](#)”. He shared his thoughts about BREXIT and referred back to the “Let me vote” campaign and European Citizen’s Initiative (ECI). It aimed at reducing the democratic deficit by granting all mobile Europeans the right to vote not only in local and European elections, but also in regional and national elections in their country of residence. According to Philippe Cayla, enhancing voting rights would bring major improvements to the content of European citizenship and to the multicultural character of Europe. Extending voting rights in regional and national elections to all European citizens residing in Member State other than their country of origin would not only strengthen the sense of equality, but also create an

important debate on the national level. Political parties would be obliged to take into account the views and demands of a European citizen electorate. The problem of limited voting rights was most evident during the UK referendum, in which EU citizens residing in Britain and expats living abroad more than 15 years were not allowed to take part in the referendum. On the other hand, British citizens from the Commonwealth were invited to vote, which created a problem of double standards.

Monica Frassoni expressed her views about the way in which the Green party happened to become a major player in the “Remain” campaign in the UK. The British Green Party focused mainly on environmental issues, human rights and political participation. It claimed that from a pragmatic standpoint remaining in the EU was beneficial for the UK. She was surprised that the British Green Party, which did not have the reputation of being particularly pro-European, became very involved.

Monica Frassoni also shared her concerns about the fact that the campaign was non-factual. She raised a very important question: how to regain a possibility to make campaigns based on facts? She stated that democracy was hijacked during the BREXIT campaign, which was biased and which allowed people to believe what they wanted. She emphasised that there is a need to address the fears on which right-wing parties capitalise. Unless we do not do something that changes the narratives and logic of migration of third country nationals and EU citizens, right-wing sentiments will prevail. Nigel Farage conquered because of people’s fears, according to Monica Frassoni. She also raised a question about why the Commission never took up what they are strong at presenting facts and rationality in the campaign? The problem is the culture within the institution which sees as its only counterpart not the citizens but governments. What could be done to strengthen the role of citizens?

The presentations by the panelists were followed by a lively debate. The participants raised many important points. One of them stated that the anti-EU and anti-immigration sentiments are present all over Europe and that if a referendum on EU membership was to take place for example in the Netherlands, it is very likely the result would be to leave the EU. Another person claimed that the main reason behind the growing anti-EU sentiments are the harsh austerity measures which have failed the people of Europe and of Britain. The BREXIT vote was a vote against the political establishment, according to the participants. One of the problems which contributed to BREXIT was lack of much needed communication from the EU Institutions, a deplorable failure. One of the participants also stated that there was a collective failure going back a long time ago which led to BREXIT. The main reasons why BREXIT happened was the fact that there has not been civic education on European and on European citizenship in the UK. There was also consensus that the BREXIT campaign was non-factual and shameful, especially considering the tragic murder of MP Cox two weeks before the referendum.

In concluding the debate, Monica Frassoni in particular claimed that it “was all up to the EU citizens”, who had to defend their European rights and could not rely on the EU institutions or national governments to defend them.

DAY 2, 30 AUGUST

Session “Rights”

The first session of the second day of the Summer University focused on one of the three key themes of the ECIT Foundation: “Rights”. The guest speakers were Marie-Hélène Boulanger (Head of Unit “Union citizenship rights and free movement”, European Commission, DG Justice) and her colleague Aikaterini Dimitrakopoulou, Adrian Berry (Barrister at Garden Court Chambers), and Thomas Kramer (Programme Director of the Master of European Legal Studies). The session was moderated by Tony Venables (Founder of ECIT Foundation). The main questions for this debate were:

How to work together in response to Brexit and other crises? How to make European citizenship work properly and close the gap between the fine principles of European Law and how people especially those who are vulnerable, are treated in practice? What reforms are necessary to enforce rights?

The session started with a presentation on citizens’ rights by Marie- Hélène Boulanger who first talked about the legal basis of European citizenship. As highlighted by the Court of Justice, citizenship of the Union is not supposed to replace the citizenship of the nation state. Therefore, EU citizenship is additional to Member State citizenship.

Citizens’ rights:

- Article 20 TFEU: every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union.
- Article 21 TFEU and Article 45 of the Charter: the right to move freely.
- Article 22 of the TFEU and Article 39 of the Charter: right to vote and to stand as a candidate in municipal and European Parliament elections.
- Article 23 TFEU and the Article 46 of the Charter: right to diplomatic protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State.

- Article 18 TFEU and the Article 21 of the Charter: non-discrimination on the basis of nationality.
- Article 24 TFEU and the Article 44 of the Charter: right to petition the European Parliament.

The preparation of the 2016 EU Citizenship Report:

- Public consultations,
- Two Flash Eurobarometers – on EU Citizenship and on Electoral Rights,
- EP hearing on 15/3/2016,
- Inter-service group on citizenship,
- Other sources: studies, complaints and requests from citizens, SOLVIT, MS expert groups (free movement, consular protection), conferences and workshops feedback, parliamentary questions (public consultations are not the only sources of information).

Public consultation on EU citizenship:

A total of 2170 citizens and organisations from all 28 EU countries took part in the 2015 public consultation on EU citizenship. The largest proportion of respondents were Italians (14%), closely followed by British, Germans and Greeks (each 11%). 98% of respondents had travelled within the EU at least once. 60% have lived in another country for at least 3 months.

What would help EU citizens to settle down in another EU country?

- 87%: if authorities provided information and assistance responding to the individual needs and questions of newcomers at their request (one-stop-shop and websites),
- 49%: policies to promote dialogue between cultures, mutual understanding and inclusion (especially at schools),
- Difficulties encountered in day to day life with regard to the exercise of rights as an EU citizen: 64% did not have any problems.

Those who had problems:

- 69%: lengthy or unclear administrative procedures,

- 51%: lack of sufficient information on their rights as non-nationals or lack of awareness,
- 41%: difficulties in getting private services – for example opening a bank account or accessing utilities.

Eurobarometer on European citizenship:

- 87% respondents are familiar with the term “citizen of the Union”,
- 52% also knows what being an EU citizen means,
- 91% knows that they are citizens of their country and the EU,
- 37% female respondents were not sure what it means to be an EU citizen.

Citizens are becoming more aware of their rights but there is still some way to go. The groups most likely to feel informed are those between 15-24 years old, living in larger towns and those who completed full-time education. 25% of Europeans feel informed about what they can do if their rights as EU citizens are not respected; 51% – not very well informed; 3% – very well informed; 23% – fairly well informed.

Standard Barometer n. 83 (2015):

Which of the following do you think is the most positive result of the EU? Seven in ten Europeans think that free movement of people within the EU brings economic benefits to their country. Those who support it most are people with higher education, self-employed and employees, people informed about their rights and those who know the term “citizen of the Union”.

Consular protection:

There are 90 million trips outside the EU for business or pleasure each year. All EU Member States are represented only in 3 countries in the world. Only few MS are represented in the vast majority of countries – big ones would therefore take care abroad of the citizens of small EU countries. Certain conditions have to be met to be eligible for consular protection by another MS:

- Notion of non-representation, the protection is provided by any MS: all MS have an obligation to give consular protection and it has to be given on the same conditions as to the nationals of that state.
- If a country is unrepresented (there is no embassy of a MS in that particular non-EU

country), but also if his country's consulate is not effective (case to case basis evaluation). 72% of people are aware of their right to consular protection in a country outside the EU. 75% wrongly assume that they have rights to seek help from EU embassies within the EU.

Electoral Rights:

In the 2014 elections to European Parliament there were EU wide election campaigns in over 260 cities across Europe and the Commission held many citizens dialogues throughout Europe. New features were introduced, such as the *Spitzenkandidaten*, which reinforced democratic legitimacy. There is also a potential to enhance public interest in the next European elections. However, the low turnout remains a major problem. Young people are the largest group of abstainers.

Flash Barometer 431 – what to do to increase turnout in elections?

- Provide Information about the relevance of EU policy in people's daily lives.
- Provide more information about the programmes of the candidates.
- Provide information about the objectives of lead candidates.
- Provide information about the European Parliament.

What would make voting easier:

- if voters received individual letters explaining how to register and vote (80%),
- if voters were automatically registered on the electoral roll as a result of registering as a resident (79%),
- if there was an online process for registering on the electoral roll (69%),
- if voters were able to vote electronically or online (67%).

The extensive presentations on citizens' rights by Marie - Hélène Boulanger and her colleagues were followed by a short presentation by Adrian Berry (Barrister at Garden Court Chambers), who shared his view on European citizenship and BREXIT. He stated that nationality has social resonance but transnational concepts are good because they restrain nationalistic feelings.

Nevertheless, there is a big challenge in terms of promoting them. He also pointed out that the BREXIT campaign was mainly about immigration issues. Despite the popular rhetoric, the EU was not responsible for austerity in the UK, as the “Leave” campaign was presenting.

Adrian Berry also raised an important question: How to salvage the European project? One of the solutions could be to offer special authorisation to work for low skilled labour in parts of the UK where concerns arise about low skilled migration (in particular in Northern England). He also stressed the idea that citizenship rights should be more about the ability to transform lives – not only about political rights. Therefore, there is a need to understand how people actually live their everyday lives and based on that, new narratives on European citizenship should be developed.

A number of participants criticized the idea of restrictions on freedom of movement to make it more acceptable. Rather than restrictions, their measures were possible such as more action of the local level to strengthen services to receive new comers (cf. the proposal in the background document for a free movement solidarity fund).

The next panelist, Tomasz Kramer (Lecturer at the European Institute of Public Administration) gave a presentation about challenges to European citizenship. There are moves towards strengthening of EU citizenship but it is more in the “books” rather than in practice, and the Court of Justice is no longer very proactive in this field (there has been a shift since 2011). Member States are allowed to make exemption of movement rights. He also pointed out that there is still lack of awareness about citizenship rights. Even in capital cities workers at foreign ministries do not know what their European citizenship rights are. Another important problem is that those rights seem to be enjoyed mainly by the 4 million people who are permanently resident in another Member State, so they are not fully exercised by the 500 million EU citizens! Thus, the biggest issue is the fact that European citizenship right is not enjoyed by all; there is a need to make it more democratic and more inclusive.

Some of the participants also expressed their concerns about the growing gap between the fine principles of European citizenship and the actual practice. Despite the existing laws to protect minorities and vulnerable people, they still suffer discrimination and limited protection of their rights. This is most evident in the case of the Roma community. Citizenship rights are also often not fully enjoyed by non-mobile citizens, which reinforces the view that only the privileged EU citizens who can travel can fully exercise their rights. One of the biggest challenges, however, according to some participants, is the need to enhance voting rights, according to Philippe Cayla from Européens Sans Frontiers and other participants. Philippe Cayla was one of the organisers of the “Let me vote” European Citizens’ Initiative. It called for reducing the democratic deficit by granting all mobile Europeans the right to vote not only in local and European elections, but also in national elections in the country of their residence. He also pointed out that there is not enough information about European citizenship in EU passports, which has a very strong symbolic

relevance.

In the conclusion of this session, the Chairman suggested that the Commission should bring together in one package on its website all its activities on European citizenship, which should be available to the wider public.

Session “Involvement”

The second session focused on citizens’ involvement. The panelists at this session were: Pamela Bartlett Quintanilla (Transparency and Democracy Campaigner, Greens/EFA Group in the European Parliament), Daniel Freund (Head of Advocacy EU integrity, Transparency International) and Carsten Berg (Director of The ECI Campaign). The session was moderated by Alberto Alemanno from The Good Lobby who introduced the theme of citizens’ involvement.

Since at least 1992, the citizens have become the focus of EU attention. After being de facto non-existent – unless he/she was economically active, the citizen became a fully-fledged actor and his/her potential to contribute to the EU project recognized. This explains the EU participatory turn of 2009 and the many experiments aimed at reconnecting citizens with the technocratic, elite-based political Brussels sphere. Yet, despite these efforts, the Commission consultation procedures, EP broadcasted hearings, its petition system, the EU Ombudsman oversight mechanisms remain a prerogative of the euro-passionate public. The literature agrees that they did not prove effective in connecting citizens to the EU policy process, which remains dominated by the “usual suspects”.

As stated by Alberto Alemanno, 'ordinary' citizens do not participate in EU affairs: they lack information, literacy and incentives to actually get involved. Given the dominant role played by the EU in citizens’ life, this outcome appears disturbing. All the more so when one considers the multi-million Euro involvements of corporate interest and the ensuing imbalance in the representation of interests in the EU.

Alberto Alemanno also mentioned that despite the fresh, countless EU and national political leaders’ calls for the need to radically reform the EU machinery and projects, little is likely to emerge from the EU aimed at addressing the citizen’s challenge. This calls for a *de jure condito* re-assessment of the role that EU citizens can realistically play in the daily operation of EU policymaking.

The introduction was followed by a set of questions to the panelists:

There are two opposing views of the EU governance. The dominant picture depicts the EU as that of an opaque and technocratic process dominated by EU and domestic civil servants working in

closed policy networks. But then there is another, more positive one. Studies suggest that the daily EU policymaking process is more open, accessible and possibly responsive than many national legal systems. On the basis of your own experience, which of these two images is the most accurate: the EU as a closed, impenetrable network for citizens or rather an open, accessible system?

The future of lobbying regulation depends on the revision of the Transparency Register. Where do we stand on this debate? What should we ask the EU Commission to do to ensure an open and transparent interest representation?

Despite its inherent limits, the ECI carries the potential to empower EU citizens in the policy process while contributing to the creation of a EU public sphere. Where do we stand on the reform of the ECI?

According to Pamela Bartlett - Quintanilla, there is not enough openness between the national and European level, which is a major problem leading to a blame game. There is a strong impression among citizens that deals are made behind closed doors, despite the fact that there is a possibility to stream many debates, something you cannot do at the national level. Parliament is a very open institution but it is harder to get to know what each government is proposing in the Council working group.

Pamela Barlett Quintanilla also made a point that instead of deciding whether the EU works and is fully democratic, we should be realistic and tell people what can be done and what cannot. Often we do not like the policy answers and then we say that it is about the institutional structure. Nevertheless, austerity was a political choice of the political majority and this is something that needs to be changed at the ballot box not that much by changing the Institutions.

Daniel Freund answered the question on transparency in the EU lobbying processes. The EU policy making and lobbying activities are still not sufficiently transparent. The introduction of the EU Transparency Register was a positive first step; however, it is not sufficient. The Transparency Register is an online list of organisations and individuals lobbying European law and policy making. The lobbying groups or individual lobbyist who register are normally required to disclose their budgets and clients. The shortcoming is that the EU Transparency Register is voluntary. Thus, despite the positive development of rising numbers of registered lobbyists, there is also a growing number of the un-registered ones.³

³ On 28 September 2016 the EU Commission proposed a mandatory Transparency Register covering all three EU Institutions – the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. As stated by First Vice-President Frans Timmermans, "The EU institutions need to work together to win back the trust of our citizens. We must be more open in everything we do. Today's proposals for a mandatory transparency register covering the Parliament, Council and Commission are an important step in the right direction." The proposal came in after 12 weeks of public

In general, the panel gave a nuanced picture of EU policy making as very open in some respects, and closed in others, so that the answer to the questions suggested for debate depended on the particular case or area of policy.

Carsten Berg presented the topic of the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI). The ECI is a new tool of transnational, digital and participatory democracy. It enables one million EU citizens to call directly on the European Commission to propose a particular legislation. For an ECI to be accepted, signatures of 1 million EU citizens from at least 7 EU Member States are required. The proposed ECI also has to be within an EU competence to be admitted. The legal basis of the citizens' initiative is set out in Article 11, paragraph 4 in the Treaty on European Union:

“Not less than one million citizens who are nationals of a significant number of Member States may take the initiative of inviting the European Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties.

The procedures and conditions required for such a citizens' initiative shall be determined in accordance with the first paragraph of Article 24 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.”

Between 1 April 2012 and 1 August 2016, 56 ECIs were proposed, 29 were registered, but only 3 of them succeeded.⁴ The high failure rate can be explained by the still relatively low awareness of the ECI instrument, particular ECI campaigns, organisers' lack of financial resources and technical obstacles. Many critics also point out that the requirement to collect such a high number of signatures (one million signatures from different countries) decreases chances for success. Often due to lack of resources, it is impossible to reach out to such high number of people. There is also the issue of voting age - many activists propose that 16 and 17 year-olds should be allowed to vote. Other obstacles to the effective functioning of ECIs mentioned at this session were strict registration rules and flaws of the online system.

According to Carsten Berg, less restrictive registration, taking ECIs seriously and allowing for Treaty amendments would make ECIs more successful. In addition, simplifying and harmonising the required personal data, eliminating ID numbers, improvements of the online system (OCS), collecting email addresses to be able to send follow-up emails, allowing 16 and 17- years olds to vote and more practical support would make the ECIs more usable and enable them to have

consultations from which 975 responses were collected from individual citizens and 783 from organisations. The proposal was part of a broader commitment of the Juncker Commission to reform the EU to make it more transparent and democratic. See European Commission - Press release, “Delivering on transparency: Commission proposes mandatory Transparency Register for all EU institutions” available from: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-3182_en.htm.

⁴ For more information, go to The ECI Campaign website: <http://www.citizens-initiative.eu/#home>.

greater impact.

Session "Trust"

The last session of the second day of the Summer University on European Citizenship evolved around the theme of "Trust". It consisted of presentations by Carmen Mazijn (former President of Erasmus Student Network Brussels), Sophie Gaston (Head of External Affairs at Demos) and Elisa Pinelli (Coordinator of "Education towards European Citizenship" at Europe Direct Forlì). It was moderated by Federica Chiarella from the ECIT Foundation.

Sophie Gaston gave an overview of the current loss of social trust and an increasing discontent in the EU and UK against the authorities at any level. Since the global financial crisis, the mood and nature of European politics and society has endured significant change. This is also symptom of increasingly volatile political environments within Europe's nation states, which are giving rise to an emergent, and dangerous, internal culture of fear and a sense that citizens are becoming more and more disenfranchised and disconnected from their political institutions. This culture threatens not only the strength and health of nations' democracies, but also the future of the European Union itself, and the principles of solidarity that underpin its success. A clear result of this trend is obviously BREXIT: fearful and scared citizens, convinced by a populist and propagandistic campaign, voted to leave the EU. Sophie Gaston affirmed that citizens have the right to information. Keeping citizens constantly informed and avoiding their manipulation is one of the main tasks that the State should be able to fulfill. This statement brings to the question: if the State does not feel part of the EU, how can citizens be informed about EU issues and feel part of it?

After the brief presentation of Sophie Gaston of the British breakdown of trust and social contracts, this panel focused predominantly on citizenship education. In recent years citizenship education has been gaining greater relevance. On 17 March 2015 EU education ministers and the Commissioner for education, culture, youth and sport Tibor Navracsics held a meeting in Paris on Citizenship education. At the meeting they stated that they have "a special duty to ensure that the humanist and civic values we share are safeguarded and passed on to future generations" through education.⁵ The report claims that:

"The primary purpose of education is not only to develop knowledge, skills, competences and attitudes and to embed fundamental values, but also to help young people - in close cooperation with parents and families - to become active, responsible, open-minded members of society."

⁵ "Declaration on Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education". Informal Meeting Of European Union Education Ministers Paris, Tuesday 17 March 2015.

Children and young people represent our future and must have the opportunity to shape that future. We must combine our efforts to prevent and tackle marginalisation, intolerance, racism and radicalisation and to preserve a framework of equal opportunities for all.”⁶

Despite the spread of citizenship education across Europe, it is still very difficult to find examples of best practice for European citizenship education. This is particularly an issue in secondary schools. As pointed out by Tony Venables in the *Draft Discussion document for the Summer University on European Citizenship*: “The EU has a recognised role to promote of foreign languages, which is apparently on the increase, but limited competence in the area of education. The Commission could use its competence for Union citizenship to propose a model curriculum after widespread consultation.”

In this session we also touched upon the idea of introducing an entitlement for every European citizen to participate in an Erasmus programme at some point of his or her life. There is a link between the Erasmus+ programme and the feeling of being a European citizen. Those who participated in the Erasmus programme have a stronger sense of belonging to Europe.

In this session Elisa Pinelli made a presentation about the EU citizenship education programmes at primary, lower secondary and upper secondary schools directed by the Europe Direct Forlì from the University of Bologna. It organises meetings at schools to explain the history of the European Union and how it works. The idea behind this programme is to raise awareness about European citizenship, strengthen a sense of belonging and to promote citizens’ active participation in the future.

The specific topics taught include: “EU history and Institutions”, “European citizenship”, “Opportunities to study and work abroad in the EU”, “EU environmental policy”, “EU monetary policy and the current crisis”, “Human rights protection in the EU”, “Common Agricultural Policy”, “The European Parliament” and the “Globalisation and the international trade”.

As stated by Elisa Pinelli, despite almost 150 meetings per year and reaching out to almost 2500 each year, there are still many obstacles. Some of them are deep and generalised ignorance about the EU objectives, policies and Institutions, wrong or negative information from the media, negative portrayal of the programme by the government and political parties, often propagandistic information about the EU and limited teachers’ working time, which prevents them from deepening their knowledge about specific EU issues.

Elisa Pinelli also made an important point that EU citizenship should not only be taught and discussed at schools. In Forlì (Italy), for example, each year the Forlì municipality organises the Europe Day celebration for a group of 250-300 students who participate in games and stands on

⁶ Ibid.

EU. Citizenship education should also be extended to teachers. Since 2013-2014 the “Education towards European Citizenship” Project has been organising an annual training course on the EU also for school teachers.

DAY 3, 31 August

Final brainstorming session: Quo Vadis? “Civis europeus sum” after all and for all!

The final brainstorming session was led by Nuala Mole (Founder of AIRE Centre), Niccolo Milanese (Chair of European Alternatives), Delphine Bourgeois (President of the Consultative Council on European Affairs of Ixelles), moderated by Inga Wachsmann (Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme).

Questions for debate: *Could the components of this first transnational citizenship of the modern era - rights, involvement, trust- be brought together in a more organising framework? What are the other future deadlines and challenges?*

The final brainstorming session attempted to answer the above questions and offered some reflections on the meaning of European citizenship. Nuala Mole posed an important question about the definition of European citizenship. Is European citizenship a pragmatic concept defined by practical benefits or is it an emotional, psychological cultural concept which is about how you feel as a European citizen? The two are so intertwined that you cannot have the one without the other, according to her.

There has been a consensus among many in the room that there is this bureaucratic, obstructive behaviour on behalf of the national governments who are failing to deliver the rights they have signed up to in theory. This is not helped by popular and wide spread indifference. Lack of awareness of citizenship rights is a real challenge. Many people are not well enough informed where do their rights come from? (bilateral treaties, Council of Europe, not just the Commission, Parliament and Ombudsman) and whom to address when they want more rights. As stated by Nuala Mole, during the BREXIT campaign people in the UK were unaware of their workplace rights deriving from the EU. BREXIT is the tip of iceberg existing across Europe, but this problem has existed for 25 years.

As stated by many other participants, there is also the problem of enforcing European rights. There has been a gap between the principles and practice. In the final session Roger Casale stressed that enforcing European rights should be a bottom up rather than a top down process. The idea of a “European Year of Free Movement” to increase the importance of this significant

right deriving from European citizenship has been put forward at the final session. Others stressed the need for civic equality as a way of protecting citizenship rights or the need to implement a minimum standard of living. A proposal was also made to introduce a transnational list for people to say what they think about austerity and the economic policy in general. As pointed out by Niccolo Milanese, there is a very negative mood about potential disintegration in the EU shared by grassroots organisations and at elite gatherings alike. Nevertheless, this situation could also turned into something positive – it is a chance to make more radical changes towards a more broader, inclusive and democratic European citizenship.

What should we do? Steps to be taken after the Summer University

Before the Summer University took place, proposals were made by the ECIT Foundation to:

- create a broad coalition for European citizenship to take on a responsibility which is currently everyone’s and no one’s;
- test the feasibility of an ECI collecting over million signatures to demand a stronger European citizenship to counteract the resurgence of racism and xenophobia.

At the final session all participants agreed that much more needs to be done to enforce European rights and strengthen European citizenship. All were willing to cooperate with ECIT which could act as a resource centre and participate in a future coalition. We also believe that now is a great opportunity for hot research on topics such as free movement, to counteract the arguments against it. There was also a consensus that although a lot is going on around citizenship education, but there is still need for research on the actual practice of the education on European citizenship. Some participants also stressed the need to establish links with other civil society groups, reach out to expert groups, and to engage with businesses and entrepreneurs concerned about citizenship. With regards to Brexit, it has also been proposed to lobby the EU Institutions side in the EU-UK negotiations.

At this final session a proposal was made to launch an ECI on voting rights. We agreed that this could be even more effective than ECIT Foundations’ initial proposal for an ECI for a stronger European citizenship. According to the *ECIT Guidelines on European Citizens’ Rights, Involvement and Trust*⁷, European citizens’ rights to vote and stand as candidates in elections to the European

⁷ ECIT “Guidelines for European Citizens’ Rights, Involvement and Trust”: <http://ecit-foundation.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/ECIT-Guidelines-for-European-Citizens-Rights-Involvement-and-Trust.pdf>.

Parliament and municipal elections in the Member State of residence should be extended to national and regional elections and referenda. As pointed out by Tony Venables, the fact that some EU citizens taking advantage of the right of free movement and residence rights are denied the chance to vote and standing in national elections, either in their country of origin or the country of residence undermines the spirit of the EU law and Convention on Human Rights. Proposals for an ECI on political rights could be presented at the next Summer University in August 2017.

The Summer University left ECIT and the participants to work on these proposals and an ever longer list of priorities drawn up by Inga Wachsmann:

- Second Version of the Draft Discussion Document
- Sharing interesting events where participants can connect to or meet again
- Sharing methods and materials:
 - Research on free movement,
 - Working on upcoming elections,
 - Co-working research on citizens' rights,
 - Mapping citizenship education practice.
- Launch of an ECI on political rights on all levels
- Providing Legal help
- Reaching out to Business
- Lobbying Eu institutions in Brexit process
- Thinking together about next Year's Summer University and enhancing the group.

There was a consensus that the Summer University had been a success and should be repeated in one year's time at the same location. This would provide a timescale and framework for a partnership to deliver practical results for the promise of this first event.