

The Youth Directorate: The Agents of Transfer and the Agents of Change

Enikő Demeny, Institute of European Studies, Cluj
Zdenka Machalkova, Institute of Ethnology, Brno

The Council of Europe conceives of a European community based on common values, most often specified as "democracy, the rule of law and human rights". These values are or should be shared by all those who are/or who would like to be members of this community. The Council of Europe assumed an important role in the consolidation of these values in all its member states. In its vision young people have to play an important role in this process. As Franco Marziale, the ex-director of the Youth Centre pointed out: Europe cannot be *built* without young people¹

Each construction starts always from a plan, from an idea about what has to be constructed and how. In world history there were many inspiring ideas, plans and visions about possible worlds people could construct. The transformations of these ideas in reality always depended to an important degree on peoples who were in a position to put these ideas into practice. There is a complex process from the stage of imagining and designing ideas and principles concerning society to a stage when these ideas and principles are put into the practice and have an effect on the citizens' life. We propose to understand and interpret the above-mentioned process in a particular section of the Council of Europe. Our aim was to present and analyse how the model of the Council's youth policy is put into practice and perceived by employees of the Youth Directorate and received by the youth leaders being educated.

Our research is based on the analysis² of documents and on anthropological fieldwork. During the five weeks spent in the Youth Centre we conducted semi-structured interviews with the employees of Youth Directorate and with participants in a training course (TC1)³. We participated as observers in some programs of TC1 and in the informal meetings that took place during the two weeks training course. We also took part in the everyday life of the Youth Centre⁴ therefore we were in daily, informal contact with the young participants, the trainers, and all the employees being present in the Centre in that period.

1. The model of Council of Europe's Youth Policy

The development of the Council of Europe's youth policy is closely connected with the social, economic and political transformations that took place in Europe. The first experiment for establishing a youth centre was made at the beginning of 60s in the framework of the Council of Europe's Cultural Cooperation programme. However, there were the events of May 1968

that determined the Council to pay even more attention to the youth sector. In 1968 young people were asking for more possibilities of participation in shaping the policies and decisions that affected their lives. Two important debates took place⁵ in the Council of Europe concerning the issues raised by young people. As a result of these debates the Council adopted a recommendation for creating the European Youth Centre and the European Youth Foundation.

As Daniel Menschart pointed out in his report about the Councils youth policy⁶ in the period between 1960 and 1980, non-governmental youth organisations were recognised as the priority context for learning about democratic participation. Therefore both governments and members of parliament agreed that youth policy should be based on the promotion of these organisations. The social, economic and political context of this period offered a suitable context for the application of this model.

2.1. The Co-managed System - an Unique Model

The key concept of the Council of Europe youth policy, that is youth participation, found its expression in the co-management system based on co-operation between governments and youth organisations. This is the governing principle of Youth Directorate's youth policy and it is the model the Council of Europe is very proud of. It is viewed and praised as unique, as distinguishing the Youth Directorate from other Council of Europe Directorates and also from the European Union. It is claimed to be the top achievement, the most elaborate form of partnership and the expression of the Council's ideal of democracy. It is regarded as an avant-garde concept.

This concept of youth participation is incarnated in the co-managed bodies posed as a unit in the structure of the Youth Directorate. The co-managed bodies are the Governing Board, which manages and takes all the decisions on the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation. At the time of our research⁷ it comprised twelve governmental representatives and twelve representatives of youth organisations; six coming from National Youth Committees⁸ and six from International Non-governmental Youth Organisations.⁹

From a decision-making point of view the Governing Board is the top of the iceberg. On the ground are different youth organisations united in the Youth Council which appoint 25 representatives for a so-called Advisory Committee: sixteen from International Non-governmental Youth Organisations, eight from National Youth Committees and one from a non-traditional association. The representatives appointed by the national governments are united in the European Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Co-operation in the Youth Field (CDEJ).¹⁰

An interesting outcome of this co-managed system is the distribution of decision making power among the parties involved. It was surprising for us that some employees of the Youth Directorate who work in close connection with the co-managed structures claimed that the position of the youth organisations in the decision making process is stronger than the position

of the governments. It was said that the strength of the youth organisations lies in their preparedness to achieve common opinion in contrast to governmental representatives, who often face difficulties in formulating a common solution because everybody holds its own opinion and interest. The fact that youth organisations on the Board find a common position more easy was interpreted as them following an utilitarian strategy. They lobby to sustain their organisation rather than for the benefit of young people.

The Council of Europe encourages its member state governments to adopt the model of co-management in their youth policy, but like in many other cases faces difficulties. First of all in order to adopt this system it is necessary to have a well developed infrastructure of youth organisations and this is surely not the case in post-communist countries. The problem seems to be for new member states to accept this system even on the Council level.¹¹

2.2. Rethinking the target group of youth policy

During our fieldwork a process of restructuration was going on in the Youth Directorate. Not only the functioning of the co-managed bodies was reevaluated but the target group of youth policy was subject of rethinking too. Beginning with the 1980s the ways of young people to participate in social life have changed. In order to be active and creative in civil society, young people no longer consider it necessary to be permanently involved in organisations. Their involvement is rather of short-term nature, depending on their interests and needs. Organisations suffered the consequences of this trend and they were seeking for a new legitimacy. A youth policy that focuses exclusively on youth organisations was questioned.¹²

The majority of young people does not join any youth organisation and does not want to live an organised life. This had been the case in western countries, but the enlargement gave this question a new specific impetus. In the new member countries due to past experience young people are particularly suspicious of youth organisations. As this is so, the question arises: Is it really adequate for them to adopted the Council of Europe's model of youth policy? Does this kind of model of youth participation provide a real multiplying effect and does it help young people? How suitable could the western youth policy be for the new member countries if it is no longer fully suitable in the West either?

The negative tendency toward the target group can be observed in the opinion of one employee of the Youth Directorate, who claimed that the attempt of the Youth Directorate to extend the target group caused opposition from established organisations, because "they don't want to share the cake".

"As there were still the same people who came here, the same organisation who have contributions from our projects. I don't want to say that they have bad projects but they don't want to share with others. You can see the difference between the principles of solidarity, and all these big beautiful principles. When you see the reality they are far from this principle not really applying that at all."

This statement was followed by a suggestion to extend the target group to organisations

working on the local level. Looking for new partners led our respondent to discern that if young people from new member countries want to join some kind of youth organisation they follow different interests than those of the traditional partners of the Council.

The rethinking of the target group was not a main concern for the majority of our respondents and even in the recommendations for the restructurations in the section it is only mentioned that there is a need to identify new multipliers. In spite of the questioning of the model here is no alternative model in sight. The opinion was formulated that although the new Youth Centre in Budapest represented an important step toward decentralisation the learning process within Central and Eastern Europe was somewhat hindered because of the emphasis on the pan-European nature of youth policy of the Council:

"Western organisation would enlarge and set the agenda, Western values are to be adopted, Western working methods to be used." 13

However, according to Peter Lauritzen, the Director of the Youth Centre from Budapest decentralisation and regional cooperation would be necessary because contrary to the proclaimed brotherhood of the socialist international there is a lack of cross-border contacts between neighbours in Central and Eastern Europe. However, some officials of the Council are afraid that regional cooperation would create an "Eastern ghetto".

2.3. Intercultural learning

The Council of Europe youth sector proclaims to work with young people in developing a European identity based on common values and to contribute through its action programme to the implementation of the Council of Europe's priorities, with particular emphasis on democratic consolidation, social cohesion and the fight against racism and xenophobia¹⁴ One of the main tools of implementing this policy are the training courses organised by the Youth Centres. Intercultural learning is an important dimension of these training courses and it should help in solving the dilemmas that the integration process raised. Intercultural learning is connected with political socialisation. Many authors point out that the current situation in Europe makes political socialisation paradoxical. László Kéri¹⁵ argues that this paradox is connected with the contradictions created by the issue of unity and diversity:

"Europe shall have to provide cultural and political answers to challenges affecting its future simultaneously. The answer is a paradoxical one. The political response will of necessity be dominated by the common universal elements, because the problems of power /institutions`do not lend themselves to definitions based on diversity. In this sense a common European answer calls for standardised institutions and mentality. The foundation of this homogeneity is more or less given. The common European political contents will sooner or later be incorporated into compulsory national curricula. However culturally, Europe has always been, and shall remain, a world of diversity, a wealth of differences"16

What could be the aim of political socialisation in such paradoxical times? A possible solution could be to develop skills for tolerating ambiguity by engaging in intercultural learning situations.

"Intercultural learning is identical with political socialisation under the conditions of second modernity: it means to understand the world, to develop the personal qualifications to become a social actor in this world and learn how to exist and survive in a paradoxical historical situation. Intercultural learning cannot take place between delegates, with their flag in front of them ... These people behave like ambassadors they always protect themselves. What you have to do is take your flag away, put your delegation sign away, then you become the person who you are, and then you are opening up to a process of exchange... Tolerance of ambiguity means that you accept the person next to you, opposite to you as just as right as you are. Tolerance of ambiguity is a little bit an opposite educational aim to becoming a missionary. You are not going out and teaching all the people what should they do. You are going out to learn what other people are about, you will represent yourself, but you are open to exchange with others.¹⁷

Although these ideas were formulated by a top level employee of the Youth Directorate and some members of the educational team also claimed that they do not want to train missionaries this view is not reflected in the actual official practices of the training course. At the beginning of the training course we observed that youth leaders were told that they are there in three roles: as representatives of their countries, as delegates of their own organisation and as individuals. After the course they are supposed to become multipliers or missionaries of the Council who would become "agents of change" in their home environment by spreading the information they acquired in the training course

3. Putting Youth Policy into Practice: the Agents of Transfer and the Agents of Change

In this chapter our attention is focused on the persons who put the programs and ideas of youth policy into practice - the employees of the Youth Directorate, the administrative staff, secretary, program coordinators, trainers. We call these people agents of transfer - because they are working in a sector which is strictly defined by educational aims¹⁸. In this part of our paper we will present how these agents of transfer perceive their work, how the principles of youth policy are put into practice in a training course and how the prospective agents of change, the youth leaders evaluate the program offered to them.

3.1. Working in the Youth Centre

As some employees told us, they were coming to work for the Council of Europe because of their belief in the values that the Council promotes.

"The idea of human rights was very important for me already a long time ago and I found words for this idea when I began to work with the Council..... I am here because I want to work for a better world."(trainer)

We do not claim that people we interviewed are naive dreamers nor do we want to raise the

feeling that we are too optimistic about them, but when listening to their statements we heard many times that work here is important for them, has a special significance, is hard and enjoyable¹⁹. We could observe that it causes also a lot of emotional strain on people, specially when dealing with the life stories and problems of the participants.²⁰ Work in the Youth Centre is not an eight to four o'clock business. We could watch people working until late at night. Generally, the enlargement doubled their work. It brought new tasks and difficulties, made them rethink their work, adapt their methods to the new demands, and to new kinds of problems²¹.

In spite of the problems and difficulties they encounter in their section as well as in the Council of Europe as such, they are happy to work there. They see the Centre as a good place for exchanging ideas and for meeting different people. It was striking for us that the majority of respondents claimed that they are happy to work here and not for the European Union. They claim that the European Union does not treat its members as equal partners, different types of exclusion take place there and there is a lack of social sensitivity.²²

The Youth Centre is a residential building with a friendly atmosphere, which also we as researchers could feel. Meeting with young people is on the everyday schedule. Working here offers for employees a lot of community space. We felt at first to be in an exceptionally egalitarian institution. But soon we learnt that it had its own interior rules,²³ and a strict hierarchy though generally the atmosphere was very different from the rest of the Council:

"It seems to be different from the rest of the Council. The atmosphere is quite relaxed, probably because there is direct contact. It is much more informal. Open doors, you can talk to people".

3.2. The Model of the Council - Whose Problem?

In the majority of our interviews with employees of the Council we find some kind of uncertainty about the model and its applicability to new members countries. We can say that it is to some extent a general problem of the Council of Europe, which has a specific significance here - in the educational sector.²⁴ We could feel that our respondents were aware of their position as agent of transfer and in connection with this reflected the model and transfer problems often. The topic came out even without putting a direct question. Also, could we observe some kind of awareness and suspicion which had arisen after hearing about our topic of interest and the countries we were coming from. Some people interviewed claimed that the worries about the transfer of a model was a particular western problem.

"There exists a western complex of fearing to impose any model on East European countries."

Aware of this problem they take the position of suggesting and showing how things could be. The need of dialog was often stressed²⁵ and the conviction that there is no one good model and no one good solution.

"We never try to go and say this is the way you should work, this is the way you should do things. It is more a question of exchanging experiences .. It's based on co-operation. We try to encourage the co-operation between two partners and in order to do that we try to show examples of what was done in other countries. How to find according to ones own condition the best solution. We don't have a solution. We try to be as able as possible and definitely to avoid becoming people who have a supervising solution."

On the other side a dialogue with the Eastern side is quite hard to establish and a dreary picture is drawn of those who have "too big expectations", who "feel like in Garden Eden" and who have a "certain kind of American dream" and are like "poor cousins at a rich cousins wedding". They are said not to make proposals or question the existing model, because they are not able "to share the doubts" or at least they are too polite to do so. Even if there is openness to dialogue, the other side does not respond²⁶ or responds just with curiosity. Or it has an attitude which hardly leads to dialogue²⁷. As a consequence it is the Western side that takes responsibility and evaluates and decides if the model is good.²⁸ What we heard sounded somehow like a western monologue about imposing something on the East.

"There is a general feeling among many people from the Western part of Europe that we should not impose any model, we should not have some kind of colonialist approach. It's the very first feeling, but at the same time we realise that they are interested very much in the American dream, in western pattern so they are really pushing us to pick up on all this, on living standards and cultural model"

Analysing the interviews we got the strong feeling the eastern side was not heard because their statements did not suit the picture that was expected. The Eastern side was supposed to complain more and to state difficulties as the Western side was penitently doing. Instead the Eastern member states asked for the creation of new programs. There was a demand for developing youth policy and youth activities. The number of participants seeking for a place in the training courses was increasing. They obviously wanted to learn more in this field.

4. Training courses - the Main Educational Tool of the Youth Centre

The idea of the training courses is rooted in the conviction that *to create new democratic pluralist structure you need to train the persons in this system*. The courses are run in co-operation with the European Youth Forum, and their aim is to enable young people actively involved in European youth questions to play an efficient and informed role in European and international youth work and to improve the quality of youth activities with an intercultural dimension.²⁹

At present the Centres run four types of training courses³⁰. All of these courses are designed for youth leaders, representatives, and delegates working in an international context. The philosophy behind this type of selection is that these youth leaders are perceived as multipliers, who should pass on what they have learned, spreading the values of the Council of Europe and thus contributing to the emergence of a European cultural identity. After the training they are

supposed to become agents of change and missionaries of the Councils youth policy and values.

4.1. The presentation of a training course

We participated in the training course *How to Organise International Youth Activities* (TC1), organised in the Youth Centre in Strasbourg between the 21st of June and the 4th of July 1998. The main aim of this course was to give an introduction to the basic concepts of organising youth activities and to encourage the reflection on intercultural learning. The educational team of the course was formed by two trainers from the European Youth Centre, two trainers appointed by the European Youth Forum³¹ as well as an external consultant.

The participants were between 18 and 30 years old, and according to the selection criteria they had to be actively involved in a youth organisations, preferably in the field of international cooperation or activities. There were 36 participants from 26 countries³², 18 girls and 18 boys, 27 of them between 18-25 years old, nine between 25-28³³. The selected participants were working in their youth organisation from half a year to 14 years. The average time for working in a youth organisation was around 4 to 5 years. The participants were selected from organisations with the following profiles: minority youth association, religious youth association, international student exchange organisations, organisations that promote intercultural learning, organisations with an ecological profile, one trade union, one handicraft organisation. During the selection process organisers try to ensure a balance between gender, cultural background, regions, different types of experience and organisations.

The main part of the course covered theoretical and practical aspects of organising international youth activities, as well as practical learning of different skills: setting objectives, working in a team, communication, preparing a program, setting and managing budgets. One other part of the training course focused on the intercultural education. The informal moments - free-time and leisure activities - were seen as indispensable parts of working and learning in an intercultural group context. The third part was political education, participants were informed about the Council of Europe and European Union structures and policies.

The course comprised lectures³⁴, workshops³⁵, simulation games³⁶, team work³⁷, presentations³⁸ and discussions³⁹ and leisure time activities⁴⁰ and it was intended to be a mutual learning situation based on the experience of the participants in youth work. Active participation, group- and teamwork, and learning by doing formed the basis of the course. The official language of the course was announced to be English and French. Therefore the majority of the participants spoke English, but a few of them spoke only Russian and no English or French. Because of this fact at the beginning of the course the educational team changed the second official language from French to Russian.

4.2. A general evaluation of the training course from the participants point of view

On the basis of the interviews and the discussions with the participants we can conclude that for the majority of the participants the training course was a positive experience.⁴¹ They appreciated the possibility to take part in the course, to meet people from different countries and to make new friends. Some of the participants emphasised the importance of these personal relationships for their further career:

"... it was important to get in touch with youth leaders from different countries, to make new contacts. Maybe some of them will become presidents, some of us something else and when you have, I mean the roots, I mean the base, and friendship will influence and promote a better understanding between each country. I will be actively in co-operating with these people".

All of the participants interviewed regarded the workshops connected with the project work (programming, lobbying, and budgeting) and the elaboration of the team-projects as the most useful part of the course. Some participants pointed out that besides the particular content of the course it was a benefic experience for them to observe how the educational team of the training course was working. We can affirm that a certain category of the participants were not simple consumers of the programme offered for them but they tried to understand at an upper level the educational process that was going on during the course.⁴²

"it was very interesting for me not to learn the exact content of that situation, but to observe the situation, and to see how the group reacts and the team acts, and to try just to do something at a superior level and to understand what is going on.

They (the team) are doing a good political job in such an environment, I am really impressed, they are incredibly skilled .. but I find it very-very ideological".

During our discussions with the members of the team they emphasised that in the non-formal education parts of the course they did not want to offer the right answers or the best solutions to the discussed problems. Their aim was to raise some questions connected with intercultural learning situations and to make the participants think about them. Our interviews showed that at least in some cases they achieved this aim.

"work here it make you to think, the games were very interesting for me, I learn a lot from them. They made me to think about some problems I just ignored before, . For instance I found that I am more nationalist than I thought I was. It's very good to realise it in order to change it. Because through those games I did notice I mean I found some areas which I should reconsider."

However there were participants who felt the lack of a kind of summarising the meaning of the simulation games. Some participants claimed that these games create artificial situations and their connection with real life is slight. Therefore they questioned the educational power of these games.

"I didn't like the game, because it didn't depend on my intellect I doesn't see analogy between the game and reality" (participants from South Eastern Europe in the plenary)

Some participants who, although sharing the view that the training course was very good and useful for them, formulated criticisms or proposals for improvement. Some of the participants claimed that there were too much information or that some information were presented too late therefore they could not use it in their projects. It was also mentioned that too much work that had to be done, the too strict program, the lack of time for discussions or for asking questions.⁴³ The schedule of the course was also criticised by some participants.⁴⁴

Interesting about these criticisms is that in our interviews all of them were formulated by participants coming from Western Europe. Although participants from Eastern countries formulated critical remarks during the course, in the interview they were not mentioning anything. A possible explanation of this fact could be that participants from the Eastern countries, because of their very limited possibilities to travel abroad, were thankful for the opportunity to participate in the training course in Strasbourg and they did not feel in the position to criticise anything.

5. Close encounter of the third kind - Meeting with East Europeans

5.1. The employees view on differences

We wanted to find out how those employees who participated in many training courses see the differences in the attitudes of Eastern and Western participants. For many of the interviewed employees the most important challenge of the enlargement was the encounter with East Europeans in different activities: in classical training courses, study sessions or in the new type of courses⁴⁵ organized by the Youth Directorate. This last type of training course place "the agent of transfer" not on the neutral ground of the Youth Center but in a place where they "do not have real knowledge about the specific context."

Looking for differences and specificity of East participants we generally get answers such as that "Eastern Europeans are not the other kind", that they are individuals and everybody has its own personality and it is not possible to generalise according to the region participants are coming from. Quite often we were told that there are bigger differences between the South and the North then between the East and the West. However, in relation to the differences between East and West it was stated that these differences increase as much as we are shifting to the East. While the countries of Central Europe did not present significant differences in comparison to the Western European countries, in the countries of the former Soviet Union differences appear. The more to the East a country is situated the bigger are the differences.

As a particular problem of the East Europeans the big expectations toward the Council were mentioned, their expectation to find experts there, their problem with discussing things and feelings all the time, with evaluating and reflecting. Also the problem with using and understanding some terms and concepts was mentioned. On the other side it was claimed that

Eastern Europeans are more eager to speak about the country they are representing.

The biggest difficulties for the people engaged in the training program was to allow for intercultural learning taking the form of non-formal education. This caused lot of discussions and internal criticism in the Youth Directorate. One of our respondent even claimed that Central and Eastern Europeans have different needs for education. They prefer lectures, debates and cognitive learning. This preference was explained and belittled by identifying such needs with their inclination to listening to authority and characterised as a teacher student relationship:

"Young people are more used to have training with more formal structure: teacher - student relationships. And these activities which you know are exercises and little groups and games. Sometimes they say that it is not serious business for them. We are here to do some serious work. Forget about these silly children games, let's do some serious business. It takes some time before they realise that, well it's a game, but it is still a serious business. It comes out from it. It's not something you can obtain from a teacher to student relationship. It comes from personal involvement."

We met many antagonistic statements and it is hard to generalise. The real source of differences is seen in the past regime, which caused different position and perception of individual in society, a tendency to passivity and to waiting for something what will be brought by authority. We could identify two opposite tendencies: a tendency to overestimate the differences and a tendency to suppress the differences. In both cases it was stressed that it is a problematic view and it could have unpleasant consequences.

5.2. Young participants attitude toward differences

We were curious to find out how the participants in the training course we observed think about differences (cultural, personal) and how they evaluate the intercultural meeting that took place during the two weeks. The majority of the participants claimed that there were no differences between them because of their culture or because of the region they were coming from. They emphasised that the similarities between them are much more important then the differences⁴⁶ and attributed the differences mostly to the personal ones.⁴⁷ Only a few persons from those interviewed thought that it is just normal that they are different from each other because they were born and grew up in different cultures

"Of course they are different and of course they have different values. Because every people has his own world vision, values, culture. So when the people come here they get information about different cultures and values. When they making a symbiosis they are making something. They are adding good stuff and they learning something and this of course promotes understanding. European people have different values."

From the interviews it seems that the participants tried to avoid to take the existence of cultural differences for granted. Instead, they preferred to think about other participants as individual personalities not as representatives of a certain culture. However if we examine all the differences mentioned in these interviews we can find both personal (language skill, age, education, organisational skills) and social or cultural ones (gender⁴⁸, regions-economic

situation, ethnicity and religion⁴⁹.) What was interesting for us was not that these differences came out during the course but to observe how these youth leaders tolerated these differences.

What we could see did not make us very optimistic about the future of a multicultural Europe. Even these young people who considered themselves more open than the average citizen from their countries⁵⁰ have a very low degree of tolerating differences. Even if the majority of the participants had a good time in the course it was sad to see that those who were in some aspect different felt excluded (who didn't speak English- was seen as a problem⁵¹, who does not accept the authoritarian leadership style felt frustrated⁵², who was not enough European felt stupid⁵³) or even were stigmatised. (who was too educated was stigmatised as a strange person, who speaks too much, who refused to work in the rhythm imposed by the course was seen as lazy and it was questioned what is he was doing here⁵⁴)

One of the main principles of the Council is democracy, and democratic participation. If the training course is seen as an educational tool the principle of democracy was for sure among the values that it wanted to promote. If we take the definition that the level of development of a democracy can be judged by the treatment of its minorities we can have some doubts about how the democratic values were put into the practice by the young participants in TC1. While the majority of the participants had a good time, there were some participants who felt excluded. The rest of the participants did not observe this exclusion⁵⁵ or did not want to deal with it. Not one of these problems was discussed in plenary sessions either.

6. Eurocentrism-europism

Only one of the participants claimed that the western values were prevailing in the course. In his opinion the course was about competition and he thought that nobody was really taking care of the other. The relationships that were established were seen as superficial by him and mostly serving the achievement of some organisational or career goal. The fact that their accommodation was provided in separate rooms was seen by him as an obstacle to creating more close friendships. While he was speaking about the idea of separate rooms he mentioned their (western European) hang up on privacy, that for him was not an important issue at all.

There was an other participant who also perceived the course as being eurocentric:

"I came here not to learn about intercultural learning, but to learn about how people think, how people react to such a thing. However, when I come here and I hear people talking about intercultural learning I realised that they are speaking about inter-European learning..Somebody asked whatever the Youth for Europe is for the support of European identity. It was said that no, it is not for that. But we, or at least me we are not naive. I had to play theatre." (Turkish girl living in Germany, graduate student)

She claimed that basic concepts of the course, such as the concept of "project" itself for example, were taken for granted without anyone taking into account that this concept could

have a different meaning for a person who did not grow up in a western country.

What has to made us to think seriously about this issue is that in this case not colonised people from outside of Europe are claiming the eurocentric attitude. Both of the participants are young people who are living in Europe, but who feel somehow excluded from it or at least different from its norms. What is then Europe, whose Europe it is or who are the Europeans? And who will be those people living in Europe who will be the others. Those who will resist to assimilate the shared values? The literature on nationalism uses already the concept of Europism as a new form of nationalism. What has to be addressed is the question how the growing awareness about European unity not to lead to europism.

6.1. Intercultural learning: a possible solution?

In the Council of Europe's conception intercultural learning should be the solution to encountering differences. We wanted to find out how the intercultural learning is going on in practice. In the first day of the training course the participants were told that they are here in three roles, as representatives of their countries, as delegates of their organisations and as individuals.

In the intercultural and interculinar evenings participants had to represent their countries. Each participant had to put on the table something specific for his/her country. Many of these specific things were bought from the supermarket and it the appearance of a traditionally dressed girl from Georgia with some cakes made by her mother especially for this occasion was like a curiosity. The high point of this evening was to be the consummation of these foods. However, it seemed that for the majority of the participants the presented food had not a special symbolic meaning or significance.

When the participants had to present something from the spiritual culture of their country, some stereotypical representations came out. Folk-dances or folk songs were performed mostly by participants from Eastern European countries where the official representation of tradition is still closely connected with the folk-culture that is usually seen as the expression of "The true national identity". It was to be seen that what the participants felt obliged to present was not something very close to their everyday life experience. Some felt clearly embarassed by presenting them. Some participants from Western or Central European countries presented little games they used to play or pieces of music they liked. It was only one participant who was speaking about her personal experience of what it means for her being a minority women in Germany, but nobody paid attention to her and the majority of the participants was bored by her discourse. There were participants who did not want to present anything, however they were compelled to do it by the rest of the group. All participants had to play here the role of the representatives of their countries and as we could observe some of them did not feel comfortable at all in this role. It was interesting to see, however, that the atmosphere has changed when the official part of the intercultural evening was finished and the normal party began. The participants, released from the burden of representing something were dancing happily to Macarena and other music what they felt seemingly more close to then what was

presented by them a few minutes before.

We can affirm that in this first part of the intercultural evening maybe an intercultural meeting took place but not an intercultural learning or dialog. We are not suggesting that intercultural learning did not take place during the training course. It certainly took place, but not in the formal parts of the above mentioned events. In the personal or small group discussions, in the team-work, during lunch or dinner, in pow-how groups or at the parties, when participants could be just themselves, and not representatives or delegates, they had the opportunity to see how they differ and in what they were similar with each other.

6.2. European Unity Mission Impossible?⁵⁶

Young participants about the Council of Europe, European Integration and Europe

If we examine the motivations of the participants for taking part in the training course TC1 we can see that they are generally focused around the next items: to learn organisational skills, to exchange ideas with other people, to establish new contacts.⁵⁷ None of them mentioned that he or she would like to become the missionary of the Council. The question that arises then is whether the young participants are seen by the Council of Europe as some tool for implementing a certain policy or for advertising the Council or whether they take part in the courses to satisfy their own needs and interests.

We tried to find out what they knew about the Council of Europe before the course and what they learned about it in the training course. While discussing about this topic some participants were addressing the issue of European integration too. All of the participants heard about the Council of Europe before they came to the training course. Some of them learned about it in the school or university, others heard or read about it in the media or during elections. Some participants mentioned that he/she knew only that the Council existed and nothing more, that is was one of the many Euro institutions. Others had a more clear image, for example they knew that it is different from EU but they didn't know exactly how it differed. However, all of the participants mentioned that their previous knowledge about the Council was an impersonal one.

"I knew what we learned in school for me then it was just a stuff to memorise, I knew for example that the Council of Europe is different from the European Union, but the difference was not clear to me at all, I had a slight idea about it, but nothing concrete, just that it exists, it is one of the organisations among many others, that works for peace, Until now my knowledge about the Council was impersonal, my colleagues used to talk about it (the Council of Europe) but then it was in a jargon for me, I didn't understand too much.,I knew that there were all those Europe things, Euro-buildings Euro- I don't know how they call it. But I know, that I did not know what are they doing, I didn't know the difference between different kinds of Euro-organisations. I had a big mess in my mind about the Council of Europe."

All of them emphasised that here they get a personal knowledge about the Council and due to this they feel it more close to them now. What was important for the participants was the direct contact with the Council: they visited the building, saw its employees, and lived in one of its

residential areas:

"now I learned a lot about it, this is a completely different knowledge, lets say more lively, or more meaningful information. That's because the context in which I get this information., What is different that now I have a personal contact with it, now it means more for me., Now I don't mix the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, and European Union. You learn here how to approach the system., now I feel it more close to me, now it's like a practical exercise to see the Council of Europe. Now I have something personal , I mean more personal information about it."

Taking into account the importance the participants gave to the personal contact with the Council it is predictable that it will remain for the majority of young people a distant institution, one of the many Euro institutions where only some privileged people, like the leaders get access.

A survey carried out four years ago among European adolescents⁵⁸ shows that youth from Eastern countries are more enthusiastic about EU then those from West.⁵⁹ Although not all of the interviewed participants felt that they would have something special to say about the issue of European integration those who formulated an opinion confirmed the above mentioned attitude. One participants from Iceland for example was quite sceptical about the issue of integration⁶⁰ and she observed that participants from poorer countries are more eager to do something to change their situation and are more passionate about the issue of European integration.

" I feel that countries that are not so wealthy are more anxious to have some work done. And they want their improvements to be done first, because their conditions are really bad. And I can really understand that they have a great motivation for integration I mean I am not doing my organisation work because I think everything is terrible. I do my work because I think it could be better. I can feel it that they get more intense often during the discussions, they are more patient about their work in lot of ways."(participant from Iceland)

The participants from Georgia or Ukraine confirmed her opinion. They were very enthusiastic about European integration and seemed to be open to assimilate the western tradition.

"I want to help. I want to be more close to European traditionI really want to be part of Europe, not to go in the direction of the East .. to be like Turkey, or Albania. I want to help, to solve the problems, to bring a little peace, to help to bring my people to Europe". (Ukraine)

"and one thing we want is integration in the international life. Because we want to be integrated in Europe, we try to involve Georgian Youth so they can participate also on international level activities and in international life" (Georgia)

The Georgian participants however consider themselves different from the Europeans:

"This is my first time in Europe. For me it is a great opportunity to come here because I didn't understand European people. How these European people think, how they think about something, I didn't know before how they look like, what problems they have, what problems they have not. I understand them very little -because I did not meet European

people before." (participant 1 from Georgia)

"I've never worked with people from different countries. I mean at all. Here you can analyse how the people in Europe are thinking. I mean what are their problems. First thing is that they are very nice people. But European people are different. It looks that Palestine, Macedonian and Georgia seem to be closer to each other. I mean we have something in common I mean the East-South is different from the North, and I mean Europe. ..The Eastern and the Southern people are more undeveloped, they are poorer, the traditional way and culture is very different from Europe. Europe is a classic tradition which already got the biggest economy and biggest influence in this territory, its simple. In Georgia the understanding and mentality is different, it's not depending everything on money. So, I mean people have different values, because they already when they are born they live in these conditions.. And the mentality is very different, you can talk to everybody in your country and when you talk with European..... of course I am not saying that they are..... no, they are very, very smart people. They have open mind, open brain..... They are smart." (participant 2 from Georgia)

and they are aware that in order to become integrated in the European structures the different values have to be balanced:

"The values are different and you have to balance them and that is the problem to integrate into European structures." (participant 2 Georgia)

The intercultural meetings could be a place where the negotiation of values could take place. What could be those values that should stay at the base of our European identity and that should be shared by all Europeans? We were curious to find out what answers give those people who are involved in the training of the next generation of Europeans.

The employees attitude toward the common values of Europeans

We asked them what is the key word for European identity in their opinion. It was said that this question is still discussed very much and it is hard to define it. As core elements of this identity were mentioned the common geographical space⁶¹, the power which made the Council of Europe exist⁶², cultural heritage⁶³, common history, diversity, humanist kind of approach. Human rights was also mentioned several times as an unifying aspect and a common value:

"We have certain number of values which are common to all of us, they are actually European values but they are universal as well."

"Personally I believe or at least think that there are a number of common values, which we have or I would like all people share. They are not necessarily the same values as on the other continent."

"I mean all those values are things which make us similar to each other. Me coming from Turkey, Iceland, Romania So, we have these things and we are trying to go in this direction to improve all those. This makes us work together and be same at the certain point. It's why the Council of Europe is here and why we work for it."

"There are universal values, these values unify the people from all over Europe"

As such values were claimed human rights⁶⁴, democracy, respect, tolerance, respect for differences, social work field, co-operation, gender equality, respect to human dignity.

"There are certain immaterial values first of all rule of law. You don't recognise them as such but if you loose them you recognise that you are in a Gulag."

The employees personally engaged in training found it harder to formulate the basis of a European identity.

"The basic question of human rights. Yes, it's institutionally said but personally I found that there are certain rights which people need to have in every country. Things like tolerance, respect, respect and equal value for every person in society, respect of gender. I think things like this are basic values. I am hesitant to go any further, . There are a lot of problems and you have to be very careful with these things..And than what we will make of it I wonder sometimes. There is as much difference as there is in common."

Conclusion

In this paper we focused our attention on the activity of the Youth Centre and we proposed to achieve a better understanding of the work that is done there by analysing one of its main activities: a training course. Our aim was to find out how the youth policy of the Council of Europe and its basic principles (democracy, human rights, the rule of law, participation, the raising of European consciousness) are put into practice in this particular environment, how this policy is understood by those who have to put it into practice and finally how it is received by those for whom it is designed: the youth leaders.

The picture we got after the five weeks of fieldwork is an interesting one. The very coherent and well defined aims of the Council concerning its basic principles show a more blurred picture at the level of those employees of the Council's Youth Directorate who have to put these values or basic principles into practice. We could observe the difficulties these employees face while trying to find proper modalities through which these values and principles can be transferred to young people during the different activities organised for them. This process of transfer became even more difficult after the enlargement of the Council with countries from Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. The employees are confronted with the fear of becoming some kind of colonialists or people who brainwash young people's minds. For this reason they reflect intensely and evaluate critically their work all the time. The solution that it is preferred by them in this process of value transfer is to raise questions connected with the basic values of the Council, to make the participants think about these issues and to apply these principles during their activities rather than to "offer" this values for the participants as "The Values" they should follow. The most difficult issue seems to be the task of raising the European consciousness of these young people. When the "agents of transfer" themselves face difficulties in formulating what "European" means for them, then the difficulties they face while transferring this hardly definable "europeanness " to the young people are easy to imagine.

We also presented in this paper the attitude of young participants toward Europe and its institutions, especially toward the Council of Europe, its programs and toward the question of European integration. Although the majority of young participants had a more or less clear picture about the Council of Europe before the training course, this was perceived rather as a

distant institution, one of the many "Euro-institutions". What they appreciated in the training course was that it made it possible for them to "get in a personal contact with the Council" and through this to feel that it is an institution that exists for them too. The problem of European integration was perceived differently by the Western than the Eastern European participants. While the first group was less enthusiastic or even skeptical regarding the process of integration the East European participants were speaking more enthusiastically about it. However, some participants from Eastern Europe perceived themselves as different from "the Europeans" and their countries different from the "European traditions". They emphasised that the balancing of these different traditions is a necessary step for a successful integration. While they claimed that they are ready and eager to get integrated in the "European tradition", some participants from already integrated countries, but who feel somehow excluded from these, posed a certain resistance toward the "integration" in European tradition. In their view this integration is more an assimilation and is a result of an eurocentric attitude that defines the norms of Europeness and excludes those who do not correspond to these norms. This attitude is defined in the scientific literature as "europism" and it is perceived as a new form of nationalism. The attitude of these young Europeans should be a signal for those who have a word to say on the policies of integration of young people.

When one goes down from the declarative level of the very coherent and well defined principles of the Council and from the good intentions and efforts met at the level of employees to the moment when these principles have to be effectively put into practice the picture one got is less satisfying. The actual philosophy on which the selection of the participants for the training courses is done favors a very limited number of young people. How much the majority of young people will benefit from the activity of these multipliers and at what degree these training course will serve the interests of this small elite group of selected youth leaders is a question that has to be addressed. Going further we could see that the principle of democracy is not always functioning even inside these selected group of youth leaders. Those participants who were somehow different from the "norm" of a European youth leader felt themselves excluded from the group. These inadequacies can be partially the fault of the organisers but can also be the manifestation of some European youth leader's low level of tolerance toward differences. Because the youth policy is based to an important degree on these young European leaders it is important to see what kind of leaders are trained. When they are insensitive toward people who are different from them also the future of a Europe of differences is endangered.

Notes

1 Franco Marziale. A glimpse of utopia. In *Year Book of Youth Directorate, 1996/1997*, Strasbourg

2 we studied the official publications of the Youth Directorate and the different rapports about the youth sector, listed in the bibliography.

3 In Training Course 1: How to Organise International Youth Activities

4 we were eating there, spending there the siesta, playing billiard in our free time

5 24 September 1968 an report by Marcel Hicter *Un monde malade de sa jeunesse*, and a second report in 1969 that was concerned more directly with devising a youth policy

6 Daniel Menschart. Study on the Policies and Activities in the Youth Sector of the Council of Europe, Council of Europe publication, Strasbourg August 1997

7 In the time we were conducting our research a process of evaluation and transformation took place tackling also changes in the co-managed structure.

8 Network of National Youth Councils.

9 Network of youth organisation working on European level.

10 How the name of the unit implies its aim is to provide intergovernmental co-operation. Its tools are regular meetings and conferences of European ministers responsible for youth. CDEJ also manages a system of national reviews of youth policy.

11 As an example for clashes between governments and Governing board decision was used the situation when shocked governments had to accept the decision of the Governing board to support a program of Youth Homosexual Organisation, involved in AIDS prevention.

12 the presentation of above mentioned changes was made on the base of the Daniel Menschart rapport: *Study on the Policies and Activities in the Youth Sector of the Council of Europe*, Council of Europe publication, Strasbourg August 1997

13 see more about this issue in Peter Lauritzen. Description of an experiment in Learning about the Grater Europe in *Yearbook of the Youth Directorate 1996-1997*

14 see a more detailed description of the main objectives of the Councils youth sector at Priority tasks

15 Kéri, László. Europe is a Geographical Expression, Nothing More. Perspectives of Sociology and Political Science. In Magne Angvik and Bodo von Borries (eds.) *Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political Attitudes among Adolescents*. Vol 1. Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung, 1997, pg. A 428

16 of the Youth Directorate in Menschaert, Daniel. Study on the Policies and Activities in the Youth Sector of the Council of Europe, Council of Europe, MEP(97) 19 Stasbourg, 1997 m pp. 28

17 The quotations from lecture given by Mr. Lauritzen in a training course for minority youth leaders in Slovakia, in 1995 and published in the report about this course written by Vanyi, Balint : *The Beauty of the World. situation and perspectives of minority young people in Europe* edited by the Youth Directorate.

18 What is important to know, is that work is carried out from an educational angle. Of course we are tackling social problems, we are tackling drugs problems, we are tackling unemployment problems but from an educational point of view. This centre is not a social welfare institution, it is not the role of the youth sector to solve all the problems of the young people. What we can do is for example to train young people, to inform so that when they are back home they can do something in their town, in their village to help with these problems.

19 Working in Youth Centre in Budapest is my life. She is very happy to work with the Council of Europe because in the youth organisations from Romania she would not succeed to get a position because of corruption in the Romania Youth Ministry.

20 Special task of Roma study session, or training courses in Bosnia.

21 The work is made harder by some special East European multipliers falsifying and multiplying visa provided by the Council of Europe for their East European colleagues.

22 It is ambivalent, but it seems that weakness and strength of the Council of Europe lies in its function as transition and preparation station for EU. The Council of Europe was always praised and highly appreciated in comparison with European Union. And I do think that the Council of Europe is more than other European institutions open to what happens actually in the countries. I think it gives more space. Not only to tell people what to do. It's small thing but it does help. European Union gives the standards. There is no space for discussing or for negotiation. Just do or don't. And I think it's really a different approach. And we are used to say that we are sometimes a laboratory of ideas for European Union. Which can take them up, because they have the money. We have the ideas and they have the money. There is little bit rivalry between us. We are jealous of their money and they are jealous of our ideas. There is a lot of problems, but I still believe in this institution. I am happy to be here not European Union.

European Union is just for rich people. It puts such pressure on countries, which I don't like.

23 And in connection with this is much less flexible than Youth Centre in Budapest.

24 In interview there emerged reflection that CE is completely western organisation or organisation with western dominance. The problem of organisation is that it did not recognise that after enlargement its eastern border is Japan. From one respondent's answer we got following illustration: The train was running and they just put new carriage and nobody asked which direction. Most common were statements stressing that the Council of Europe is poor organisation in sense of money and power. It was mentioned many times that the Council of Europe does not have any or at least much power, it is a weak organisation with none impact. It sets standards but is not able to push countries to keep them. And also vice versa, as it doesn't have power, it is not able to respond to expectations of new members countries.

25 We have to be equal partners and find what we want to build together..

26 I came to Budapest to learn something, but they do not want to teach me anything.

27 In some country some people will react saying we do not have anything to learn from you what you pretend teaching us we know how to work with organisation.

28 To deal with this problem Youth Directorate developed a new sector a research sector to develop more scientific approach to the questions to understand better the situation.

29 Council of Europe, Youth Directorate. Training Course I. How to Organise International Youth Activities. Strasbourg, November 1997

30 How to Organise International Youth Activities (TC1), Working in International Youth Structures (TC2), Training for Trainers (TC3), and Long Term Training Course on International Youth Work

31 European Youth Forum: set up in 1996 by national youth councils and international non-governmental youth organisations from Europe. EYF acts as a political representative for young people in discussions with the institutions of European Union, the Council of Europe, the United Nations and similar bodies.

32 Ukraine 2, Russia 1, Latvia 1, Lithuania 2, Iceland 2, Finland 2, Estonia 1, Albania 1, Belarus 1, Georgia 2, Norway 1, Malta 1, Denmark 2, Luxembourg 1, Spain 2 one Catalan, Portugal 1, Netherlands 1, Romania 1-Hungarian, Palestine 1, Germany 1-Turkish, Moldova 1, Greece 1, Slovenian 2, Hungary 2, Macedonia 2, Poland 1

33 the distribution of the participants according to their ages: 18-5, 19-2, 20-3, 21-8, 22-2, 23-2, 24-1, 25-5, 26-5, 27-0, 28-4

34 European Structures: Council of Europe, Youth Directorate, European Union

What is a project?

What is culture? Thoughts, models and definitions

Foundations and Programmes: European Youth Centres, European Youth Foundation, European Union: Youth for Europe

35 Project management workshop, Leadership and Motivation, Conflict management, Visions: personal and organisational, Visions and Change, Workshops on: Programming, Lobbying, Methodology, Budgeting

36 Albatross (intercultural learning); Whom would you take with you , and Card game (stereotypes and prejudices), Make a little change on you (change, identity), Sheet of paper on the back (evaluation)

37 Themes and teams, Project work, Creative presentation of the projects

38 European Youth Center-briefly, Aims and Objectives of the Course, Training code of conduct, Youth structures, Types of Project,

39 Resources and needs, Each other realities, work, background; Motivations-the timeline

40 intercultural evening, interculinary evening, barbecue, diner in Strasbourg

41 I am very pleased with all the training course I don't see any problems, I think it was very well prepared. It was an Introduction course, and the training course was exactly what its title suggested: an introduction. And for this purpose I think it was perfect. Everything is very organised and describe to the details. Its knowledge, skills and confidence and know how things works. Now I feel like everything is possible, I feel more confident and I feel more optimistic.

42 I am older then the team. For me it was a question to observe them because I think that I get more experience then some of the members of this group and I am also eager to learn these things to lead a group, to work with a team, not only to be a participant. Therefore it was very interesting to see the different working styles, also what is important for other participants who are they, how they thing about some things. I tried to observe the way these trainers worked with the group, with people coming from different countries, different cultures

I am looking for the way the team leaders work with us, how they do the games, what is the outcome, what are the questions raised by the games. The games, you know made us think more deeply about some problems

I was watching the team during their work and it was a great experience. I am impressed. I liked almost every exercise what they made us to do. I am going to have an international course in August and I am going to use some material from here.

43 sometimes we didn't have enough time, that we had to work during lunch, for example or during dinner. I don't think that this is a good method., I would try to be very strict on the timetable, I mean the coffee break to be coffee break not work-break, for example I would put less hard information on such a short time. We get a lot of hand out so I think who is interested in something can read about it , I wanted to make a comment, because I am quite skeptical, Ive got a lot of question to ask. And I didn't get time to ask. So I felt frustrated.

44 in the first couple of days we didn't learn anything, we did the games and it was really nice, we getting to know each other, and that is very important too, but all of us come here to learn something, come here with a lot of expectations and if after 2 days you feel that you didn't learned anything new your enthusiasms will probably fall down. This was bad.

45 It is new type of course specially designed for new members countries - former Demosthenes program now International training courses in central and eastern European countries or Assistance program for the Development and Consolidation of democratic stability was created. Its specificity is to one country, where the program takes place. The managing team is composed from Council of Europe secretarial site, one of the tutors. It has also international dimension offering exchanging experience.

The program is founded and managed by European Youth Foundation. One of the main aims is to bring together people from governmental and non-governmental sector, encouraging to adopt new youth policies and reinforcement non-governmental sector. There is stable core of the program similar to program of training course and then so called ala carta part of the program where they decide according the needs..

46 there are some differences but we are young people and it's quiet easy to communicate, we do not represent the normal citizens from our countries, we all are coming from youth organisations, we are more open for changes, we are all hard working, we are facing a lot of problems in our countries, we have the same ideas and interests, we have certain aim to get know each other, we are more cosmopolitan., with more connection with Europe, Of course there are some differences but we are young people and it's quiet easy to communicate. Of course we are here with certain aim and we have the same interest because we are Youth organisation. That point in character which we have everybody in common. Even you see some differences but when you sit down and talk I don't think it matters. Because you can communicate.

47 for example I come from B. but it doesn't necessary mean that all people from B. are like me, I would rather stress the personally differences then the differences do to the region or country we are coming from, you have to judge person not region

48 I was really worried before I come here, that I am a girl, I am so young, nobody will speak to me

49 for instance we have two Muslims. Muslims are different of course.

50 See quotation from footnote no.30

51 In our pow how group it was J. and he speaks only Russian, and it was a little bit difficult because we always had to translate for him.. and sometime it was just more easy for us to ignore him(participant)

52 I felt very frustrated. If you don't agree you are seen as stupid, who did not fight is seen weak. But one more week and I will go home and I will have not to deal with these people it does not depend on the country it depends on the persons attitudes I don't like that it seems that there are two possibilities Or you are weak or you are authoritative, and hated

53 I felt as a stranger here. Let me give you an example. Let us take the notion of project, for example. In my country this concept has a totally different meaning then it has in Europe. Our world project means life project for example, in any case it is something not very clearly set up, ambiguous. In opposition with it in Europe the project has an aim, it has a budget, a timetable, a start and a deadline, and things like that. We didn't have this concept of project, and I have no skills to make a this kind of project while those from Europe, even if I am much more educated then them have this skill of writing projects .and I felt so stupid. If you have this skill of writing project is OK, if you have not nobody is interested in what you know. This can you give a little clue how I felt here. Neither my team, nor these young people would understand me because they are already in the process of integration (assimilation?) in Europe.

54 Some of the people were not chosen well but this is the fault of the organisation that sent them here. But this is my very subjective opinion. People were coming here to work. And if they are not motivated to work on a project, or to come even to the project because they are tired and they don't want to spend their whole life with work, ok, but this is a training course, not a holiday. Maybe this was not clear for them but for me it was very clear from the every beginning that I will came her to work not to rest.

I have problems with x. He is this kind of take-it-easy person, and he takes everything easy and I don't think that it is always good. He is funny and nice but he could get sometimes on my nerves. I was very nervous and angry with him, it was really difficult to work with him

55 Participant were very open , everybody speaks with everybody, I didn't felt excluded., and I think nobody felt excluded

56 the title of one groups project from TC1

57 Participants motivation as stated in the application forms: to develop ability to organise international youth activities,to increase the quality of the activities in youth organisation, to establish new contacts, exchange ideas and methods, to know more about youth organisations, improve the possibilities of cooperation, working with youth people in context of cultural diversity, learn financial managing, to learn skills, competence in international youth work, to learn organisational skills

58 15 years in 1994 when the survey was carried out, so 19 years in 1998 when the training course TC1 took place. Therefore the participants from the training course belong to the generation on which the survey it was effected.

59 Andreas Körber. Knowledge, Associations and Concepts in In Magne Angvik and Bodo von Borries (eds.) Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political Attitudes among Adolescents. Vol 1. Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung, 1997, pg. A 143

60 I am quite skeptical, I am not against E.U. not at all. But I am skeptical and before I start praising the E.U. Ive got a lot of question to ask. And I didn't get time to ask. So I felt frustrated. Join and no matter what. But I have a lot of question to ask.

61 What it means to be European is somehow related to the reality I that the Europe exists, if we believe in it or not..

62 It is very difficult, but I will answer very easily. I think this identity is what made a institution like Council of Europe come out and be created. .Now there are institutions working for it to promote European identity or European construction it's also that part of it. It's here

63 As Europeans we have in common our cultural heritage. I would say a cultural heritage which makes us different from the States for example.

64 All men deserve equal treatment. Unfortunately you can't brainwashed people to understand that everybody has unique equal value