This paper is taken from

Teaching Citizenship
Proceedings of the seventh Conference of the
Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe
Thematic Network

London: CiCe 2005

edited by Alistair Ross, published in London by CiCe, ISBN 1 85377 389 1

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as

Ross, A. (2005) Introduction: Constructing Citizenship through Teaching, in Ross, A. (ed) Teaching Citizenship***. London: CiCe, pp 1-11.***

Introduction: Constructing Citizenship through Teaching[1]

Alistair Ross
International Coordinator, CiCe

This collection brings together a series of edited papers from the seventh CiCe conference held in Ljubljana in May 2005. The conference had has as its theme the teaching of citizenship, and in this introduction focuses first on the nature of citizenship and how citizenship is constructed, and secondly on the role of teaching and learning in that process of construction. In considering the construction of citizenship, citizenship will be illustrated both as a construct in nation-building (taking the example of a recently independent nation, Slovenia) and at citizenship as a construct in building a non-national entity (the European Union). The role of teaching and learning in how citizenship could be taught will be illuminated by drawing on the work of Jerome Bruner.

What is meant by Citizenship? Citizenship is an important aspect of our identities: it is that aspect that involves our political involvement and participation in a community – traditionally, as W J M Mackenzie described it, a community associated with a place:

> … those who share an interest share an identity; the interest of each requires the collaboration of all. Those who share a place share an identity. *Prima facie* this is a fair statement, whether 'the place' is taken to be 'space-ship earth'; or a beloved land; or a desolate slum or a public housing scheme. (Mackenzie, 1978)

Citizenship thus requires the collaboration of all. Citizenship, in this sense, can be seen as a duty, a necessary part of being a member of a community. For a community to work, the members must participate. Involvement or participation is an active state – it is not merely accepting a label, assenting to be a part of something. Finally, it is something that everyone should do: it is a communal activity, not just a spectator activity, and certainly not an elite pursuit.

Citizenship also relates to identities, in the plural. While legal citizenship may be confined, we can in the broader sense be citizens of several 'places', as Mackenzie puts it – citizens of earth, or citizens of the traditional and original *polis*, the city – and of a range of 'places' in between. Formally and in law, those who are citizens of states in the European Community are citizens of both their own individual nation-states and citizens of Europe.

There are three particular definitions of citizenship that will be drawn on in the following argument: the work of T H Marshall in the 1950s, Karel Vasak in the late 1970s, and John Urry in the 1990s.

Marshall (1946) was first to suggest that citizenship is essentially about the establishment and the exercise of rights. Citizenship was a process of belonging to a political entity that gave its members the protection of particular rights. Rights are intrinsically that which is defined by citizenship: as Montero (1992) puts it, 'The defining and primordial element of citizenship is the enjoyment of political rights'.

---

[1] This is an edited version of one of the keynote lectures that opened the conference

The idea that all people have 'rights' is a relatively new concept. Thomas Hobbes, writing in the 17th Century, said that without civil government the life of people was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" (1651, *The Leviathan*, Ch 13), but that nevertheless, people are born with rights: the rights to life and liberty (Ch 14). John Locke added to this the right to property. In his *Second Treatise on Government*, (1690, Ch 5) he argues that natural law begins and ends with the natural right of property: the purpose of civil government, he argued, was to protect property and the right of property.

Traditionally, these rights were granted by a nation state, and Hobbes, Locke and others devised explanations of how civil society was a contractual relationship between people, who agreed to join together to create systems of person-made law that guaranteed particular rights – of liberty, property, political participation and freedom of expression. These rights were dependant – unlike the absolutism or divine right that had characterised much political authority up this point in history – on the consent of the people.

It was Marshall, writing in 1950, who suggested that there had been three stages in the development of citizenship – citizenship gave civil rights in the eighteenth century, political rights in the nineteenth century, and social rights in the twentieth century. Civil rights included the right to property, privacy, and to freedom of expression; political rights extended voting rights from the richer male property owners to the poor and to women; and social rights include education, health care, social security.

The early definitions of civil rights, by contract philosophers such as Hobbes and Locke, were incorporated in the English Bill of Rights of 1689, which set out the conditions of parliament for the invitation to William of Orange to become a constitutional monarch: the king had to acknowledge the right of Parliament (and not of the King) to make and enforce laws, raise taxes and maintain an army, and that elections to Parliament should be free, its meetings frequent, and its proceedings free from interference.

The American Declaration of Independence nearly ninety years later spelt these rights out rather more clearly:

> "… all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."
>
> (Unites States, 1776)

The French Revolution led to the adoption by the French National Assembly in 1789, of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. Probably drafted partly by Mirabeau (who had written "Toute l'Europe a applaudi au sublime manifeste des États-Unis d'Amérique", and partly by Lafayette, the links to the American Declaration are clear.

The French Declaration lists additional rights: the right to resist oppression, the right to have officials responsible to the public, and Freedom was defined as 'the power to do anything which does not harm another: therefore, the only limits to the exercise of each person's natural rights are those which ensure that the other members of the community enjoy those same rights'.

These rights – in France, England and the USA – were not uniformly upheld at the time, or subsequently. In particular, slavery, colonisation and the treatment of indigenous populations were not seen as subject to these rights. Very often women were not seen as

included in statements of rights. Other countries began to adopt similar statements of rights in the centuries that followed, but again, often with (in practice) limited applicability. For example, at the 1815 Congress of Vienna, held by the states that had defeated Napoleon, condemned the slave trade as inconsistent with human rights, but did little to acknowledge the demands for greater democracy and self-determination). It was only very gradually that these kinds of rights became to be seen as universal.

But these were only the first stage of Marshall's trilogy of human rights. His next two stages – political and social rights followed in many parts of the world. The Czech jurist Karel Vasak has proposed dividing human rights into three generations, divided according to the watchwords of the French Revolution: Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. These in many ways extend Marshall's division (1979/1982).

First-generation human rights concern liberty. They are civil and political in nature, protecting the individual from the state. They include freedom of speech, the right to a fair trial, and freedom of religion. They are largely negative rights, and are seen at the global level in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948): they summate Marshall's first two waves of rights.

Second-generation human rights concern equality, and are essentially social, economic, and cultural in nature. They should lead to different citizens having equal conditions and treatment, the right to work and to be employed, and thus the ability to support a family. These are largely positive rights – things the State should provide for its people. Some of these are found in Articles 22 to 27 of the Universal Declaration: more are detailed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (United Nations, 1966). This range of rights is, very broadly, equivalent to Marshall's third wave of rights.

Third-generation human rights concern fraternity and solidarity, and focus on the rights an individual has as a claim upon society. Generally, this third generation has not yet been addressed in any binding human rights agreement, but we are now extending our idea of rights yet further. The third writer on rights to be introduced is John Urry, who suggests six new categories of rights:

- Cultural citizenship – each culture has the right to preserve its identity

- Minority citizenship – minorities have rights to reside in and remain in other societies, and have as full rights as the dominant group

- Ecological citizenship – the right to live in a sustainable environment

- Cosmopolitan citizenship – everyone has the right to relate to other citizens, cultures and societies without state interference

- Consumer citizenship – the rights to open access to goods, services and information

- Mobility citizenship – the rights of visitors and tourists moving through other countries and societies (Urry, J.,1995)

What is also changing, in our time, are ideas about who makes these rights, who grants them. In its original sense, citizenship was membership of a political community which brought with it rights to political participation, and certain duties. As Mackenzie said, it was associated with a place. The traditional rights of citizenship came about by being members of a sovereign state – a process that started here in Europe when the Treaty of

Westphalia in 1648: Cardinal Mazarin effectively buried any remaining vestiges of the supra-national authority of the Holy Roman emperor and asserted the absolute sovereignty of the nation state. But this has sovereignty has become eroded, particularly over the past sixty years. The state's right to grant citizenship and to rule over what rights citizens have has been fragmented. This has come about in a variety of ways: the possibility of dual or multiple citizenship has grown greatly, for example. Certain rights have been placed above the nation-state: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for example, places a moral; obligation on signatory states to respect greater rights. Much more significantly, the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe, 1950) creates legal rights for Europeans that are superior and enforceable above the state level. The European Court of Human Rights and the European Court of Justice have judicial powers that surpass those of the member states. This has broken the link between human rights and the territory of the nation state. Political rights are being given and guaranteed by a body greater than the nation-state. As Soysal puts it, this is 'a new model of membership, anchored in the deterritorialised notions of person rights" (Soysal, 1997).

These new forms of citizenship are uncoupling rights from territory. But 'there is an increasing contradiction between rights, which are universal, uniform and globally defined, and social identities, which are particularistic and territorially specified' (Urry, J., 2000).

The European Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (European Union, 2000) includes precepts concerning democratic forms of government, and of the rights of citizens, which members of the Union enforce through their own law and through the European Human Rights court in Strasbourg. Significantly, these definitions are extended beyond the boundaries of the European Union, in that

- Nations seeking to join the Union must demonstrate their adherence to the precepts of the European Convention

- Nations seeking trade and other bilateral agreements with the Union are, through the Cotonou Agreement, expected to include human rights agreements.

Citizenship implies working towards the betterment of the community one lives in through participation, volunteer work and efforts to improve life for all citizens. This is not therefore simply the same as the old-fashioned legal definition of citizenship, which was narrower, territorial and specifically related to allegiance to the government of a state (and probably related to nationality). In the context of citizenship education, these new dimensions and comprehensions of citizenship seem useful: to educate about legal national citizenship only would be a narrow description of the methods of acquiring citizenship – *jus sanguinis* versus *jus solis*, and a listing of formal rights and duties. But the broader definition requires some consideration of community – or communities – and of the notion of belonging. Using this definition, the 'political community' can be any grouping that has a political agenda, meaning any group involved in seeking or maintaining support for some public or common action. In this sense, politics is observed in all human group interactions including corporate, academic, and religious, and not simply in governments.

Citizenship is about the construction of a community of rights. This community can be a nation state – like, for example, Slovenia, which became a nation state just 15 years ago. A community can also be larger than this: the European community is also a community

of rights – one which Slovenia joined just a year ago. And communities that grant rights can be much smaller – for example, a school.

We will return to the school as a site for rights when we consider teaching citizenship – but first consider some points about the creation of these larger communities. Benedict Anderson, in *Imagined Communities* (1983/1991, identified some interesting aspects of how the nation-state communities, that were larger than the personal and direct, created an imagined political community, that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because members will never know most of their fellow-members, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. It is limited because it has finite, though elastic boundaries beyond which lies other nations. It is sovereign because it came to maturity at a stage of human history when freedom was a rare and precious ideal. And it is imagined as a community because it is conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.

What are the characteristics of nation or community-building?

There is – of course – a history, which has in a point of self-awareness, of self-recognition as a group. Slovenian history is presented as stretching into antiquity: parallels are often drawn with particular provinces in the Roman Empire, for example. The identity of the people living in the territory is – invariably in all countries, not just in Slovenia – described as 'freedom loving', ' A free rural community', and so on. Slovenian traditions are described at an early stage, and are also given special global significance: for example, in the 13th Century there was a tradition of making the Duke swear that he would defend the people's will and rights before he could be enthroned. Only after swearing would a peasant, sitting on the throne in the interim, give up the throne to the Duke. This tradition survived till the late middle ages, when the French lawyer and philosopher Jean Bodin described it in his legal work as a democratic act inaugurating a ruler: this, it is said, was read with interest by Thomas Jefferson, one of the authors of the United States Constitution (Prunk, 1994).

In many emerging nations there's a 'father of the nation'. The European Union has Jean Monet, the architect of the Treaty of Rome. He has been institutionalised in the Jean Monet Professorships that crop up in all our Universities. In Slovenia, the father of the nation is Primoz Trubar, a Protestant preacher who first codified the Slovenian language, in 1550 a book of Grammar and a catechism, and later translated the New Testament (1555-1577).

The translation of both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible into Slovene was a major undertaking in Protestant literature of the late 16th century. This undertaking was the work of Protestant writer and theologian Jurij Dalmatin (1584), and served to establish the pinnacle of Slovene Protestant literature, as well as to mark a unique milestone on the historical path of Slovene cultural development.

This element identity of language is common in many communities – though not in the European Union. As Anderson observes when a language develops a written form and emerges into print it becomes symbolic, and from this comes a significant literature. Print languages laid the foundation for national consciousness in three ways: they created unified fields of exchange and communication, they gave a new fixity to language, and they created languages-of-power of a kind different from the older administrative vernaculars. With a literature came publishing: Janz Mandelc in Ljubljana pioneered

published books in Slovene in Ljubljana in the 16th Century. There is, of course, a parallel in Europe: a great European publishing industry has developed, made larger and more complex by the very lack of a common language.

Many histories claim to be those of freedom loving people, sometimes labouring under some kind of oppression: Slovenian history is no exception, describing the creation of an identity of a freedom-loving, progressive people (Prunk, 1994). Society in the 16th Century is described as being organised vertically, rather than horizontally.

In any history is found a series of symbolic events – seen in retrospect as turning points. These is often enshrined in the museum, or exhibition – or now, the web-site Benedict Anderson points out that the museum allowed the state to appear as the guardian of tradition, and this power was enhanced by the infinite reproducibility of the symbols of tradition.

It is interesting how far back in antiquity history is projected. Constructs such as Europe and Slovenia are given 'histories' that far pre-date the time that anyone had a conception of what they were. There was a travelling exhibition of Neolithic Europe – sponsored by the European Union – that asserted the pan-European nature of this group, who could have had no conception of what Europe meant (Euro Pre Art, 2000). There are many other examples of so-called European history stretch far back into the past. Slovenia does the same: there are descriptions of Slovenian history that predate the Roman period, followed by the Slav Proto-state (Prunk, 1994). Slovenia also included in this pre-history ties and contributions to European history: this city was supposedly founded by the ancient Greek, Jason, after the voyage of the Argos. The first Christian Roman Emperor, Theodosius, defeated his pagan rivals and established his ascendancy in 394 on Slovenian soil. Indeed, there's one theory that describes the Slovenes as the true originators of the European idea (Savli *et al*. 1989)

Along with the Museum is the Academy, as enshrining the high culture, academic learning and structures of the community. The Academia Operosorum Labacensium was founded in 1701 by tweve Ljubuljanian lawyers, six theologians and five medical doctors. The European Union has followed suit in fostering the academy – in many forms, including a European university, and more important, the Socrates-Erasmus programme of which we are a part.

Anderson also cites the census as part of the process of establishing a nation: being enumerated, being counted and identified is, he suggests, an important element – and the Habsburg Empire held its first census in the 1770s, asked inhabitants to identify themselves by categories, one of which was Slovene: just under a million were able to call themselves Slovene. The establishment of an educational system is often seen as key in disseminating the idea of community. Elementary schools began teaching in Slovene in 1774, further embedding the language – and the identity.

Trade and economic infrastructures support the territorial aspects. Improved road systems in the early 18th Century partly consolidated the grip of the Austrian Empire, linking Vienna at the coast at Trieste, but also allowing a freer movement of ideas and consciousness between the Slovenes. The railway built in the 1850s to Trieste also helped the spread of modernity and identity.

Part B of the concept of the nation includes the idea of borders, a territorial line. Maps of Europe abound, with various attempts to identify the different Europes – geographical, political, the Europe of the Eurovision Song Contest and the Europe of the European Football Cup. The map also worked on the basis of a totalizing classification, says Anderson. It was designed to demonstrate the antiquity of specific, tightly bounded territorial units. It also served as a logo, instantly recognizable and visible everywhere, that formed a powerful emblem for the nationalism being born. The Slovenian territory has had a number of changes over its history, as has been the fate of many of the states of Europe over the past few centuries. One of the first to produce an authoritative, if not official, map of Slovenia was Map of the Slovene Lands, first published in 1853 by Peter Kozler. This was the result of a fairly exact statistical study of the ethnic 'border'.

These aspects are a mixture of symbolic and conceptual terms, but also enshrine an activity: they are all about individuals and groups taking the initiative, forming institutions, creating processes. Communities are constructed by participation, by taking part. Rights are established by contesting and asserting them: and we can see these processes of assertion and contest in both the histories of Slovenia and the European Union.

There are also iconic aspects to establishing a political community. There are flags and anthems; and in the 20th Century there were a whole range of new icons, from stamps to airlines. Every new state in Africa in the 1960s had its own national carrier: Slovenia follows suit. Postage stamps give a particularly fluid method of national expression: they can change their iconography month by month, to reflect the seasons and the politics. Flags are a particularly potent icon, wrapping up within them statements and assertions about identity. The Slovenian national flag is based on a generic tricolour that dates back to the revolution of 1848 and is based on the flag of the Duchy of Carniola (Kranjska), which was then then the "very notion of Slovenedom". The flag of Carniola derives its white-blue-red combination from the colours of the Carniolan coat of arms. The coat of arms of the Republic of Slovenia is a shield with a stylised image of Mountain Triglav, with undulating blue lines below it and three six-pointed golden stars, arranged in an inverted triangle, above it. It is a heraldic composite, combining icons from the coats of arms of the Counts of Celje, the Duchy of Carniola and the Socialist Republic of Slovenia.

Finally, national anthems: the older states with martial music and words that identify the foreign as hostile and threatening – the British anthem has a verse, not now used, that runs "Scatter her enemies, And make them fall: Confound their politics; Frustrate their knavish tricks". Interestingly, both the Slovenian and the European anthem are considerably more pacific. Schiller's Ode to Joy reminds us "Alle Menschen werden Brüder" – all men are brothers; while the Slovenian anthem runs: "No war, no strife shall hold its sway/ Who long to see/ That all men free/ No more shall foes, but neighbours be."

Himna	*National Anthem*
France Prešeren (Slovene)	**France Prešeren: A Toast (English)**
Zive naj vsi narodi	God's blessing on all nations,
ki hrepene dočakat' dan,	Who long and work for that bright day,
da koder sonce hodi,	When o'er earth's habitations
prepir iz sveta bo pregnan,	No war, no strife shall hold its sway;

da rojak   Who long to see
prost bo vsak,   That all men free
ne vrag, le sosed bo mejak!   No more shall foes, but neighbours be.

Translated by Janko Lavrin

Friedrich Schiller
Freude, schöner Götterfunken,   *Joy, bright spark of divinity,*
Tochter aus Elysium,   *Daughter of Elysium,*
Wir betreten Feuertrunken,   *Fire-inspired we tread*
Himmlische, dein Heiligtum.   *Thy sanctuary.*
Deine Zauber binden wieder,   *Thy magic power re-unites*
Was die Mode streng geteilt ;   *All that custom has divided,*
Alle Menschen werden Brüder,   *All men become brothers*
Wo dein sanfter Flügel weilt.   *Under the sway of thy gentle wings.*

To this point, we have examined the nature of citizenship, as essentially concerning the establishment of rights, and the changing and extending nature of these rights. These rights have become separated from the entities of the nation-state. We have also examined some of the ways in which nation-states and supra-national communities establish identities, citizenship and rights. In particular, we have looked at three kinds of ways in which citizens rights are disseminated – through symbolic icons, through abstract conceptions, and through active participation.

How should our pre-schools, schools, colleges and universities disseminate these ideas of citizenship to their students and learners? What does teaching this sort of citizenship entail?

Jerome Bruner , in his 1966 book, *Towards a Theory of Instruction*, argues that:

> "human beings have three ways of knowing—through action, through imagery, and through the medium of symbols. Each is a system with powers and shortcomings, but the special glory of man's mind is that he has three approaches to grasping things, and these are often translatable into each other in a fashion that permits not only deeper understanding but the ferreting out of contradiction and nonsense."

Bruner is not talking about stages of development here, or sequences of learning. Growth in is a process of elaborating three modes of knowing:

- *Enactive* where a person learns about the world through actions on objects.

- *Iconic* where learning occurs through using models and pictures.

- *Symbolic* which describes the capacity to think in abstract terms.

It is not a coincidence that these three modes of knowing correspond to the three ways in which citizenship is disseminated and rights are understood.

Bruner argued that we should teach the 'structure' of subjects. He advocated the introduction of the real process of a particular discipline to students. So, in earning history students might become involved in genuine historical enquiry. This might involve examining a building, then using the information acquired to trace records of various

kinds in order to answer the questions generated about the origins, purposes, and history of that structure.

> To instruct someone... is not a matter of getting him to commit results to mind. Rather, it is to teach him to participate in the process that makes possible the establishment of knowledge. We teach a subject not to produce little living libraries on that subject, but rather to get a student to think mathematically for himself, to consider matters as an historian does, to take part in the process of knowledge-getting. Knowing is a process not a product. (1966: 72)

Bruner's underlying principle for teaching and learning is that a combination of concrete, pictorial and symbolic activities will lead to more effective learning. The progression is: start with a concrete experience then move to pictures and finally use symbolic representation.

But our knowledge of most socio-political learning is that in many societies young children rapidly pick up iconic forms of the nation state and the community – studies show American six year olds recognising the flag, the presidency, the White House and Congress; and then, later in their schooling, are introduced to the symbolic or conceptual representation, through civics lessons that describe the structures and processes, the list of rights and duties – but rarely examine enactive forms of citizenship.

Young people should develop an appreciation and an understanding of the citizenship rights that have been achieved in the past. These rights were hard-fought for, and should be valued, and we should value those who fought for them. But how can we translate this abstract conceptual knowledge into enactive forms?

One possible way is through children and young people being aware of situations in which rights are denied. There are many places where regimes do not recognise the rights of various groups of the population, or indeed all of the population. Young people are often actively engaged in work with organisations such as Amnesty International, in lobbying and demanding the rights of others.

But a more general and personal approach would be through recognising that there are further rights to be obtained. Returning to Karel Vasak's "three generations of rights", we are reminded that the third generation is largely yet to be won. This third generation involves fraternity and solidarity, the rights an individual may claim from society. John Urry's (2000) list of six new categories may suggest areas in which children, young people, and indeed adults might become actively involved in arguing for and establishing new rights. Because it is in arguing for and achieving that enactive learning happens.

Indeed, many young people are engaged in these areas:

- Cultural citizenship, where there is wide interest in, and sympathy for, the rights of diverse cultural groups, particularly in the face of globalisation; and where there are many successful attempts to preserve cultures and languages. A rights agenda may well develop here.

- Minority citizenship, where questions of asylum, settlement and migration are not necessarily knee-jerk reactions, particularly among many young people. International conventions on refugees are under attack, and many young people are interested in actively defending and possibly extending these rights.

- Ecological citizenship is a particular potent area that resonates well with young people. The right to live in a sustainable environment seems particularly interesting to the young, and is an area of active participation and active learning.

- Cosmopolitan citizenship is again an area in which young people are active in many situations. Relationships across cultural and ethnic differences are increasing, in places very rapidly; yet in others are held back. The rights to relate to other citizens, cultures and societies without state interference is another area for activity.

- Consumer citizenship has a wide range of meanings: it is not merely about being an informed purchaser, but an active decision maker and actively demanding consumer rights and responsibilities: curtailing the power of producers to exploit consumers, and to exploit workers and natural resources.

- Finally, mobility citizenship, the rights of visitors and tourists moving through other countries and societies.

The argument is, therefore, that enactive learning of citizenship will naturally involve the enactive aspects of citizenship. This will not be about the study and appreciation of rights won in the past, and the icons and concepts that relate to these, but the involvement of young people in establishing rights in their own schools and societies, and extending rights to the third generation. Teaching Citizenship is learning citizenship through participation.

References

Anderson, B. (1983, 1991) I*magined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition ed. London & NY: Verso

Bruner, J. (1966) *Towards a Theory of Instruction*. Cambriudge MA; Harvard University Press

Council of Europe (1950) *The European Convention on Human Rights* (adopted Rome, 4 November 1950, with five Protocols: Paris 20 March 1952; Strasbourg 6 May 1963; Strasbourg 6 May 1963: Strasbourg 16 September 1963; Strasbourg 20 January 1966)

Dalmatin, J. (1584) *Bibilija, tu je vse svetu pismu stariga inu noviga testamenta, slovenski tolmacena skuzi Jurija Dalmatina*. Wittenberg

Euro Pre Art (2000) *European Pre Art*: http://www.europreart.net/

European Union (2000) *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*. Nice: European Union

Hobbes, T. (1651) *The Leviathan, or the Matter, Forme & Power of a Common-wealth, Ecclesiasticall and Civill*. London: Andrew Crooke at the Green Dragon

de Lafayette, and Jefferson, T (1789) *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*. Approved by the National Assembly of France, August 26, 1789

Locke, J. (1690) *Two Treatises on Government*. London: Millar, Woodfall *et al*

Mackenzie, W. J. M. (1978) *Political Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Marshall, T H (1950) *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Montero, C. (1992) The concept of citizenship in the treaty on European Union, *Common Market Law Review*, 29, 1139

Prunk, J. (1994) *A brief history of Slovenia. Historical background of the Republic of Slovenia*. Ljubljana, Mihelac

Savli, J., Bor, M. and Tomazic, I. (1998) *Veneti: First Builders of European Community: Tracing the History and Language of Early Ancestors of Slovenes*. Vienna: Editionees Veneti

Soysal, Y. (1997) 'Changing Citizenship in Europe: Remarks on Postnational Membership and the Nation State' in Cesarini, D. and Fulbrook, M. (eds) *Citizenship, Nationality and Migration in Europe*. London: Routledge

Trubar, P. (1550) *Catechismus et Abecedarium*. Tubingen

United Nations (1948) *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948) New York: United Nations

United Nations (1966) *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, came into force 3 January 1976) New York: United Nations

United States (1776) *Declaration of Independence*: The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united states of America in Congress, July 4th 1776

Urry, J. (1995) *Consuming Places*. London: Routledge

Urry, J. (2000) *Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge

Vasak, K. (1979/1982) For the Third Generation of Human Rights: The Rights of Solidarity (Inaugural Lecture to the Tenth Study Session of the International Institute of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 2-27 July 1979) [unpublished], cited in P. Alston, A Third Generation of Solidarity Rights: Progressive Development or Obfuscation of International Human Rights Law? (1982) 29 *Netherlands International Law Review*. p 307