Bounded Inclusion: Race, Migration and the Making of the European Educational Space

Nancy Spina

Mount Saint Vincent University

Recommended Citation

Spina, Nancy. (2020) "Bounded Inclusion: Race, Migration and the Making of the European Educational Space," *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale*. Vol. 49 : Iss. 1. [https:// doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v49i1.13436](https://doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v49i1.13436).

Bounded Inclusion: Race, Migration and the Making of the European Educational Space

Inclusion limitée : race, migration et composition de l'espace d'enseignement européen

Nancy Spina, Mount Saint Vincent University

Abstract:

The creation of "European educational space" is one of the objectives of the European Union's (EU) cultural policy. This paper examines an overlooked contradiction within the European educational space discourse, namely the tension between its stated goals of creating a new European identity based on common cultural heritage and its reliance on intercultural education's ideas of trans-ethnic identities to address the challenges of immigrants' integration. Relying on the insights of critical race theory, the paper argues that the key assumptions behind the European educational space and intercultural education, far from being contradictory, are interconnected insofar as intercultural pedagogy informs the tropes of "migrants," "integration," and "multiculturalism" that are at the core of the European dimension of education's discourse. The paper argues that these tropes are part of an evolving discourse about immigrant education that allows the EU to maintain a facade of multicultural benevolence while perpetuating a differential inclusion of EU and non-EU migrants in Europe. To support these claims, the paper critically examines the evolution of the discourse surrounding migration and integration in the EU, focusing on the main policy initiatives on immigrant youth education elaborated from the 1970s onwards.

Résumé

Le présent article étudie une contradiction négligée dans le discours de l'espace d'enseignement européen, à savoir la tension existant entre son objectif déclaré de créer une nouvelle identité européenne fondée sur un patrimoine culturel commun et son recours à des idées d'enseignement interculturel d'identités transethniques pour répondre aux défis de l'intégration des immigrants. S'appuyant sur la théorie critique de la race, l'article avance que les suppositions clés derrière l'espace d'enseignement européen et l'enseignement interculturel se rejoignent dans la mesure où la pédagogie interculturelle renseigne les nœuds discursifs que sont « migrants », « intégration » et « multiculturalisme » qui sont au cœur du discours de l'enseignement à dimension européenne. Ces nœuds font partie d'un discours évolutif sur l'enseignement des immigrants qui permet à l'UE de préserver une façade de bienveillance multiculturelle tout en perpétuant une inclusion différentielle des migrants européens et non-européens dans l'Europe. Pour appuyer ces affirmations, les principales initiatives politiques envers l'enseignement aux jeunes immigrants élaborées depuis les années 70 sont examinées de façon critique.

Keywords : immigration; European Union; integration; race; intercultural pedagogy
Mots clés : immigration; Union Européenne; intégration; éducation; race; enseignement interculturel

Introduction

The European Union (EU) represents one of the most ambitious supranational political projects in current world affairs. Its main objective is the creation of a common economic, social and political space across Europe. To achieve this goal, EU institutions, especially the European Commission, have supported policies that encouraged the liberalization of the movement of goods, capital, services, and people across the borders of the Union's member states (MSs). Policy areas such as trade and, more recently, border control have been at the forefront of EU activity. Over the years, however, the EU has paid growing attention to the

cultural dimension of the European integration project (Shore, 2000). The rationale for this interest is that, to be successful, this project's political and economic pillars need to be complemented by ideas and values shared among European citizens.

Education is one of the most important components of this EU cultural policy (Walkenhorst, 2008). Since its inception in the late 1950s, the EU (then “European Communities” and later “European Community”) has engaged with educational issues (Nóvoa, 2013). Until the mid-1970s, education was seen mostly through an economic prism to further the Community’s economic integration. Since then, the scope of EU involvement in this field has noticeably increased, to the point that today scholars talk about an autonomous “European educational space” or “dimension” (Barbousas & Seddon, 2018). This space comprises new initiatives, strategies, and goals involving education in Europe, and reflects debates about the meaning of Europe, European identity, and citizenship (Philippou, 2005; Ollikainen, 2000; Soysal, 2002; Lawn, 2011). Within this space, the organization and content of education have been transformed from a purely national issue to one in which the EU as a supranational entity plays a major role. The involvement of the EU in educational matters has also progressively become more layered. From the economic-centred emphasis on vocational training that characterized debates in the 1970s, now the EU engages with broader issues such as “culture,” “diversity,” “integration,” and “citizenship education.” As a result, the integration of immigrants has acquired growing relevance in EU educational activities (Eurydice, 2019; Van Driel et al., 2016). From its initial interest in making EU MSs respect the cultural and educational rights of temporary guest workers, since the 1980s the EU has called for the implementation of intercultural education (IE) to foster inclusion and integration of migrant and non-migrant youth (Hadjisoteriou et al., 2015). Interculturalism, often referred to as the “pedagogy of welcoming” and “dialogue” (Sirna, 1997, p. 88) aims at addressing the problem of immigrant students’ poor academic performance and their limited social integration in the host society through the promotion of openness and tolerance towards cultural and linguistic differences and by equipping students with the cognitive skills and knowledge necessary to deal with diversity (Coulby, 2006; Alred et al., 2003; Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010; Leclercq, 2002). Through the integration of immigrants in Europe, IE supports the quest for a new trans-ethnic European identity that is consistent with the EU’s “unity in diversity” motto (Schissler & Soysal, 2005; Gundara & Jacobs, 2000).

The emergence of a European educational space, particularly the initiatives directed at the integration of immigrants, is considered a welcome development in the field of education in Europe. It represents a move away from the nationalistic approaches that historically have characterized this domain in the region (and elsewhere) and a more suitable framework to deal with the challenges of contemporary multicultural societies (Fass et al., 2014; Leclercq, 2003; Philippou, 2005). The European space of education, however, is not as progressive and transformative as its supporters claim. This initiative’s framing of who counts as “migrant,” how this subject should relate to the host community and the features that define an intercultural society are part of an evolving discourse about immigrant education that contributes to the differential inclusion of European and non-European migrants, with the former construed as members of the community and the latter as “outsiders within” (Hansen, 1998; Balibar, 1991a). IE plays a central part in sustaining this exclusionary project. Its emphasis on a flexible and trans-ethnic identity provides the epistemological foundation for the promotion of a *European* identity and citizenship based on a common cultural heritage and universal values. This pedagogical approach contributes to what I define as the “bounded” inclusion of non-European migrants while maintaining a facade of multicultural benevolence founded on human rights and equality. From this perspective, the shortcomings of EU educational initiatives for immigrants are not limited to the inappropriate

implementation of intercultural pedagogy by EU MSs or the contradiction between educational policies that welcome and foster diversity and border practices that over time have severely limited the access of non-European migrants to the continent (Driessen, 2000; Leeman & Ledoux, 2003; Hajisoteriou & Panayiotis, 2016). Instead, by creating two categories of individuals, one who benefits full access and membership to the community and those who have partial access and membership, the discourse on the European educational space reflects, rather than challenging, Europe's restrictive stance towards immigration.

The argument developed in this paper is based upon the insights of critical race and postcolonial theory and their applications to the European case (Ahmed, 2000; McClintock, 1995; Stoler, 1995; Goldberg, 2002; Razack, 1999, 2002; Thobani, 2007; Lentin, 2008). Critical race and postcolonial scholars emphasize the need to de-essentialize the "universal" and "racelessness" that animates modern liberal thought, bringing attention to how society is organized along racial lines and how racializing practices are embedded within particular sociohistorical contexts. From this perspective, knowledge is not innocent but tied to power, and representations of the world and the subject are central in shaping beliefs and actions (Tikly 1999). Liberal notions of subjectivity, belonging, and community are, therefore, a result of race-thinking, namely "a structure of thought that divides up the world between the deserving and the undeserving according to descent" (Razack, 2008, p. 8). Critical race and postcolonial theorists have highlighted the impossibility of detaching Western liberalism from its connection to race, either as a biological or cultural construct (Wynter, 2003; Da Silva, 2007)¹. The liberal emphasis on "civic nationalism" has not fundamentally challenged the exclusionary dynamics that characterize "ethnic" versions of nationalism through what Goldberg (2009) defines as "racism without race" (on this point, see also Brubaker, 2009). Contemporary forms of liberal nationalism are characterized by the replacement of racial difference by cultural difference. Culture then becomes the distinguishing marker between individuals who can become part of the community by sharing civic values such as democracy, respect of the law, and tolerance of diversity and the "others" whose cultures are incompatible with modern liberal democracy (Razack, 2008; Fozdar & Low, 2015; Halikiopoulou et al., 2013).

When considering Europe as the main focus of analysis, postcolonial and race theory scholars point to the fact that, despite the efforts to expunge race from the European political sphere, racism continues to define the continent's social and political fabric (Goldberg, 2006; Hesse, 2007; Lentin, 2008). The racialization of culture has done little to detach the construct of Europeanness from naturalistic notions of race (Bonnett & Nayak, 2003). Europe, under this vision, is unique, and, by implication, superior to other regions of the world. As Julia Suárez-Krabbe (2014) notes, "(t)he idea that Europe is white, democratic, the cradle of human rights, and the best place from which to produce knowledge continues to be very strong" (p. 168). This superiority complex means that the discourse about race is reproduced through the interaction of the oppositional, yet mutually dependent, relationship between Europeanness and non-Europeanness, or Whiteness and otherness (Rodríguez Maeso & Araújo, 2017; Bonnett, 2016; Hesse, 2007). Recently, critical scholars have begun to apply these insights about race to the European integration project, focusing on its role in the construction of European identity and citizenship (Hansen, 2002, 2004; Ammaturo, 2019), European governance (Hansen & Jonsson, 2014), the treatment of ethnic minorities (El-Tayeb, 2011), and Europe's colonial legacy (Turunen, 2019; Hansen & Jonsson, 2014). The present work seeks to contribute to this emerging literature, expanding it to include the analysis of efforts

¹ For a different view of the possibility of reconstructing liberalism to become a means of anti-racism critique and of racial justice see Mills (1997, 2008).

to create a European educational field (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002; Suárez-Krabbe, 2014; Pasiás & Roussakis, 2012; Stevenson, 2012).

To critically analyze the European educational project and trace its trajectory over time, this paper focuses on the main policy initiatives on immigrant youth education elaborated by the EU and other European institutions from the mid-1970s onwards². These initiatives are examined not as a formal and transparent set of educational policies containing guidelines, measures, and neutral categories, but as a type of discursive formation, namely “a group of statements which provide a language for talking about—i.e., a way of representing—a particular kind of knowledge about a topic” (Hall, 1992, pp. 201–202). Understanding policies as discourse means considering them as practices of truth and power production reflecting the interests of their producers. As other discursive productions, policies construe the objects on which they center and articulate how we can speak about them. As projective and enactive texts, they describe future contexts and “present a plan of action in response to a perceived need, but also construct the action and need in particular ways” (Liddicoat & Diaz, 2008, pp.137–138). Despite their veneer of social reform, policies as a form of social regulation tend to support, rather than undermine, the status quo (Teasley, 2008). European educational policies on immigrant youth—this paper contends—follow similar political dynamics.

In operational terms, the analysis of the evolution of Europe’s migrant youth education is performed through the application of critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA; Weiss & Wodak, 2007; Wodak, 2013). This type of textual analysis focuses on the ways in which power manifests itself through language, showing how ideological presuppositions are hidden underneath the surface structures of language choices (Machin & Mayr, 2012). According to CDA, discourses are instantiated in specific texts, which are constitutive of and constituted by specific genres, which in turn are located within different fields of practices. Texts, CDA’s main unit of analysis, are understood as specific artefacts of writing or speech from which we can infer broader social and political dynamics in a community. As a textual method of analysis, CDA’s main objective is to determine whether the texts constituting a given discourse (in this case, immigrant education) are defined by a coherent genre, namely “a socially ratified way of using language in connection with a particular type of social activity” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 14). For this purpose, the analysis tries to foreground patterns and trends that characterize collected textual data. The patterns and trends extrapolated from the textual data are then organized around key recurring themes, or “discursive nodes.” In this exercise, the purpose is not only to foreground what is “said,” but also “all the discursive rules and categories that were a priori assumed as a constituent part of discourse and therefore of knowledge” (Young, 1981, p. 48 in Hook, 2001, p. 522). In analyzing a given discourse, CDA also does not limit its analysis to specific structures of a text, but systematically relates these to structures characterizing the sociopolitical context (what Bourdieu calls “fields of action”; Bourdieu, 1997) in which the discourse is located. Consistently with a CDA approach, this paper examines ways of talking about immigrant education in Europe (the European space of education discourse) as they are inscribed in official documents (texts)

² This paper examines policy initiatives elaborated by the regional institutions most directly involved in the establishment of a European educational space, namely the European Commission, the Council of the European Union, and the Council of Europe. While the Council of Europe (COE) is not formally part of the EU institutional framework, its work has substantially contributed to shaping this space’s European dimension. The complementarity between the EU and COE on matters of European policy (including education) stems from the fact that the former often refers to the latter’s standards when drafting legislation (On this point, see Council of Europe, “The Council of Europe and the European Union,” retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/european-union>). It should also be noted the EU does not have the authority to pass binding legislation in the educational field, a policy area that remains a responsibility of member states. The EU’s main role is to facilitate cooperation and coordination among member states by setting policy goals, providing guidelines and monitor implementation, activities carried out mainly through a policy process known as the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). On the application of OMC to the educational field, see Lange & Alexiadou, 2007.

about immigrant youth that comprise a delimited set of linguistic practices (a policy genre composed of the key discursive nodes of “migrant,” “integration,” and “interculturalism”) as they relate to broader debates about migration and educational policy in Europe (the sociocultural field of action). The texts considered in this paper represent a purposive sample of EU and Council of Europe’s official documents published during the period under consideration (from the 1970s to today). The selection is based on the relevance and salience of the texts’ content. The selected texts are official documents either dealing specifically with migrant education at the European level or that elaborate on this topic as part of a more general discussion of related themes such migration, integration, or education in Europe.

The paper is structured as follows. The first part elaborates on the main tenets of the analytical framework guiding this work. The second section examines the policy developments characterizing the EU educational field from the mid-1970s to the end of the 1980s, while the third and fourth sections trace the evolution of these policies from the 1990s to the present. The concluding section considers some of the implications of the argument developed in the paper for the study of education policy in Europe.

Discourse, Racialization and (Supra)nation-Building

Critical scholars have stressed the ongoing centrality of discourse in shaping the knowledge and practices that legitimate inclusions and exclusion in modern nation-states (Razack, 2007; Balibar, 1991a; Foucault, 1997). As Said notes, “the will to exercise [...] control in society and history has also discovered a way to clothe, disguise, rarefy and wrap itself systematically in the language of truth, discipline, rationality, utilitarian value and knowledge. And this language in its naturalness, authority, professionalism, assertiveness and antitheoretical directness is [...] discourse” (Said quoted in Hook 2001, p. 524). Consequently, a critical analysis of educational policies requires that we dismantle the discourse constituents to reveal what they conceal, including “the institutional supports and social structures and practices underlying the production of truth” (Hook, 2001, p. 526). In analyzing the discourse of immigrant education in the EU, this paper pays attention to the ambiguity of the discourse’s main nodes, namely “immigrant,” “integration,” and “interculturalism.” It considers EU educational policy for immigrant youth as a special kind of *racialized* educational discourse based on culture that establishes and naturalizes a distinction between the White EU migrant or national and non-EU-migrant as perennial cultural “other.”

Critical scholars have emphasized how liberal discourses produced within modernity about nations, identities, citizenship, and universalism serve to “legitimate ideologically and to rationalize politico-economically prevailing sets of racialized conditions and racist exclusions” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 1). From this perspective, race is an indispensable organizing principle in the ongoing discursive and material boundary construction both within and outside nation-states, even in self-defined multicultural ones (Thobani, 2007; Lentin, 2008). This is also true in the construction of a supranational and multicultural community such as the EU. A central component of this racialized discourse is “Whiteness.” Whiteness is considered a position of epistemic and material privilege in modernity and postmodernity (Frankenberg, 1993; Wiegman, 1999). Racialized discourses centred on Whiteness, which uphold and render invisible the domination exercised through and for the maintenance of White privilege, are central to not only to “universal” conceptions of citizenship, human rights, and education, but also to the “unmarked” and “unnamed” practices that stem from these discourses such as intercultural education (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 1).

In this reading, the EU initiatives on immigrant education as a liberal racialized discourse of bounded membership and differential inclusion are tightly linked with the Union’s contemporary supranational-building project. As Shore notes, the EU community-building project can be understood as the process leading to the creation of a more unified

“nation-state of Europe” (Shore, 2000, p. 2). One of the main problems haunting the EU is that of creating a “common culture” and a unified “people” that can be hailed by the project and ultimately legitimize it. In the EU case, the cultural elements that underlie national identities tend to divide European nationals (Shore, 2000). To achieve this goal, from the 1980s onwards, the EU has been actively deploying its cultural politics to create a common past and future for its people when it became obvious that economic means were not enough to create an EU community. Critical scholars of nationalism have pointed to both the importance of manufacturing shared pasts and futures in creating national communities and creating the “people” to legitimize the racialized, gendered and classed external and internal boundaries of communities (Balibar, 1991b; Yuval-Davis, 1997). In more recent times, national projects have managed the arrival of previously “non-preferred races” (e.g., Canada) by including them as “outsiders within” despite the granting of formal citizenship. This selective inclusion did not challenge the foundations of these projects as “White nations,” and scientifically-based notions of “race” (Lentin, 2005; Mackey, 2002; Hage, 1998). As Bourdieu (1997) notes, the creation of “the people” of a community requires a “principle of classification” “capable of producing the set of distinctive properties which characterize the members of this group, and also annulling the set of non-pertinent properties which part or all of its members possess in other contexts (i.e., nationality, age or gender)” (p. 130). National policies such as immigration and citizenship perform the same function of governing access and differential membership even in multicultural national communities (Thobani, 2007). However, within the nation, educational discourses and practices have played an important role in creating “citizens” and maintaining hierarchies of race, class and gender (Dei, 1996; Apple & Franklin, 2004). Under their innocent gloss, educational discourses create “new histories of the nation, the ‘self’ and ‘the other’” (Popkewitz, 2001, p. 180). Thus, from a critical perspective, the EU educational discourse of immigrant education is one of the means of creating the community’s identity, people and the much-needed distinction between genuine and false members (Balibar, 1991a).

The Immigrant Education Discourse in Europe and its Origins

The first policy discussions about migrant youth education at the European level emerged in mid-1970s. The geopolitical background within which these discussions took place was the oil crisis and its economic fallout in the continent. The economic stagnation brought by the crisis led to a substantial reduction of the demand for foreign labour in European economies (Van Mol & de Valk, 2015). Until that moment, across the continent most migrants were European citizens (primarily from Southern Europe), and were employed through guest workers programs in North-Western Europe. The expectation was that these individuals would return to their country of origin once the contract expired, although, in practice, few did. It is at this historical juncture that European governments began to denounce growing migration pressure, voicing concerns over their labour market, welfare systems, and security. These anxieties were related to the threat that migrants’ settlement posed to national identities and political stability (Brochmann, 1999). Receiving countries responded with stringent immigration policies, which allowed for the stabilization of immigrant communities while keeping them in place by making the acquisition of citizenship more difficult. These policies, however, transformed rather than halted migration. Indeed, the population of foreign residents continued to grow (Van Mol & deValk, 2015). Migrants from non-European countries who had come under labour recruitment schemes increasingly settled permanently and brought their families with them. The residing migrant population’s composition also changed during this period, with the share of non-European migrant populations significantly growing. In this period, numbers of asylum applications started to rise in Europe. The restrictions on the entrance of foreigners into North-Western Europe also had

another effect. From the mid-1980s onwards, migration flows increasingly diverted towards Southern Europe (Van Mol & de Valk, 2015).

In this context, European institutions started to recognize the importance of migrants' integration for the European project and the role that education played in creating Europe as a common social and cultural space (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002). The EU (at the time still European Community) established a Directorate for Research, Science and Education (1973) and launched its first "Action Program for Education" (1976). The EU also started to focus its attention on issues of European identity³. The COE, with a longer institutional presence in the field of education, became particularly active in terms of migrant education (COE, 1976, 1977). Europe-wide policy initiatives related to education were introduced with caution since this domain touched upon core "assets" of a nation, such as history, culture, and language. Indeed, the first educational initiatives at the European level caused resistance in MSs (Karlsen, 2000).

In the policy documents introduced in this period, equal opportunities in the field of education between migrants and nationals are established. The cultural encounter between the two groups is presented as mutually enriching and "contribut(ing) to the unification of Europe" (Council of Europe [COE], 1976, par. 3). Yet, the intervention of national governments is deemed necessary since migrants' different cultural values, and the educational difficulties they experience "may aggravate social problems" (COE, 1976, par. 2). National governments are recommended to provide information about the migrants' cultures to avoid prejudice and misunderstanding among citizens, to mainstream migrants' vocational training and to foster their educational and cultural development through the establishment of language and culture of origin classes. The initiatives aiming at ensuring that community migrants are not treated in less favourable terms than nationals are to be understood as a part of the broader goal of strengthening cohesion among MSs and to promote and realize "the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress while respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms" (COE, 1976, par. 2).

Educational initiatives in this period also allow for important insights into the European integration project. Although at the time its right to intervene in immigrant education stemmed mainly from its power to ensure individuals' labour mobility rights, the EU begins to construe itself as a unit consisting of cultural, social, and political areas, with education considered as instrumental "to the full and healthy development of the Community" (EEC, 1976 cited in Hansen, 1998, p. 10). By expanding its role beyond economic cooperation and into the cultural, social, and political arenas, the EU started to imagine and realize itself as a state (Cullen, 1996). A (supra)national narrative begins to take shape, a narrative based on common values and mutually enriching contacts. However, in this early period, two separate sets of initiatives regarding the education of migrants are devised. On the one hand, there are those that refer to non-European migrants (see, for instance, COE's Recommendation on the Education and Cultural Development of Migrants; COE, 1976); on the other hand, others refer only to *European* migrants and their families (e.g., "Council Directive on the education of the children of migrant workers"; Council of the European Communities, 1977). For the latter category, unlike the former, there is no reference to cultural values, educational difficulties, and the potential for conflict that their presence may engender. Moreover, it is only for this category that equality of treatment in all aspects of life between European migrants and nationals is recommended.

The emphasis on cultural differences between European and non-European migrants continues in the 1980s. To foster the integration of settled immigrants, MSs must pay

³ See, for instance, the European Council's "Declaration on European identity" issued in 1973.

attention to their “educational and cultural development” (COE, 1983). The education of migrants becomes an increasingly multifaceted affair. National educational policies must allow migrants “to participate fully in the social life of the host country,” to have “equal opportunity concerning nationals of the host country for their personal and professional development” and “to foster their development and to enhance *their contribution to the society in which they live*” (COE, 1983). Consistent with the construction of European migrants as “friends,” MSs are encouraged to enhance migrants’ contribution in the host society in economic, social, cultural, and demographic terms (COE, 1984). The close and amicable relationship between European migrants and nationals is revealed in the description of second-generation migrants. These individuals, who constitute the largest migrant group in the 1980s, are characterized by “possible familiarity with the habits, customs, and culture of the countries in question” and “the extent to which they may have become integrated in the society” (COE, 1984). Moreover, MSs should sponsor activities in which second-generation migrants “foster their own cultural identity and (to) establish friendly contacts with the local population and participate in the local cultural life” (COE, 1984).

In addition to the educational provisions recommended during the previous decade, the 1980s are characterized by the introduction of Intercultural Education for the academic success and social integration of migrants. In the COE’s 1983 Resolution on migrants’ education (COE, 1983), a specific research agenda is proposed, which includes the creation of parameters for defining “cultural identity” and “related behaviour,” “rigidity of cultural attitudes, rejection of other cultures, racism,” and “situations and processes of social marginalization.” By the end of the decade, the use of IE is recommended for the education of *all* youth since it is “the only way of making use of the valuable asset represented by the presence of young migrants in schools” (COE, 1989), to meet the needs of schools which are transformed by migration into multicultural schools and to prepare all youth to live in a multicultural society. These elements will also be reiterated in initiatives on teacher education. Given the central role teachers have in the socialization of youth, IE must be incorporated in their professional training. To overcome their own cultural biases, teachers in training should know more about educational systems and cultures other than their own, use materials that give a “truer” image of other cultures and engage in teacher exchanges (COE, 1984).

The 1980s policy initiatives define Europe as a multicultural community. This phenomenon is presented as irreversible and positive, and it may lead to “*closer links* between the *peoples of Europe* as well as between Europe and other parts of the world” through “a fuller understanding of the cultures and ways of life of other peoples, as well as, in the event, of their *common* cultural heritage” (COE, 1984, p. 1, emphasis added). For this reason, the educational interventions at the European level are influenced by the goal of developing “a greater unity *between its members* promoting, among other things, their economic and social development” (COE, 1984, emphasis added). However, integration within a multicultural society requires appropriate management. All European youth need to be prepared to live in this “new” type of society. The documents of the period promote IE as a means of overcoming prejudice against difference heightened by traditional forms of nationalism. The extension of the educational approach to all students becomes a way to ensure integration by teaching open-mindedness, understanding of cultural diversity and reciprocal dialogue.

Policy interventions in Europe’s educational field in the 1970s and 1980s are generally regarded by European scholars, particularly those supportive of IE, and by EU official discourse as a series of progressive moves promoting the integration of all migrants, the positive understanding of cultural identities and differences and an understanding of

Europe as a multicultural society⁴. However, as Chock (1995) argues, the ability to construe a discourse as apparently non-racializing, classing and gendering, yet reinforcing these structures of domination can be achieved by using ambiguity. The first of these ambiguities consists in the use of the term “migrant.” In the policy documents of the time, “migrant” refers to *all* individuals (EU and non-EU) who reside in an EU country but who do not possess that country’s citizenship; “integration” in turn is understood as involving all migrants. Similarly, a celebration of “diversity” is of all diversity, and “multiculturalism” encompasses all cultures present in Europe, including non-Western cultures. However, EU initiatives refer to the *European migrant*, to the celebration of *European diversity* and identities, and the multiculturalism to be fostered is that of *European cultures*. Therefore, it is possible to provide an alternative reading of the EU educational discourse with its discursive nodes of “migrant,” “integration,” and “multiculturalism” and the role of IE. In this reading, the EU initiatives are part of a broader effort of the Union to construe a “people” with a “European identity” and to support “social cohesion” (Shore, 2000). The introduction of IE is an essential step towards the “Europeanization” of citizens. This process involves the assimilation of migrants to the host country’s culture; yet, at first, it requires the acknowledgement that multiple identities are possible and then, the creation of a homogenizing intercultural/trans-ethnic European identity.

While the promotion of IE for all youth has been hailed as a positive move away from the creation of monolithic national identities, the adoption of IE has to be set in the context of the European integration project, and that the adoption of an intercultural identity is a political tool which allows for the coexistence of national identities within a broader community, one which is still highly raced, gendered, and classed. Indeed, the goal of European integration through education is to “strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European civilization and the foundations on which the European peoples intend to base their development today” (Hansen, 1998, pp. 11–12). Moreover, the European cultural model “is distinguished by the fact that it is not designed to supersede or replace national cultures. In the relationship between European and national cultures, there is no substitution, no transcendence, no conflict or even compromise, simply reciprocal enrichment and cross-fertilization” (Hansen, 1998, pp. 11–12). In this context, IE constitutes the epistemological limits of a notion of multiple coexisting European identities that is a central component of the racialized discourse of Europeanization.

The discourse of immigrant education, similarly to other educational discourses and practices, allows for the construction of an ideal trans-ethnic/national European “self,” “nation,” and non-European “other” (Hermann et al. 2004; Popkewitz, 2001). The establishment of sameness within the community allows EU nationals to recognize one another as members of a shared community. While this politics of belonging is construed through the complex processes of EU educational initiatives, it simultaneously organizes the mis/recognition of other “cultural identities” that do not belong. The cultural differences that cannot be arranged along the spectrum of European differences are those of Europe’s “outsiders within.” These exclusionary dynamics, which begin to emerge in the 1980s, will be fully developed in the following decade.

The Discourse Reaches Maturity: The “European Dimension in Education” and Immigrants

The debate about immigrant education during the 1990s is shaped by developments characterizing migration in Europe that took place since the fall of the Iron Curtain in the

⁴ See for example Rocha-Trinidad and Sobral-Mendes 1997; Campani 2002 and Eurydice 2004.

late 1980s. Migration patterns towards and within Europe underwent significant changes and further diversification in this period (Van Mol & de Valk, 2016). The opening of the borders of Eastern Europe induced new migration flows across the continent. The concomitant abolition of internal borders in the mid-1990s considerably eased intra-EU movements. EU MSs stepped up attempts to attract highly skilled and educated migrants. Moreover, student migration from outside the EU became increasingly important in some parts of the EU (Lange, 2013). Simultaneously, entrance into the EU became progressively restricted, via tighter border controls at Europe's frontiers. These restrictions in turn contributed to an increase of irregular migration (Castles et al. 2014). Since the 1990s, the EU also started to exert a more direct influence over migration policies from third countries into the EU and on intra-European mobility. It also acquired official competence regarding educational matters (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002). The turning point was the Maastricht Treaty, the inter-European agreement introduced in 1991 that provided the legal foundations for the EU to propose cooperative action in education and laid the foundations for a comprehensive and coherent approach to complement actions taken by MSs. This new focus has "intriguing implications for educational policies dealing with cultural issues" (Hansen, 1997, p. 8). Indeed, while being resisted in the previous years, the cultural politics of European identity and people take a front seat in EU-led initiatives in this period.

The urge to link education with culture is one of the key components of the project of a "European dimension in education," an idea that is elaborated in various EU policy documents in the 1990s⁵. Its main educational goal is that of providing youth with the skills necessary for the new economy. Education is understood holistically and, therefore, should "form" the individual and the people for tomorrow's society. In other words, education and training provide

the reference points needed to affirm *collective identity*, while at the same time permitting further advances in science and technology. The independence they give, if shared by everyone, strengthens the *sense of cohesion* and *anchors the feeling of belonging*. Europe's cultural diversity, its long existence and the mobility between different cultures are invaluable assets for adapting to the new world on the horizon. (European Commission, 1996, pp. 15, 28; emphasis added)

To create the "people" through the European dimension in education, all educational and training systems at the compulsory and non-compulsory level must actively promote a "European vision" (European Commission, 1996, pp. 15, 28). The promotion of Europeanness is to be sustained through language teaching so that youth are proficient in three European languages, by embedding the teaching of European citizenship across the curriculum and by modifying content in the fields of literature and social sciences, with particular attention to the field of history which should be cleared of nationalistic undertones (European Commission 1994, 1996). The European dimension in education also has the role of promoting "civic-mindedness and the values of pluralism and tolerance" (European Commission, 1994, p. 10), and in this sense, it can be used in fighting racism and xenophobia. The Union must defend non-EU nationals "both in the interest of its position in the world and in the name of human rights and fundamental freedoms" (European Commission, 1994, p. 14).

An important tenet of the emerging European dimension in education is the emphasis on Europe as a multicultural society in which integration must occur while respecting

⁵ The documents considered are: the "Green Paper on the European Dimension in Education" (European Commission, 1993), the "Report on the Education of Migrants' Children in the European Union" (Commission of the European Communities, 1994), the "White Paper on Education and Training: Towards the Learning Society" (Commission of the European Communities, 1996) and the report "Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training" (European Commission, 1996).

“differences” and maintaining national identities (European Commission, 1994, 1996). The multicultural citizens of Europe must be “identifiable as citizens of their own countries but integrated into the host societies, and they remain attached to their countries of origin, but open to their everyday environment” (European Commission, 1994, p. 10). However, if integration and the peaceful coexistence of culturally different communities are to be achieved, the number of non-EU migrants must be regulated by managing migratory flows (European Commission, 1994).

Making European citizenship a rallying point for European youth does not place IE on the backburner. The intercultural school is presented as the ideal type, since “interculturality in the school focuses the whole problematic of citizenship” (European Commission, 1996, p. 19). The most appropriate pedagogical approach employed in these schools is “border pedagogy,” a strategy for “learning about the cultural Other, by looking critically at how images, representations and texts are constructed and at their hidden messages” and that “facilitates learning of how to identify one’s own ‘borders’ those of others, and the borders of the external social world” (European Commission, 1996, p. 19).

When addressing the issue of categorizing European and non-European migrants, in educational policy documents elaborated in this period there is a recognition of differences between the two groups. It is acknowledged, for example, that while the former has mobility rights within Europe, the latter does not. However, this difference must not have a bearing on the educational rights of non-European immigrant youth. Migrants’ academic success and social integration are, in fact, in “the interest of Member States themselves and of the Union as a whole” (European Commission, 1994, p. 16). The integration of all migrants is necessary to avoid “social exclusion.” Yet, while the existence of various cultural identities continues to be positive and inevitable because of globalization, cultural identities are not all equal. Some cultural identities must be limited, and their numbers policed through EU and national control of migratory flows. If these are not controlled, the possibility of integration and peaceful coexistence among different cultural communities is at stake. Moreover, non-European nationals may also constitute a “burden” to the national and supranational welfare system (European Commission, 1996). Thus, while the European migrant has been portrayed positively, the non-European migrant is construed as a threat that can be included in the community but only in a limited number. Non-European migrants’ identities and cultures are a challenge to a multiculturalism that encompasses only European diversity.

Over time, European institutions, like their national counterparts, recognized that it was necessary to integrate non-European migrants for pragmatic purposes (i.e., economic needs, avoidance of social conflict). However, inclusion does not entail “equal” inclusion or full membership in the (supra)national community (Hage, 2000). Differential inclusion along the lines of race, class, and gender has, in fact, been a hallmark of community-building and belonging. IE and the European dimension in education respond precisely to this need. On the one hand, IE legitimizes the possibility of multiple identities (e.g., an original cultural identity and an intercultural identity), on the other, far from constituting a radical form of knowledge, it neither undermines racialized modernist assumptions about the links between culture, identity, and community, nor does it challenge the humanist assumption that identity exists prior to social processes (Da Silva, 2007). IE makes a distinction between those who belong to traditional, homogenous non-Western national communities and those who belong to multicultural and progressive Western national communities. An “intercultural identity” seems to be easier to achieve for the latter.

The use of interculturalism in the European discourse about education in the 1990s did not, therefore, overcome the chasm that characterized the representation of European and non-European migrants in the previous decades. IE instead represented an opportunity for the EU to further legitimize the creation of a European identity in which original cultural

identities are not erased. On one hand, the “right” to intercultural education encouraged European and non-European citizens to maintain their cultural identities and acquire the skills for a tolerant intercultural identity. On the other, the focus on cultural identities allowed for the identification of the “genuine” members of the community based on Europeanness and for the continued mis/recognition of the “false” members who cannot claim this status.

Still a Bounded Inclusion: Immigrant Education in 21st-Century Europe

Since the turn of the millennium, issues related to migration and education have become even more central to the European project (Alexiadou & Jones, 2019). Both from within and outside Europe, migration flows have continued to shape the continent’s social and political fabric. While the number of European citizens living in other EU countries and of incoming non-EU citizens (both regular and irregular) continued to climb, other trends that characterized the previous decade, such as the rise of anti-immigrant sentiments among European voters and the increased tightening of Europe’s external borders, have become even more prominent (Geddes et al., 2020). Europe has been the stage of two major “crises”—one affecting its economic stability, the other its borders (Castells et al., 2018)—which have hardened citizens and policy-makers’ attitudes towards migration and social cohesion. As a result, concerns about European countries’ ability to welcome new migrants and fully integrate members of existing communities of non-European descent (some of which born in Europe and possessing European citizenship) became more acute and politically divisive. In parallel to these events, the EU’s authority in the field of immigration and integration further increased as part of the reforms introduced with the Treaty of Amsterdam (which came into force in 1999). In this context, the issue of immigrant education was included in the category of “integration policies,” whose goals is to further integration, support equality, and prevent ethnic/racial discrimination across Europe (Eurydice, 2004). The changes brought with the Amsterdam Treaty did not lead to new educational approaches or provisions that explicitly regard immigrant youth at the European level⁶. However, the invisible process of racialized (supra)nationalization, which has been ongoing since the mid-1970s, has become more visible. In this context, with shared educational principles agreed upon among MSs, a common European approach to education takes a more definitive shape, leading towards the creation of a more coherent “European Model of Education” (Hingel, 2001, p. 4).

Despite presenting itself as progressive and benevolent, this model does not support the establishment of an educational system that is inclusive of non-European migrants. For instance, while the ambiguity of the term “migrant” still exists in the EU discourse, the use of “third-country nationals” allows us to gain insights on the differential integration and the dubious equality reserved for non-European migrants. The construction of the category non-European migrant and youth does not contradict the process of community-building and racialization that has occurred during the previous decades. Non-European migrants, whether first-, second-, or third-generation, are granted “as near as possible” the same rights as other nationals within the EU (Council of the European Union, 2003a, art. 2). However, despite the rhetoric of human rights and democracy, non-European migrants continue to be constructed as those whose numbers must be managed and whose presence in the territory is justified by their economic and demographic contribution to the MSs and the EU. Their entry and concession of long-term residency should be based on a shared assessment of the economic and demographic developments within the Union and MSs (Council of the European Union 2002, art. 28; 1999b, Section 3, art. 20). For instance, non-European migrants are granted

⁶ See Council Directive concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents (Council of the European Union, 2003a), the Declaration by the European Ministers of Education on intercultural education in the new European context (Council of the European Union, 2003b); the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue (COE, 2008).

long-term residency only if “they have adequate resources and sickness insurance, to avoid becoming a burden for the Member State” (Council of the European Union 2003a, art. 1(7)).

The notion that non-European migrants are to be integrated as “second-class” members of a nation and the EU is also exemplified by the fact that the granting of social and cultural rights should be “a key element in promoting economic and social cohesion, a fundamental objective of the Community” (Council of the European Union, 2003a, art. 4). The European migrant and national continue to be necessary for the legitimacy of the community building project as “demos,” for s/he embodies the “new Europe” through her/his mobility, intercultural/European identity and contribution to the EU’s economic, social and cultural *development*. Non-European migrants continue to be included for the economic progress of Europe and the social advancement of the EU project and its people.

As in the previous decades, the multiculturalism to be fostered is that “of our European societies” (Council of the European Union, 2003b, art. 7 p.2). Other non-Western cultures are to be respected and practised, but do not contribute to the European “shared cultural heritage.” While educational policies are to contribute to integration, national historical, and cultural heritage are to be respected (Hingel 2001). Moreover, while intercultural dialogue and debate are encouraged, they must occur within the respect of “the basic values of *European* societies and *their* cultural heritage” (COE, 2008, p. 11, emphasis added). Therefore, integration policies “must necessarily cover all areas of society, and include social, political and cultural aspects. They should respect immigrants’ dignity and distinct identity and take them into account when elaborating policies” (COE, 2008, p. 11). Respect and dignity of non-Western cultural identities must not entail the negotiation of European values and heritage.

In the educational realm, the non-negotiation of fundamental European values is upheld by intercultural education, which continues to be embraced in EU education and integration policies in this period (See, for instance, Council of the European Union, 2003b, art.10). IE continues to be understood as tool for the differential management of cultural diversity and to avoid social conflict “arising in our schools as a result of discrimination, racism, xenophobia, sexism and marginalization and to resolve conflicts in a non-violent way” (Council of the European Union, 2003b, art.10). The educational approach continues to be supported since it offers “a forward-looking model for managing cultural diversity” (COE, 2008). In this perspective, racism is not a political tool inherent to community-building, but the result of individual ignorance or stemming naturally from the encounter between cultures. Demands for inclusion and equity can only be made insofar as they do not counter the EU supranational community with its fictive identity and people. For this reason, IE, and the European dimension in education it supports, are, like liberal multiculturalism and multicultural education in other contexts, not radical tools that counter racism or nationalism, but nation-building tools that allow the community to adapt to new economic and social circumstances without countering its original racialized and racializing power (Razack, 1997 Mackey, 2002; Thobani, 2007; Dhamon, 2009).

As it is deployed in the European dimension of education, IE is also complicit in reinforcing a particular version of European identity. The EU acknowledges IE as an identity-building device necessary in a multicultural society and a means to manage “multiple cultural affiliations in a multicultural environment” (COE, 2008, p.18). IE recognizes the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of multiple identities, thereby not challenging the existence of nationalized cultural identities and legitimizing the possibility of multiple belongings to another community. In this way, it supports the EU’s need to build and emphasize “common grounds” amongst MSs and their nationals. This construction of identity is not new and does not challenge humanist and Western understandings of identity influenced by modernity and the birth of the nation-state. Similarly, it does not question the historical construction of the

hegemonic modern White identity, constructed as border-crossing, global, and shifting between the “universal” and the “particular” (i.e., a White ethnic/national identity), while representing non-Western identities as “particular” and “immobile” (Wiegman, 1999, p. 119). The new White and Western intercultural identity is simply the tolerant and liberal anti-racist version of modern Whiteness based on biological racism, which has historically been a unifying category central to the maintenance of European hegemony during imperial times (Wiegman, 1999; Stoler, 1995). Moreover, the fact that an intercultural/new European identity can shift from one form of identification to another—from the national to the supranational—is not a testimony to the non-nationalistic and non-racialized characteristics of this new identity, since the interplay between universalism and particular is identical to the one characterising older versions of racial knowledge and related notions of nation.

Conclusions: The Racialized Discourse of Immigrant Education in Europe and its Implications

This paper has sought to foreground the ambiguities at the center of the educational discourse about immigrant education in Europe. For this purpose, the analysis has focused on educational texts related to immigrant education as a discourse within the context of Europe’s regional integration project. The paper has shown how, from its inception, immigrant education has been a means to select and “nationalize” certain immigrants to include them in the European Union’s supranational community. The paper has also challenged the EU’s benevolent understanding of inclusion and showed that exclusion in the EU is not only about “keeping them out,” but about allowing non-European migrants in without full membership—a bounded inclusion. In this perspective, the educational discourse on immigrant education is yet another practice that furthers the selection of members carried out by immigration and citizenship policies at the nation-state level.

This discourse has been articulated and performed by privileged members of the EU community, such as EU bureaucrats and researchers, who possess the power to “imagine” how the (supra)nation ought to be and can define the obstacles to the realization of this image. White and/or liberal scholars are key producers of the knowledge that belies these practices. From the privileged positions they occupy in Western nation-states, they can “objectively” define the homely White space of the nation and imagine themselves as possessing “governmental belonging” and legitimate “managerial capacities” (Hage, 2000, pp. 31–47). These practices of exclusion, under the guise of anti-racist practices and knowledge maintain White supremacy and define White identities as not being invested in White power. They also highlight racism and racist actions as performed only by the lower classes, extremist neo-fascist groups while concealing the racialized practices and knowledges stemming from the “civil” and privileged members of the EU community.

The analysis of EU policy initiatives in the field of immigrant education and integration as racialized discourse has begun to unravel how these policies are articulated within, and instrumental to the broader project of European community-building. The inclusion of non-European migrant youth in these initiatives does not challenge the racialized community formation but makes it more difficult to question its exclusionary nature. The definition of “persistent” cultural identities, whether national, supranational, or multiple, is indeed not a means to respect cultural differences, but one to create political identities and characters in the same manner that biological racism did (Thobani, 2007). This type of cultural identity is used to sustain practices of bounded inclusion, thus preventing non-European migrants from benefiting from de jure and de facto membership in the Union. Not acknowledging the sociohistorical contexts in which educational discourses emerge when analyzing educational initiatives entails a “politics of forgetting” (Kowalczyk & Popkewitz,

2005). These politics parallel that of all nationalist practices and therefore raises issues of complicity with these practices.

Critical scholars have pointed to the central role that “legitimate” knowledge production has had in imagining and realizing racialized knowledge and practices. If that is the case, is it possible to counter the liberal EU discourse on education? The implication of the analysis carried out in this paper is that the first step in that direction consists of situating education within the context of national projects that are inherently exclusionary, even in the case of officially “inclusive” multicultural or intercultural projects. This move would imply the overriding of a self-serving distinction between “good” and “bad” nation-building and nationalism (Balibar, 1991b). Multicultural/intercultural projects necessitate the creation of a raced, gendered and classed notion of “people,” which, even if worded through universalism, are still exclusionary (Balibar, 1991b; Kowalczyk & Popkewitz, 2005). A second step to counter the official EU discourse on immigrant education is that of understanding “race” and “racism” in their present articulations not in biological terms but as stemming from culture and as a typical political tool of identity and community building in modernity (Lentin, 2005). When looking at the role of race in the EU case, it is, therefore, necessary to consider European Whiteness and, above all, how it has evolved into a more benevolent liberal form without severing its link to symbolic and material privileges. Finally, and related to the previous point, it should be a priority to examine how the EU educational discourse reinforces the hierarchical organization of belonging through a benevolent act of liberal inclusion *within* its supranational boundaries. In sum, to continue to theorize about education and integration without questioning the racialized, classed, and gendered dimension of knowledge and power, and the reproductive function that education performs in (post)modernity does not further the sociological imagination of a just society. On the contrary, this thinking perpetuates Western elites’ self-serving quest for inclusion while maintaining their White privilege.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in postcoloniality*. New York: Routledge.
- Alexiadou, N., & Jones, K. (2019). Educational policy-making in Europe 1986–2018: Towards convergence? In A. Traianou & K. Jones (Eds.), *Austerity and the remaking of European education*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Alred, G., Bryam, M., & Fleming, M. (2003). Introduction. In G. Alred, M. Bryam, M., & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Intercultural experience and education*. Toronto: Multilingual Matter Ltd.
- Apple, M., & Franklin, B. (2004). Curricular history and social control. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1998). *Key concepts in postcolonial studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Balibar, E. (1991a). Racism and nationalism. In E. Balibar & I. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Race, nation, class: Ambiguous identities*. New York: Verso.
- Balibar, E. (1991b). The nation form: History and ideology. In E. Balibar & I. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Race, nation, class: Ambiguous identities*. New York: Verso.
- Balibar, E. (1994). Racism as universalism. In E. Balibar (Ed.), *Masses, classes, ideas: Studies on politics and philosophy before and after Marx*. London: Routledge.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Barbousas, J., & Seddon, T. (2018). Visualizing the European space of education: Analytic borderland, transnational topologies and spaces of orientation. *European Educational Research Journal*, 17(6), 766–783.
- Barnor H. (2007). Racialized modernity: An analytics of white mythologies, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(4), 643–663.
- Bell, G. H. (1994). Intercultural pedagogy and the European dimension in education. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 5(2), 25–34.
- Bonnett, A. (2016). Whiteness and the West. In C. Dweyer & C. Bressey (Eds.), *New geographies of race and racism*. London: Routledge.
- Bonnett, A., & Nayak, A. (2003). Cultural geographies of racialization: The territory of race. *Handbook of cultural geography*, 300–312.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brochmann, G. (1999). The mechanisms of control. In G. Brochmann & T. Hammer (Eds.), *Mechanisms of immigration control: A comparative analysis of European regulation policies*. Oxford: Berg.
- Brubaker, R. (2009). Ethnicity, race, and nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 21–42.
- Campani, G. (2002). *I saperi dell'interculturalita'*. *Storia, epistemologia e pratiche educative tra Stati Uniti, Canada ed Europa*. Naples: Liguori Editori.
- Castells, M., Bouin, O., Caraça, J., Cardoso, G., Thompson, J., & Wieviorka, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Europe's crises*. Cambridge: John Wiley & Sons.
- Castles, S., De Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Chock, P. (1995). Ambiguity in policy discourse: Congressional talk about immigration. *Policy Sciences*, 28(2), 165–184.
- Coulby, D. (2006). Intercultural education: theory and practice. *Intercultural Education*, 17(3), 245–257.
- Council of Europe. (1976). *Recommendation 786 on the education and cultural development of migrants*. Adopted by the COE Parliamentary Assembly on 16 September 1976 (9th Sitting). Retrieved from <http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=/Documents/Adopted Text/ta76/EREC786.htm>
- Council of Europe. (1983). *Resolution No. 1 on migrants' education*. Adopted by Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education on May 10–12 1983 (13th Session). Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/e/cultural_cooperation/education/standing_conferences/m.13thsession_dublin1983.asp
- Council of Europe. (1984). *Recommendation No. R (84) 9 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on second generation migrants*. 20 March 1984, No. R (84) 9. Retrieved from <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=603625&SecMode=1&DocId=682216&Usage=2>
- Council of Europe. (1989). *Recommendation No. 1093 on the education of migrants' children*. Adopted by the COE Parliamentary Assembly on 31 January 1989 (19th Sitting). Retrieved from <http://assembly.coe.int/mainf.asp?Link=/documents/adoptedtext/ta89/erec1093.htm>
- Council of Europe. (2008). *White paper on intercultural dialogue: "Living together As equals in dignity."* Strasbourg, 7 May 2008. Retrieved From http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/default_EN.asp
- Council of the European Communities. (1977). *Council Directive No. 486 on the education of the children of migrant workers*. *Official Journal L* 199,6(8), pp. 32–33. Retrieved from <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31977L0486:EN:HML>

- Council of the European Union. (2002). *Presidency conclusions, Seville European Council, 21–22 June 2002*. Retrieved from http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/72638.pdf
- Council of the European Union. (2003a). *Council Directive No. 109 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents. Official Journal L 016*, pp. 44–53. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l23034.htm>
- Council of the European Union. (2003b). *Declaration by the European Ministers of Education on intercultural education in the new European context*. Athens, 10–12 November 2003. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/declaration-by-the-european-ministers-of-education-on-intercultural-ed/16807462b5>
- Cullen, H. (1996). From migrants to citizens? European community policy on intercultural education. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 45(1), 109–129.
- Da Silva, D. F. (2007). *Toward a global idea of race*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dei, G. J. S. (1996). *Anti-racism education*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Dhamoon, R. (2009). *Identity/difference politics: How difference is produced, and why it matters*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Driessen, G. (2000). The limits of educational policy and practice? The case of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *Comparative Education*, 36(1), 55–72.
- European Commission. (1993). *Green paper on the European dimension of education*. COM (93), 457 final, September. Brussels. Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/936/01/education_gp_COM_93_457.pdf
- European Commission. (1994). *Report on the education of migrants' children in the European Union*. COM (94) 80 final. Brussels. Retrieved from <http://aei.pitt.edu/1257/>
- European Commission. (1996). *White paper on education and training: Towards the learning society*. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf
- European Commission. (1997). *Accomplishing Europe through education and training*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Council. (1973). *Declaration on European identity*. Bulletin of the European Communities. December 1973, No 12. Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities, 118–122.
- Eurydice. (2004). *Integrating immigrant youth into schools in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit. Retrieved from http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/eurydice/Integrating_immigrant_children_2004_EN.pdf
- Eurydice. (2019). *Integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools in Europe: National policies and measures*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fass, C., Hajisoteriou, C., & Angelides, P. (2014). Intercultural education in Europe: Policies, practices and trends. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), 300–318.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Society must be defended*. New York: Picador.
- Fozdar, F., & Low, M. (2015). 'They have to abide by our laws... and stuff': Ethnonationalism masquerading as civic nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 21(3), 524–543.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Geddes, A., Hadj-Abdou, L., & Brumat, L. (2020). *Migration and mobility in the European Union*. London: Macmillan
- Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2002). *The racial state*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2009). Racial comparisons, relational racisms: Some thoughts on method. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(7), 1271–1282.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(2), 331–364.
- Gundara, J. S., & Jacobs, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Intercultural Europe: Diversity and social policy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hadjisoteriou, C., Faas, D., & Angelides, P. (2015). The Europeanisation of intercultural education? Responses from EU policy-makers. *Educational Review*, 67(2), 218–235.
- Hage, G. (1998). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1992). The West and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & B. Gibeon (Eds.), *Formations of modernity* (pp. 275–331). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hansen, P. (1997). Education in a multicultural European Union: Between intercultural visions and a realpolitik of immigration. *Migration: A European Journal of International Migration and Ethnic Relations*, 32, 5–40.
- Hansen, P. (1998). Schooling a European identity: Ethno-cultural exclusion and nationalist resonance within the EU policy of "The European dimension of education." *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 9(1), 5–22.
- Hansen, P. (2002). European identity, European integration and the colonial connection. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(4), 483–498.
- Hansen, P. (2004). In the name of Europe. *Race & Class*, 45(3), 49–61.
- Hansen, P., & Jonsson, S. (2014). *Euroafrica: The untold history of European integration and colonialism*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Herrmann, R., Risse, T., & Brewer M. (Eds.). (2004). *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hesse, B. (2007). Racialized modernity: An analytics of white mythologies, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(4), 643–663.
- Hingel, A. J. (2001). Education policies and European governance—Contribution to the interservice groups on European governance. *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, 5, 7–16.
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis. *Theory & Psychology*, 11(4), pp. 521–547.
- Karlsen, G. (2002). Educational policy and educational programmes in the European Union. In J. Ibanez-Martin & G. Jover, (Eds.), *Education in Europe: Policies and politics* (pp. 23–49). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kowalczyk, J., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2005). Multiculturalism, recognition and abjection: (Re)mapping Italian identity. *Policy Futures in Education*, 3(4), 423–435.
- Lange, B., & Alexiadou, N. (2007). New forms of European Union governance in the education sector? A preliminary analysis of the Open Method of Coordination. *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(4), pp. 321–335.
- Lange, T. (2013). Return migration of foreign students and non-resident tuition fees. *Journal of Population Economics*, 26(2), 703–718.
- Lawn, M. (2011). Standardizing the European education policy space. *European Educational Research Journal*, 10(2), 259–272.
- Leclercq, J. M. (2002). *The lessons of thirty years of European cooperation for intercultural education*. Document DGIV/EDU/DIAL (2002) 8. Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- Leclercq, J. M. (2003). *Facets of interculturality in education*. Brussels: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Leeman, Y., & Ledoux, G. (2003). Preparing teachers for intercultural education, *Teaching Education*, 14(3), 279–291.
- Lentin, A. (2005). Replacing ‘race’, historicizing ‘culture’ in multiculturalism. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39(4), 379–396.
- Lentin, A. (2008). Europe and the silence about race. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 11(4), 487–503.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Diaz, A. (2008). Engaging with diversity: The construction of policy for intercultural education in Italy. *Intercultural Education*, 19(2), 137–150.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. London: SAGE
- Mackey, E. (2002). *House of difference: Cultural politics and national identity*. London: Routledge.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial context*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mills, C. W. (2008). Racial liberalism. *PMLA*, 123(5), 1380–1397.
- Nóvoa, A. (2013). The blindness of Europe: New fabrications in the European educational space. *Sisyphus—Journal of Education*, 1(1), 101–123.
- Nóvoa, A., & Lawn M. (2002). Introduction. In A. Nóvoa, & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space* (pp. 1–13). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ollikainen, A. (2000). European education, European citizenship? On the role of education in constructing Europeaness. *European Education*, 32(2), 6–21.
- Pasias, G., & Roussakis, Y. (2012). “Who marks the bench?” A critical review of the neo-European “paradigm shift” through higher education policies and discourses. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(1), pp. 127–141.
- Philippou, S. (2005). The ‘problem’ of the European dimension in education: A principled reconstruction of the Greek Cypriot curriculum. *European Educational Research Journal*, 4(4), pp. 343–367.
- Popkewitz, T. E. (2001). Rethinking the political: Reconstituting national imaginaries and producing difference. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2/3), 179–207.
- Razack, S. (1999). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Razack, S. (2002). *Race, space, and the law*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Razack, S. (2007). Stealing the pain of others: Reflections on Canadian humanitarian responses. *Review of Education Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*. 29(4) 375–394.
- Razack, S. (2008). *Casting out and the eviction of Muslims from western law and politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rex, J. (1995). Multiculturalism in Europe and America. *Nations and Nationalisms*, 1(2), 243–259.
- Rocha-Trinidad, M. B., & Sobral-Mendes, M. L. (1997). Intercultural education: Policies within Europe. In Woodrow, D. (Ed.), *Intercultural education: Theories, policies and practice* (pp. 7–20). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rodríguez Maeso, S., & Araújo, M. (2017). The (im)plausibility of racism in Europe: Policy frameworks on discrimination and integration. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 51(1), 26–50.
- Schissler, H., & Soysal, Y. (Eds.). (2005). *The nation, Europe and the world: Textbooks and curricula in transition*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.
- Sirna, C. (1997). *Pedagogia interculturale. Concetti, problemi, proposte*. Milan: Guerini Studio.

- Soysal, Y. (2002). Locating European identity in education. In A. Nóvoa & M. Lawn, (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space* (pp. 55–66). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stevenson, N. (2012). Cosmopolitan education and cultural citizenship: A critical European perspective. *Cultural Sociology*, 6(1), 113–128.
- Stoler, A. (1995). *Race and the education of desire*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Suárez-Krabbe, J. (2014). Pluriversalizing Europe: challenging belonging, revisiting history, disrupting homogeneity. *Postcolonial Studies*, 17(2), 155–172.
- Teasley, C. (2008). The culture of discourse on educational reform in Spain. *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 26(4), 249–279.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Tikly, L. (1999). Globalization and Education in the Postcolonial World: Towards a Conceptual Framework, *Comparative Education*, 37(2), 151–171.
- Van Driel, B., Darmody, M., & Kerzil, J. (2016). *Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU*, NESET II report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Van Mol, C., & de Valk, H. (2015). Migration and immigrants in Europe: A historical and demographic perspective. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe: Contexts, levels and actors* (pp. 31–55). New York: Springer.
- Van Mol C., & de Valk H. (2016). Migration and immigrants in Europe: A historical and demographic perspective. In Garcés-Mascareñas B., Penninx R. (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe*. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer.
- Walkenhorst, H. (2008). Explaining change in EU education policy. *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(4), 567–587.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wiegman, R. (1999). Whiteness studies and the paradox of particularity. *Boundary*, 2(26), 115–150.
- Wodak, R. (2013). Dis-citizenship and migration: A critical discourse-analytical perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 12(3), 173–17.
- Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257–337.
- Young, R. (Ed.). (1981). *Untying the text: A post-structural anthology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender and nation*. London: Sage Publication.
- Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2010). Leadership styles and multicultural education approaches: An exploration of their relationship. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(2), 163–183.

Nancy Spina received her PhD from the Department of Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, and a Master of Arts in Women and Gender Studies at the University of British Columbia. Her main areas of interests are curriculum theory, comparative education, critical pedagogy, and critical race studies.