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**Abstract**

*A resurgence of national and international interest in citizenship education, citizenship and*

*social cohesion has been coupled with an apparent emergence of a language of crisis (Sears*

*& Hyslop-Margison, 2006). Given this background, how can or should one consider a*

*subjective sense of membership in a single political community? What this article hopes to*

*show is that confining the subject of citizenship or patriotism to a national framework is*

*inadequate in as much as there are grounds to argue for a more expansive and, at the same*

*time, integrated outlook. Patriotism, like Citizenship, is still open to interpretation and*

*potentially in danger of falling short of a richer conception. Education, therefore, needs to*

*incorporate inclusive practices and encourage an integrative mindset in order to accommodate:*

*increasingly complex identities, associations, experiences and continuing changes in the political*

*landscape. In this article, the author argues for the importance of learning ways in which*

*to value and respect diversity while working towards a principle of unity in diversity.*

*Cultivating a subjective sense of membership in a single world polity is vital in matters*

*pertaining to sustainability and justice.*

*In response to considering possible ways of sharing a subjective sense of membership in*

*a single community and some implications for Citizenship, Patriotism and Citizenship*

*Education, this article looks to three areas: ways in which to understand the notion of*

*citizenship and patriotism, cultural crises and the notion of a cosmopolitan nation and,*

*finally, the personal dimension to education for world citizenship.*

... contemporary democratic theory begins from the supposition that

meaningful democratic citizenship requires that citizens share a subjective

sense of membership in a single political community. (Williams, 2003, p. 210)

**Introduction**

At first glance it would seem difficult to imagine how citizens may share, ‘a subjective

sense of membership in a single political community’ given increasingly common

experiences of changes: in migration, increasingly complex identities and the general

impact of globalisation. Different national contexts will, undoubtedly, offer different

perspectives of citizenship and membership. Traditionally, how membership is

felt at a subjective level will also vary accordingly.
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In Britain, for example, notions of citizenship and ‘Britishness’ have tended to

be backward looking, trying to construct a sense of identity and culture through a

cultural heritage and history of the past. Alternatively, an interdependent sense of

nationality, as in the examples of Scotland and Canada, has held people’s allegiance

together, albeit through association with another dominant nation. The example of

South Africa, however, presents a notion of common allegiance to its constitution

that is forward looking in an effort to promote national unity. Looking back, under-

standably, is not considered desirable given the South African context and its

history.

Initially, experiences of national allegiance appear varied. Global socio-economic

and political shifts, however, have resulted in more shared encounters and concerns.

This is evident with respect to understanding citizenship, patriotism and a sense of

belonging, for example, where former attitudes are being questioned and under

review. In recent times, these former conceptions, particularly in England, have been

contested in a number of ways. Confusion and tension has occurred with attempts

to understand what is meant by a common culture and what notion of ‘Britishness’,

for example, citizens can identify with. This is where education in Britain has

identified Citizenship Education as a significant way to address such issues with

a potentially vital role to help promote a notion of membership, as citizens, in

a shared, single political community.

In Britain, Sir Bernard Crick, former government citizenship advisor and Emer-

itus Professor of Politics at Birkbeck College University of London, describes citi-

zenship education as bringing about a change in the ‘civic culture of society’ (Crick,

2002). Interest in civic culture, in Britain, continues to generate discussion in the

public sphere of government and policymaking, helped along by the media, and

resulting in highlighting particular issues. Among the various aspects of citizenship,

affected by current public debate is the subject of identity. This has been related

to increased concern and debate about youth disaffectedness and youth culture, the

notion of ‘Britishness’ incorporating another contentious issue, namely immigration.

Citizenship education, in Britain, has largely been a political and public response

to a sense of crisis. A sense of crisis is nothing new in times of significant changes.

Citizenship education has certainly been a cause of significant amendments to the

National Curriculum for England and Wales and employed in the nation-building

project. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the call for social cohesion by govern-

ment, and the founding of institutes like the Centre for Social Cohesion (http://

www.socialcohesion.co.uk/) is a direct response to recognition that the national

community is increasingly diverse. It may also be an attempt to alleviate any fear

of social fragmentation as a consequence of a multicultural Britain.

Fear for the loss of civic culture and civic responsibility, not to mention national

sovereignty, seems to have prompted calls for instilling a sense of patriotism, or

national pride, in education. Hence, the sustained debate about ‘Britishness’.

Citizenship has in the past meant the privileging of persons who share a com-

monality against those who do not; such as those sharing the same language, values,

practises and experiences. The nation-building project has historically been supported

by patriotic sentiment. One need only look at examples of propaganda posters from
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the great world wars, or the rhetoric in the public media in times of more recent

conflict. Instilling a sense of patriotism has helped generate and reinforce particular

attitudes and commitments, pledging allegiance to preserve what is common between

those who share mutual interests against those others who are perceived to pose a

threat to the national interest. In recent times perpetuating a sense of crisis has helped

strengthen arguments for cultivating patriotism through citizenship education.

A further challenge besetting those in education is how citizenship may best be

understood and, in the British context at least, what notions of Britishness ought

to be promoted. There are undoubtedly various interpretations as to the nature and

culture of citizenship, and Western liberal thought has dominated the field in the

literature. Whilst I draw from a predominantly Western canon and refer to examples

from the British context, I make the following conjecture: What emerges from the

discourse is not, I would suggest, exclusive to Britain or Western societies. Instead

concerns about diversity, unity, identity and social cohesion are extensively, and more

frequently, encountered trans-nationally.

Taking into account policies and educational reforms that have taken place over

recent years in a number of countries, a political and social angst about citizenship

and civic culture is fast becoming an international experience. The recent debate

about ‘civic deficit’ by the Civic Experts Group (2006) in Australia and the decision

to make citizenship education in secondary schools a compulsory part of the National

Curriculum for England and Wales (2001) are examples. Cultivating a culture of

angst and renewed emphasis on civic culture in Britain, have been growing concerns

about youth civic engagement, or rather disengagement, and young people’s knowl-

edge, or lack thereof, of democratic processes and interest in social cohesion. These

issues are arguably concerns shared trans-nationally.

Crick’s call for change can be attributed to the fact that citizenship has been under-

going changes and the civic culture of most national communities, at the grassroots,

increasingly reflects a global community, or its effects, in some way. Global trends,

which have contributed greatly to the changes experienced in citizenship, need to

be acknowledged, understood and accommodated in some way if nations and their

citizens desire social cohesion and progress. This is not to undermine the sover-

eignty of the nation state, but rather remind us that nations need to align them-

selves more closely to an expansive vision and redefine their roles as members of

an international community. Anthony Giddens elucidates on the consequences of

approaching citizenship:

The nation state is not disappearing or losing its power in the world, but

it is being reshaped, especially in the West and especially in Europe.

Giddens (2000, p. 20)

The gradual emergence of a global era cannot be ignored. Effectively, a growing

awareness in public discourse of the global effects of the actions of nations and their

people, relying on a growing interdependency between nations has brought about,

for better or worse, a more expansive outlook. As Giddens (2000), recalling the

American sociologist Daniel Bell, writes: ‘... the nation-state becomes too small to

solve the big problems but too big to solve the small ones’. A multi-layered stance
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on citizenship, therefore, is appropriate given the already apparent global influences

in the community at every level.

Education in global citizenship, or world citizenship, therefore, requires familiar-

isation with and understanding of the network of relationships and processes that

pertain to a complex and multifarious world, inclusive of the local community to

which citizens belong. By engaging in aspects of this ongoing debate, which are

pertinent to the discourse for citizenship education and civic culture, the following

argument will emerge. A world-embracing vision derived from cultivating a primary

allegiance beyond one’s country to principles of justice, unity in diversity and ‘the

worldwide community of human beings’ (Gutmann, 2002; Nussbaum, 2002, cited

in Banks, 2004) is imperative in matters of sustainable development and justice. It

follows, then, to say that education for ‘meaningful democratic citizenship’, which

‘requires that citizens share a subjective sense of membership in a single political

community’ (Williams, 2003), must work to cultivating a common allegiance to the

‘worldwide community of human beings’.

A cosmopolitan approach is, indeed, compatible with, and reinforces, liberal values.

Some liberals frame and contain their arguments about citizenship and patriotism

to a national context (Tamir, 1995; Rorty, 1998; Miller, 2000; Callan, 2006). In the

same vein, Melissa Williams (2003), has argued for citizenship as shared fate within

the context of arguing for civic nationalism. I would wish to argue that this same

notion lends itself to a notion of world citizens in an emerging global civic culture.

As world citizens in an international ‘community of shared fate’, the implicit

need in a liberal democracy is recognition of universal principles, such as basic rights

and opportunities of all citizens as fundamentally equal. An international civic culture,

something identifiable in institutions such as the United Nations and human char-

ters, as in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, ensures the potential

to secure individual rights and freedoms. One need only look to the 2008 State of

the World’s Human Rights Report by Amnesty International to see a catalogue of

cases of human rights violations in various national contexts to understand a moral

and political global landscape where collective consciousness and action are required

from the international community. It is no wonder that appeals are thus made by

Amnesty International for governments to:

... show the same degree of vision, courage and commitment that led the

United Nations to adopt the Universal Declaration of Human Rights sixty

years ago. (Amnesty International, 2008)

Consequently, respect for the oneness and diversity of humanity is a primary liberal

principle upon which to build just institutions at global, national and local levels.

A primary liberal principle of equality needs to be reinforced by a principle of unity

in diversity to be fully appreciated. Inherently, notions of citizenship cannot con-

ceptually be confined exclusively to national boundaries. With the emergence of a

global era, conceptions of citizenship have continued to evolve and cosmopolitan

arguments seem most conducive to supporting liberal principles. Citizenship is

more than membership of an Athenian city-state, or even the modern notion of the

nation state. There are, thus, important implications for the need to evaluate and
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reconceptualise the notion of citizenship and subsequently patriotism in order to

accommodate citizens and nations states as they evolve.

A more expansive notion of interdependency with cultural, political and social

complexities is supported by a notion of citizens as members of a moral and political

community. For this reason inclusive principles and practices, respectful of differ-

ences and the uniqueness of others, are crucial to the discourse of social cohesion

and peaceful coexistence. Respecting diversity is not concerned solely with tolerance,

however. Neither can it be sustainable for meaningful democratic citizenship in a

global context for any nation that a dominant culture demand assimilation into its

practices irrespective of the complex associations and attachments of its citizens

and hope, thereby, that its citizens will feel a love for the state. Where states have

enforced a dominant culture over their diverse populations, without accounting for

particular cultural, religious group considerations, the consequences are striking.

Consider aboriginal groups whose cultural and political rights have been suppressed

to the point of near extinction of their practices and heritage.

Education for Global or World Citizenship can support the efforts to help

gradually realise mutual goals in the ongoing project, not just of nation-building but

inter-national or world-building polity, taking into consideration the citizen as

a political and moral person. It is important, therefore, that citizens see themselves

a members of a single world community in order to respect rights and differences. What

is important, for education, is emphasis upon critical and respectful evaluation of

citizenship and patriotism in the classroom in accordance with an ever-changing world.

Understanding patriotism or citizenship today may require a different, perhaps

richer and more expansive, conception than those understood in the past. Critical

engagement necessitates a need to examine the challenges presented in understand-

ing the relationships and the role of citizens as members of a single moral and

political international community as well as national and local communities as well.

**Citizenship, Patriotism and Change: A Culture of Crisis and its Effects on**

**Civic Culture**

*Understanding Citizenship and Patriotism*

An important consideration is that Patriotism like Citizenship has and continues to

experience change over time. How such changes are accommodated is vital to under-

standing citizenship and, consequently, patriotism. The increasingly apparent nature

of citizenship as multi-layered and complex may be largely attributed to the forces

of globalisation and a global network of systems. The world has, thus, become more

accessible than before. As Anthony Giddens puts it, ‘... there is a much higher global

level of integration than ever before ... we are in a new kind of society in our relation

to science and innovation ...’ (Giddens, 2000).

Notions of patriotism, like citizenship, have also experienced and continue to

experience changes, according to particular contexts and values in societies over time.

Thus there have been various interpretations of what patriotism implies. Patriotism

may be understood as a sense of loyalty to, or love of, country. Love of country
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may be interpreted in many ways, thus taking various forms. It all really depends

on how we choose to interpret patriotism.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the notion of ‘country’ has also varied conceptually with

time. For the purpose of understanding changing concepts it is useful to consider,

briefly, how changes to notions of country have come about. This is particularly

interesting in reference to how civic life and citizenship is understood.1 An expansive

notion of love of country, patriotism or citizenship is not, necessarily new. However,

mechanisms of rapid global growth have helped increase greater interdependence

among nation states, thus reinforcing a potentially more cosmopolitan perspective

of the world. Implicit in the term interdependence are notions of mutual assistance,

support, interaction and cooperation, increasingly necessary for political considera-

tions and public policy. Concerns about sustainability and security have become

unmistakably global. Environmental concerns, a prime example, have placed countries

in a position of accountability to one another, forcing governments to acknowledge

pressing concerns, which demand the need for collaboration and the urgency of

commitment to action. In this way, physical borders, and it could be said political

borders too, are, indeed, artificial constructs. Viroli (1995, p. 47) comments:

Fatherland is not a natural reality but an institution: it is ‘a new erected

state [novi status] which now we call properly the Commonwealth [Rem-

pulicam], or our Country [Patriam]’. Like one common ship under the

direction of a pilot, our country is ‘a certain common state [unus aliquis

status]’ under one prince or one law. Our love or charity (amor et caritas)

for our country comes therefore from the persuasion that our own safety

and the safety of our property rest upon the safety of our country. For

this reason we rejoice at the good of the commonwealth and we suffer at

its miseries.

Institutions, like a ship, not only require a pilot but also individuals who, together,

constitute the society, which establishes law and order in order for the ‘common

ship’ of the state to come into being and sail effectively on its course. Briefly, States

are territories that have generally been historically shaped with experiences and

boundaries shifting with time and particular contexts. Viroli’s references to notions

about: ‘Fatherland’, ‘State’ and ‘Commonwealth’ illustrate the changes in language

and consequent varied conceptions about the notion of a country.

There is a hermeneutics to understanding change: gathering and interpreting a

shared conception of values from a social, cultural and historical heritage helps

construct a conception of a shared community. Similarly, the relationship cultivated

between citizens and the state experiences shifts too and is subject to change.

Change is inevitable with time. What matters is learning how to understand change

and developing attitudes and practices, which are conducive to change for the better.

Diverse perspectives in a plural society need to be inclusive of citizens and com-

munities, consultative in nature, in order to help construct future integrative and

cohesive communities. This is the implication of some2 who aim to provide ways with

which to cope and understand global change from a socio-political and historical

perspective. Most of our current understandings of citizenship are based on the
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historic convergence of boundaries of citizenship (territorial, cultural, national,

linguistic, institutional and moral) that are now pulling apart (Williams, 2003, p. 209).

Dustin provides a model that demonstrates the need for institutions, individuals

and communities to adapt understanding in order to construct new meaning and

vision for a potentially robust and comprehensive concept, or ship, in which to sail.

Evidently, a positive influence of global change is the possibility to provide a more

fluid way in which citizens can relate to their country and the rest of the world.

Diverse communities have brought with them multiple identities. According to

Giddens education and citizenship can help promote tolerance of multiple identity.

This important value can be promoted in what Giddens describes as a, ‘cosmopolitan

nation, ... which enables every citizen to live comfortably with several identities, to

be English, British, European, and perhaps even a citizen of a wider emerging world

society’ (Giddens, 2000, p. 21).

Another fundamental aspect of change is how it has affected and transformed

everyday life: ‘we do not experience our lives as fate, as previous generations tended

to do’ (Giddens, 2000, p. 20). Being destined to follow on in a trade or profession

or being a woman destined for domesticity are no longer determined or expected.

Admittedly, this is probably more the situation in developed rather than other

developing countries. The restructuring of citizenship, institutions and societies to

accommodate the global transformations as Giddens describes, have also, he adds,

had an impact on emotional lives.

Giddens (2000) identifies four consequences of approaching citizenship. The first

of these is the major impact as a consequence of change on, ‘sovereignty and the

nature of national identity’.3 He describes the nation state, especially in the West,

as being reshaped, and he claims a direct consequence is the experience of a ‘fuzzy

sovereignty’, leading to potential conflicts or new possibilities for peace.

For Giddens (2000, p. 21) this notion of a ‘fuzzy sovereignty’ is experienced in

Europe where, ‘nations are everywhere seeking to redefine their past, and recapture

a new identity for the future’. On the one hand, this can be the cause of conflict; he

gives the example of Kosovo here. On the more positive side of a newfound optimism,

Giddens draws on the experience in Northern Ireland, claiming, ‘the peace process

in Ireland, whether it is successful or not, would not have been possible without it

... . A citizen can be in Northern Ireland, connected to Ireland, connected to the

UK, but also—crucially connected to the European Union’.

In an attempt to, ‘recapture a new identity for the future’, attempts have been

made to redefine patriotism and national identity, describing patriotism as the glue

of a society. This is precisely how Gordon Brown has presented patriotism. In a

speech promoting ‘Britishness’ Gordon Brown (2006), then speaking as Britain’s

Chancellor of the Exchequer, not yet Britain’s Prime Minister, urged supporters of

the Labour party to:

... embrace the Union flag ... a flag for tolerance and inclusion ... We have

to be clearer now about how diverse cultures which inevitably contain

differences can find the essential common purpose also without which no

society can flourish.
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He called for his party and its supporters to be ‘unashamedly patriotic’:

... just as in wartime a sense of common patriotic purpose inspired people

to do what is necessary, so in peace time a strong modern sense of

patriotism and patriotic purpose which binds people together can motivate

and inspire.

Looking at how a ‘common patriotic purpose’ has been interpreted and imple-

mented in different contexts in the past and from examples of present day, there

may be few inspiring examples. Brown’s inclusive, unifying vision of embracing the

Union flag asks for a different commitment to change or motivation from its citizens

than to another example, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo. There, the sense

of patriotism promoted in its soldiers is quite different and ethically questionable.4

To be ‘unashamedly patriotic’ demands care and attention, avoiding extreme forms

of nationalism, which have been known not to be tolerant of diversity.

*Cultural Crises and a Notion of the Cosmopolitan Nation*

In the process of responding to change and restructuring communities to accom-

modate change, nations have, and continue to experience, social and political anxiety.

In light of this, concern for national cohesion has translated into the emergence of

a perceived social crisis incorporated in newfound angst about youth apathy and

political participation; diversity, unity, allegiance, citizenship; and, more recently

again in the media in Britain, patriotism, identity and ‘Britishness’.

Citizenship, with its long tradition of being nationally bound, is presented with

the challenges of an international landscape both from within and outside national

borders. The visibly increasing diversity of people and widening economic and

political relationships formed have created a new priority to reconstruct and orient

some map of meaning about citizenship, belonging and, leading from that, notions

of patriotism amidst rapidly changing features of national communities.

It is difficult to comment upon all aspects of the challenges facing change in the

context of national communities. But for the purposes of this section, I will consider

some dominant themes. Among these are: coping with a multi-cultural society and

its diverse populations as a result of recent and past migration, the fear of loss in

a sense of civic pride and active political participation in young people. It is impor-

tant to consider how to understand patriotism in light of these issues.

Migration is certainly not a new phenomenon but has been a strong contributing

factor to understanding notions of diversity. In Britain, for example, the recent

expansion of the European Union has meant an increase in movement and migra-

tion, something that has attracted much attention in the media, particularly where

citizenship and civic culture is concerned.

What has become increasingly apparent nationally, in Britain certainly, is that

second- and third-generation migrants have assimilated to a dominant national cul-

ture but have also successfully associated with the minority cultures of their parents

and grandparents. This presents a new dimension to what it is to be British, for

example. The conjecture here is that this experience reveals a more complex notion
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of identity and belonging that is not exclusive to Britain but may be found elsewhere

too. Such changes have introduced an interesting challenge to the discourse of

citizenship and patriotism. Contemporary Britain may, indeed, be a fusion of

cultures. However, a recent survey carried out in Britain among Asian youth, has

suggested that there is always a danger that less dominant cultures may have to

assume or assimilate to the dominant culture to feel accepted and have a sense of

belonging to their community. Over a third of the Asians in a survey commissioned

as part of BBC Asian Network’s Asian Nation (2007) agreed that they needed to

ascribe to being a ‘coconut’, a person who acts or thinks like a white person, to be

accepted and ‘get on’ in the UK. This certainly has ramifications on questions

concerning ‘Britishness’, sovereignty and any notion of national identity.

Nevertheless, a hybrid identity, where there exist multiple attachments with rich

experiences of association and identification with other cultures, are becoming

increasingly commonplace. This may translate in multiple forms of meaningful,

subjective citizenship. A sense of belonging to more than one community is possible,

in the same way as the earlier example of the Irish citizen who can identify with a

multiple sense of community that extends to the rest of Europe (Giddens, 2000).

A young person in Britain with migrant parents, for example, can identify with

multiple languages, cultures, religion, have a hybrid identity, and still feel British.

Cultural, national, and global identifications and attachments are complex,

interactive, and contextual. The ways in which they influence an individual’s

behaviour is determined by many factors. (Banks, 2004, p. 8)

Diversity in citizenship is important and integral to understanding citizenship in a

global community. There’s no doubt that young people face a variety of challenges

and experience more complex moral, social and political relationships than previous

generations.

Amid a growing sense of crisis, one consequence is concern for the youth culture

of a nation. This may well be a universal pattern of intergenerational human concern

of the older generations caring for the future of their young. At such times it is

important not to cultivate what has been described as ‘a cult mentality’. Cultivating

this kind of ethos seems to perpetuate anxiety. This may not be the most helpful

way to engender social cohesion. It is increasingly the culture of fear, fear of national

disintegration, which threatens social cohesion and is perpetuated by:

... a cult mentality that precludes meaningful dialogue about effective

reform. A cult mentality routinely commits to simplistic slogans and dogma

while remaining unreflective about attending assumptions, implications,

and alternatives. (Stein, 2001, cited in Richardson & Blades, 2006, p. 14)

In Britain the subject of young people and how education can best serve them has

been a huge and ongoing debate, which does not seem to be exclusive to Britain.

Alan Sears and Emery Hyslop-Margison (2006) produce some valuable insight into

research carried out and present an interesting account of ‘the Cult of Citizenship

Education’. They draw attention to the pattern of a culture of crisis emerging across

a number of countries over recent years, with particular reference to a culture of
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people’s civic attitudes and behaviour, which contributes to a ‘cult-mentality’

particularly towards young people.

Public perception and the general discourse of citizenship can become vulnerable

to clichéd, stereotyped depictions of young people. A label given to young people who

wear hooded sweaters, as ‘hoodies’, is one example in Britain where young people

have been perceived to suggest menacing behaviour if seen to be wearing a particular

type of garment. Almost certainly, the outcome of these kinds of public discourse,

assisted by the media and political figures,5 determines the relationships cultivated

and the subsequent civic culture promoted. Against this backdrop, there is a need to

sensitively consider how best to respond to and include young people in civic society.

The claim here is that, essentially, citizenship education needs to be multi-layered,

as is already adopted in citizenship education for England and Wales. The imple-

mentation of a multi-layered approach to the subject includes three strands with a

proposed fourth. These are: social and moral development, community involvement,

political literacy and the fourth recommendation to be included, identity and diver-

sity: living together in the UK.6 This fourth strand holds promise, proposing to

unpack discrete areas, which would best be addressed directly in order to appreciate

how individual citizens can integrate with others in their community. Most important

would be how to consider the relationship between these aspects and not merely

consider them as independent strands.

In their discussion of a prevailing ‘cult mentality’, Sears and Hyslop-Margison

refer to research carried out with young people, examining the differences between

public perception and young people’s responses to issues pertaining to civic knowledge,

sentiment, and engagement. Importantly, this research points to concern expressed

about what has been described as the growing ‘ignorance’, ‘alienation’ and ‘agnos-

ticism’ among young people.

... Citizens, especially young ones are often described as ignorant of the

basic information required to function as citizens; alienated from politically

participating in their societies; and agnostic because they supposedly do

not believe in the values that support democratic citizenship. (Richardson

& Blades, 2006, p. 15)

These concerns correspond with Giddens’ statements about change and its con-

sequences on citizenship. Among other things, he identified concerns about identity

and diminishing trust in political institutions and politicians. Perhaps what has

occurred over time is a change in the dynamics in the relationships between citizens,

political institutions and politicians. Contrary to public perception, young people

are potentially more knowledgeable then previous generations with their ability to

access the world more readily. Perhaps young people need to be trusted in their

capacity to engage in matters of importance to the community, to critically evaluate

different viewpoints, even those not shared by the dominant culture. What is inter-

esting and important to note about studies carried out in a number of countries

with young people by Hahn (in 1998) and Chareka (in 2001), cited by Sears and

Hyslop-Margison (2006), is that they found young people, ‘alienated from the formal

political process’, nevertheless:

© 2009 The Author

Journal compilation © 2009 Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia

476

*Muna Golmohamad*

Young people in both studies were willing to participate in community

activities or in advocacy when they see themselves actually making a

difference ... (Hahn (1998), Chareka (2004) cited in Richardson & Blades,

2006, p. 19)

This reinforces the view that not all young people are in such a state of social and

political malaise. In fact, quite the contrary, young people’s involvement in volun-

tary groups, gap years and environmental activities demonstrate concern. It’s quite

the reverse to what some policy makers may think, particularly when discussing civic

deficit. As research in Canada confirms, some youth have different perceptions about

civic engagement, and are actively engaged in the community while somewhat

cynical of partisan politics (ibid., p. 19). This supports the conclusions of Sears and

Hyslop-Margison in their chapter, based on such research, that it all really depends

on how we interpret political participation and civic engagement. Perhaps what this

shows is that change in the socio-political climate is emerging and thus a new

politics is needed. In his speech to the National Council of Voluntary Organisations

on politics, Gordon Brown (2007) spoke of Britain needing:

... a new type of politics which embraces everyone in the nation and not

just a select few, a politics that is built on consensus and not division, a

politics that is built on engaging with people and not excluding them, and

perhaps most of all a politics that draws upon the widest range of talents

and expertise, not narrow circles of power

Naturally, politicians make speeches, which some may cynically say is all part of

the rhetoric. But perhaps there is something seriously worth considering in what

Brown says even if it is part of an eloquent political speech. ‘A new type of politics’

as described by Brown, suggests possible revisions of how citizenship and patriotism

have been formerly understood. This is potentially refreshing for political relations.

What can be learnt from past conceptions about patriotism and citizenship and what

kinds of relationships will a liberal democracy encourage with a vision of democracy

that is inclusive and unifying with all its diversity and looks to *a new kind of politics*?

The role of education cannot be ignored here.

The discourse surrounding citizenship and patriotism seems more heightened

than before: with renewed debate about education for citizenship, whether patriotism

is important and whether it should be taught in schools.7 Views are quite divided.

There is general concern, still, about what is meant or understood by patriotism.

Then there is the matter of how to teach patriotism, a concern expressed especially

among teachers. There has been some suggestion that with knowledge and increased

participation in democratic processes, attachment to one’s country will increase,

thereby creating more responsible and loyal citizens. However, knowledge about

democratic processes is not enough in itself.

A new kind of politics has, indeed, emerged with the environmental crisis urging

each of us to remember the now familiar slogan to ‘think global and act local’. This

has also filtered down to citizenship education classes, where children have been encour-

aged to think and act as responsible and caring citizens about the environment and
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‘fair-trade’, for example. But perhaps another slogan to consider may also be worth-

while: to *see the global in the local*. This way, citizens can look to the everyday

experiences of the world and the increasing diversity of people in the community

and hopefully be encouraged to believe that they are each a meaningful part of the

nation-state and that it acknowledges, reflects, and values their cultural group and

them as individuals.

To think global and act local demands that individuals be informed and aware

of their role to assist in safeguarding interests pertaining to environmental sustain-

ability or as consumers. However, to see the global in the local, can be perceived

positively as noticing the influences, the choices and variety offered within the imme-

diate community, as is increasingly the common experience. Recognition of diversity,

if encouraged and cultivated in education, can lead to acceptance of and value in

difference. Difference need not be a cause of social fragmentation or indifference.

Moreover, recognising difference has the potential to demonstrate the way in which

communities are no longer isolated from the rest of the world since the world is

more frequently visible in the local sphere. This is another way to look at how we

form relationships with our immediate environment and make connections with the

rest of the world in very concrete terms.

Earlier the impact on sovereignty, identified by Giddens as a consequence of

approaching citizenship in light of global changes, invites the question whether

patriotism does, indeed, matter and, if so, how to understand it in light of what has

been outlined above.

*The Personal Dimension: Education for a New Politics*

Viroli attempts to explain the artificial construct of the institution of the state, a

place where individuals are united by persuasion of reasons of personal or collective

safety. He presents an outlook of how societies and individuals have built their

socio-political, and no doubt moral relationship, based on security from some per-

ceived threat or some notion of individual gain. Like Viroli, Benedict Anderson’s

more acclaimed description of a nation as an ‘imagined community’ has been influ-

ential in furthering the debate and helping to reconceptualise the notion of nations

and, thus, citizenship. Anderson’s analogy lends itself to arguing for a world com-

munity. His ‘imagined community’ is an abstract community united by values agreed

upon. The education project for citizenship is vital, then. It can be instrumental to

engage in ways in which it may be possible to imagine a tolerant, inclusive, com-

munity, and become active in a cosmopolitan nation.

... citizens in a democratic society work for the betterment of the whole

society, and not just for the rights of their particular racial, social, or cultural

group ... becoming a citizen is a process. Education must play an important

role in facilitating the development of civic consciousness and agency

within students ... . (Gonçalves e Silva cited by Banks, 2004)

Many aspects influence society and the psychological is an important one to help

understand how societies’ actions are based on the way that relationships are
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understood. The psychologist H. B. Danesh (1997) has presented a very interesting

argument on how individuals and societies have in the past, and can hope in the

future, to relate. He describes three societal models: the authoritarian, the indul-

gent and the integrative. Each society has its orientation, worldview, intellectual life

and relationship. There isn’t enough space to elaborate upon Danesh’s work apart

from saying that he presents a socio-moral account of how societies with these

particular influences have translated this into four aspects of life within the society.

What is conducive to a progressive, liberal cosmopolitan outlook of society, and one

that he prescribes to as desirable, is the integrative model. Briefly, instead of an

orientation to power, as in the authoritarian model, or pleasure, as in the more

adolescent indulgent model, the integrative society and its citizens are orientated

to growth. It’s worth considering, for a moment, Danesh’s description of the different

worldview perspectives of each of his models and the relationships held in each

between the individuals and their respective societies. The authoritarian society is

dichotomous to the rest of the world and the relationship is hierarchical between

the state and members of its society. The indulgent model of society has a world-

view that Danesh describes as indiscriminate. The relationship held between this

society and its people is not cohesive but chaotic, a model akin to a neo-liberal

individualistic society. The integrative society, however, has a worldview that respects

unity in diversity and its relationship is consultative, not a hierarchical distribution

of power but one where members are equally valued and decision making is achieved

through consultation. Danesh points to a society that thinks and acts for the pros-

perity of all people, with individuals who would more readily commit to a more expan-

sive, cosmopolitan, notion of society. The worldview, of unity in diversity, promotes,

and is supported by, an intellectual life of creativity and the consultative relation-

ship cultivated encourages growth and creativity.

This model is well suited to supporting a liberal cosmopolitan perspective in a

global era with a ‘higher global level of integration than ever before’. It is one way

in which to support the educational project to introduce citizenship education in

communities increasingly experiencing diversity by looking at relationship fostered.

These relationships look to the psychological and moral considerations in: interper-

sonal, inter-institutional relationships, as well relationships between communities.

A cosmopolitan nation and Danesh’s model of an integrative society, which encour-

ages a consultative relationship between the state, its institutions and its citizens,

seem mutually compatible when revisiting notions of patriotism and citizenship.

Both notions of a cosmopolitan nation and an integrative society would allow for

and accommodate a principle of unity in diversity where citizens may flourish equally.

Successful relationships in this model require an integrative attitude and an environ-

ment that is orientated to growth, as Danesh describes. In order to understand

how this may be possible it is important to consider the personal aspect of citizenship

education.

In ‘Citizenship as Identity, Citizenship as Shared Fate and the Functions of

Multicultural Education’, Melissa Williams distinguishes the personal aspect, or

psychological dimension, as implicit and integral to the subjective notion of citi-

zenship. (Williams, 2003) This dimension is arguably a vital aspect of citizenship
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and community building as I’ve already tried to suggest. The personal aspect is

fundamental to cultivating and supporting multiple, existing and future relationships,

which affect citizens and communities at any level in the project of social cohesion.

The personal aspect of citizenship is a key aspect of how patriotism and citizen-

ship may be understood. This approach can be associated with, and supported by,

views expressed by Joseph Carens when he says:

One way to belong to a political community is to feel that one belongs, to

be connected to it through one’s sense of emotional attachment, identifi-

cation, and loyalty. (Carens cited by Williams, 2003, p. 210)

A subjective sense of membership in a single political community relies upon creating

a sense of belonging. Isaiah Berlin recognises this, fundamentally, as a ‘human need’.

Berlin describes belonging as a human need as significant as that for food and

shelter, although this is stated in a context of belonging in a fraternal sense to

membership of a community from birth:

The sense of belonging to a nation seems to me quite natural and not in

itself to be condemned, or even criticised ... But in its inflamed condition

... it is totally incompatible with the kind of pluralism I have tried to

describe ... (Berlin cited by Burtonwood, 2006, p. 14)

In pluralist societies, whose members represent a variety of political, cultural and

religious communities, this inflamed notion is dangerous and understandably an

area where teachers fear to tread when asked to teach patriotism. The ‘inflamed

condition’ can also be likened to, and its members subject to, what Eamon Callan

describes as ‘idolatrous love’ of country, the possibility of love being corrupted or

a hierarchical relationship, a ‘vertical relation of reverence between patriot and

country ... a quasi-deified nation’ (Callan, 2006, p. 531).

Here there is an affinity between Callan and Danesh’s description of hierarchical

relationships, which are not conducive to a socio-political community. It is also

worthwhile asking the object of love in the imagined community, which we share

with other strangers in a community. Is it the cultural language, history, traditions

shared, in other words an ethnic nationalism? Or rather is the object of devotion

the values, liberal or cosmopolitan, which are observed regardless of ethnicity or

group affiliation, a community of shared fate? (Williams, 2003). Through cooper-

ation and interaction with others, caring for principles, valuing each member as a

member of equal worth, the ties of affection and attachment deepen, not in an

idolatrous way but as a form of care or concern. There is nothing to say that the

circle of a community bound by national borders with others cannot extend to a

world community.

For liberal nationalists the primary allegiance is to liberal values shared in a

bounded community of the state. For cosmopolitans, the primary allegiance is to the

community of humanity and global justice. The two positions of liberal nationalism

and cosmopolitanism need not be in conflict as Kok-Chor Tan (2005) argues per-

suasively. National sovereignty may be fuzzy but is not redundant. It is just that, for

cosmopolitans, the basic structure of society and social justice is global. Feelings
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of patriotic attachment are legitimate and need not be aligned with a sense of attach-

ment to political membership. In fact Tan argues that as far as liberal principles

of distributive justice are concerned, liberal principles are universally applicable

and need not be confined to national borders. Kok-Chor Tan (2004) sums up the

two positions of nationalism and cosmopolitanism providing a very compelling

explanation of how citizens may adapt to a globally integrative environment without

compromising other attachments.

... the purpose of a common nationality, in the view of liberal nationalists,

is to enable citizens to transcend the local and parochial bonds and ties of

family, kin, and tribe, and to extend the scope of their moral universe to

also encompass strangers (who are fellow citizens). Shared nationality,

therefore, motivates citizens to tend to the needs of compatriots who are

otherwise strangers by making them all fellow members of a shared

‘imagined community’ (to borrow Benedict Anderson’s famous phrase).

This reason for cultivating a shared nationality operates as an equally

compelling reason for ‘cultivating humanity’, to borrow Nussbaum’s

inspiring phrase ...

So understood as an expansionary moral project, there is nothing in the

liberal nationalist idea of affinity to suggest that our moral world has to

cease suddenly at our national borders. (Kok-Chor Tan, 2004, p. 104)

Martha Nussbaum rightly reinforces the liberal idea that we are all ‘created equal’

and bear ‘inalienable rights’. But she goes further to point to a weakness. The liberal

seems to be ‘preoccupied with looking after the rights of the local branch of the

species’, forgetting the cosmopolitan critique, as she puts it, ‘... that their rights

matter as human rights and thus matter only if the rights of foreign humans matter,

too’ (Nussbaum, 1996); What matters, institutionally is an integrative network, a

system of cooperation in a world of interdependency. It is the ‘expansionary moral

project’ and the ‘meaningful subjective membership’ of a single political and moral

community to which education must focus on. The conjecture here is that educa-

tion needs to begin with the personal aspect of citizenship.

It seems reasonable to suggest that citizens’ need to belong is accompanied by

the need to feel that their contribution is meaningful and of value. If the liberal

cosmopolitan egalitarian principle of equal worth is to be upheld institutionally then

this must translate in the way citizens identify with others in order to strengthen

relations. This concerns the civic culture desired in a cosmopolitan nation and global

order. Banks’ comments supports this view:

Individuals can develop a clarified commitment to and identification with

nation-state and the national culture only when they believe that they are

a meaningful part of the nation-state and that it acknowledges, reflects,

and values their cultural group and them as individuals ... (Banks, 2004)

It is important that education be involved in developing a wider, comprehensive

picture of different perspectives in the community. In terms of a multicultural society

where there will be differences, education can assist in developing acknowledgement
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and understanding of differences and work on exploring common understanding and

areas of concern which citizens share. A change in civic culture needs to acknowl-

edge differences. John Tomasi introduces a helpful way to describe the importance

of the relationship between public values and what he calls, ‘society’s ethical back-

ground culture’. According to Tomasi (2001), the ethical background culture:

... serves as a kind of map of meaning, a map that influences the way

anyone making a life within that society finds the world morally intelligible.

A society’s public values unavoidably influence the society’s background

culture, thus informally influencing how well the social world in practice

delivers or makes available many personal, non-public payoffs ... (Tomasi,

2001, p. xvi)

Recognising a ‘shared nationality’ where all have rights and need to belong to an

imagined community extends to and highlights the notion of interdependency, in

order to safeguard and work for the betterment of the whole society. Once again,

an integrative approach would present a more desirable way of understanding

individual maps of meaning. As such, it is important to take into account the social

and ethical background culture of society when looking to civic culture and educa-

tion for citizenship. It is important to emphasise the relational aspect of the sub-

jective notion of membership in a single political community. As Audrey Osler and

Hugh Starkey (2005) claim, citizenship involves:

... making connections between our status and identities as individuals

and lives and concerns of others with whom we share a sense of community.

(Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 5)

Making connections in this way with others in the community, which may be the

imagined community of the nation, or other states, lend itself more towards a

liberal cosmopolitan integrative view. Osler continues to describe citizenship as: ‘...

a feeling, status and a practice ... immediately experienced as a feeling of belonging

to a community’ (Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 9). The importance of teaching world

citizenship would mean that individuals would be encouraged to consider the rights

of the individuals and cohabitants of a world community of multiple states and nations.

To ‘make connections between our status and identities as individuals and lives

and concerns of others with whom we share a sense of community’ as Osler describes,

does, I would suggest, require a particular mindset, an integrative attitude, which

citizenship education can help nurture. It is important, given what I’ve tried to

suggest that citizenship education help students to feel comfortable with various

identities and attachments they have. Banks (2004) quotes Stephen Castles intro-

ducing a concept, which suggests the ‘human need’, to use Berlin’s words, to live

in a global community: ‘Students need to be educated in ways that will enable them

to function effectively in multiple communities’.

Wider commitments to attachments make it possible to discuss matters that relate

to sustainable development, social justice and individual and collective responsibility.

The psychological aspect of citizenship and identity needs closer attention and I

have written on citizenship and identity and aspects of the self, more precisely the
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notion of an integrated self elsewhere (Golmohamad, 2004), but cannot give space

to this here.

Citizenship does, indeed, imply membership of a political community. However,

it is important to add at this point, that the present social, moral and political climate

is pregnant with reasons to highlight the importance of considering the subjective

sense of membership in a single political community; particularly citizenship as

shared fate. The environment is just one example why it’s important to consider

the arguments for citizenship as ‘shared fate’.

One visible example of how a citizen may conceive of themselves sharing subjec-

tive membership of a single, I would suggest, world community, is a thirteen year

old by the name of Severn Suzuki (1992), who, representing The Environmental

Children’s Organization (ECO), addressed an assembly of adult representatives of

world leaders, organisations and worldwide communities at the Earth Summit in

Rio de Janeiro. Below is her complete speech, which needs to be read in full:

Here, you may be delegates of your governments, business people, organizers,

reporters or politicians—but really you are mothers and fathers, brothers

and sister, aunts and uncles—and all of you are somebody’s child.

I’m only a child yet I know we are all part of a family, five billion

strong, in fact, 30 million species strong and we all share the same air,

water and soil—borders and governments will never change that. I’m only

a child yet I know we are all in this together and should act as one single

world towards one single goal. In my anger, I am not blind, and in my

fear, I am not afraid to tell the world how I feel ...

At school, even in kindergarten, you teach us to behave in the world. You

teach us:

not to fight with others,

to work things out,

to respect others,

to clean up our mess,

not to hurt other creatures

to share—not be greedy

Then why do you go out and do the things you tell us not to do?8

**Conclusion**

For the purpose of this article I have tried to limit my arguments to thinking about

the experiences and responses to some changes over time concerning patriotism

and citizenship and its influence on civic culture and education. The growing pains

and anxieties of the global world and the emerging integration of those forces have

lead to increased diversity and interdependency within and between nations. The

‘culture of crisis’ can be interpreted as a response to these changes. One outcome

is a generation which can more readily access and relate to the world at many

levels. But it has proven to be a time when the notions of patriotism and citizenship

being bound and limited to the boundaries of the nation state are being challenged.

A ‘new politics’ is emerging.
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The ‘fuzzy sovereignty’ to which Giddens refers describes one way to consider

changes in the political community, a window of opportunity for a possible new

kind of democracy, which holds an integrative outlook with inclusive practises. An

integrative cosmopolitan nation is not only attractive as a notion but also conducive

to moving forward with change for the betterment of all, if liberal nationalists are

ready to take up the challenge. A new politics is emerging and citizenship educa-

tion needs to adapt to it. A principle of unity in diversity can help develop social

cohesion at every level, respectful of the rights and needs of others while holding

on to what the individual regards meaningful to themselves.

Non-reflective and unexamined cultural attachments may prevent the

development of a cohesive nation with clearly defined national goals and

policies ...

Balancing unity and diversity is a continuing challenge for multi-cultural

nation-states. In most nation-states in the past, citizenship education was

designed by powerful groups to promote their: social, economic and

political interests and to eradicate the cultural characteristics of diverse

groups. Unity in most nation-states has been achieved at the expense of

diversity. Unity without diversity results in hegemony and oppression;

diversity without unity leads to Balkanisation and the fracturing of the

nation-state. (Introduction, in Banks, 2004)

Aspirations to build just and cohesive communities based on principles of justice

and unity in diversity means that the education project can work to creating a robust

cosmopolitan conception of democratic citizenship. The personal, relational aspect

of citizenship can support a curriculum for world citizenship to reinforce the notion

of meaningful democratic citizenship at every level. Education for citizenship pro-

vides a space for students to learn more about what Giddens describes as the ‘democ-

ratisation of emotions’ (Giddens, 2000, p. 21): ‘True democratisation of everyday

life is just as important as formal democratisation in the political sphere ...’. This

can help make citizenship meaningful and a way in which citizens can gradually

develop understanding of how it may be possible to ‘think global and act local’ or

even ‘see the global in the local’, exploring ways in which immediate everyday life

can contribute to global understanding and change. There are already well known

global campaigns concerned with collective interests, the millennium goals just one

example.

Education for World Citizenship can assist a great project to educate the ‘critical

spirit’, as Giddens (2000, p. 25) calls it. The critical spirit describes ‘... critical

engagement with one’s own position in society and an awareness of the wider forces

to which all of us as individuals are responding.’

The sobering perspective of a thirteen-year-old in 1992 helps to remind us of and

reinforce the view that basic fundamental issues concerning human rights, human

dignity, social justice, and the moral community of human beings, extend beyond

national boundaries and national allegiance. It’s vital for students to engage in a

process of consultation about fundamental issues and concerns and more impor-

tantly the caring relations that can be fostered through engagement with others in
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an environment that is open, reflective and encourages an orientation to growth in

learning and action. As to examples of practice, I have written on this elsewhere

(Golmohamad, 2007). There I discuss a particular example of a learning environ-

ment, where I follow an integrative model of theory and pedagogy. Here different

perspectives are shared from theory and experience of cultures, examined in con-

sultation and interactive classroom situations. Perhaps students are best suited to

critically and reflectively engage with the question of whether patriotism is impor-

tant and how, if it is important, it may be conceived. This is something that should

be open for consultation.

To, ‘share a subjective sense of membership in a single political community’, for

this writer means to extend one’s allegiance to the community of humanity and a

liberal-cosmopolitan global notion of justice. Citizenship education needs to look to

engage beyond national allegiance and patriotism in the way it has been understood

and used in the past as a form of ‘idolatrous love’. An allegiance to justice and

humanity, however, is critical for citizenship education to prepare citizens to better

serve their country and for a sustainable future.

**Notes**

1. In his essay entitled ‘decline and revival’, Maurizio Viroli (1995) gives a socio-historical

account of different notions of ‘patriotism’ and the different conceptions of love and alle-

giance, which were consequently determined. Viroli offers socio-historical insights into ways

in which patriotism has been understood including differing notions of *patria* whether love

and loyalty to the republic and common liberty and the common good, the king or literally

the soil of the country of birth.

2. William Dustin (1999) provides a model by which to understand this. He describes a relation-

ship between a vertical hermeneutical and a horizontal homeostatic dimension. According to

Dustin, we interpret meaning from a heritage of past and existing cultures, history, and experi-

ences. From this we construct new, alternative, imagined future communities that are inclu-

sive of individuals and communities. At the centre of these two axes is citizenship.

3. The others are identified as: ‘the impact of globalisation on political legitimacy and trust in

politicians’, ‘the changing nature of the economy’ and ‘the fundamental changes in civil society’.

4. An estimated 60% of combatants in the DCR conflict are children, and 35% of these children

are recruited voluntarily. The child soldiers are often supported in their endeavours by the

community at large, and are led by a sense of patriotism and promises of prosperity. See http://

www.amnestyusa.org/filmfest/pittsburgh/2005/09142005.html

5. In recent times public perception that hooded garments imply menacing behaviour in young

people was reinforced when shopping centres decided to ban such clothing from shopping

malls. This was also supported and reinforced by local police. See http://findarticles.com/p/

articles/mi\_qn4159/is\_20030525/ai\_n12738159

6. This recommendation for a fourth strand was made in an independent review of the Citizen-

ship curriculum led by Sir Keith Ajebo in 2007 for the government Department for Children

Schools and Families (DFES). See http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/default.aspx?

PageFunction=productdetails&PageMode=publications&ProductId=DFES-00045-2007&

7. Jessica Shepherd in a recent article for the *Guardian*, a national broadsheet newspaper, reveals

the rise of interest and concern about the debate on national identity and patriotism in

citizenship lessons in Britain. She discusses different perspectives on how important it is to

teach patriotism based on a recent study asking for responses to questions on patriotism from

students and history teachers. See http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2007/jul/17/schools.uk

8. http://www.childcareexchange.com/eed/issue.php?id=1590
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