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This chapter introduces the main question addressed by the book: does Erasmus student mobility contribute to EU citizenship? Traditionally, citizenship is linked to the nation state; EU citizenship is limited by state-based nationality but differs from it in that nationality is above all about having the right to settle somewhere, whereas EU citizenship is predicated on movement. EU citizenship is part of an integrative agenda, but has been imposed ‘top down’ and has not worked ‘bottom up’. Can student mobility be engaged to energise this process? Erasmus student mobility might serve as a seed bed of citizenship because universities have long been seen as places of national citizenship formation. The university is a special place, constituting part of the public sphere and, according to Habermas, facilitating development of citizenship by communication and interaction. Habermas’s ideas are seminal to the analogy developed between the public space of the university as a locus historically of the cultivation of citizenship as a nation building device, and the Erasmus Programme, a transnational student mobility programme fostering a transnational EU citizenship, as suggested by the Commission. This hypothesised analogy underpins the methodology for the empirical study at the heart of the book.

## Citizenship – a concept in flux

We are told that the Erasmus Programme is creating ‘the first generation of young Europeans’:[[1]](#endnote-1) ‘truly European citizens’.[[2]](#endnote-2) These are remarkable tributes. They invite investigation. Can an educational programme achieve this much? Does the Erasmus Programme enable students to ‘live’ European citizenship by undertaking Erasmus student mobility? If the Erasmus Programme creates European citizens, is it contributing to the developing concept of European citizenship, and if so, how? Under the Erasmus Programme, students spend time living and studying at a different European university from their own. Historically, universities have been exalted as places where citizenship is cultivated: students living and learning and interacting: becoming citizens. Universities as nurseries for citizenship: in many nation states, a long-established aspirational paradigm. Can the Erasmus Programme translate this to the European scale?

If it can, what sort of citizenship might be cultivated under the transnational aegis of the Erasmus Programme? European citizenship, asserts the rhetoric. But this is a broad term; whilst often used more or less synonymously with EU citizenship, it lacks the legal precision which delineates the boundaries of that specific legal status. Not all those who may identify as European citizens are EU citizens. Think of residents of Europe, of beneficiaries of the ECHR, of citizens of countries aspiring to become EU Member States. Our focus is on EU citizenship, that status so prized but so skeletally outlined in the Treaties. The experiences of students who have spent time as Erasmus students are explored to see how they measure up to EU citizenship, but more than this, whether their time as Erasmus students may have a role in putting flesh on the rather bare bones we find in the Treaties. After all, the CJEU has had no qualms in undertaking just such a task in numerous of its judgments. In what ways are Erasmus students ‘truly European citizens’ and does this make them ‘truly EU citizens’? Do their experiences suggest that any citizenship they ‘live’ (or may go on to ‘live’) matches or differs from the EU’s own conception of EU citizenship? Might Erasmus student mobility contribute to the development of EU citizenship, and if so, how?

Circularity is an evident risk: to see whether Erasmus does contribute to EU citizenship we need to crystallise our understanding of EU citizenship. Only then do we have a measuring stick against which any contribution by Erasmus student mobility can be evaluated. The baseline used here is EU citizenship as it is portrayed by some of the major EU institutions. What this means is explored in the following chapter.

But before we narrow our focus to EU citizenship, to universities as the environment in which our students may, or may not, live EU, or European, citizenship, and to the specifics of that life, it behoves us to take a step back and ask two fundamental questions: first, what is citizenship? And second, what is special about student mobility such that it may constitute a forum for citizenship creation? Two and a half thousand years ago Aristotle addressed this first question, stating that ‘the nature of citizenship…is a question which is often disputed: there is no general agreement on a single definition’.[[3]](#endnote-3) Today there is still no simple answer, but there is broad agreement about some points.

Citizenship has traditionally been linked with the nation state, a ‘sorting device for allocating human populations to sovereign states’.[[4]](#endnote-4) Under international law, the relationship between states and their citizens is a legal bond that requires respecting by other states, including the right of states to decide who their citizens are. In this respect, EU citizenship differs significantly from national citizenship, in that Member States decide entitlement to their own citizenship but not to EU citizenship, this following automatically from the Treaties.

In international law, citizenship is generally referred to as nationality, in other contexts an ambiguous term, sometimes more loosely used to denote membership of an ethno-national group and having no bearing on legal status: we might think here of the component parts of the United Kingdom, and how people describe themselves as English, Welsh or Scottish. EU citizenship is defined by the boundaries of state-based nationality, though it is conceptually quite different. The position of residents in an EU member state who do not hold the nationality of any EU country, so called third country nationals (“TCNs”), is quite distinct. EU citizenship is both different from and similar to the citizenship of a nation: different in that the status of EU citizenship is transformational for the resident alien in another EU Member State, similar in that lack of the status implies some exclusion even for the lawfully resident. The incremental advance of CJEU case law magnifies these distinctions. The notion of citizenship erects symbolic borders against those who live outside the community physically as well as those who live within the physical space denoted by the term citizenship but do not belong socially.[[5]](#endnote-5) It is a form of affiliation, transcending other forms of affiliation such as those of family, clan or tribe.

Being a citizen of a country is above all about having the right to settle within that state.[[6]](#endnote-6) In stark contrast, the primary right of EU citizenship, and certainly the most valued by those who hold or hanker for the status, is the right to leave one’s own country and move to another. This raises intriguing questions about the logic of the weight given by the CJEU to the integration into the host state of the migrant EU citizen if EU citizenship is a concept predicated upon mobility, especially in the light of the oft-quoted maxim of the Court of Justice that ‘EU citizenship is destined to be the fundamental status of nationals of the Member States’.[[7]](#endnote-7) The EU’s effective elevation of the right of free movement to the status of a fundamental right resonates with, but ultimately denies, Kant’s conception of world citizenship, or cosmopolitanism: that all human beings have a right of hospitality in any country. But in the EU context, we are never far from awareness that any such right operates very differently not only as between those inside and those outside its external borders, but also amongst those inside, depending on whether they hold the golden ticket which EU citizenship bestows, or whether they do not.

Borders have become even more important to the EU since it started to develop its Area of Freedom, Security and Justice: the ‘fortress Europe’ policy of policing its borders. This begs the question of the identity of the community bounded by these external borders; traditionally, externally bounded nations, defined in relation to a particular territory, have bestowed national citizenship with an intention to denote, create or reflect a sense of loyalty and identity. Human beings need to belong to a community.[[8]](#endnote-8) This sense of togetherness, often deriving from common interests, territory, and pride, feeds into a sense of identity. Identity embraces concepts both of status and of feeling, dimensions of citizenship identified by Heater. It may be underpinned by a sense of civic responsibility, and if so, identity may blossom into citizenship. An individual may have multiple identities based on religion, race, class or other fundamental aspects of the way they live, but citizenship transcends these other identities, and goes further than the concept of identity itself. The quest to conjure into existence a European identity took many forms, eventually overtaken at Maastricht by a citizenship just as elusive, one which has repeatedly been said to find expression in the lives of Erasmus students.

A person’s identity, more particularly, a person’s national identity, is an element of that person’s citizenship. History is of crucial importance to any such sense of identity: a nation’s ‘collective memory’.[[9]](#endnote-9) The word ‘nation’ is derived from *natio*, a community of people of the same descent, integrated geographically, probably culturally too, by virtue of a common language, customs and traditions, though not yet politically integrated in the form of state organisation. This conception of nation persisted through the Middle Ages and into modern times. After the French Revolution, the nation became regarded as the source of state sovereignty, and nowadays is understood to have political self-determination. National solidarity was developed in the nineteenth century by conscription and mass schooling, both developing bonds and feelings of attachment towards the nation state by the lower middle classes;[[10]](#endnote-10) universities played a similar role for those who attended them: a minority, but an influential one.

One of the difficulties inherent in conjuring up an EU identity is its relative lack of history. Indeed, it is ironic that some of the most powerful expressions of identification with the EU are to be found in the UK as it prepares to leave the EU. The threat of loss cements appreciation, by some, of what will be lost.

Historians and romantic writers fostered a nationalism which led to a collective identity central to the citizenship arising in European countries after the French Revolution. Crucially, the word ceased denoting a pre-political entity, shifting instead to embodying membership of the democratic polity and so defining the political identity of the citizen: from *polis* to *demos*. So it is too with EU citizenship: the constant uphill struggle to address concerns about the EU’s democratic deficit culminated not only in direct elections to the European Parliament but also, later, to a modest helping of transnational political rights, twin outcomes which fail to enthuse those entitled to them in fairly equal measure.

Eventually, national identity defines citizenship not from the ethnic and cultural identity of its citizens but rather from the actions of citizens who actively exercise their civil rights: identity giving rise to citizenship in action. The concept of nationalism could foster even a willingness to lay down one’s life for one’s country, arguably the ultimate in active citizenship. Such loyalty is not something required of EU citizens: the ‘united Europe’ of its post war conceptualisation was restricted to a common market: an economic mechanism to allow goods and other factors of production to flow across borders. The economic mission of the EU has shifted with the introduction of citizenship, and we must not overlook the attempts at emphasis on participation and political membership: citizenship not just as a status or one of multiple identities, but something acted out by participation in a community; a life, not just a sorting device or a label signifying entitlement. Truly European citizens: citizenship created, developed, enhanced by life as an Erasmus student?

In 1860, after the reunification of Italy, D’Azeglio stated that ‘having made Italy we must now make Italians’.[[11]](#endnote-11) Citizens traditionally identify with the country of their citizenship and the rights they gain from it. Indeed, modern citizenship is the juridical institution that embeds both identity and rights in the modern nation state. Part of the story of EU citizenship is the story of an attempt to fashion a European identity: that having made Europe the next step is to make Europeans. This is a project in which the EU has harnessed the potential of its citizenship: actual EU citizenship, the normative status, not merely the fuzzily undefined, comfortably rhetorical, ‘European citizenship’, and also of the Erasmus Programme. Citizenship was utilised in the creation of the nation state: specifically, in the creation of a national identity linking holders of national citizenship to the nation state in question. Likewise, EU citizenship has been portrayed as part of an integrative agenda to bring together the peoples of Europe, to provide a rationale for cross-border solidarity, though as a ‘top down’ initiative it was possibly over-idealistic in its expectation that it might drive a ‘bottom up’ move at the same time.

There have always been some who considered that economic integration would lead to a European identity which would in turn lead to popular level support for the idea of greater political integration, though this is not a universally accepted analysis.[[12]](#endnote-12) The mechanics of European integration and identity construction are a matter of considerable contestation, but attempts to create the trappings of a collective identity by means of a flag, a common passport, an anthem, are regarded by most EU citizens quizzically at best and with derision at worst. Anderson asks ‘Who will willingly die for Comecon or the EEC?’;[[13]](#endnote-13) we might riposte ‘We’re not going to be asked to do so’. Put like this, it seems incontrovertible that the EU is still at its heart not even a pale shadow of a nation state. Despite the CJEU’s valiant attempts over more than twenty years to put flesh on the bones of EU citizenship, and the fact that it is prized by all those desirous of the mobility between nations it facilitates – that is, for its strategic value – and, as an object of envy (as nation state citizenship historically has been) divides those who have it from those who do not, as an integrative institution the work of EU citizenship is far from done.

It is, therefore, hard to imagine anyone asserting *‘civis Europeus sum’* with particular pride;[[14]](#endnote-14) yet it is, perhaps, easy to imagine it being said with relief. Why should this be? The answer to this surely lies in the rights and benefits attaching to EU citizenship. EU citizenship may be sui generis in not entailing obligations: citizenship duties referred to in Art 20(2) TFEU remain effectively undelineated;[[15]](#endnote-15) it is however highly prized for certain of the rights it bestows, most particularly the right of free movement. Whilst fundamental human rights are, by definition, universal, the same is not true of political rights, essentially rights associated with participation in the democratic process, generally bestowed on citizens, and seen by some as the quid pro quo for obligations. However, in the liberal tradition of citizenship dominant for the past two centuries, the list of legal duties attaching to citizenship is not extensive: to obey the law, participate in education for a prescribed period, pay taxes, and, if required, undertake jury service or military service. Self-evidently, this list bears little relation to EU citizenship.

The seminal work of Marshall considered that citizenship rights could be divided into three categories: civil (resembling what are more commonly referred to today as human rights or fundamental rights), political, and social, which he saw developing in chronological order.[[16]](#endnote-16) The idea of social welfare provision can be traced back a long way: in Ancient Greece, public baths and gymnasia were provided to members of guilds; in the UK, the development of responsibilities of parishes for the poor dates back many centuries, and the Victorian Poor Laws a century and a half. Marshall’s analysis has been questioned, but the now widely accepted idea that citizenship requires a social element to complete the status is not dissonant with his conceptualisation. During the past century, the idea has gained currency that the state has the duty to ensure social justice and an adequate level of welfare for all its citizens. This conception of citizenship involves rights and entitlements, largely in the national sphere. There is growing concern with attaching to citizenship ideas of social obligation and duties rather than simply rights and entitlements, though arguably these ideas are there in embryonic form in the CJEU’s insistence on some evidence of ‘integration’ or ‘genuine link’ as a ticket for social welfare benefits consequent upon EU citizenship.[[17]](#endnote-17)

Aristotle, as noted earlier, asserted that there was no agreement on a single definition of citizenship; following on from that, we can conclude with the related observation that citizenship is a continually changing concept: Marshall’s analysis is rooted in this proposition, and EU citizenship is no exception here.

## (b) Student mobility – a citizen’s awakening?

Investigating the nature of a particular citizenship as it may be lived out and developed in the context of a particular form of student mobility, calls for some observations about student mobility. If we are to consider whether Erasmus student mobility may make European – more particularly, EU - citizens, we first need to ask a prior and more general question: what is special and distinctive about the mobility of students, such that it might have potential as a site of citizenship cultivation?

Student mobility is a specific type of migration. It is recognised as distinct, primarily because of the customary shortness of duration of student mobility (and customary and assumed intent to return to the home state). Student travellers are part of a migratory elite, in some ways similar to monks of the Middle Ages and merchants of the Renaissance, but different in that their destiny is still an open question. The student traveller is not yet the ‘cosmopolitan citizen of the world’ who is able to ‘live in several worlds without settling in any’ but may be en route to becoming such a person, in the tradition of the humanistic scholar ‘ubiquitous in centuries of European scholarship’.[[18]](#endnote-18) The student traveller is also generally on the border between youth and adulthood and therefore in the process of transition in their own personal life journey, crossing a symbolic border just at the time when crossing a physical border to study in another country.

In times gone by, the grand tour abroad was a rite of passage for the sons of the elites of Europe. More recently, similar claims have been made that student mobility is an elitist phenomenon. Such claims must be taken seriously, if its potential to develop or contribute to citizenship is being examined. These claims arise from the financial investment necessary to study in a different country, as to which the assistance available to such students is highly variable. Students travelling abroad for the entirety of their degree (so-called degree mobile students) are particularly affected, liable for any fees payable, unable to minimise living costs by residing at home, and often without access to financial support from either their home or host country. The story of the determination of the CJEU that such students will not have their ability to access higher education abroad unduly limited is an important aspect of its self-imposed mission to give meaning to EU citizenship for such students, and although Erasmus students, as credit mobile students, face different issues, this is to an extent their story too.

The other basis for the ‘elitist’ label currently attached to student mobility is that it appears to have become the latest form of cultural capital (in Bourdieu’s terms) which some students (and their parents on their behalf) aspire to acquire.[[19]](#endnote-19) Furthermore, students are more likely to wish to invest in their cultural capital if they already have mobility capital in the form of significant prior travel experience, perhaps having lived abroad or from foreign links in the shape of parents or grandparents. The acquisition of language competence through these means is often a spur, as are national traditions of migration which may make it more or less likely that a young person will travel. The reasons for categorising international student mobility as a form of ‘capital’ in Bourdieu’s terms are convincing:[[20]](#endnote-20) enhancing human capital by improving language skills and accessing foreign work experience, bolstering career prospects by adding in general terms to an individual’s social and cultural capital, reflecting and reproducing social advantages and disadvantages. ‘Mobility capital’, a sub-species of human capital, denotes the ability of people to build up their skills because of what they learn from living in a different country.[[21]](#endnote-21)

There is considerable evidence that students who already have a stock of mobility capital are those most likely to choose to build upon it by studying abroad.[[22]](#endnote-22) This rings alarm bells in the context of citizenship because of the varying accessibility of these putative advantages. Inequalities arise from the relative ease or difficulty in participating in student mobility caused by affordability and personal circumstances. In the context of a transnational citizenship, such inequalities are magnified and have a multi-dimensional effect. The very different arrangements which Member States have for financing higher education and students mean that student mobility has a highly variable impact in, as well as on, different countries. There are numerous factors which influence the attraction of different locations to students, not only the financial support regime they operate and which students are entitled to use it, but systems for qualifying for access to higher education and language of tuition, to name but two.[[23]](#endnote-23) These variations affect both countries and students. For countries, student mobility is not a cost-neutral good. It can make a considerable difference whether a country is a net exporter or net importer of students, and at times the litigation which has ensued from the impact of would-be degree mobile students on national higher education policy has caused considerable consternation amongst Member States’ governments, straining the solidarity upon which EU citizenship is predicated: in trying to level the playing field for EU citizen students from different countries, the CJEU’s reasoning has sometimes magnified the effect on the countries themselves.[[24]](#endnote-24)

For students, there are several ways in which going abroad to study for part only of a degree (so called ‘credit mobility’) is a more accessible proposition than full degree mobility. First of all, students go for a much shorter time: under the Erasmus Programme, for three to twelve months, rather than an entire degree course. Whilst this still requires a certain amount of courage and a propensity to be ‘seduced by difference’,[[25]](#endnote-25) it is decidedly less of a challenge. Secondly, if credit mobility occurs in the context of an organised study programme, arrangements may be in place to ameliorate the financial exigencies of the study abroad period.[[26]](#endnote-26) This is particularly the case with the Erasmus Programme. Finally, there are the administrative advantages of participating in an established programme which ensures recognition of the studies undertaken, such as the ECTS system developed for the Erasmus Programme.[[27]](#endnote-27)

It is certainly true that participation is still easier for students who are not burdened with caring responsibilities or who can afford to relinquish a part-time job or a tenancy, and issues such as these will continue to act as barriers for some students from poorer families, but a large-scale programme with inbuilt attempts to minimise the difficulties is at least structured with a view to redressing the balance. It is indubitable, however, that these barriers are not only more intractable for some groups but also that they combine with a lack of appreciation of the potential advantages of student mobility to deter those to whom life has dealt a poor hand, and who evidence suggests may benefit the most from transnational interactions such as those experienced during educational exchange programmes.[[28]](#endnote-28)

So is Erasmus student mobility in truth the mobility of the rich? An interesting and partially subsidised programme which enhances the CVs of those born into a life of opportunity: a self-perpetuating elite? It is easy to be cynical, to dismiss the Erasmus Programme as born of idealism and grown into a convenient machine for the burnishing of the gilded youth already at ease with a life crossing borders: a charmed time in which they can further refine their linguistic and cultural competences before embarking upon the international careers for which they were always destined. Is this in all honesty the citizenship nurtured by the Erasmus Programme? Is this how it addresses the notorious democratic deficit: by furnishing opportunities for those who already have them, to advance the lives of those most easily advanced?

A step back is called for. The Erasmus Programme is alleged to provide fertile ground for the development of European citizens. Let us consider briefly what the mechanics of such development might be. There are many reasons why student mobility is regarded as a promising seed-bed, but we need to consider where the process of such development is hypothesised to take place: the university. Universities have long been seen as places conducive to the development of citizenship, both as a facet of a national identity, but also as conceived of functionally, the cultivation of the active citizen desired by that society. In Newman’s time, universities were attended by the few, but that did not stop him from perceiving their value for the many: ‘if a practical end must be assigned to a University course…it is that of training good members of society’.[[29]](#endnote-29) We need to ask how this could come about: what is special about the university as a location? Habermas suggests an answer: the university as public sphere, a special place where citizenship can develop through discussion, through communication, through interaction.[[30]](#endnote-30)

But is it so? And does it translate to the transnational scale? We need to talk to the students about the lives they lead at their host universities, how they relate to each other while there, and how these special places operate to provide opportunities for this to happen: indeed, whether they do so. This model of citizenship development demands much of these brief sojourns in other lands, of those who go there and the places where their stays are centred. Who are the Erasmus students, and is it right to dismiss them as an exclusive elite, propelled primarily by thoughts of self-advancement? No man is an island, intones the poet: certainly, if a man tries to live as an island, we may doubt his citizenly qualities. And so, we will look at how students spend their time, at their aspirations and motivations, the effect they have on each other and the legacy of their period abroad. We will look at students visiting universities in other European countries under the auspices of a programme designed to encourage their awareness and utilisation of their rights as EU citizens, and from their words, we will hope for insights into the potential for European citizenship formation in the public space afforded by universities in Europe.

This book is structured to assist in the search for such insights. As a starting point, when asking whether Erasmus student mobility may contribute to EU citizenship, we need to have an initial conception of what EU citizenship is, so that we can see whether spending time as an Erasmus student builds upon the foundations. Chapter 1 of this book therefore considers what these foundations are, looking at EU citizenship from the perspectives in turn of the Treaties, the Court of Justice of the EU, and the European Commission. This leads into an outline of the genesis of the Erasmus Programme, initially a project aiming at the cultivation of a European identity and ultimately polity, more recently extolled and promoted for its citizen creating properties, the civic or cultural conception of citizenship interwoven with the economic promise of the educated young who cross borders to participate in Erasmus.

Chapter 2 focuses on where Erasmus student mobility takes place: universities, historically seen by many nations as the nurseries in which their citizens are cultivated, though long also welcoming citizens from elsewhere. Universities remain institutions run largely according to national models, but in Europe this is increasingly tempered, to an extent at least, by the quasi-harmonising influence of the Bologna Process. Ostensibly with overtones of transnational citizenship, its role in the widespread marketisation of universities raises questions about their ability to constitute public spaces fit for the critical debate postulated to form part of the communicative interaction which feeds into citizenship development.

Chapter 3 takes a step back and asks how and why the EU became involved with higher education at all, given the preference of nations to preserve their autonomy in the educational sphere. The role of the CJEU in facilitating the EU’s operations in this area is outlined, with the development, initially as part of the project to create a European identity and then to foster citizenship, of the Erasmus Programme, the EU’s flagship short term student mobility vehicle, complementing the assistance bestowed by the CJEU on students wishing to study abroad for their entire degree. The significance of the fact that Erasmus students do not need to be EU citizens is considered in the context of the widespread elision between the terms EU citizenship and European citizenship, a point addressed at various junctures in the book.

Following this exploration of the hopes for the Erasmus Programme as a citizenship creation project, attention turns in Chapter 4 to the means by which this might be achieved in the public space constituted by European universities. The communicative interaction hypothesised as the process translates as communication between students. This point generates a discussion about EU language policy over the years, and the tensions arising from the EU’s preference for multilingualism and the cultivation of less used European languages, its aspirations for competitiveness in the global marketplace, and its concerns about the dominance of English. It is argued that these tensions threaten to undercut the effectiveness of the EU’s language policy in the creation of its citizenship.

The scene is then set for an investigation into how this plays out in practice. Chapter 5 consists of an analysis of the accounts by students from many European countries who were interviewed about various aspects of their time as Erasmus students. This chapter considers whether these richly detailed experiences, often recounted in the students’ own words, match the rhetoric surrounding the Erasmus Programme and its potential for citizenship creation, and finds that in many respects they fall short of expectations and even run counter to the aims and objectives of Erasmus. The methodology underpinning the interviews and their analysis is summarised in the book’s Appendix.

The conclusions set out in Chapter 6 draw on the findings recounted in the previous chapter to endeavour to answer the question whether the transnational EU citizenship can be created by communicative interaction in the public space of the university under the aegis of the EU’s programme for student mobility, analogously with the cultivation historically of national citizenship. The book returns to the seemingly interchangeable usage between the terms EU citizenship and European citizenship, the former strictly normative and the latter with its more hazy and indeterminate boundaries. Ultimately, it is the shared role of EU citizenship and the Erasmus Programme in the efforts to create a European polity which points to EU citizenship as the citizenship aspired to by the Erasmus Programme, aspirations which are however undermined to varying degrees by certain practical aspects of Erasmus’s operation.

Perhaps inevitably, the book is rounded off by a brief Epilogue about the possible impact of Brexit on the main themes under consideration, such brevity largely dictated by the miasma of uncertainty clouding the author’s vision at the time of writing.
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