Jürgen Oelkers

The European Crisis and Education for Democracy [*)]

1. Winston Churchill and Europa

On thursday September 19th 1946, Winston Churchill gave a famous speech at the University of Zurich,[1] in the auditorium of the University to be precise. The auditorium is one of my favourite places in the academic world, not only because of its fine art nouveau interior and the juvenile fresco at the rear wall, but because it is at the same time intimate and representative, really a place to say something very important. (I did not lecture there!)

A what a speech Churchill gave - it was, lucid, profound, bold, in a sense very dramatic and not far away from brilliant, and it was quite short too, a masterwork from the master of political rhetoric. And so it was no wonder that the last sentence was the peak of the whole speech: Churchill called out, in my favourite academic place: "Let Europe arise!"

This short proclamation is often cited in connection with today's troubles that is summed up in the word "Brexit", Britain's leaving of the European Union as the result of a national referendum that was very unusual for British democracy. And no one less than Boris Johnson, the former mayor of London who now is somewhat infamous, in his book *The Churchill Factor* (Johnson 2014, ch. 20), directed the view back to the speech at my University.

But was Churchill a crown witness for the "Brexit"? He gave the speech not as Prime Minister but as the opposition leader, after Clement Atlee and the Labour Party had won the House of Commons election on July 5, 1945. One year later Churchill was staying privately in Switzerland, being there for holidays at the Lake Geneva where he even took painting lessons, when he finally accepted an invitation to the University of Zurich.[2]

For that he had to leave Calvinist Geneva, the city of Rousseau, and head for Zurich, the financial capital of Switzerland where at that time "bankers" were called "banquiers". Nevertheless Churchill hat to leave the French speaking for the German speaking Switzerland if you really will call Swiss "german" german. Churchill was accompanied by his wife and daughter and they stayed only two days. This was because of the bad wine they served him as malicious tongues told us.

Now his speech is frequently quoted only in terms of its final sentence and has thus been interpreted with corresponding pathos: "Let Europe arise" from the ruins of the war to new splendour. However, in truth, the speech was a cool manifesto not only for a revival of

---

[*)] Lecture given in the University of Lodz July 14, 2016.
[1] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/brussels/website/media/Basis/Geschichte/bis1950/Pdf/Churchill_Rede_Zuerich.pdf
[2] On the occasion of a visit to Switzerland: Vogt (2015).

Europe following the war, but for a "United States of Europe" *without* the United Kingdom. Indeed, in the middle of his speech, Churchill states: "We British have our own Commonwealth of Nations".

Churchill was speaking as a victor with a view from the British Isles onto the ruins of Europe. In Switzerland, in a way also an island although in the mountains, he was received with great enthusiasm as the saviour of Europe. What he termed "the European Family" of the future, was to be based on the future partnership between France and Germany. The United Kingdom was not part of the plan.

This plan referred to the two old rivals on the continent. Both countries can come together when they reflect on their spiritual roots: "There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany". If the two are united and forget their previous hostilities, then Europe, in its largest part, would become as free and happy as Switzerland today (i.e. at the time of the speech).

And indeed Switzerland, in 1946, had no damages of war and some Swiss might have thought that their country was meant to be the role model for Europe in Churchill's speech. But Churchill never supported direct democracy and also not federal in contrast to central forms of government. So it was only a compliment that everybody in the audience liked to hear. And Churchill had not in mind that Swiss people never declare themselves "happy", because too much work still has to be done.

With regard to the structure of the future United States of Europe, Churchill said:

"The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honour by their contribution to the common cause. The ancient states and principalities of Germany, freely joined together for mutual convenience in a federal system, might take their individual places among the United States of Europe".

If not all European states wish to participate in the new union, then the union would have to begin with those who are willing, and who are able to take the step: "In all this urgent work, France and Germany must take the lead together", France as a central state and Germany as a federation.

Churchill's prediction was stunningly accurate, with the exception of one issue. The European Union was created, France and Germany were reconciled and took over the leadership, numerous small states have joined on an equal footing and what has developed since 1946 was and is not a new state, but a community of nations.

For the United Kingdom, however, there has not been a renewed *splendid isolation*.[3] Following the decline of the Commonwealth, the country joined the Union in 1972, after Charles de Gaulle had previously prevented the country from entering by veto.[4] He did not consider the United Kingdom to be suitable for Europe and rejected even accession talks. The

---

[3] The Canadian classicist and senator George Eulas Foster (1847-1931) coined the term "splendid isolation" to indicate the wise and intelligent distance between Great Britain and the European continent.
[4] The Wilson government applied for accession in 1967.

reasons were summarized, according to the Guardian: Excessive debt, the wrong currency, and bad food.[5]

But the General's *bêtises* were in vain. On January 1, 1973, the United Kingdom became a member state of the European Economic Community, which comprised nine countries at that time. In 1993, with the Maastricht Treaty the European Union was established and the United Kingdom did not leave but stayed in. But mentally the Britons became "semi-detached", being in and out at the same time.[6]

Churchill's Zurich speech made another matter clear. The union of Europe was designed to act as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union, that is, a political-military union rather than a primarily economic one. Churchill foresaw the proliferation of the "atomic bomb" and wanted to be prepared. According to him, there was no guarantee that the United States alone would have access to nuclear weapons and this again was a good prediction.

Churchill did not speak of a Europe growing further together. The idea of the union, which should be an association and not a single state, was vague anyway, and it is no coincidence that Central Europe first came together economically with the European Coal and Steel Community (1951) and that it was only with the Treaties of Rome (1957) that initial approaches were also agreed for parliamentary and legal cooperation. But it was not meant to go towards a "United States".

By contrast, the preamble to the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union of October 26, 2012, states that the union is "determined to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe".[7] The United Kingdom again agreed and did not veto.

The formula has frequently been interpreted as growing together politically, and thus as a transfer of sovereignty rights of the single nations towards the European Union, which would result in a "United States of Europe", which is exactly what Winston Churchill did *not* intend in Zurich. But he had a comment ready: "The trouble with committing political suicide is that you usually live to regret it".

2. *A word on the "Brexit"*

On June 23, 2016, the United Kingdom voted on whether to leave the European Union. In legal terms, the referendum does not have a binding character for the government, but in a democratic society, the majority vote must be accepted as an expression of the will of the people. The British government called for the referendum and must accept the result, as Prime Minister David Cameron made clear on June 24.

In the media in continental Europe, the outcome of the referendum has been interpreted as a victory by the "populists" and "simplifiers". The course tone of the campaigns in the run-up to the referendum, the lack of information content of media debates and the

---

[5] https://www.theguardian.com/world/1967/nov/28/eu.france
[6] Harold James in: Neue Zürcher Zeitung July 1st 2016, p. 37.
[7] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=DE

limiting of complex problems to a few catchphrases have also been criticized. As such, emotions, and not the arguments, were decisive.[8]

Following the referendum, the strategy of the Prime Minister to even hold a referendum was criticized, and according to critics, it was also difficult to convey that he voted against Brexit although he had attacked the European Union so strongly in the past. The referendum thus was called a "suicidal" strategy and not by chance Winston Churchill was often quoted. Furthermore, it has been criticized that there is no plan for dealing with the consequences of leaving the EU. And finally, it was noted with disapproval that old people had decided the vote.[9]

One conspicuous aspect in the debate following the referendum is the fact that the democratic process was hardly appreciated at all. Both camps triumphed or struggled, but it must be noted that simply the citizens were asked and gave an answer. And more than 70 percent went to vote. So any commentators first and foremost should respect this democratic circumstance.

The derogatory term of "populist" completely fails to recognize the sovereign of democracy, namely the people in all their opinions. Those who lose a democratic referendum are required to bow to the majority vote, but should not assume that the vote has been influenced by any clouding of consciousness. Moreover, the winners should always respect the losers and not go on to badmouth them.

It is the democratic right of mature citizens to decide not to stay part of the European Union in a fair vote. And those who fear a boomerang effect, or sees the dominoes toppling with a view to the remaining member states, should look to the arguments that decided the referendum in England and not ask whether the citizens cast the "wrong" vote.

It is also undemocratic to consider only one's own political camp as correct when it comes to referendums. In a democracy, many camps may be correct, which is why we have a debate and come to a conviction in the first place. But this also involves the ability for self-correction in the light of superior arguments by others.

Campaigns may be led in a tough and emotional manner; the political fight, at least for existentially important issues, inevitably leads to stark differences, but these differences are based on conviction and not on higher powers. For this reason, democratic processes do not have a guarantee for success, for whichever political position one takes. Every decision has to take risks and this is not a question of "true" or "false" but what will happen after the decision.

The exit has been perceived and discussed under the abbreviated name of "Brexit". Political campaigns of course require slogans that catch the attention of the media, but slogans are tricky if only for the fact that they are never chosen to make the cost of a decision visible. And the cost is likely to be high in this case, because firstly, the vote was not an "exit", but rather the beginning of a lengthy process, and secondly, the decision might affect the future of the United Kingdom in a very unexpected way.

---

[8] According to the former EU Commissioner Chris Patten in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung (NZZ No. 148 of June 28, 2016, p. 10).
[9] Election turnout of young people between 18 and 24 years was low, 36 percent in average (Süddeutsche Zeitung No. 152, 4th of July 2016, p. 9). The referendum took place in in the middle of University exams.

Now, what have been the arguments? One key argument of the proponents was the democratic deficit of the authorities in Brussels and the opaque structures of the distribution of funds available to the European Union. There can indeed only be trust in democracy if participation and transparency are ensured. Another key argument referred to the figures of migration that for many people in Great Britain seemed to be too high because of lack of controls. But what is lamented is only the consequence of the European right of abode. And consequently this right was attacked by the Brexiteers.

But whatever people like Boris Johnson or Nigel Farage had in mind during the campaign, they throw Europe a curve ball and offered a new crisis as a result of a democratic vote. Given this the question arises as to how the crisis in Europe is linked to education towards democracy.

This was discussed after the British voters decided but mostly in a negative way. Austrian actor Christoph Waltz for example spoke of an "abysmal stupidity"[10] but this popular statement is not without pitfalls. It seems to be that only uneducated people really can be "stupid", all voters in Great-Britain have been educated so how can a democratic decision be "stupid"?

In the following I shall present some thoughts on how democracy can be conceived and why decisions such as those leading to Brexit must be conceived as a normal risk, irrespective of how individual groups may associate this with a phantasy of demise or redemption. But if you want a decision, you will get one. This is one consequence of democracy.

3. Democracy

My understanding of democracy is strongly influenced by John Dewey, not at least because he opposes German statism and does not view democracy purely as a procedure. Decisions such as "Brexit" are not simply based on a referendum, but they assume a lived democracy, that is, political passion as well as emphasis and criticism. If democracy is lived, it cannot be boring. So political struggle and also errors are nothing else than indicators for a living democracy.

John Dewey's book *Democracy and Education* was published in 1916, exactly one hundred years ago. Today, the book is still a benchmark for international debate on the relationship between education and the democratic society. Dewey himself was a sought-after expert, who consulted in state education reforms in China (1919 to 1921), in Turkey (1924) and in Mexico (1926). Thus, his practical expertise as an educator is not just based on the famous "laboratory school" in Chicago, which was also run not by him, but by his wife Alice.

Dewey's book was written in New York and also published there.[11] At this time, Dewey taught as a professor of philosophy at the private Columbia University.[12] The university president Nicholas Murray Butler was one of the most well-known educational

---

[10] Sky News July 4th 2016.
[11] *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* was published as part of the "Text Book Series" issued by Paul Monroe (1869-1947) by New York publisher Macmillan & Company. The publishing company was founded in 1869.
[12] John Dewey switched to Columbia University in 1904, after having taught in Chicago for ten years.

publicists in the country. He was a co-founder of the New York Teachers College, which became part of Columbia University in 1898 and which is until today a leader in American educational research. Butler appointed Dewey and they both shared educational as well as philosophical interests.

A crucial precondition for the theory of democratic education was the historically unparalleled growth of American cities in 19th and early 20th century, which was the result of an equally unparalleled immigration. The population of the city of New York more than doubled between 1890 and 1900 and was over 4.7 million in 1910. A key issue was the social integration of these masses in the light of a high risk of poverty. Public schools became an important place of integration, which by that became a focus of political attention.

The development of the American educational system between 1850 and 1930 had a number of different parameters, of which the most important ones can be summarized as follows:

- Expansion of secondary schools and the targeted development of a high school for all pupils.
- State financing: reducing school fees and the development of free school attendance.
- Specifying school districts and expansion of school administration.
- Integration of the children of immigrants into regular classrooms.
- School experiments and accompanying research.

In the urban centres, improvements in the state school system were heavily influenced by experience with immigration; it would not have been otherwise possible to cope with the pressure of enduring immigration. Frequently, young families arrived with their school-aged children who had to receive American education which would have been impossible without schools, teachers and a growing administration.

As part of this, strong contrasts between individual immigration groups had to be endured and overcome, the lack of education of many parents had a negative effect on school attendance, as did child labour following primary school and the violence in the ghettos. So it was not simply a success story and in a way the struggle for education persisted until today.

In the light of immigration and the consequences for public education, Dewey (1916/1985) asked the question of how – and that also means with which philosophy – schools should develop in order to be of service to a democratic society. This also revisits the previous discussions conducted since the mid-19th century within the teaching profession and among the heads of school districts. Here, the language of "progressive school reform" originated.

The question was how this "new education" could be linked to social and political democracy. The answer was not only striking, but it would also require some getting used to: Dewey's groundbreaking book is noticeable for not containing any reference to political democracy. The book is not about power, there are no political parties, no striving for a majority, no heated public debate, no contested vote and no shift of power. Democracy is simply a shared communal *form of life*.

Democracy as a form of government is the organization of power. For this reason, the ideals of educators must be understood against the backdrop of real democracy. For Dewey,

an ideal type of democracy plays a central role, which is modelled on the American understanding of neighbourhood. Individuals are educated as democrats in local democratic communities, including schools, which bear civil responsibility. In the contemporary literature, this ideal is termed "Dewey's Dream", and is considered a landmark (Benson/Harkavy/Puckett 2007).

We all know Churchill's bon mot: "Democracy is the worst form of Government, except for all the others".[13] That might be true insofar as we don't have alternatives. But "democracy" is not only government but also life and therefore requires trust that often will be tested.

Ideally democracy is the exchange between different groups, fair public debate and, ultimately, an agreeable compromise. But this should not conceal a fight for power and also take into account that there can be disputes between irreconcilable interests and permanent unsolved problems. In any case, American politics should not be equated with the behavior in a community, and American society is anything but egalitarian, including and particularly not in education (Alexander/Entwisle/Olson 2014).[14]

On the other hand, democracy is not possible without an anchoring in life worlds. Theories that only address forms of government fall short of the mark. Democracy must take place in everyday life and the democratic form of life must be convincing in the long-term, also and especially when dissatisfaction regarding democracy is articulated.

In this sense, Dewey's idea is productive in that democracy is not only a power game and politics must deal with everyday convictions whose occurrence it cannot control. Marxists might say: The basis is intelligent and can defend itself. So even riots are an articulation of democracy.

To put it another way: Dewey's theory of democracy refers to the ideal of coexistence of different groups, and is in this sense a communal form of life, which continuously encourages smarts decisions and intelligent forms of adaptation, without however being able to anticipate the effects. But was has to be done is democratically negotiated.

Can the same be said for the European Union? Or is it destined to act in a continuous crisis mode, supported by a bureaucracy which is by now faced with so much mistrust as though the Union is being ruled from Washington and is constantly attacked by Donald Trump or Bernie Sanders.

4. *The European Crisis*

First of all: The European crisis is not a figment of "populists'" imagination, but a real phenomenon. The crisis has at least four different dimensions, namely the management of the economy, the flow of refugees, political cohesion and freedom of movement according to the European right of abode.

---

[13] Speech House of Commons, November 11th 1947.

[14] This study is one of the few longitudinal studies on the relationship between social background, academic success and transition to adulthood. Over a period of 25 years, almost 800 children from the black ghettos of Baltimore were studies. The study shows that and the way in which background and ethnicity create social destinies that cannot be breached by education.

These four dimensions can be explained as follows: The European Union has neither a common currency nor a joint political structure. The financial crisis, originating in the United States, lead to a weakening of the Euro area, but also had a huge impact on the other European currencies. The Swiss franc for example, as a "reserve currency", has been adversely affected as a result. The same also applies to the British pound after the Brexit referendum.

The philosophy of financial policy has two contrasting approaches, namely austerity or transfer of debts from rich to poorer nations. Due to the financial turbulence, the European Central Bank has expanded its own area of responsibility to the absolute limit.

Concrete European financial policy is disintegrating visibly in northern and southern countries. With its austerity measures, it has forced countries, in particular those such as Greece but also Portugal, to implement huge cuts in spending, which have been associated with a huge image loss of the entire European project.

The crisis is also, relatedly, a crisis of the job market. In most European countries, the high rate of youth unemployment is a result of sealing off the job market by the employees and at the same time the result of misguided educational policy. It is no coincidence that youth unemployment is low in countries with a dual vocational training system, and thus with attractive alternatives to school-only education.

The project "European Union" has never been clearly defined, with irritating uncertainties in terms of the aims of the union in particular that exist to this day. There is talk of different speeds of political integration and a "post-nationalist Europe" has also been projected, but in actual fact, the national states have proven themselves to be robust and resistant.

Most of us no longer speak of a "United States of Europe" in the sense of the American model. In truth, the European Union is an association of interacting national states, who will not let their sovereignty be restricted in essential dimensions such as budget autonomy and parliamentary rights.

So in summer 2016 it would seem as if Europe stands in a self-chosen "trap", as Claus Offe (2016) puts it. And London based weekly The Economist even quoted punk band The Clash and spoke of "Anarchy in the UK" (The Economist Vol. 420, No. 8996, July 2nd to 8th 2016).[15] But to quote a famous German politician: Do we have alternatives?

The European Union is a union to negotiate solutions, and by that a union that is constantly coping with crises. This is also due to the fact that, ultimately, it is the heads of government who take the decisions, which presupposes unanimity. A political union was never established and only a few critics still hold a plea for a *political* union and thus the United States of Europe (Simms/Zeeb 2016).

The most serious crisis in the past few years is that of the fast growing migration from non-member countries. Another aspect of the crisis is the internal migration flows within the European Union, which lead from poor member states to rich member states. The opening and closing of borders in 2015 and 2016 led to a further radicalization of the crisis.

---

[15] „Anarchy in the UK", Clash's first single, was released on November 26th 1976.

The disagreement over how to cope with massive migration from non-European countries also strengthened the nationalist movements within the member states. Here, European policy faces the dilemma of not really being able to fight the causes of the refugee flows and not wanting to cope with the consequences together, and yet still having to come up with a solution.

The fourth dimension of the crisis is the Inner-European freedom of movement in accordance with the Schengen Agreement. Switzerland has had to discover that this principle is non-negotiable, although the consequences are not borne equally by all member states. On the other hand, the influx of citizens from poor European regions must not simply be accepted if social unrest is to be avoided.

As a rule, the different dimensions of the European crisis are *not* linked to issues of education, except in the very general sense that the European Union should be concerned with the high-quality education of its citizens. Education is not a panacea for crisis management, but it is a decisive framework condition for the continuation of the European Union.

5. *Education towards Democracy*

This can also be explained in terms of different dimensions: Education for democracy is concerned with securing a high-quality liberal education for all, trust in democracy, education across the lifespan, equality of opportunity and not least the issue of integration into society.

It is a truism that a high level of education is a, if not *the*, decisive prerequisite for living together in a society which is at the same time complex and differentiated. However, this task is realized very differently in different European countries, which is demonstrated by indicators such as funding in education, school facilities, teacher salaries, or also by empirical data on school quality.

Particularly in the area of education, specific national traditions and resources determine policy, European solutions are not possible or at least are not strived for. In contrast, the European Union has launched and also funded numerous initiatives and projects to coordinate the national educational systems. The EU has also been involved in the agenda setting although with limited success, because how public topics are managed in the area of education is only of rhetoric importance.

John Dewey termed a trust in democracy as "a common faith", that is, with a faith in democracy which is not meant in a religious way, but rather in terms of a positive experience with democratic living together. To repeat: Dewey rightly pointed out that democracy cannot be merely understood as a *form of government*, but must also be conceived of as a *form of life*.

Trust in democracy can only develop through participation and the successful interaction between different social groups. As such, it is decisive how learning takes place and with whom in democracy. This alone shows the importance of votes that call for a clash of views, in which arguments as well as emotions become important and which hopefully also make risks visible.

A further fundamental towards democracy is the fact that governments can be voted out of office if their work is unconvincing. This also requires the formation of opinions. It is not for nothing that David Hume indicated that every government is only based on opinion, and also that those in government cannot rely on anything else (Hume 1994, p. 16). In consequence, public opinion can quickly become the government's greatest enemy.

In Switzerland a bon mot indicates that government has to fear the people but not vice versa. And this contradicts fundamentally with what English economist und political journalist Walter Bagehot wrote 1867 in his book *The English Constitution*: "There *are* nations in which the numerous unwiser part wishes to be ruled by the less numerous wiser part" (Bagehot 1867, p. 50). This is so because the lower classes are "not intelligent", have no "political ability" and only an "incomplete education" (ibid., p. 54).

What Bagehot did not say that in his time lower classes were excluded from higher education and were at best treated as "respectful poor" (ibid.). So one can image why Marxism emerged in England. Anyway, "stupidity" of the voters is an old argument for elitists on one hand and bureaucrats on the other. In both cases education for democracy is not needed, for elitism contradicts participation and bureaucracy does not require mature citizens that might control it.

Education towards democracy must further be viewed as a process that covers the entire lifespan. As such, "democracy" is not target, but rather the space for political and social experience. Democracy presupposes a public sphere and must be understood in terms of the problems that affect society and cannot simply be solved in a technical or bureaucratic manner. And this has no end in age.

Citizens are prepared to form their own opinions on particular issues and then to make their own decisions. The fact that they can do this is the result of an experience with democratic processes that make clear who the sovereign is and for whom there is no substitute. This experience is the crucial contribution of education towards democracy.

Equality of opportunity has been the subject of debate in Europe since the mid-1950s of the previous century, based on objectives that largely related to the industrial workforce of that time. The issue revolved around so-called "Begabungsreserven" ("talent reserves") from educationally disadvantaged social classes. The measures were geared towards opening higher education to children and young people from the working class. Equality of opportunity was thus largely synonymous with social advancement.

A democratic society can only be convincing if the educational system enables social advancement opportunities. And this has to be paid by public taxes. Those who for their studies have to get into high levels of debt such as in England or the United States, are living with a rubber check.

Contrary to Human Capital Theory, a university degree is no longer a guarantee for a higher income. As such, educational opportunities are being used, even though at a higher price, without resulting in a real equivalent value in the employment system, at least not for all graduates.

The term "equality of opportunity" is somewhat misleading to the extent that there cannot literally be *equal* opportunities for all. The educational system in particular is characterized by numerous inequalities, which cannot be removed or which are associated

with new inequalities. What education can do, however, is provide access to professional life and beside this to a participation in society.

Attempts to make the educational system more egalitarian have been made time and again, without providing a convincing solution to the core problem, namely access to society. The same education of all children and young people is evidently only possible up to a certain age and has follow-up costs, because either the transitions are not achieved or connections are only ensured if significant inequalities are accepted. So schools can serve democracy without being themselves very much democratic.

A key problem of the past few years is the social integration of groups of migrants from non-European countries. A frequent discussion in Europe concerns existing or non-existing limits. These limits are flexible and depend in particular on educational capacities and corresponding investments.

There has been far too little debate on how schools and universities have to change over the next ten to twenty years to lead new groups towards substantial education without neglecting children and young people from the indigenous population.

To sum up: The different crises in Europe can only be addressed politically, and also only on condition of globalization and problems that cannot be solved alone. Just like the United Kingdom, Europe is not an island. Nobody, said John Donne famously, is an island and "if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less".[16] For this reason alone nobody can seal oneself off, even a hermit can only retreat from society if he or she previously lived in it.

But for many citizens, globalization processes are alien, because these processes cannot be controlled democratically. The deficit in democracy is due to size and inaccessibility, and no amount of education will be able to change this.

But education can ensure that citizens perceive themselves as democrats, in spite of any differences of opinion, who are familiar with procedures to participate in the debate in a self-confident manner, who can withstand contradictions, and who ultimately accept the decision of the sovereign.

In the long term, one of the most urgent social problem will be the integration of immigrants. Schools have limited capacities and are only able to handle rapidly growing numbers with difficulty, if at all. Reports from real life show that direct integration into regular schooling is difficult to impossible. Some children and young people are illiterate or literate in their own language. They must attend school in a foreign country, whose language they do not yet speak. And they have to adapt to new requirements of achievement, with which their parents are also unfamiliar.

Those who have ever seen how adults are taught in a Swiss asylum accommodation center – the German term "reception camp" ["Auffanglager"] has thankfully been avoided –, adults who are effectively illiterate in their native language and are suddenly supposed to learn German, after having just been rescued from a floating coffin in the Mediterranean Sea, can imagine what kind of educational and didactic challenges are associated with integration.

---

[16] *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, Meditation 17. (Written in 1624)

And those who can understand how difficult the transfer from accommodation centers to the communities is already, also have an idea of what will face schools in the future.[17]

The problem is compounded with rapidly rising numbers and an uncontrolled influx. It is currently not clear what these two trends mean for Switzerland. It is also unclear whether a European solution can ever be achieved and implemented with fixed or flexible quotas. The political upheavals are already enormous and may yet grow into a test case for liberal democracy. At any rate, democratic ways of life are aimed at integration, which excludes any form of "völkisch" thinking. I never thought, as a German, that I would have to write such a sentence.

Social integration presupposes at least the following conditions: mastering the national language, knowledge of the principles of democracy, school qualifications, successful access to the job market and life perspectives for families. Schools are involved more or less directly in all of these conditions.

Those who do not speak the teaching language will quickly fall behind; those who then cannot fulfil achievement requirements will not gain qualifications, or only poor qualifications, that are making entry to the job market extremely difficult and life perspectives drastically reduced. After all, schools have the task of making individuals familiar with democratic ways of life and preparing them for a society whose norms and values are no longer determined by a *single* religion. This is for many people coming to Europe hard to understand.

Our future living together will be crucially determined by the success of these endeavours. To this extent, democratic education has not only an indirect, but also a direct influence on society and its life forms. Those who do nothing will encourage the creation of ghettos and strengthen the racists who knew it all along. Thus, there is no alternative to integration.

And finally: The formula "democracy as a form of life" comes from an immigration country that offered sanctuary to millions of Europeans. Now, Europe must, whether it wants to or not, offer sanctuary on a far denser area. In order to make refugees be able to utilize the opportunities of integration, they will need school education and regular qualifications, in addition to positive experiences in the new country and as such, recognition, and not merely language courses.

Literature

Alexander, K./Entwisle, D./Olson, L.: The Long Shadow. Family Background, Disadvantaged Urban Youth, and the Transition to Adulthood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation 2014.

Bagehot, W.: The English Constitution. Reprinted from the "Fortnightly Review". London: Chapman and Hall 1867. .

---

[17] Evidence in Oelkers (2015).

Benson, L./Harkavy, I./Puckett, J.: Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform: Civic Society, Public Schools, and Democratic Citizenship. Philadelphia: Temple University Press 2007.

Dewey, J.: The Middle Works 1899-1924, Vol. 9: Democracy and Education 1916. Ed. by J.A. Boydston; intr. by S. Hook. Carbondale/Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press 1985.

Hume, D.: Political Essays. Ed. By K. Haakonssen. Cambridge/UK: Cambridge University Press 1994.

Johnson, B.: The Churchill Factor. How One Man Made History. London: Hodder&Stoughton Ltd. 2014.

Oelkers J.: Gutachten über die schulische Qualität von vier Asylunterkünften im Kanton S. Gallen zuhanden des Trägervereins für Integrationsprojekte St. Gallen (TISG). Ms. Zürich: Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft 2015.

Offe, C.: Europa in der Falle. Berlin: Edition Suhrkamp 2016.

Simms, B./Zeeb, B.,: Europa am Abgrund. Plädoyer für die Vereinigten Staaten von Europa. Übers. v. H. Freundl. München: C.H. Beck 2016.

Vogt, W.: Winston Churchill in der Schweiz. Zürich: Verlag NNZ Libro 2015.