LEARNED VOICES OF EUROPEAN CITIZENS: FROM GOVERNMENTAL TO POLITICAL SUBJECTIVATION

Voces aprendidas de los ciudadanos europeos: de la subjetivación gubernamental a la subjetivación política

Les voix appris des citoyens européens: de subjectivation gouvernementale à subjectivation politique

Simons MAARTEN* y Naomi HODGSON**
* *Dekenstraat 2. Leuven B-3000. Belgium Kuleuven Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Center for Educational Policy, Innovation and Teacher Education and Laboratory of Education and Society. Correo-e: maarten.simons@ ppw.kuleuven.be*
** *University of London. Institute of Education. Correo-e: naomihodgson@hotmail.com*

SUMMARY

The article focuses on the way in which voice operates within the current discourse of democracy, citizenship, and learning. Based on an analysis of «learning devices» and «citizenship devices» we will show that the individual is asked to articulate him or herself in particular ways as evidence of engagement, of inclusion, and of participatory democracy. It is someone's «personhood» –issues related to identity, preferences, feelings of ownership…– that comes to count as evidence of civic engagement and political involvement. This process of personalization –the inscription of the individual as a person that turns him or her into a European citizen– will be described as an important aspect of the current mode of governmental subjectivation. To address this we explore, in line with Jacques Rancière, the notion of «political

subjectivation». While governmental subjectivation involves a process of identification with the order of society, political subjectivation is a paradoxical process of de-identification with the social order. It is about the articulation of one's voice as equal within a social order in which one has no voice according to the ruling organisation of positions.

Key words: European citizenship, voice, lifelong learning, governmentality, subjectivation, devices, Rancière.

RESUMEN

El artículo se centra en estudiar la forma en que las voces operan dentro de los actuales discursos sobre democracia, ciudadanía y aprendizaje. Partiendo de un análisis de los «dispositivos de aprendizaje» y de los «dispositivos de ciudadanía», mostraremos cómo se pide al individuo que se articule de un modo particular, como prueba de su compromiso, inclusión y participación democráticos. Es la personalidad del sujeto –a través de la insistencia en cuestiones relacionadas con la identidad, las preferencias, los sentimientos de pertenencia…– lo que se tiene en cuenta a la hora de valorar su nivel de compromiso cívico y participación política. Este proceso de personalización –que cataloga al individuo como una persona que torna en ciudadano europeo– será descrito como un aspecto importante de la actual subjetivación gubernamental. Para abordar esta cuestión exploraremos, en la línea de Jacques Rancière, el concepto de «subjetivación política». Mientras que la subjetivación gubernamental implica un proceso de identificación con el orden social, la subjetivación política es un paradójico proceso de desidentificación con el orden social. Se trata, por un lado, de articular la voz de uno como un igual dentro del orden social; un orden social en el que, por otro lado, ese mismo uno no tendrá voz dentro de la organización dominante de las posiciones.

Palabras clave: Ciudadanía europea, voz, aprendizaje a lo largo de la vida, gubernamentalidad, subjetivación, mecanismos, Rancière.

SOMMAIRE

Dans cet article nous discutons comment la voix opère dans le discours contemporain de la démocratie, du citoyen et de l'éducation. Basé sur une analyse des «dispositifs d'apprentissage» et «dispositifs de citoyenneté» nous montrons que l'individu est demandé de s'articuler dans des manières spécifiques; notamment comme évidence d'engagement, d'inclusion, et d'une démocratie participative. C'est «l'être personne» de quelqu'un –les questions qui se rapportent aux identités, les préférences, les sentiments de possession…– qui devienne l'évidence d'engagement civique et politique. Ce processus de personnalisation –cette inscription de l'individu comme une personne qui fait de lui un citoyen européen– sera décrit comme un aspect important de l'apparition de la subjectivation gouvernementale d'aujourd'hui. Pour confronter cette matière nous explorerons, en accord avec Jacques Rancière, la notion de «subjectivation politique». Bien que la subjectivation gouvernementale

implique un procès d'identification avec l'ordre de la société, la subjectivation politique est un procès paradoxal de dé-identification avec l'ordre social; mais dans laquelle il y a aussi une possibilité d'articuler sa voix, néanmoins que selon l'organisation de positions on n'a pas de voix dans cet ordre.

Mots clés: La citoyenneté européenne, de la voix, l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie, gubermentalité, la subjectivité, les mécanismes, Rancière.

INTRODUCTION: CITIZENSHIP IN THE LEARNING SOCIETY

In the constitution of Europe within and as a knowledge society, citizenship is constructed in a particular way, in which learning is central (Edwards, 2002). There is a strong tendency to frame the development of democratic citizenship as a «learning problem» and to translate current challenges in terms of a lack of democratic citizenship competences (Biesta & Simons, 2009). The «competence-based» approach to the understanding of education and citizenship has been formalized in European policy and this operationalisation has instituted a number of instruments and procedures through which the European citizen is governed. This interrelationship between democracy, citizenship, and learning, and the centrality of learning for government and self-government have been termed, following Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality, the «governmentalisation of citizenship as a learning process» (Delanty, 2003; Simons & Masschelein, 2008a). We aim here to provide a further analysis of this interrelationship by focusing on the way in which voice operates within the discourse, and through related instruments, of democracy, citizenship, and learning.

We begin our analysis from the premise that «voice» is central to current discourses on democracy and European citizenship. To participate as a democratic citizen is to raise one's voice, to express one's personal beliefs, and to engage in forms of interaction and dialogue that evidence one's identity with and ownership of a collective European project (Council of Europe, 2008; Hodgson, 2011b). Citizenship is framed here as an interactive process of identity formation and ownership through the personal expression of voice that requires specific learning processes. The concern that motivates our critical analysis of voice in relation to citizenship is whether all voices can and should be framed in this way. Some preliminary examples illustrate this. There is, for instance, the voice of the older worker who is not interested in lifelong learning. Often, that voice is considered to be his/her personal opinion and a symptom of de-motivation, an indication of an irresponsible attitude, or a lack of identification with the common purpose of achieving a profitable business/a competitive economy/a strong European knowledge society. The prevailing message seems to be: he or she should learn to learn, or learn to be motivated to learn. But should his/her voice be framed immediately in that way? Could it not be heard directly as a kind of «political voice», that is, a voice that not just raises a personal opinion but questions our common discourses on

lifelong learning and active citizenship? Another example illustrates our concern further: the recent statement by German students –«We are not human capital»– in reaction to university reforms in line with the Bologna Process (*cf.* Masschelein & Simons, 2010). This is a clear voice indeed, but in line with common framings the resistance this voice expresses is often regarded as a lack of identification with the European project and, hence, as necessitating further learning processes, dialogue, ownership, and democratic participation. Once again, their voice is primarily regarded as the expression of specific needs that should be taken into account in view of the further democratization of the existing order. But could their voice not be the articulation of a kind of political statement that questions that order itself, instead of signalling a lack of ownership? And furthermore, if these voices can be approached in a different way, can it shift our understanding of the role of education and educational research in matters of citizenship and democracy? To pursue this concern we raise two questions about the current understanding of citizens' voice. First, who exactly is the subject constituted according to this idea of voice, that is, the learning subject demanded of democratic European citizenship promoted today? Second, is there another way of addressing this «subject of voice» and in what way does it pose an issue for education and learning?

To address the first question, we draw on a Foucauldian perspective to disentangle how current policy discourses and related practices construct the European citizen and learner as a «subject of voice». More specifically, we seek to understand the construction of the European citizen by focusing on processes of «governmental subjectivation». Governmental subjectivation refers to the process that renders the self intelligible as a certain subject and leads to a particular kind of self-government. It is at the same time, however, a process of inscription in technologies of control and power that renders individuals governable. In other words, those being governed are incited to calculate themselves, their work, and life according to the same patterns and to govern themselves accordingly (Rose & Miller, 1992). These processes of subjectivation cannot be disconnected from the specific instruments, procedures, and techniques, or «socio-technical arrangements» (Law, 2004) that function as «human technologies» in the sense that what it is to be human –that is, how to render the self, others, and the world intelligible, calculable and hence governable– is actually produced through these technologies (Rose, 1999, 52). We will refer to these technologies relating to citizenship and learning more specifically as «devices». By analysing specific «learning devices» and «citizenship devices» in the first sections of the paper, we aim to understand current processes of governmental subjectivation and, in doing so, to create a picture of the «subject of voice» that is constituted. This picture will elaborate on what we have termed the «ecological subject».

To address the second question, we refer to the literature that argues that the reconceptualisation of the political subject as an «active citizen» (Hoskins *et al*., 2006) governed in terms of choices, aspirations, and self-fulfilment effects a depoliticisation of citizenship (Barry *et al*., 1996, 50; Biesta, 2009, 151). Our analysis

of the personalisation of citizenship as part of this depoliticisation takes a specific turn, however, as we extend Foucault's governmentality perspective using the work of Jacques Rancière. We explore, in line with Rancière (1998), the notion of «political subjectivation». While governmental subjectivation involves a process of inscription in the order of society, political subjectivation is a paradoxical process of «de-identification» with the social order, but in which one also articulates one's voice as equal within that social order in which one has no voice according to the ruling organisation of positions. According to this line of thought, then, we explore the idea of «political voice» in relation to political subjectivation as an alternative to the current governmental focus on the «subject of voice». We begin, then, by detailing the discourses and devices through which the subject of voice, the active learning citizen, is constituted.

1. VOICE, LIFELONG LEARNING, AND EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

The EU Lisbon Treaty (2009) exemplifies the discourse of governance in Europe and, in particular, the concern with democracy, transparency, and accountability that shapes the way in which the European citizen is addressed. The Summary of the Treaty[1] indicates the prominence of the notion of «giving voice» in the current discourse of democratic governance and citizenship. The Treaty, it states, means «more opportunities for citizens to have their voices heard» and a «stronger voice for citizens» in the name of a more democratic, transparent, and efficient Europe. In the discussion that follows we indicate how «giving voice» and «having one's voice heard» is part of a very particular form of subjectivation characterized by personalization, and how specific devices related to learning and citizenship actually constitute people as subjects of voice. We will briefly indicate how «learning devices» operate in processes of governmental subjectivation before turning to focus in more detail on «citizenship devices».

2. HOW TO BECOME A COMPETENT INDIVIDUAL?: LEARNING DEVICES AND GOVERNMENTAL SUBJECTIVATION

As indicated, citizenship is framed as a learning problem; «learning» and «citizenship», then, are not discrete objects. The concept of citizenship as it operates today is constituted by a particular attitude to learning, which entails the acquisition of numerous competences. The documents and devices referred to here will clarify how personal engagement in such acquisition, and evidencing the desired competences as a lifelong learner, provides evidence of «active citizenship».

1. Http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/glance/index_en.htm.

The Lisbon Strategy has issued in numerous instruments and procedures for the measurement and management of its aims, in which «citizenship» and «lifelong learning» are central to the governance of Europe as a knowledge society. The Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training 2020 (ET2020), for example, illustrates the centrality of education to European integration and the construction of European citizenship:

In the period up to 2020, the primary goal of European cooperation should be to support the further development of education and training systems in the Member States which are aimed at ensuring:

a) the personal, social and professional fulfilment of all citizens;
b) sustainable economic prosperity and employability, whilst promoting democratic values, social cohesion, active citizenship, and intercultural dialogue (OJEU, 2009, 3).

Beyond maximizing engagement in education, training, and employment for economic benefit, such a strategy is also attached to the achievement of sociopolitical goals: the promotion of democratic values, social cohesion, active citizenship, and intercultural dialogue.

ET2020 also indicates how democracy, citizenship, and learning are interrelated. Here, and indeed across European policy more broadly since the inception of the Lisbon Strategy and documents such as «Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality» (CEC, 2001), «education and training» refers to a specifically defined object and technique of governance defined as lifelong learning. The term «learning» has become disconnected from education and teaching and becomes instead a «production force» for «human capital» for which the individual is personally responsible (Simons & Masschelein, 2008). In this context, the focus on the individual has shifted in terms of the way in which he/she is addressed. She is addressed as both entrepreneurial, that is, as one who looks at herself as an object of investment through learning, and in terms of her citizenship. As a lifelong learner, she is asked to approach learning and self-investment as a requirement for both individual benefit and collective welfare.

The capitalizing, entrepreneurial attitude required is evident in a competence-based approach to understanding learning, as stated in the EC's «Competences Supporting Lifelong Learning» (2010). The establishment of this set of competences requires the development of the means to, and processes by which to, «adequately assess, record and provide evidence of the competences developed by citizens in formal, non-formal and informal learning environments» in order that these can be taken into account «for the purposes of employment» and to «facilitate the identification of their evolving competences and future learning needs» (p. 3). Such measures and their usage would be best achieved by the adoption of «a standardised terminology and approach to classification… by all stakeholders in both education and training and the labour market» (p. 3). Hence, it is in terms of learned competences that European citizens can express their unique personhood,

which they can and should manage in view of optimal benefits and employability. The process of personalization through which people come to understand their personhood in terms of their learning lives for which they are personally responsible, however, is at the same time an inscription in an infrastructure that renders the European area for lifelong learning governable. The «standardised terminology and approach to classification» is illustrative of this.

Describing these standardized and standardizing measures and the related discourse as «learning devices» indicates the process of governmental subjectivation, that is, how exactly individuals come to understand themselves as «learning citizens». The European Union's *Europass-program* is one example of a learning device that enables the individual to actively articulate him or herself according to this standardised language. The Europass includes several components *(Europass CV, Europass Language Passport, Europass Mobility, Europass Diploma Supplement and Europass Certificate Supplement)* and functions as an electronic portfolio that enables each citizen to make the personal outcomes of learning processes visible. In using the portfolio, the citizen becomes able to objectify him/herself in terms of accumulated competences; it renders their level of employability visible; it offers information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of one's set of competences; it enables one to become responsive to needs in the environment; it renders the self and one's level of employability visible to and in relation to others etc. In using these instruments individuals are involved in a permanent process of «self-documentation» and «self-marketisation» (*cf.* Tuschling & Engemann, 2006, 462-463), required to live a mobile life. Combined with the *Basic Competences for Lifelong Learning* and also the *European Qualifications Framework*, these devices incite people to regard themselves as entrepreneurial, mobile, and responsive individuals, who need to formalize, validate, and tune their lives as lifelong learners. It is important to elaborate in more detail on the result of this process of subjectivation.

What is constituted here is what we want to call the «ecological (learning) subject», which can be distinguished from the «social (educated) subject» (Hodgson, 2011a; Simons, 2009). To come to understand oneself as an ecological subject implies a particular understanding of space, time, and the self, which has shifted from its modern form. The space within which the individual orients herself has shifted from fixed territory, social positions, and stable institutions to «environments». The ecological subject assumes a permanent confrontation by environmental conditions to which she must be responsive and adapt. She is a subject that sees herself as in need of a permanent reorientation of herself within her environment in response to the resources available at a given moment. In that regard, the ecological subject is someone with a «momentary-ecological self-understanding», that is, time is framed in terms of the «here and now» and space is approached in terms of «environments» (Simons & Masschelein, 2008b, 2009). This is different from the social subject, and what we could call her «historical-institutional» self-understanding. An historical understanding of time implies the assumption of a fixed temporality (in linear terms of progress, teleology…) and is combined with an understanding of space in terms

of relatively stable institutional settings. A clear indication of the shift is that typical modern social notions of «progress» and «emancipation» (and their teleological and institutional assumptions) are displaced by now typical ecological notions such as «innovation» and «empowerment». Innovation and empowerment take the environment here and now, that is, the available resources, as a point of departure. This shift in the conceptualization of time and space entails a different conception of the self. The ecological subject is the subject that perceives herself as located within an environment and as involved in a continuous process of self-improvement and identity-building through the productive, entrepreneurial mobilization of resources to face the changes in his/her environment.

The emergence of the ecological subject, and its distinction from the social subject, is illustrated by the devices employed. For example, the portfolio could be regarded as a learning device that plays an important role in the constitution of the ecological subject. The specificity of the way that the portfolio works becomes clearer when compared with the social subject located within an institutionally organized society. In a society of institutions, with relatively stable routes and locations, the «curriculum vitae» (CV) serves as an adequate device. In line with a linear understanding of time (e.g. important life phases) and an institutional conception of space (e.g. educational institutions), the CV offers a chronological overview of someone's individuality, structured according to the transitions of one's socially– (temporally and institutionally) phased biography. While the CV usually lists institutionally-based educational qualifications, the portfolio gives an overview of learning outcomes and the competences one has at one's disposal. The portfolio assumes an individuality in permanent motion and, in line with an environmental understanding of space and a momentary time-conception, it captures the balance of accumulated competences in personal learning trajectories. The CV is a historic-institutional device, while the portfolio functions as an ecological-momentary device. While the social subject is constituted as an «educated person» through the CV, the portfolio turns the ecological subject into a «lifelong learner».

What we want to stress is that specific learning devices, for instance the Europass program and discourses that are «signalling the ability of individuals to act in a self-organised way in complex, changing and unpredictable contexts» (CEC, 2010), constitute a particular subject: the ecological subject[2]. The ecological subject is someone who recognizes lifelong learning as an indispensable requirement to face changing environments, who feels the need to give an account of herself as «a competent person», and who expresses her personhood through an up-to-date overview of the results of her learning life. However, this personalisation of the individual in terms of the accumulated competences is at the same time an ins-

---

2. «Council conclusions on competences supporting lifelong learning and the "new skills for new jobs" initiative», http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st08/st08798.en10.pdf; accessed 15/09/2010.

cription in the current governmental order. Devices such as the portfolio at once allow the individual to account for him or herself as a competent person and contribute to the standardizing of a common discourse of education and training. This articulates the «personalising» and at once «standardizing» or «uniformising» mode of government of the ecological subject. We turn now to an analysis of «citizenship devices» to add further detail to our picture of the ecological subject.

3.   HOW TO FEEL AT HOME?: CITIZENSHIP DEVICES AND GOVERNMENTAL SUBJECTIVATION

The process of standardizing measures and the seeking of a common language by which European citizens are addressed is already evident in the examples of learning devices above, but can be seen also in the development of means of measuring public opinion, for example, through the European Social Survey, and of measuring citizenship itself, or as it is more specifically termed, «active citizenship». We will briefly summarise this before turning to more specific «citizenship devices» by which the citizen is addressed, with particular reference to the Europe for Citizens programme.

«Active citizenship» relates to a particular concern with participation, through the operationalisation of which citizenship is rendered measurable and governable. The evidencing of active citizenship constitutes the measurement and management of participatory democracy, and therefore of the efficiency of citizenship devices and learning devices. Measures and benchmarks such as the Active Composite Citizenship Indicator (ACCI) have been developed by the Centre for Research on Lifelong Learning (CRELL) at the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission using data drawn from the European Social Survey[3-4]. The CRELL report reads:

The research project on «Active Citizenship for Democracy», coordinated by the European Commission's Centre for Research on Lifelong Learning (CRELL), has produced the following definition of «Active Citizenship for Democracy» (Hoskins, 2006):

> Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterised by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy.

Active citizenship is partially overlapping with the concept of social values concentrating its interest mostly at meso-and micro-level. Thus, active citizenship is understood in the very broadest sense of the word «participation» and is not restricted to the political dimension. It ranges from cultural and political to envi-

---

3.   http://active-citizenship. jrc.it/Documents/active%20citizenship/Measuring%20Active%20 Citizenship%20across%20Europe.pdf.

4.   There is not space here to discuss the European Social Survey. For analysis of the way in which the European citizen is addressed by this, see HODGSON (2010).

ronmental activities, on local, regional, national, European and international levels. It includes new and less conventional forms of active citizenship, such as one-off issue politics and responsible consumption, as well as the more traditional forms of voting and membership in parties and NGOs. The limits of active citizenship are set by ethical boundaries. People's activities should support the community and should not contravene principles of human rights and the rule of law. Participation in extremist groups that promote intolerance and violence should therefore not be included in this definition of active citizenship (p. 11).

The definition, derived from social capital theory (p. 9), needed to be operationalised, that is, made measurable, in order to build the ACCI:

> Towards this end we identified measurable and distinctive elements in the definition of active citizenship, which we designated «dimensions of active citizenship». The dimensions are: participation in Political Life, Civil Society, Community Life and the Values needed for active citizenship (recognition of the importance of human rights, democracy and intercultural understanding) (p. 11).

The measurement of active citizenship then refers to the measurement of modes of participation identified as appropriate to the values of human rights, democracy, and intercultural understanding. Such activities are placed on a scale ranging from, for example, signing a petition to being a member of a political party.

The development of composite indicators for active citizenship is an example of the ways in which we are asked to account for ourselves in terms of our citizenship: citizenship becomes an object of concern for the development of personal competences. We turn now to provide a particular example of a citizenship device, the «Europe for Citizens» programme[5], which indicates the particular practices through which Europeans are asked to engage as active citizens. This returns us to the role of personal voice in evidencing one's engagement and inclusion.

The leaflet promoting the Europe for Citizens programme reads that, despite its «undoubted successes», the European Union is concerned to address the «distance between the Union and its citizens» (EfC, p. 2):

> In order to bridge this gap, it is important to engage in a dialogue directly with you, the citizen and to encourage you to talk with people living in other countries. By doing so, you will be involved more directly in shaping the Europe you wish to live in. You will feel increasingly at home in Europe (p. 2).

The act of vocalizing one's Europeanness bridges the gap between the EU and its citizens and between citizens of member states such that Europe «feels like

---

5. The Europe for Citizens programme 2007-2013 is administered by the European Council's Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual, and Culture, and is aimed at encouraging European integration through fostering engagement and participation: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php. Accessed 15/09/2010.

home». The Europe for Citizens programme is comprised of four Actions, which indicate how this feeling at home in Europe is to be fostered.

Action One is entitled «Active Citizens for Europe» and this, as with the outline of all the Actions, starts with direct questions to the European citizen:

> Do you know people from towns twinned with your own town?
> Have you already participated in a project with citizens from other EU countries?
> Would you be interested to share your ideas about the future of Europe with other European citizens?

The Action is concerned not only with knowing Europe but about knowing other Europeans and with the creation of Europe through such interactions. To this end, Action One is concerned with town twinning and citizens' projects, encouraged to foster participation in the form of direct dialogue and communication. Examples of suggested projects, for which citizens must apply for funding, are citizen panels, citizen juries, and citizen cafés[6] (EWFC, 2).

This is reinforced by Action Two, «Active Civil Society in Europe», which refers to the operation of and participation in think tanks and civil society organisations (e. g. voluntary organisations, NGOs, trade unions). EU-level civil society organisations will enable transnational European projects involving or representing the interests of European citizens and thereby contributing to «mutual understanding» and identifying «shared concerns and values» (p. 2). These values and concerns, by being identified by means of European projects, are thereby defined as inherently European values and concerns, or as the values and concerns of a European public.

Action Three, «Together for Europe», builds on these forms of participation, but seeks to make them more visible to the wider community by facilitating three forms of project. The first involves the organisation of high-visibility events to «inspire and motivate citizens», «stir their imaginations», and «help them to identify more closely with the European project» (p. 1). Such events should make citizens «more aware of the EU's history, achievements and values and facilitate intercultural dialogue» (p. 1). The second aspect of Action Three is «the funding of surveys, studies and opinion polls which improve understanding of European citizens, citizenship and identity» (p. 1). This forms part of the process of evidence-based policy-making and, in the production of statistical knowledge about Europe, creates a sense of a European public (whose opinions are gathered) and makes this visible through the presentation of statistical data to the public (for example

---

6. The notion of «citizen cafés» does not refer necessarily to purpose-built cafés but to a method «for creating a living network of collaborative dialogue around questions that matter in real life situations» that has since been used in the consultation process for the next phase of the Europe for Citizens programme (see http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/news/news1071_en.htm.). This is discussed further in HODGSON (2011a, 2011b).

via Eurostat or the media). The third aspect also relates to visibility, through the promotion of the Europe for Citizens project itself. The European Commission wishes to develop information and dissemination tools to communicate the opportunities the programme offers, with particular reference to «European actions relating to citizenship» (p. 1).

The fourth and final aspect of the Europe for Citizens programme focuses on history, and is entitled «Active European Remembrance». More than promoting an awareness of European history, this aspect requires active engagement with this history. As with the other sections, the description is preceded by questions:

> Did you ever visit the site of a former concentration camp? Would you spend some of your time collecting testimonies of survivors of Nazi and Stalinist persecutions? How important is it for you to keep alive the memory of Europe's past? (p. 1).

Understanding Europe's past is essential to understanding why it exists, its future objectives, and avoiding similar events in the future (p. 1). Active remembrance, then, entails the preservation of:

> sites where mass deportations and exterminations took place under the Nazi and Stalinist regimes. They safeguard the memories and experiences of survivors and witnesses. They encourage citizens, and particularly the young, to ponder the causes and consequences of these two totalitarian ideologies. Finally, the networking between organisations sharing similar concerns is also being encouraged (p. 1).

While the concern is with particular, horrific, aspects of European history, the purpose of active citizen engagement is its value here and now. Such engagement grounds a sense of a shared history and of a shared purpose in the maintenance of peace and democracy as Europeans, but this is in order to mobilize a particular attitude in the individual, of innovation, adaptability, and mobility, for a future in which the shifting policy landscape can be understood as operating to protect Europe from its past, and from those non-Europeans still governed according to totalitarian ideologies.

The ways in which the EfC programme relates to the policies previously discussed, such as the Education and Training Framework 2020, further illustrates a desire to evidence Europe in a particular way (e.g. through measurable active participation), which requires the individual European citizen to articulate him/herself in a particular way. The role of dialogue and projects and the relationship to history further illustrates the emergence of the ecological subject, its «momentary-ecological self-understanding», and clarifies how this relates to the constitution of the lifelong learner through learning devices. After exploring this in more detail, we can further discuss the mode of governmental subjectivation at stake.

The four Actions of the Europe for Citizens programme focus on Europe as a physical, geographical space with specific resources (values, initiatives, heritage…) that have to be mobilized in view of transnational democratic engagement and the construction of the idea of Europe or, more particularly, European citizenship. The future –Europe for citizens– is not approached as a linear, teleological narrative in

which people are collectively engaged. Instead, the future is what can be constructed drawing upon resources available within the current contexts and based on personal engagement. Citizens are addressed in terms of the necessity of their personal engagement in the form of projects, dialogue, exchange, active remembrance etc. in order to constitute a shared sense of ownership and feeling of belonging, that is, of feeling «at home» (EfC, p. 2). The European citizen here is framed as under construction through a process based on personal engagement and identification. It relies on the engagement of individuals identifying themselves as Europeans and proactively engaging as citizens as such, in which citizenship itself is a competence and thus a focus for personal improvement. In line with the constitution of the individual as lifelong learner, European citizenship is framed in terms of personal responsibility; it is inscribed in the personal make-up of each individual and frames the understanding of what it is to be a person among others.

The personalization of citizenship is further articulated in the leaflet promoting the EfC programme. It engages its citizens in a dialogue, addressing the individual with direct questions, to introduce each Action. People are not addressed in the institutional language of rights and duties or social responsibilities and obligations. Underpinning the programme is an ecological understanding of resources for personal identification and the possible «collective» mobilization of persons and their feeling of belonging and ownership. Additionally, the leaflet's references to networking and «active remembrance» further emphasize the way that citizens are asked to relate to history, as a resource for positive learning outcomes. Active remembrance is a tool to make history into a useful resource. Not only is the understanding of history as a resource intended to galvanize a sense of a shared purpose in mapping Europe's future, but also such projects, intended to draw attention to the possibility of human atrocity, reinforce who the citizen is that is required for this future by encouraging such projects to be used not only for their historical educational value but also as a resource for the development of transversal competences and making contacts for future collaboration. In line with a momentary-ecological understanding, the past is no longer approached in linear terms but as something that is available in the present (as a resource) in view of constructing a future.

As part of the set of citizenship devices operating today, the Europe for Citizens programme enables us to further our exploration of the mode of governmental subjectivation currently taking shape, that is, how citizenship, closely aligned with lifelong learning as discussed earlier, is inscribed in the constitution of the ecological subject. Based on the discussion of learning devices and citizenship devices above, we elaborate this in terms of Foucault's four-part schema (*cf*. Simons, 2009). The first part of Foucault's schema is entitled «substance», that which will be worked on in one's (self) government. Here, this refers to that which is subject to our judgment as a learning citizen (Foucault, 1994, 263; see also Dean, 1995). The second, the mode of subjectivation, refers to «the way in which people are incited to recognize their moral obligations» (p. 264) and, in our view, citizenship duties. The third aspect is concerned with «the means by which we can change ourselves» (p. 265)

in order to become citizens, which Foucault refers to also as «self-forming activity» or «asceticism in a very broad sense» (p. 265). The fourth aspect concerns «the kind of being we aspire to be» when we behave as a learning citizen and Foucault terms this the *telos* (p. 265). Adopting this schema we will address specifically how individuals are inscribed as citizens through their «personal voices», and how processes of personalisation through voice play an important role in the constitution of the ecological subject.

First, the substance of the lifelong learner is the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and competences, and the experienced weaknesses and strengths in available competences, according to which each individual is able to articulate their «personhood». In terms of citizenship, the substance refers to what is subject to one's judgment as a learning citizen. As a lifelong learner, the learning citizen is someone who objectifies him or her self in terms of specific citizenship competences, and who seeks to evidence his/her personal feelings of ownership, identity, and belonging in a particular way. This entails a focus on the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and competences that enable one to remain engaged in the ongoing construction of identity and ownership through dialogue, communication, active remembrance, and projects.

Second, this objectivation of one's self as a more or less competent person is linked up with a particular mode of subjection, that is, how one is incited to understand oneself in these terms. Because competences are framed as the ability to perform in a particular environment, the learner is someone who submits herself to the needs and demands of that «complex, changing and unpredictable» environment. The assumed deontology is no longer an institutionally-based responsibility but an ecological sense of responsiveness or flexibility. Hence, the lifelong learner exposes herself to the permanent feedback of needs, challenges, trends, opportunities etc. The active competent citizen is incited to recognize his/her obligations as citizen in a particular way. The primary concern is not an institutional (juridical, political) inscription, but a personal responsiveness and personal sense of obligation to available resources in view of constructing shared values, understanding, common identity, and ownership. Furthermore, this is an active and ongoing process of self-improvement; no longer an institutionally-positioned and historically-framed individual, but an environmentally-located person facing the challenges and resources of changing environments.

Third, a particular kind of work upon one's competences, «self-forming activity», is required to give shape to one's personhood. One has to ensure a relation of permanent monitoring, investment, innovation, and marketing in respect of one's knowledge, skills, attitudes, and competences in view of shaping one's personhood. Monitoring involves a permanent observation and evaluation of one's competences in view of fine-tuning what one has to offer and what is required. Investment is about calculating the energy, resources, and time that will be spent to adapt one's competences to the environment or to find an environment where one's competences can be employed. Innovation then is the learning process

through which available resources are efficiently and effectively transformed into employable competences. Self-marketing is the activity of making visible to others one's personhood in terms of competences in order to gain access to an environment. Self-marketing implies a process of impression-management by using, for instance, available validation frameworks and the discourse of key competences. Impression management is successful when your own self-image coincides with the image that others have of you. In sum, the work upon the self required of the lifelong learner is competence-management and impression-management of one's learning personhood. Additionally, part of this personal work is the active construction and development of identity, networks, and ownership. This work upon the self is not anti-social; an aspect of our active citizenship entails engagement, dialogue, and collaboration but in a way that capitalizes on our relations to others as a resource. This work upon the self, mainly through identification with Europe and «European values», actually combines the shaping of oneself as a person with activities of participation and democratic governance. This active form of identification involves at once personalization and inscription into structures of participation and democratic governance.

Fourth, the *telos* in this mode of subjectivation –that is the kind of being the ecological citizen aspires to be– is to be someone «who feels at home». As a competent person, the lifelong learner aspires to a kind of personal autonomy –«the ability to act in a self-organised way»– that should be understood as the condition of permanent employability –«in complex, changing and unpredictable contexts». It is someone for whom Europe appears as a home, a kind of *oikos* or household, and that includes not an institutional but foremost an ecological habitat for ongoing self-improvement and growth. The ecological subject wants her personhood and personal voice to be taken as the expression of citizenship. The active citizen's feeling at home manifests in active engagement, democratic participation, civic employability, and wellbeing, and an aspirational attitude of permanent self-improvement in respect of these. And from the viewpoint of governance, the aspiration could be described as a condition of «civic employability» for which the individual is responsible, that is a condition where each individual, regardless of the changing environments, adapts and remains able to raise her own personal voice within the governance and participation structures.

This overview, from the perspective of Foucault's four-part schema, details how the «learning devices» and «citizenship devices» discussed are constitutive of what we have termed the ecological subject. We turn now to a discussion of the de-politicising tendencies of this mode of governmental subjectivation and the personalization of voice it entails in line with Rancière's notion of political subjectivation and political voice.

4. POLITICAL SUBJECTIVATION: RANCIÈRE AND THE ASSUMPTION OF EQUALITY

As illustrated in the preceding sections, the European discourse of active citizenship and lifelong learning, and related devices, implies a particular mode of subjectivation. People are inscribed in the current governance regime as ecological subjects, and through their voicing themselves as active learning citizens. As a consequence, «lifelong learning» and «active citizenship» can function as a medium in which to frame conflicts and challenges in societies as problems of, for instance, learning, competences, and dialogue. Additionally, problems become individualized, or more particularly «personalised» (lack of motivation to learn, problems of «feeling at home», low sense of ownership…), and learning and citizenship experts are mobilized to support the personal learning trajectories of European citizens. Each citizen of course can have his or her own interests and aspirations, and is placed in a position to raise her own, personal voice; however, it is according to ruling procedures, frameworks, and vocabularies that they have to raise this voice and it is in terms of employable competences that they have to make themselves visible. Dialogue, in this context, then, refers to a speaking together as individuals with personalized voices seeking consensus. Ecological subjectivation is therefore in this sense a governmental subjectivation; becoming an ecological subject is an inscription that renders the self governable.

Elaborating on the work of Rancière, we want to interpret this mode of subjectivation, and the accompanying personalisation, as a kind of de-politicisation; to do so it is necessary to define more precisely what «the political» is, and then to offer a description of another form of subjectivation. So far, voice has been referred to as an articulation of one's personal beliefs and preferences, as a measure of one's participation and inclusion, a means of governance, and therefore, as part of a «personalizing» mode of governmental subjectivation. Here, we make a distinction between «personal voice» in line with processes of governmental subjectivation and «political voice» in reference to processes of political subjectivation. Foucault's term «subjectivation», and the four-part schema that elaborates it, has so far here referred to «governmental subjectivation». Rancière refers to this as «identification»[7-8]. We will outline how this relates to the particular form of governmental subjectivation

7. The Foucaultian concept «subjectivation» is specified here as «governmental subjectivation», and could be regarded in line with Rancière's notion of «identification», that is, being inscribed to identify oneself with the existing societal order (RANCIÈRE, 1992, 1995). For a further discussion on the similarities (and differences) between the Foucaultian notion of «governmentality/governmental regime» and Rancière's notion of «police order» see SIMONS & MASSCHELEIN, 2010.

8. Rancière's use of the notion of political subjectivation and his critique of the common understandings of «equality» and «democracy» not only offer their own unique insights into the context under discussion here but also illustrate the critical attitude present in Foucault's thought. As argued elsewhere (Hodgson, forthcoming), the critical force of Foucault's thought is often lost in governmentality studies as the underpinning attitude of «de-governmentalisation» (GROS, 2005) is missed.

we have depicted so far, which enables a move to consider the idea of political subjectivation.

The constitution of Europe involves the constitution of a space where everything is assumed to be intelligible and expressible in terms of competences, personal interests, and personal voices. Besides this symbolic constitution, it includes a process of «identification» (Rancière) or «governmental subjectivation» (Foucault) through which individuals come to understand and govern themselves as ecological subjects according to specifically-determined competences, learning aspirations, and identities. Self-government here is government according to what is perceived to be the true substance of the self, i.e. one's own competences, feelings or identity. Identification (Rancière) or governmental subjectivation (Foucault) are characterised by the assumption that there is no outside, that is, everything of value can be expressed in those terms and hence nothing or nobody can be outside. As Rancière stresses: «Today, all of us are supposed to be "included" in a totality that is defined in consensual terms as an addition of groups each regarded to have its own identity», adding that «the barrier/division/limit has become invisible» (Rancière, 2001, 348). For Rancière, «the political», a term closely related to democracy or the «power of the people as the unqualified within a given order», is precisely that activity that brings the limits (not assumed to be there in the social and governmental order) back into question. We will now elaborate in more detail Rancière's understanding of «the political» before turning to consider a different understanding of voice and subjectivation termed «political subjectivation».

Democracy for Rancière is not a kind of political regime (among others), but is the «institution» of the political. Rancière illustrates this with the example of a revolutionary woman, Olympe de Gouges, who stated on being sentenced to death during the French Revolution «that if women are entitled to go the scaffold, they are entitled to go to the assembly» (Rancière, 2004, 302). De Gouges demonstrates in her statement that women were supposed to belong to the private, domestic sphere (they could not vote and could not be elected), and hence were excluded from or perceived as unqualified for public life (and to discuss publicly issues related to the common good). At the same time, however, women were considered to be a possible threat to the common good as they could be sentenced to death in a public judgement. According to Rancière, such a statement results in the construction of a «disagreement» *(mésentente)* or democratic «dissensus». Olympe de Gouges had no «qualification» to make her statement, and was not part of the public community of that time (she did not qualify to be concerned with the common good), yet at the same time she presents herself as being part of that community, by making a public statement, claiming nothing else than having no part. Because the statement of the woman intervenes in the governmental order and its symbolic constitution within which we are used to seeing things as given, it is not just a personal opinion or interest she is giving. Rather, her intervention constitutes a «dissensus about the part-taking in the common of the community» *(ibid.*, 306).

According to Rancière, this democratic moment involves a process of «political subjectivation», and not a process of «governmental subjectivation» or «identification». Yet it is important to keep in mind that this subjectivation is a paradoxical process of identification («two worlds in one and the same world», Rancière, 2004, 304) and that the political subject is always highly paradoxical. The political subject does belong to the world of the social order and the «common good», and uses its language and way of seeing things, but is at the same time outside that world because it only indicates to that world that it does not belong to that world. As such, political subjectivation disrupts governmental subjectivation or identification. The political subjects of democratic interventions use names (or concepts) or identify themselves with groups they actually cannot identify themselves with, but their doing so creates the paradoxical democratic moment: «I am a *proletarian*» (answered by a revolutionary in the courthouse when asked for his profession); «We are all *Jews*» (claimed by student movements in the 1960s), etc. The voice raised by political subjects is not a social/personal or governmental voice, but a political voice. It is the democratic voice of «the people».

Hence, what is at stake in this voice is the manifestation of «a wrong», and this voice is first and foremost the demonstration/affirmation of equality. Olympe de Gouges, by addressing others in a public language, in the very act of intervening, demonstrates and verifies her equality to all those who are «qualified» to have a part. It is important to stress at this point that Rancière is not discussing «equality» as a state of being, but the demonstration and verification of equality in a concrete act of intervening. Equality, for Rancière, is always «intellectual equality», and intellect or intelligence, far from being psychometric notions, refer to an «ability to» (speak, understand). While the logic of governmental subjectivation assumes that there is no outside, the logic of democracy, in Rancière's sense, assumes the equality of intelligences, that is, the possibility of acting as if all are able to speak and understand (no prior justification or qualification are needed). Rancière refers at this point to «the egalitarian logic in the act of speaking (*la parole*)» and that the act of speaking requires no specific qualifications (Rancière, 1998, 115).

In line with this, Rancière makes a strong claim: «Consensus, thus understood, is the negation of the democratic basis for politics: it desires to have well-identifiable groups with specific interests, aspirations, values, and "culture"» (Rancière, 2000, 125). Although this claim applies mainly to the consensus conception of democracy, it can also be applied to the current mode of European governance and participation logic discussed in the earlier sections. The promoted governance and participation structure, the related lifelong learning programmes, and the included ecological subject, indeed assume that personal learning needs, identification gaps, and specific interests as well as the differences among them pre-exist, and that every individual has a personal voice to raise and a personal learning trajectory to follow. The order that is promoted hence assumes that there is no outside, and in its eagerness to see everywhere, and particularly behind every

conflict, challenge, or development, specific personal learning needs and active citizenship opportunities, it denies all manifestations of (political) surplus or lack. The denial is exactly, therefore, the negation of the democratic basis for politics; it is the neutralisation of the process of political subjectivation where a paradoxical surplus subject is constituted in the act of demonstrating and verifying one's equality of intelligence in the name of, for example, «the proletariat», «women», «workers» (Rancière, 2001, 348). The current order, in addressing the citizen in terms of her personhood and asking her to raise her own personal voice, no longer accepts this kind of paradoxical subjectivation and usage of «wrong» names; indeed, it wants to call everyone by their real name, and thus to be able to take into account their real identities, feelings, and learning needs. These strategies of personalisation and consensus «neutralise» or «tame» democracy and result in a kind of «de-politicization»: manifestations of dissensus are translated into governmental matters, into policy or expert problems (of conflicting interests or lack of ownership, for example) requiring policy or expert solutions (dialogue or lifelong learning, for instance).

5. CONCLUSION: VOICE, CITIZENSHIP, AND (SCHOOL) EDUCATION

The focus on governmental subjectivation here has enabled further elaboration of the idea of the ecological subject. Ecological subjectivity includes a form of autonomy expressed by a particular fluency in the personalizing and at once standardizing language of lifelong learning and of evidencing how one participates. Articulation, fluency, and voice refer not only to what one says but also to what one does, the way in which one adapts his or her resources/competences to the shifting environment whose conditions must be managed and stabilized to permanently ensure stability and consensus. This is manifest in the way in which learning devices and citizenship devices enable a personalization of the way in which the individual articulates herself, and at the same time an inscription into the governmental order.

According to us, the perspective on «political subjectivation» and «democratic voices» opens up an interesting perspective to become attentive to the limits of the current governmentalisation of Europe in the name of lifelong learning and personal citizenship, and the inscribed governmental subjectivation[9]. On Rancière's view of democracy as the institution of the political, democracy is seen as an act. It does not exist *a priori* to the order into which the individual must be appropriately inscribed, i.e. given a personal voice, but is enacted by such democratic voices as exemplified above. As an act of interruption, democracy, then, always appears out of order. Democracy, according to the logic of participation and active citizenship,

---

9. This bottom-up perspective could be linked with empirical accounts of the diverse practices of citizenship identified in Europe: see for instance HOLFORD (2008).

seeks consensus, feeling at home, and thus a depoliticized notion of voice and of citizenship.

By looking out for these democratic voices as exemplified in the introduction (older learners and protesting students) and becoming attentive to them, we reframe those who, according to the governmental order, are marked as in need of reform. This is not an argument for «giving voice»; perhaps our role here is to document these voices, to let them be heard, and to try to gather more people around them. Hence, instead of supporting and facilitating a democracy of personal voices, it could be more valuable to become sensitive to political voices; looking for the democratic life of European citizens, to become attentive to their political concerns, and to find a way –and perhaps foremost in educational research– not to explain them but to bring them into circulation.

Taking up this viewpoint has also several consequences for education as well as for educational research. As far as the current focus on European citizenship finds its programmatic translation in school and curriculum reform, there is a risk that schools become sites where governmental subjectivation is played out and actually reinforces the taming of democracy. The current initiatives that seek both to include civic competences in the curriculum and to transform schools and classrooms into places of democratic participation and deliberation in order to develop citizenship competencies could be critically studied in view of promoting governmental subjectivation (Means, 2011). The objective to «produce» the European citizen –imagined as the learning citizen with an ecological mindset– through (school) education indeed could be regarded as a imposition of governmental reasoning onto school education. But this also brings another, crucial issue into the discussion: the relation between education and politics, between schools and democracy, and between the students' voice and the citizens' voice. Often, this discussion is conducted in terms of how school education (at the level of the curriculum or the organisation) can prepare individuals for political and democratic life, and thus assumes that schools in one way or another are instrumental or functional to politics and democracy.

Perhaps, and in line with Rancière, there is another way of framing the discussion by focusing on the political meaning of the school itself, and hence, paying attention to the mode of subjectivation that takes place within a school[10]. As far as school is the time and place that society offers to the new generation to renew the world, «school» should not be approached as a societal or governmental organisation, but –similar to Rancière's approach to democracy– as an act of interruption in what could be termed «pedagogic subjectivation» (Simons & Masschelein, 2010). This mode of subjectivation is less about the demonstration of a wrong and more about the affirmation of an «ability to», that is, of «potentiality» on the basis

_____

10.   At this point, the adoption of the work of Rancière in educational research and theory, and the relation between politics and education or democracy and school seems to diverge, see for instance: BINGHAM & BIESTA, 2010; LEWIS, 2010; MASSCHELEIN & SIMONS, 2010; MEANS, 2011.

of equality. Clearly, throughout history there have been attempts to neutralize the school, that is, to prevent the new generation from actually being a new generation by immediately imposing the dreams, hopes, or fears of the old generation onto them. If that is the case, it is important to examine in more detail what exactly is at stake in pedagogic subjectivation, how it differs from and relates to democratic acts of political subjectivation, and foremost how the ongoing tendency to tame or neutralize both the school and democracy is manifested.

REFERENCES

BARRY, A.; OSBORNE, T. y ROSE, N. (eds.) (1996) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

BIESTA, G. (2009) What kind of citizenship for European higher education? Beyond the competent active citizen. *European Educational Research Journal*, 8, 146-158.

BIESTA, G. y SIMONS, M. (2009) Higher education and European citizenship as a matter of public concern. *European Educational Research Journal*, 8, 142-145.

BINGHAM, C. y BIESTA, G. J. J. (2010) *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation*. London/New York, Continuum.

CEC (2001) *Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality*. Brussels, Commission of the European Communities.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2008) *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: «living together as equals in dignity»*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/white%20paper_final_revised_en.pdf.

DEAN, M. (1995) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London, Sage.

DELANTY, G. (2003) Citizenship as a learning process: disciplinary citizenship versus cultural citizenship. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 22, 597-605.

EDWARDS, R. (2002) Mobilizing lifelong learning: governmentality in educational practices. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17, 353-365.

FOUCAULT, M. (1994) On the genealogy of ethics: an overview of work in progress, en RABINOW, P. (ed.) *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984: Vol. 1 Ethics*. London, Penguin.

GROS, F. (2005) Course context, en FOUCAULT, M. *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981-1982*. New York, Picador.

HODGSON, N. (2011a) *Educational research, subjectivity, and the construction of European citizenship*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.

— (2011b) Dialogue and its conditions: the construction of European citizenship, en PETERS, M.; BESLEY, T. y XAIOPING, J. (eds.) *Policy Futures in Education. Special Issue on the European Council White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*, 9 (1), 43-56. Oxford, Symposium Journals.

HOLFORD, J. (2008) The European Citizen in a Learning Society: Governed, Mobilised or Active?, en TUBITAK (ed.) *Citizenship and Cultural Identities in the EU: Old Questions, new Answers*. Ankara, Tübitak, 105-116.

HOSKINS, B.; JESINGHAUS, J.; MASCHERINI, M.; MUNDA, G.; NARDO, M.; SAISANA, M.; VAN NIJLEN, D.; VIDONI, D. y VILLALBA, E. (2006) *Measuring active citizenship in Europe. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities*. http://active-citizenship. jrc.it/Documents/active%20citizenship/Measuring%20Active%20Citizenship%20across%20Europe.pdf.

LAW, J. (2004) *After method. Mess in social science research*. London, Routledge.

LEWIS, T. (2010) Paulo Freire's Last Laugh: Rethinking Critical Pedagogy's Funny Bone Through Jacques Rancière. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42 (5), 635-648.

MASSCHELEIN, J. y SIMONS, M. (2010) *Jenseits der Exzellenz. Eine kleine Morphologie der Welt-Universität*. Regensburg, Diaphanes.

— (2010) The hatred of public schooling: the school as the mark of democracy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42 (5-6), 666-682.

MEANS, A. (2011) Jacques Rancière, Education and the Art of Citizenship. *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 33 (1), 28-47.

OJEU (2009) *Council conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training*. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:119:0002:0010:EN:PDF.

— (2010) Council conclusions of 11 May 2010 on competences supporting lifelong learning and the «new skills for new jobs' initiative». *Official Journal of the European Union* (2010/C 135/03).

RANCIÈRE, J. (1992) Politics, Identification, and Subjectivization. *October*, 61, 58-64.

— (1995) *La mésentente. Politique et philosophie*. Paris, Galilée.

— (1998) *Aux bords du politique*. Paris, La fabrique.

— (2000) Dissenting words. A conversation with Jacques Rancière. *Diacritics*, 30, 113-126.

— (2001) *L'exclusion existe-t-elle? Les réponses de Jacques Rancière*. http://www.cndp.fr/tr_exclusion/rep_ranc.html.

— (2004) Who is the subject of the rights of man. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103, 297-310.

ROSE, N. (1999) *Powers of freedom. Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ROSE, N. y MILLER, P. (1992) Power beyond the state: problematics of government. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43, 173-205.

SIMONS, M. (2009) The public/private lives of European citizens: lifelong learning, global positioning, and performance spectacles. Paper presented at the annual conference of the European Educational Research Association (ECER). Austria, University of Vienna.

SIMONS, M. y MASSCHELEIN, J. (2008a) The governmentalization of learning and the assemblage of a learning apparatus. *Educational Theory*, 58, 391-415.

— (2008b) From schools to learning environments: The dark side of being exceptional. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 42, 687-704.

— (2009) The public and its university: beyond learning for civic employability? *European Educational Research Journal*, 8, 204-217.

— (2010) Governmental, political and pedagogic subjectivation: Foucault with Rancière. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42, 588-605.

TUSCHLING, A. & ENGEMANN, C. (2006) From education to lifelong learning: the emerging regime of learning in the European Union. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38, 451-469.