



The Role of History  
in

# **Developing EU-World Dialogue**

CLIOHWORLD Working Paper

Salzburg - Bochum

2009



# Contents

## Summary

## Background and Purpose

### Part I

**I.1. Europe and the World. What kind of dialogue is possible in the Third Millennium?**

**I.2.A Macro-Region built on History?**

**I.3. Raising awareness of how European Integration is connected to developments in other parts of the world**

**I.4. Defining Europe**

**I.5. Europe seen from 'outside'**

**I.6 Results of CLIOHRES Thematic Working Group 6 on Europe and the Wider World**

### Part II

**II.1 Overview of CLIOHWORLD initiatives for developing EU-World Dialogue**

**II.2 Remits of the Working Groups:**

**II.2.a History of European Integration and of the European Union**

**II.2.b World and Global History**

**II.2.c Developing EU-Turkey Dialogue**

**II.2.d Regional and Transnational History: Micro and Macro Regions**

**II.2.e ICT: Digitization and world history**

**II.3 Links to other Networks and Projects and their potential contribution to EU-World Dialogue**

**II.3.a CLIOHRES**

**II.3.b Tuning**

**II.3 c ENGLOBE**

**II.3.d CoRe2**

**II.3.e HUMART**

## CONCLUSIONS

## ANNEXES

**1. Contribution by Christoph Boyer, University of Salzburg**

**2. Contribution by Stefan Troebst, University of Leipzig**

**3. Contribution by David Goldman, Salzburg Global Seminar**

**4. Note on Salzburg Global Seminar**

## **5. Note on the Salzburg European Studies Centre**

## **Background and purpose**

The first plenary meeting of the newly formed Erasmus Academic Network, CLIOHWORLD, held in Salzburg in June 2009, was largely dedicated to EU-World Dialogue and what developing it means for the History Subject Area.

Our speakers were asked to address that topic from the basis of their own expertise and point of view: the Coordinating Committee of the Network had meetings with the personnel of the Salzburg Global Seminar and was able to profit from the fact that the World History Association's board meeting was taking place in Salzburg during the same days to establish links and potential for further cooperation. The CLIOHWORLD Working Groups, in launching their activities and fine-tuning their workplans, were thus completely aware of the more general framework in which each of their sectoral initiatives is placed.

All Working Groups' remits have connections to the general theme, although the most directly and evidently linked are those of Work Groups 1 (on the History of European Integration and of the European Union) and of Work Group 2 (on World/Global History, including periodization).

In the future meetings of the Network, further internal and external contributions that treat frontally or touch peripherally on EU-World Dialogue are planned. As a result, the present text does not pretend to be CLIOHWORLD's final word on the subject: rather it is conceived as a sketch on a canvas, to allow discussing and rectification as the Working Groups fill it out with their further findings and add to it their recommendations tools and guidelines.

The Network Coordinators have produced the present preliminary report or working paper to gather together in a coherent form the thinking that has gone on so far in the Network, as a tool for discussion and orientation, to be developed further as the project grows.

It has been prepared for the Coordinating Committee and Working Groups in order to clarify the context in which discussion and work at the Bochum meeting will take place.

Katherine Isaacs

Gudmundur Halfdanarson

Carla Salvaterra

Pisa - Bologna - Reykjavik

October 2009



## **1. Europe and the World. What kind of dialogue is possible in the Third Millennium?**

Europe has a heavy heritage to deal with in its attempts to develop meaningful dialogue with other parts of the world and with the world as a whole, as a global entity. The reasons are many and complex. They have to do with both how Europeans see other countries and conceptualise 'the world' and how others see Europe, and the peoples and countries that belong to it.

Europe – with both negative and positive nuances – defines its history in relation to exploration, expansion, colonisation and decolonisation: in all these phenomena, what provides the red thread running through processes and events is Europe and Europeans: they discover other continents; they colonise them; their economies change as they organise new trade flows and processes of production; they conquer and administer and fight over colonies; they preside over the process of decolonisation, from which a world is formed of states, large and small, that are asked to implement European parliamentary methods. Often the geographical boundaries of present day countries have been drawn up by the colonial powers, and have little to do with autochthonous histories and requirements.

Only during the past half century or so have the last relevant colonies obtained their independence and their right to self determination, although often in conditions that have rendered real self-government practically impossible. The experience of decolonisation, with the rise of new Europeanised national elites, has been as traumatic an experience for many countries as were conquest and colonisation. The resulting world order, based on blocks and influences from east and west, socialist and capitalist countries, intersecting the lines of the ex-colonial communities (French, Spanish, English – or Russian – speaking) is still in rapid evolution. On a world scale, relations between ex-colonial powers and the ex-colonised continue to be played out, in the military, diplomatic and economic spheres, so far with very incomplete satisfaction of the need to protect elementary human rights, a cornerstone of European values.

Europe's way of looking at history is very much dependent on the great importance it ascribes to the colonial experience.

The time of 'discovery', and the first cycle of European empires (Spain and Portugal) are considered the beginning of the Modern period in many countries, in others the beginning of the Early Modern period. Whether praised or decried, the creation of the Iberian empires is seen as the epoch-marking event. The second cycle of empires (British, French, Russian and then in the early 20th century German and briefly Italian) are seen as part and parcel of modernity.

However, it is not at all evident that on a world scale these are the processes and events that should mark off periods of time, conceptual fields of research and organisational fields of learning and teaching. Establishing a 'world time' is a very difficult task, although it is one that CLIOHWORLD has taken up: first of all, challenging European historians to assume a different viewpoint, one that looks at world developments in a less Euro-centric fashion.

But beyond the question of periodisation, there is another largely ignored side to the question. The rise of European integration, culminating in the formation of the European Union, has been to an extent symmetrical with respect to the decolonisation process. European integration too has followed on the post Second World War settlements, with the ensuing division of Europe into two blocks. There were of course many plans in preceding decades and centuries for political unifications or federations of European countries, coming from very different theoretical and practical inspirations; nonetheless, Europe actually 'happened', gradually and almost timidly, as part of the prolonged post-World War II reorganisation: in the west her colonial powers were in the process of becoming ex-colonial powers and if Europe was to count at all, it had to be united. Agreements in that direction were encouraged by the USA, amongst other things as a counterweight to the communist bloc.

After the fall of the Berlin wall and the rapid demise of the previous regimes in most of the central and eastern European countries (and the political changes in the array of parties in the western part of Europe too), the premises were laid for the slow process of creating deepening bonds between west and east in the name of shared values and experiences.

Of course, such a process of reorientation, political and economic, has not been entirely smooth and seamless. Nonetheless it is a monument to care, work, tenacity and to the European ideal that the accession process has been so rapid and, basically, uncontested, within and outside of the new member states. The EU has been infinitely enriched, although in some fields – such as history – the full heuristic benefit still has to be striven for.

Mutual ignorance about national histories is the rule amongst European countries, especially but not only with respect to the new member states. Although important steps have been taken (by the CLIOHnets, CLIOHRES and Tuning; as well as by other Networks such as CiCe and Euroclio) there is a great deal to be done simply to ensure that European citizens are informed about each other. It is reasonable to suppose that the political pitfalls, the failures and difficulties encountered (e.g. the disappointing results of the NL and FR votes on the constitutional treaty); and the at least momentary slowing of the accession process (e.g. in the cases of Turkey, Croatia, Iceland) would have played out differently if the information available to voters had led to a more informed understanding of the histories and present status of other European countries and potential Union members. A particular case in point in this regard is certainly Turkey.

Beyond fostering better knowledge about Europe itself and possession of the tools for understanding the constraints and imperatives within which it operates – in itself great and important task – there is the larger task of ensuring that European citizens have sufficient tools to understand and judge the role of Europe in the wider world. Here, contrary to what might be expected, historical studies show even more strongly than in the case of European history the imprint of colonial/anti-colonial thinking. In European university and school programmes both – in each country – the wider world is seldom envisaged on its own terms, holistically or even micro/macro area by micro/macro area, in a balanced and even-handed way. On the contrary, in each country there are particular traditions of study which regularly place at the forefront learning, teaching and research about areas in which there has been a special interest: because it is seen as the place of national origin, because it was a colony, because it has been a destination for immigrants, or because of other particular political, intellectual, religious or artistic bonds.

None of this is aimed at preparing European citizens for understanding the world in which they live, in a balanced, global and holistic way.

Globalisation is often mentioned in media and common parlance, usually as a threat: to the environment, or from competition of emerging economies. Europeans tend to see the world not as a place where they want to be, but as where they wish they were not: with global warming, environmental issues, hunger in the world, Europeans on the whole would like not to have to deal with the 'wider world'.

## **2. Europe: a Macro-Region built on History?**

Few European citizens seem to be aware that the Europe or the many imagined Europes where we live is/are connected deeply to the rest of the world.

According to some definitions, Europe is a macro-region, the western peninsula of a continent, Euro-Asia.

Of course it is a very privileged macro-region, which while conserving a multiplicity of nation-states has been able to create a new polity, not perfect, but positive. Whether or not the younger generations are aware of this, Europe is founded on the lucid awareness that its past is studded with fratricidal wars. Its nations and their rhetorics have been forged in rivalry and conflict. That today those former enemies are able to ensure the peaceful conduct of their common affairs and face the world with a relatively united front rather than acting as a lightning rod for conflicts between bellicose elites is already a major accomplishment.

Europe, then, is built on its history, but its citizens are to a large extent unaware of the imperatives that frame its existence. These imperatives derive from its national, macro-regional past and from its interactions with other world regions.

One of the major aims of CLIOHWORLD, as its name suggests, is to elucidate the History of Europe as part of World History. This means offering new insights, learning and teaching materials, and tools: not only for those studying History, or involved in European Studies in Europe, but also those who are studying Europe in other countries. It also means acquiring input and new understandings and viewpoints from students of History and European studies outside Europe.

## **3. Raising awareness of how European Integration is connected to developments in other parts of the world**

To achieve active and aware European citizenship today, it is necessary to increase the degree of awareness of the interdependence of the EU and Europe in its various definitions amongst citizens and particularly amongst young people.

This means developing greater knowledge of Europe and its history, but also understanding of how that history is connected to and interwoven with those of other continents or 'macro-regions'.

But before this can be done reciprocal knowledge, among Europeans, of the histories of their many countries must be improved. Because Europe is in its essence moulded by the presence of strongly differentiated states, each with its consolidated culture, traditions, language or languages and political institutions, understanding the process of European integration and the nature and history of the European Union, and the political and economic aggregation that preceded and accompanied it, requires a greater degree or higher level of knowledge and understanding of the histories of all European countries.

But how is European history connected to that of 'the world'? Numerous 'new' ways of interpreting those connections, or relationships, have been proposed, and many have enjoyed popularity. In the 20th century there was a general shift from looking at the 'world' with the arrogant eyes of the coloniser. This paradigm itself had many nuances, but often included racial and racist discourse, and in any case was posited on an idea of European economic, industrial and military superiority.

Whether they said so or not, Europeans considered themselves and their civilization to be superior, and presented themselves as obliged for the good of their subjects to govern them. The decolonisation process brought much new awareness, and analysis took the form of investigation of a world system (or more than one) characterised by centres and peripheries, where Europe, western Europe, was always a centre, and

usually the centre. In a mediated connection with the 1960s and with youth movements of various sorts, and the contestation of the war in Vietnam, came a greater sensitivity towards 'the other', which brought more strongly into the spotlight the point of view of the oppressed, the 'vision of the conquered', to whom various degrees of power and agency were ascribed.

Key-words and concepts used to define the colonial relationship and its consequences for non-European peoples were trauma, assimilation, acculturation and integration: usually towards or through European civilization, through the catalyst of European violence.

Today it can hardly be claimed that Euro-centrism has been put to rest. Nonetheless, and not least thanks to the work of our sister Networks, CLIOHnet and CLIOHRES, we have available a panoply of up-to-date research proposals for new ways to view Europe's relations with the wider world (see below).

Again, thanks to CLIOHRES, we possess an incomparable novel resource, comprising about 50 volumes, to attempt a new view of European countries themselves, not only the once 'great powers', but the other less well known 'powers' as well. We can now look at European national histories, east, west, north and south, as highly diverse and conflicting, but nonetheless connected phenomena. We can provide resources for higher education which will help students to look at Europe not only from Paris, Madrid, London or Brussels – giving them the possibility of looking at European history from the viewpoints of a plurality of countries, centres, cities and peoples large and small. These multi-faceted European histories are now connected, but their roots, although intertwined, push down into very different pasts.

#### **4. Defining Europe**

How should we define Europe? There is an endless and in the final analysis rather futile dispute about how to define Europe: as if it can be defined and then all the other pieces will fall into place. Actually, we suggest, the opposite is probably true. The definition is dependent on the Europe we are talking about and the Europe we are creating. The definition changes with time and context. In fact, Europe is a multi-layered, stratified formation in a continuous state of tension and transformation. Some parts seem quite obviously part of it; for others cases for inclusion/exclusion can be made both ways.

Is there an agreed geographical definition? From the Atlantic to the Urals? In some times and contexts, this is reasonable, in others less so. Does Europe stop at the Bosphorus? Europa herself would be surprised. What is the relation of Europe to the classical world, the Roman Empire and early Christianity, in which some proclaim that her deepest civilizational roots lie? Is there a special quasi- or proto-European-ness about the lands that surround the Mediterranean, even those on the other side of the Gibraltar-Bosphorus line? Where Augustine of Hippo and indeed Jesus of Nazareth lived? Is there something different about the Europe beyond the Danube and Hadrian's wall? Some facetiously, to an extent, point out that if Europe has any common roots they are pagan; Christianity arose and grew within the Roman Empire, but not exclusively in that part of it that today we call Europe.

Even if we decide, as is reasonable, to use a pragmatic working definition of Europe, subject to change with the circumstances, based on belonging to European organisations today, we will find a layered Europe or a series of 'Europes', whose boundaries are not conterminous. We can of course take the simple definition, that when we speak of Europe we are speaking of the European Union, an undoubtedly European Europe with holes in the centre (Switzerland, a relevant part of the Balkans). But certainly we will add the EFTA countries, and the countries belonging to the Council of Europe; and since our area of greatest expertise is higher education, we will certainly want to include the European Higher Education Area, which today includes 47 countries, including Kazakhstan. And what about smaller groupings, such as the Eurozone, or

Schengen? We need to draw a mental map of Europe, remembering that there are different Europes, and that they are not mutually exclusive, but dependent on each other.

### **5. “Images of Europe”: Europe seen from ‘within and beyond’**

In the formation of identities and self-representations, the point of view of others is highly significant. It is easier to see what is exceptional about Europe from 'abroad', that is, from other parts of the world, through the comparisons made by people living in other political and cultural frameworks.

Of course some facts about Europe seem obvious, although they are not irrelevant. Europe is varied indeed, but overall it is a wealthy part of the world, densely inhabited, with a high standard of living and a highly industrialised economy. European Union countries are all organised as parliamentary democracies, based on universal suffrage and the rule of law; many if not most have in their DNA some form of the welfare state model.

Europeans themselves are not very aware of what aspects of their civilisation are seen as remarkable by others. The History Network organised the Archipelago HUMAN PLUS, a Network of Networks for the ETNs of the Humanities, Social Sciences and Performing and Creative Arts. One of their most interesting initiatives was their conference on “Images of Europe”, to which they invited distinguished non-Europeans to reflect with them on the essence of European-ness.

Below we present some particularly relevant passages from the research and reflections of our guests.

#### ***Chingiz Aitmatov, author and Ambassador of the Kyrgyz Republic to France, Belgium, NATO and the European Union:***

*I try to make clear to the peoples of Central Asia that the European Union is an unbelievable achievement in the history of mankind. We should take advantage of its experience in Central Asia. This won't be easy or quick to implement, especially since our economic and social situation cannot be compared in the slightest to that of Europe. It will take a very long time, and this is why I am pleased that Europe has begin to increase its influence in Central Asia through development programmes and cooperation efforts.*

#### ***Todd Pittinsky, political sociologist, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University:***

*What lies beyond mere tolerance of the ‘other’? My research investigates positive intergroup attitudes – feelings of kinship, comfort, engagement, enthusiasm, and affection (together forming allophilia) – among groups, and how these feelings shape how people think, feel, and behave. My work shows that positive attitudes are different from and independent of the frequently studied negative attitudes toward the other – they have distinct antecedents and distinct outcomes.*

*The complex interactions of groups in today's European Union represent perhaps the greatest social experiment in promoting positive attitudes across groups that at the same time retain their distinct identities. The transnational and interdisciplinary interactions I observed in the Archipelago work groups suggest that research on these topics in the European context would yield extraordinarily interesting and useful results to building community in the context of difference.*

**Christina Slade, *Philosophical Foundations of Communications Theory*, Dean of Humanities, Macquarie University, Australia:**

*While there may be some uncertainty inside, from outside the European project is greatly envied....and of great importance. The 'internal perception problem'[of Europe by European citizens] may derive from the tension between what we may call bare citizenship – citizenship legally and still overwhelmingly nationally conceived, and cultural citizenship, the shared values and identities of the European space. I think addressing the issues of cultural citizenship, the sense of identity qua European, cannot be solved by telling people THINGS – whether values or facts. We have to engage with world views, which are to a great extent these days, no longer national or European, but transnational.*

As can be seen, these three points of view (from Asia, North America and Australia), all admiring, emphasize certain aspects of European-ness: the remarkable or unique nature of a polity, or even a culture, that defines itself through its ability to encompass and profit from its diversity. All however also emphasise the importance for Europe and for the world of establishing wider dialogue.

To these three points of view, we wish to add a fourth very significant one, that of the other Europes that exist within Europe itself:

**Gloria Wekker, *Professor and Director of GEM, Centre of Expertise on Gender, Ethnicity and Multiculturality, University of Utrecht:***

*There is another European dream, a dream of a common language, the acknowledges another Europe, a Black Europe, that exists and is developing within, around and beyond the highly evident white Europe. The presence of Blacks has been integral to Europe's genesis, not only in the sugar and coffee we enjoy daily, but also in more symbolical and historical senses. The 'black' image of Europe is definitely marginalized. I like to talk about 'images from within and beyond Europe', pointing out that Europe is, has been and must be connected to the wider world.*

Gloria Wekker reminds us that there are many Europes living together in our continents, and some of them, wrongly, are seen as more 'European' than others. She also reminds us that Europe could not, cannot and will not exist without its many stranded connections to the 'wider world'. As there is a 'Black Europe' in Wekker's broad definition, fully part of Europe and essential to it, there are certainly other Europes, 'Oriental Europe', 'Immigrant Europe', 'Roma Europe' which require new efforts at conceptualisation and will yield new understanding of the dimensions and directions of EU-World Dialogue.

Such is the inspiration and awareness that led to formulating the CLIOHWORLD project. In the second part of this working paper we will look at how the different strands of CLIOHWORLD and the other projects and Networks with which it works can contribute to the 'dream' of better knowledge and understanding of Europe and the wider world, in all their diversity.

## **II.1 Overview of CLIOHWORLD initiatives for developing EU-World Dialogue**

In what we have outlined above, it should be clear that in our view developing EU-World Dialogue requires work on many strands. The principle ones are: developing knowledge of the European Union itself, its institutional, political, and cultural underpinnings in a historical as well as a present-day context; increasing knowledge on the part of all European citizens not only of their own country and its relationship to the European Union, but also of the other EU countries, in a critical and connected way; developing understanding of how European society and the European Union include and are connected to other realities, in a “within and beyond” perspective; developing knowledge of other peoples and continents, on their own terms and not exclusively in relationship to Europe (colonisation, empire, migration). It is also very important for CLIOHWORLD to translate these general indications into tools, materials, recommendations, guidelines and conceptual frameworks defined according to Tuning methodology, so that they can be mainstreamed into European higher education and – to the extent possible – made available for other parts of the world as well.

The responsibilities of the working groups are not limited to their contribution to developing and enhancing EU-World Dialogue. However, here below we try to summarise how their efforts in this direction fit into that more general picture.

## **II.2 Responsibilities of the CW Working Groups for EU-World Dialogue:**

### **II.2.a History of European Integration and of the European Union**

Working Group 1 is mapping and investigating how and where European Union history and History of European integration is taught. The preliminary mapping indicates that in most cases where there are courses on these subjects they are not in History Departments, but rather in Political Science, Law and/or Economics. Even when there are Degree Programmes that purport to offer history courses, usually the historical component is very slight, hence most European studies courses are ‘flattened’: they lack the depth of knowledge and understanding that history can give.

Furthermore we have noted that the provision of history of European Integration and of the European Union is more frequent in new member states: this seems to indicate that such matters are ‘taken for granted’ in western Europe and not much emphasized and investigated, whereas in the new member states, for easily understandable reasons, European Union studies have been seen to be of greater interest and have developed swiftly. Nonetheless, in these cases too, the emphasis is often on how Union membership affects the country in question, with little attention paid to the overall picture.

There are some laudable exceptions, whose descriptions are being formulated so as to provide example of ‘good’ and ‘interesting’ practice, to be considered, imitated and/or taken into account.

### **II.2.b World and Global History**

This working group has the responsibility of investigating and clarifying when, how and in which intellectual contexts, the in part similar but in many ways contrasting concepts of ‘world’ and ‘global’ history have developed. In the preliminary mapping the working group has found that only rarely are these concepts clarified and used to organised degree programmes and courses able to look at history ‘globally’ or on a ‘world’ scale, Most of what purports to be world or global history is simply non-European history, of a continent, a micro or a macro area, but not giving sufficient attention to the methodological foundations of world or global history.

In particular periodisation has been considered a useful key for encouraging a re-consideration of how and on what bases a global or world history can be constructed, comprising Europe and the wider world.

### **II.2.c Developing EU-Turkey Dialogue**

Obviously the relationship between Turkey and Europe is both profound and controversial. CLIOHWORLD considers that it has much to contribute in developing dialogue. In part this is based on the activities (reader, Intensive programmes) that the working group is developing. However more in depth, the remit of this WG is to develop knowledge of the shared Ottoman heritage in much of South eastern Europe, knowledge to be developed outside of the nationalistic narratives of the single states that replaced the Ottoman Empire, including Turkey. We see this group as working on a paradigmatic, as well as very timely, sector of the EU-World dialogue.

### **II.2.d Regional and Transnational History: Micro and Macro Regions**

The work and findings of this WG are addressed largely to European history, to investigating different ways of framing it, addressing units both larger and smaller than the existing European states. Nonetheless, some of its findings will be relevant to the study of micro- and macro- regions outside of Europe as well, or, as in the case for example of the Mediterranean, partly European and partly not, according to current definitions.

### **II.2.e ICT: Digitization and world history**

The responsibilities of the CLIOHWORLD working group 3 on Digitization and History are not directly linked to EU-World Dialogue, except insofar as the Internet is by its very nature a global rather than a national or European tool. The probable contribution is to give visibility to CLIOHWORLD and its results and to assist in contacting and surveying non-European history associations and networks.

## **II.3 Links to other Networks and Projects and their potential contribution to EU-World Dialogue**

### **II.3.a CLIOHRES**

CLIOHRES, as a Sixth Framework Network of Excellence which will conclude its work in 2010, has given some attention to the European Union, particularly in its last volume on 'Citizenships and Identities. Inclusion, Exclusion, Participation' to be published in spring or early summer 2010. Most of the activities of the 180 researchers participating in the Network have been directed towards Europe from ancient times to the present, considered in a polycentric, connected and transnational way.

All of the material produced, nearly 50 books already, form a patrimony which CLIOHWORLD can use to develop knowledge of Europe.

A number of significant contributions deal with the cultural, legal, social, architectural and urbanistic history of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, and thus can provide a strong basis for developing EU-Turkey Dialogue.

Furthermore one of the six research groups, the Thematic Working Group 6, has specifically addressed over the five years of Network activity, the area of "Europe and the Wider World". This group has not addressed the themes that the CLIOHWORLD WG is looking at (the construction of the ideas of World and Global history, the possibilities of developing more appropriate periodisation schemes for use in World/Global history), rather its reflections have gone in the direction of a transnational exploration of ways of looking at and analysing the relations between European countries and individuals, and the peoples and polities of other continents. These have included reciprocal readings (non-Europeans looking at Europeans and vice versa); common themes (e.g conciliation processes in Northern Ireland and South Africa), new evaluations of the routes by which geographical and natural sciences developed in tandem with exploration, incorporating non-European knowledge into a single structure) and particularly in the attempt to look at Empires in a new way, analysing how agency of Europeans and non-Europeans, at all levels, interacted with the overarching 'imperial' political structures.

The materials created and insights achieved provide a 'given' to which the CLIOHWORLD Work Group 2 can make reference, although the specific line of work of the latter supplements and goes beyond what was accomplished in CLIOHRES.

### **II.3.b Tuning**

Tuning is a large scale university driven project in which the History Networks have been involved from the beginning, in 1999-2000, as one of the pilot subject area groups. Today all the Tuning members are members of CLIOHWORLD, and CLIOHWORLD provides the platform and the collaboration necessary for History to continue to be a key Tuning discipline. Already Tuning History has been carried out in Europe, in Latin America (19 countries), in the Russian Federation, in Georgia and in the Kyrgyz Republic. A new phase of Latin American Tuning is planned. History will be again a pilot discipline in the USA and in Australia. In this way CLIOHWORLD will be linked directly with educational policy in many continents, able to contribute and to learn from them: the essence of dialogue.

### **II.3.c ISHA**

CLIOHWORLD works closely in a relationship of mutual support with ISHA, the International Students of History Association. Thanks to this privileged relationship, CLIOHWORLD has input from students from many countries, prevalently but not exclusively European; and it will be able to participate in the International Congress of Historical Sciences, to be held in Amsterdam in August 2010, as an international actor in the field of EU and world history.

### **II.3.d ENGLOBE**

ENGLOBE is a Seventh Framework Marie Curie Initial Training Network, built on the findings and orientations of CLIOHRES and CLIOHWORLD. It seeks to join knowledge of the Enlightenment and of Global History in Doctoral Training. It has partners in Europe (most of them CW partners), in Asia, Africa and South America. Thus it will be well placed to take up indications from CLIOHWORLD and to contribute to it.

### **II.3.e CoRe2**

CoRe 2 is a project run by Nuffic (Netherlands educational policy network) with the ENIC-NARIC Networks and three Tuning Subject Area Groups (Physics, Nursing, History). The objective is to produce an agreed format and guidelines for producing Degree Profiles, to be used for recognition and programme design purposes. CLIOHWORLD partners participate in CoRe2, which will allow the CW Working Groups to use the CoRe Degree Profile template to describe dedicated degree programmes.

### **II.3.f HUMART**

Based on Tuning methodology, HUMART comprises the Humanities and the Creative and Performing Arts. History will be present as the History Subject Area of Tuning, now organised as a subgroup or commission in CLIOHWORLD. The result of the project, in which all CLIOHWORLD will be involved, will be an “SQF”, a sectoral qualifications framework for the humanities, which will be formulated at an intermediate level below the QF for EHEA and the EQF for LLL, and above the Subject Area descriptors. Considering the present world-wide uptake of Tuning, it is to be expected that HUMART can vehicle CLIOHWORLD findings worldwide.

## CONCLUSIONS

Developing EU-World dialogue will require enhancing knowledge and understanding of the EU, of the processes of European integration and of the single national histories. In particular, European citizens of each country will need to have better, less slanted and stereotyped information about the histories of their neighbours.

A major effort will be necessary to re-conceptualise Europe's relationship with the wider world. This effort will entail better understanding of the dependence and interconnection of each part and each individual in the world with the others. It will entail considering Europe not the centre but a centre, connected to other centres, in the wider world.

It will be necessary to distinguish and understand profoundly the implications of a 'world' or a 'global' approach to understanding Europe and its particular features in their historical development.

Because of the patrimony of knowledge on which it can build, the commitment of its members and the significance of the other projects and networks with which it collaborated, CLIOHWORLD is well placed to make a major contribution to the shape of European and world history studies in Europe and world wide.

## **ANNEXES**

- 1. Contribution by Christoph Boyer, University of Salzburg**
- 2. Contribution by Stefan Troebst, University of Leipzig**
- 3. Contribution by David Goldman, Salzburg Global Seminar**
- 4. Note on Salzburg Global Seminar**
- 5. Note on the Salzburg European Studies Centre**