THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE "EUROPEAN SIGNIFICANCE" OF CULTURAL HERITAGE: THE CASE OF THE CULTURE 2000 PROGRAMME

By
Christoffer Liedtke

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of International Relations and European Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Annabelle Littoz-Monnet

Budapest, Hungary
2007
(WORD COUNT: 14.705)

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the European Commission's understanding of the "European significance" of cultural heritage projects within the framework of the Culture 2000 Programme. In answering this question, the analysis contrasts two perceptions of the Commission: one as the "driver" of European integration and a unitary actor, and the other as a fragmented bureaucratic institution enjoying a high degree of discretion in its policy implementation activities. In connection with the first view, the thesis analyzes the popular interpretation of the European significance of cultural heritage as its ability to promote a "European identity" in the general public. On the basis of theoretical insights drawn from identity construction theories, the analysis of the projects, and personal interviews with civil servants working in the DG Education and Culture, I argue that the claim on purposive identity construction as part of the EU's cultural policy is difficult to substantiate. Instead, I focus on an alternative explanation of the Commission's understanding of European significance, influenced by its nature as a technocratic expert agency. The thesis also demonstrates that the technocratic nature of the Commission and its DGs still allows room for identity-related issues, but as a by-product of cultural policy, rather than as its main goal. Finally, I use my findings to draw some preliminary conclusions concerning the role of the Commission in promoting European integration in policy domains that go beyond its usual sphere of competencies.

INTRODUCTION

This year's celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome has been accompanied by countless public events, official speeches, and media headlines, all featuring a special kind of rhetoric, far removed from the routine technocratic discourse of EU regulations and directives. The European integration project, we are reminded, originated in the minds of visionaries, such as Jean Monnet, and its original design was deeply inspired by the post-war idealism and belief in the promises of international cooperation. As such, Monnet's ambitious goals extended beyond the creation of an economic union and called for the formation of a strong political community, along with all its attributes. In economic terms, European integration has been an impressive success; yet it was already at the early stage of the EC's existence that the Community's political leaders realized that genuine public support for the EC was contingent upon something less prosaic than "the price of butter."[1] This realization lays at the heart of the EU leadership's effort to find the grounds upon which to promote and strengthen a "European" identity and a "European consciousness," trying to "win the hearts" of people for the European Union. As a result, culture, long neglected by EC policy-makers, has finally made its entry in the EU public policy space. For instance, the Commission's 2004 communication states that the newly adopted Culture 2000 Programme will contribute to the "development of a European identity."[2] Within the cultural dimension of the European integration project, cultural heritage has a special role, since it possesses significant benefits for the economy, society, and the

---

[1] Michael Wintle,"Culture and Identity in Europe: Shared Experience," in *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*, ed. Michael Wintle (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1996), 10.
[2] EC Communication, "Making Citizenship Work: Fostering European Culture and Diversity through Programmes for Youth Culture, Audiovisual, and Civic Participation," COM (2004) 154 final, 10.

1

environment.[3] For this reason, the so-called "culture" Article 151 of the EC Treaty speaks of the necessity of "bringing to the fore" the "common cultural heritage" in the Community, while Section 2 of the same Article 151 emphasizes the importance of "conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance."

Given the relatively young character of EU cultural policy, most of the research on the subject has been conducted over the past decade. While the existing literature addresses a number of important aspects of this policy, there is certainly room for further research. For instance, many of the current debates focus on the role of culture in promoting European identity and strengthening a sense of European citizenship, yet neither of these two concepts has been defined in clear terms. For this reason, exploring the Commission's understanding of "European significance" in the area of culture and cultural heritage may help one gain a better insight into the non-economic foundations of the "European project" as perceived by the EU's leading supranational institution.

Also, to date, no analyses concentrate specifically on the EU-funded culture programs, such as Culture 2000, even though the latter has been an important and quite comprehensive policy instrument utilized by the EU in order to reach its goals within the domain of culture. Terms like "European significance" and "European dimension" frequently appear in the EU official discourse, yet it seems that there are no accepted definitions of the precise meaning of these concepts. In fact, in many cases these terms are used intuitively and interchangeably. This is a significant omission, because, given the principle of subsidiarity enshrined in the EU's treaties, it is precisely the "European significance" of a given cultural activity or a cultural artifact that creates a field for action at the EU level, rather than simply at the local, regional, or national level. Thirdly, while a number of scholars and practitioners claim that the EU uses culture and specifically cultural heritage to promote a certain type of European identity and

---

[3] Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, "Enlargement-Enrichment: A Plea for a Europe-wide Mobilisation in Favour of Cultural Heritage," in *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* edited by Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz (Berlin: Maecenata, 2004), 98.

increase its own legitimacy, the theoretical basis for such claims is not sufficiently sound. The under-researched nature of the heritage-identity nexus was noted by Ashworth and Larkham back in 1994,[4] yet little has changed since that time. In this regard, it is important to note that at present, there exists no comprehensive theory on supranational identity construction as such, with most theoretical approaches focusing rather on *national* identity construction.

The goal of this research work is to analyze the European Commission's understanding of the concept of "European significance" used in Article 151 as applied to cultural heritage. In other words, the key question I ask in my research is, How does the Commission decide whether a candidate project is indeed of "European significance" and thus deserves funding under the Culture 2000 Programme? In my analysis, I will draw upon various theoretical approaches to identity construction, as well on the literature on EU policy analysis and on sources exploring the internal dynamics of EU institutions and the organizational culture present within the Commission. The empirical basis of my research consists of the entire body of multi-annual cultural heritage projects that received funding under the Culture 2000 Programme over the period from 2000 to 2006. Multi-annual projects were chosen for two main reasons: a) they represent a more thoroughgoing, structural type of cooperation involving on average more actors than one-year projects and commanding larger budgets; b) as opposed to the large number of one-year projects, the multi-annual projects are more limited in number (60 total) and thus represent a sample that could be analyzed in its entirety; since analyzing the entire range of projects could only be conducted within the framework of a larger-scale research project. To enhance my understanding of the Commission's interpretation of the concept of European significance, I will also use the information obtained from interviews with DG Culture and Education civil servants and their responses to a questionnaire (see Appendix I for the text of the questionnaire) distributed during May 2007. Finally, I will analyze the EU's legal regulations in the field of

---

[4] Greg Ashworth and Peter Larkham, Preface to *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe,* ed. G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham (London and New York: Routledge 1994), xiii.

cultural policy, as well as the documents (such application forms and calls for proposal) used by the DG Education and Culture in its administration of the Culture 2000 Programme.

The thesis is structured in the following way. First, I examine the concepts of identity and cultural heritage, as well as the existing theoretical approaches to identity construction, I also identify the elements that can be applicable to the analysis of the European Commission as an "identity builder." Secondly, I analyze the proposition that the Commission, in its capacity as the "driver" of European integration, understands the European significance of cultural heritage in terms of the ability of the latter to become a basis for promoting a European identity and thus legitimizing the European integration project. Finally, having identified the weaknesses of such a view, I focus on an alternative explanation of the Commission's understanding of European significance, influenced by this institution's nature as a technocratic expert agency. The conclusion summarizes the findings of the research and discusses their relevance for a deepened understanding of the character of policy-making by the Commission.

CHAPTER 1 - USING THE NOTION OF "EUROPEAN CULTURAL HERITAGE" TO CONSTRUCT A EUROPEAN IDENTITY?

1.1. Identity, Culture, and Cultural Heritage

1.1.1. Connecting Identity and Culture

This chapter will analyze the theoretical basis for the idea that cultural heritage can be used by elites for the purposes of identity construction. For the purposes of my analysis, Thomas Risse's definition of social identity seems to be the most relevant one. "Social identities," he writes, "contain, first, ideas describing and categorizing an individual's membership in a social group or community including emotional, affective, and evaluative components. Second, this commonness is accentuated by a sense of difference with regard to other communities."[5]

The link between identity and culture is present in many definitions of the latter, such as the one given by Ross, where he says, "culture is a system of meaning that people use to manage their daily worlds... the basis of social and political identity that affects how people line up and how they act on a wide range of matters."[6] Another widely accepted definition of culture present in many contemporary analyses belongs to Geertz, who, laying emphasis on culture as public shared meanings, describes culture as "an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life."[7] Thus culture is seen as one of the key foundational features for defining both individual and collective identities.

---

[5] Thomas Risse, "Social Constructivism and European Integration," in *European Integration Theory*, ed. Thomas Diez and Antje Wiener (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 167.
[6] Mark Howard Ross, "Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis," in *Culture and Politics: A Reader*, ed. Lane Crothers and Charles Lockhart (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 39.
[7] Ibid, 42.

1.1.2. The Concept of Cultural Heritage

Moving from the concept of culture toward the concept of cultural heritage, it is necessary to mention the multiplicity of divergent views on what cultural heritage means, what it should include and exclude, and how it should be conserved, protected, interpreted and presented. The contested character of cultural heritage has a high relevance for my analysis of cultural heritage projects within the framework of the Culture 2000 Programme, since it allows us to ask pertinent questions about what types of projects are selected for funding by the Commission. First of all, there exists a variety of formal definitions of cultural heritage. The definition provided in the *UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972* states in Article 1:

> For the purposes of this convention, the following shall be considered as 'cultural heritage':
>
> *monuments:* architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature… which are of outstanding value…;
>
> *groups of buildings:* groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape…;
>
> *sites:* works of man or the combined works of nature and of man….[8]

The inherent limits of such a definition are clear, since the elements included in cultural heritage are reduced to material - built, archaeological, and landscape[9] - heritage. Since that time, there has been a tendency toward enlarging the concept of cultural heritage to include both movable and immovable aspects, tangible and intangible ones.[10] For instance, Koboldt describes cultural heritage as comprising "works of art and architecture, cultural achievements, as well as ideas,

---

[8] David Throsby, "Seven Questions in the Economics of Cultural Heritage", in *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage,* ed. Michael Hutter and Ilde Rizzo (London: MacMillan Press, 1997), 14.
[9] Jelka Pirkovič, "New Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Cultural Heritage, or How to Give Value to the Common European Heritage?," in *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* ed. Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz (Berlin: Maecenata, 2004), 108.
[10] Ibid, 110.

norms, and a common understanding of the environment that have been passed on from earlier generations."[11] Understood this way, cultural heritage comes to mean not only "sites of historical interests" but also, and just as importantly, a "set of shared values and collective memories," inspired by a "sense of accumulated communal experiences."[12] In this capacity, cultural heritage, and particularly "European" cultural heritage, takes on a markedly political character. This point is taken up quite explicitly by Peckham, who claims that heritage "signifies the politicization of culture and the mobilization of cultural forms for ideological ends."[13] A view of cultural heritage that has recently gained currency is that cultural heritage is an "invention," a "state-sponsored fabrication designed to silence dissenting voices and experiences."[14] By its very nature of celebrating the past, cultural heritage necessitates a selective approach, the finding of a balance between "remembering and forgetting," the imposition of "authoritarian readings on the past."[15] It is only logical that in this process, certain groups and their narratives are privileged, while others are disinherited. In addition, the question of how to deal with the darker elements of the past (which are, of course, plenty) remains extremely sensitive. The emphasis on cultural heritage as representing the quintessence of positive, "good" shared memories and the celebrated events of the past risks silencing others?, no less important, yet much less presentable. For instance, an excerpt from the draft Constitutional Treaty of the EU represents a telling illustration of such a selective account:

> (…) drawing inspiration from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, which, nourished first by the civilisations of Greece and Rome, characterised by spiritual impulse always present in its heritage and later by the philosophical currents of the Enlightenment, has embedded within the life of

---

[11] Christian Koboldt, "Optimizing the Use of Cultural Heritage," in *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage,* ed. Michael Hutter and Ilde Rizzo (London: MacMillan Press, 1997), 52.

[12] Robert Shannan Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture", in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* ed. Robert Shannan Peckham (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003), 1.

[13] Ibid, 2.

[14] Robert Shannan Peckham, "Mourning Heritage: Memory, Trauma and Restitution," in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* ed. Robert Shannan Peckham (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003), 206.

[15] Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture," 7, 12.

society its perception of the central role of the human person and his inviolable

and inalienable rights, and of respect for law."

As de Vries rightly points out, this rendition presents European history as a continuous process of moving forward, a meta-narrative, without acknowledging the wars, pogroms, concentration camps, and other integral parts of Europe's bloody historical past. In his view, "it is only by striking the right balance that we can be true to our identity as Europeans."[16]

As it has been mentioned before, cultural heritage always denotes a degree of selectivity, and this is also related to the question of *whose* heritage to choose.[17] Some scholars, however, suggest that heritage is always cross-cultural, defining it as a "contact zone," a place where "different pasts and experiences are negotiated."[18]

Finally, another interesting characteristic of cultural heritage is not only its politicized, but also its commercial nature. If, as Cosgrove argues, identities are increasingly constructed through "acts of consumption," then cultural heritage, having been extensively commercialized within the tourist industry, represents an illustration of such a phenomenon.[19]

Throughout history, cultural heritage has been repeatedly utilized as a tool in helping to construct and promote an identity. In its institutionalization of collective memories, as well as of collective amnesia, the notion of cultural heritage has helped to create and valorize a single identity among competing ones, a quality which has been central to the process of nation-building and to the processes of political, cultural, and territorial exclusion and inclusion which has been characteristic of nationalism.[20] Cultural heritage has also been seen as an important tool of legitimizing the authority of the nation state through the construction of "legitimate" collective

---

[16] Gijs de Vries, "Citizenship and Memory," in *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* ed. Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz (Berlin: Maecenata, 2004), 24-25.
[17] Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture," 6.
[18] Stephanos Stephanides, "The Translation of Heritage: Multiculturalism in the 'New' Europe", in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* ed. Robert Shannan Peckham (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003), 57.
[18] Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture," 7, 12.
[19] Denis Cosgrove, "Heritage and History: A Venetian Geography Lesson," in *Rethinking Heritage:Cultures and Politics in Europe,* ed. Robert Shannan Peckham (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003), 113.
[20] Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture," 6-7.

memories and the politics of "forceful remembrance."[21] As Ashworth and Larkham put it, heritage has a "proven track record of outstanding success in formulating and reinforcing place-identities in support of particular state-entities."[22] In general, culture as such has always been intimately connected with nationalist discourse and the emergence of the nation-state, since it is seen as a distinguishing characteristic differentiating one group from the other and thus becoming the basis for national identity.[23]

Since cultural heritage has an important role to play in the process of identity construction, as the histories of nation-state building testify to, it makes sense to examine the theoretical basis for state identity construction. The latter is a multifaceted phenomenon that has claimed the attention of a range of social sciences, from psychology to history to international relations. At the same time, while there is an abundance of approaches theorizing the emergence of *national* identity, there exists no single theory that would provide a comprehensive account of the development of *supranational* (e.g. European or "EU") identity. As Risse indicates, there has been no theoretical model for "understanding identity in relation to the process of 'Europeanization.'"[24] Certainly, it remains a matter of contention whether the national theoretical approaches may be transposed to deal with the relatively new phenomenon of European integration. At the same time, one should keep in mind that most of the debates about European unity and European collective and cultural identity are derived precisely from the theoretical debates about nations and states.[25] Additionally, since cultural heritage has been used so extensively for the purposes of promoting a solidifying a national identity, and since it seemingly is meant to be used in a similar way to support European integration and a "European

---

[21] Peckham, "Mourning Heritage," 208-209.

[22] G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham "A Heritage for Europe: The need, the task, the contribution," in *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe ,*ed. G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 2.

[23] Siân Jones, "Discourses of Identity in the Interpretation of the Past," in *Cultural Identity and Archeology: The Construction of European Communities,* ed. Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones and Clive Gamble (London: Routledge, 1996), 64-65.

[24] Thomas Risse, "European Identities and the Heritage of European Cultures," in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* ed. Robert Shannan Peckham (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003), 74.

[24] Peckham, "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture," 7, 12.

[25] Wintle, "Culture and Identity in Europe," 10.

consciousness," the link between the national and supranational identity construction becomes all the more relevant within the context of my analysis.

1.2. Identity Construction: Theoretical Approaches

1.2.1. Essentialism versus Constructivism

The vast plethora of existing theoretical approaches to identity may be broadly classified as belonging to one of the two major schools of thought: essentialists and constructivists. The essentialist school maintains that (national) identity is naturally ingrained (or, alternatively, God-given) and constitutes an essential part of "self," shaping both people's mindset and physical characteristics. The essentialist understanding of identity emphasizes its role as the "stable core of the self," transcendence, and its immutability in the face of social change and passing time.[26] The factors forming an identity, in the view of the essentialists, include not only language and shared historical experiences, but also a combination of environmental factors, such as "land," climate, and so on. Such an understanding of national identity has given rise to concepts like "national character," "national temper," and so forth. Largely because of the historical abuses of the essentialist ideas and the rise of alternative theories in social sciences, this school of thought has lost much of its appeal, without, however, becoming completely extinct.[27]

The more prominent school of thought that has largely replaced the essentialists is the constructivist one. Constructivists argue that identities are not rooted in nature; instead, they are the result of "nurture" and are "constructed." The focus of the constructivist approach lies in examining *how* identities emerge and develop, their major components and the factors that influence them.[28] This school of thought views identity as contested, fluid, contingent on social

[26] Stuart Hall, "Who needs 'Identity'?," in *Identity: A Reader*, ed. Paul Du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2000), 17.
[27] Menno Spiering, "National Identity and European Unity," in Cu*lture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*, ed. Michael Wintle (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1996), 112.
[28] Ibid., 117.

10

practices and discourses and thus constantly in the process of transformation and change.[29] The constructivist approach is clearly dominant in identity studies in today's academic world; for this reason, we shall focus on three major theorists belonging to this school. At the same time, as it will be shown later, the EU's policies, although aimed to promote (and therefore construct) "European identity" are not entirely free from essentialists notions of identity either.

1.2.2. Hobsbawm's Approach to Identity Construction

In what follows, this part will focus specifically on the work of three major theorists in the field of national identity studies. The first approach was developed by Erik J. Hobsbawm, who argues that national identities are "invented" within a certain historical framework. Hobsbawm describes nationalism as an "artificial, ideational vehicle" which creates the nations and which is used as a political program on the part of the elites for the purposes of creating a nation state. He posits, that in order to understand nations, it is necessary to examine national traditions, and that the latter are one kind of invented traditions. "Invented traditions," the term that Hobsbawm uses, represent "responses to novel situations which take the reference to old situations, or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition." Thus "invented traditions" constitute an attempt to establish patterns of continuity, real or imagined, in the face of transforming social contexts. In Hobsbawm's account, traditions have three main functions: a) as symbols of group cohesion and membership; b) to legitimize institutions and authority relations; c) to socialize or inculcate beliefs, values, or behaviors.[30] Importantly, despite his emphasis on the "artificial" construction of nations, this theorist also argues that before the emergence of the nation and national identity, there exist certain "proto-national ties:" they can be supra-local, evoking the sense of belonging that goes beyond one's immediate community (by virtue of sharing, for instance, common religious rituals) and, secondly, they can consist of an elite class that has

---

[29] Hall, "Who Needs 'Identity'?," 17.
[30] Franke Wilmer,"Identity, Culture, and Historicity," World Affairs 160, no.1 (1997): 5.

access and strong ties to a set of institutions, political connections, vocabulary, and means of communication, which allows it to spread its ideology and increase its popular appeal. While Hobsbawm considers nations to be "constructed essentially from above," he also says that they must be analyzed "from below," in terms of "hopes, fears, longings and interests of ordinary people"[31] In what also may be relevant to our discussion, Hobsbawm mentions several ways in which the authorities (in this case, the state) may participate in the creation of "invented traditions," and these include, first and foremost, changing the system of education, as well as conducting public ceremonies or constructing public monuments.[32] Finally, Hobsbawm maintains that the importance of nationalism in today's era of globalization and international division of labor is slowly yet steadily declining, being forced into retreat by the "supranational restructuring of the globe"[33]

1.2.3. Benedict Anderson's Approach to Identity Construction

In 1983, the same year when *The Invention of Tradition* edited by Hobsbawm was published, another seminal work appeared in the field of national identity studies. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* authored by Benedict Anderson. While sharing a number of theoretical premises with Hobsbawm, Anderson emphasizes the subjective and cultural dimensions that are largely disregarded in the latter's analysis. Anderson has become famous for coining the term "imagined community" which has since then gained an impressive currency in the academic and popular circles. "Nations, according to Anderson, are "imagined communities because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the

[31] Anthony Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism: A critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 122.
[32] Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 271.
[33] Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780,* 182.

mind of each lives the image of their communion."[34] Anderson also argues that nations are political communities that are imagined as "both inherently limited and sovereign."[35] In accounting for the origins of nationalism, Anderson emphasizes the cultural roots of nationalism. For him, nationalism needs to be aligned not with "self-consciously held political ideologies" but rather with "the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which – as well as against which – it came into being." The two most powerful cultural systems, in Anderson's view, were the "religious community" and the "dynastic realm," both of which functioned as broadly accepted frames of reference, similarly the way nationality functions today. At the core of Anderson's theory lies the development of print capitalism, as manifest in the novel and the newspaper, both of which played a crucial role in "imagining" nations and therefore in the development of national communities through their ability to teach large numbers of people. Finally, the author claims that it was the Americas which became the birthplace of the nation per se, and that the American model was later exported outside the region: "out of the American welter came these imagined realities: nation-states, republican institutions, common citizenships, popular sovereignty, national flags and anthems, etc.".

1.2.4. Anthony Smith's Approach to Identity Construction

The third theoretical approach that we will draw on is known under the name of "ethnosymbolism" and has been developed by Anthony Smith, who is perhaps the least constructivist of the three. In contrast to Anderson, Smith is critical of the modernist and instrumentalism approaches to nation-building, which posit that nations are fairly recent phenomena and that they represent artificial constructions socially engineered and even "fabricated" by elites in pursuit of their own political and economic interests. Smith maintains that the basis of a nation is an *ethnie,* which he defines as a "named human population with myths

---

[34] Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities* (London, New York: Verso, 1983), 6.
[35] Ibid.

of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more elements of shared culture, a link with a homeland, and a measure of solidarity, at least among the elites"[36]. As such, while claiming a somewhat more substantive basis for a nation, Smith's approach, in his own words, emphasizes "the role of memories, values, myths and symbols."[37] In addition, in Smith's view, identities are frequently "forged through opposition to the identities of significant others, as the history of paired conflict often demonstrates[38]" When analyzing pan-nationalist movements, Smith argues that most of the previous ones have failed to achieve their goal of unification due to the inadequacy of their cultural component, which he attributes largely to the poor condition of their communication technologies. [39] Today, however, this is a perfectly surmountable obstacle. Smith also believes in the existence of certain "patterns of European culture," uniting such elements as "Roman law, Greek philosophy and science, Hebraic ethics and Christian theology, as well as their Renaissance and Enlightenment successors" and producing what may be called a "European :culture-area."[40] Nevertheless, Smith is skeptical about the prospects of creating a supranational identity in Europe on the basis of these cultural grounds, for, as he says, in the broader European context, language, historical memories, and "myths of common descent" serve rather as divisive, than unifying, factors.[41]

1.3. Commonalities in Approaches

Despite the differences between the theoretical approaches presented above, it is possible to identify the overarching commonalities stemming from their constructivist roots that we may use in our analysis. First of all, as the three scholars would agree, identities are constructed,

---

[36] Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 22-30; Anthony Smith, *The Nation in History* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2000), 65.
[37] Anthony Smith and Ernest Gellner, "The Warwick Debates," http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/Warwick.html.
[38] Sanem Baykal,"Unity in Diversity? The Challenge of Diversity for the European Political Identity, Legitimacy and Democratic Governance: Turkey's EU Membership as the Ultimate Test Case," *Jean Monnet Working Paper 09/05*, 39.
[39] Cris Shore, *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000), 16.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid, 17.

changeable, and can be used for specific purposes, such as to promote a national project, although the degree to which they can be manipulated, imagined, and "fabricated" is debated. In any case, as Wilmer puts it, history and culture may be appropriated by political elites in order to extend the popular base of support for a particular regime or projects.[42] Secondly, the role of the elites is critical, since it is usually these groups who have the capacity to produce ideologies and control access to the means of communication and the system of education, through which they can disseminate and popularize their ideas. Finally, identities are deeply impacted and shaped by the role of common symbols, which serve to promote a feeling of historical continuity linking the community's past with its present and future. These theoretical insights are helpful in analyzing the Commission as a group of European elites promoting European identity construction for political purposes, namely, to increase public support for European integration. Cultural heritage, perceived as combining the achievements of the past and the importance of shared memories and symbols with the present and future development of political communities, is thus uniquely positioned to provide a feeling of historical continuity to legitimize the construction of a European polity.

---

[42] Wilmer,"Identity, Culture, and Historicity," 5.

CHAPTER 2 - EUROPEAN SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE: AN ABILITY TO PROMOTE A "EUROPEAN" IDENTITY?

2.1. The Commission: Using Cultural Heritage for Identity Promotion?

2.1.1. The persuasion model of identity construction

The starting point of this chapter is the popular view of the European Commission as a "driver" of European integration. The proposition that I examine here is the following: being aware of the fact to increase the legitimacy and "emotional appeal" of the European integration project, the Commission interprets the "European significance" of cultural heritages in terms of its ability to promote "European consciousness" and a "European" identity.

The European significance of cultural heritage may be understood in various ways. In this part of the thesis, I will use Quaedvlieg-Mihailović`s view on this subject as a starting point. She argues that the European significance of cultural heritage includes its *political* significance as a "visible expression of our common European culture and history" and a key element of a number of identities that people hold, including European identity. In her view, shared cultural heritage will facilitate the "development of a sense of European citizenship" and serve as an "indispensable cohesive factor" in European integration.[43] Thus this part of the thesis will take a rather political view of the European significance of cultural heritage and analyze the Commission's choice of cultural heritage projects selected for funding precisely from this angle. As such, I will rely on the so-called "persuasion model" of identity-construction, which views institutions as "active agents of change" that have a direct role in creating social identities among

---

[43] Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, "Enlargement-Enrichment," 98.

their constituent groups.[44] Applying the theoretical insights from the previous chapter, this part will ask how the Commission goes about constructing such an identity within the framework of the Programme, as well as what kind of European identity it is promoting.

2.1.2. Reasons for using cultural heritage for identity promotion

Taking this political view, we first need to elaborate why and how the Commission aims to use cultural heritage to achieve its goals. Most researchers view the desire on the part of the Community to promote a European identity as a response to the perceived democratic deficit, lack of legitimacy, and the "distance from the citizen" – all being important factors in weakening the popular appeal of the European integration project. Already in 1974, the European heads of state emphasized the need for a policy which would aim to transform the "technocrats" Europe into "People's Europe" through "concrete manifestations of the European solidarity in everyday life."[45] Similarly, in Paul Blokker's analysis, a European identity may be a suitable response to the problems listed above. In his opinion, a set of commonly accepted European values would help, on the one hand, to demarcate Europe as a separate polity in the world, and on the other hand, to consolidate the democratic foundations of the EU. In addition, a European identity may present a positive contrast to the "dark European nationalist pasts," embracing tolerance and diversity within a European framework.[46] Secondly, while cultural heritage is not the only possible ground for constructing such a shared identity, it is definitely an important one. As Rachael Craufurd Smith rightly points out, states have an extensive experience in using cultural policy to pursue their own goals and develop a "sense of national identity,"[47] which would make

---

[44] Richard Herrmann and Marilynn B. Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," in *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU,* ed. Richard K. Herrmann, Thomas Risse, and Marilynn B. Brewer (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2004), 15-16.

[45] Cris Shore, "Inventing the 'People's Europe': Critical Approaches to European Community'Cultural Policy'," *Man, New Series* 28, no. 4 (1993): 779.

[46] Paul Blokker,"The Post-enlargement European Order: Europe 'United in Diversity'?,"*European Diversity and Autonomy Papers EDAP* 1 (2006): 6.

[47] Rachael Craufurd Smith,."From heritage conservation to European Identity: Article 151 EC and the multi-faceted nature of Community cultural policy," *European Law Review* 32, no.1 (2007): 48.

it logical to try to introduce a similar "cultural dimension" at the EU level in order the bolster the feeling of "Europeanness" and thereby increase popular support for European integration.

2.1.3. Difficulties of using culture as a basis for promoting a European identity

While culture represents a potentially powerful instrument of identity-building, the problem of using culture in the European context is, of course, that the very existence of a commonly shared "European culture" and a "European cultural identity" is debated. In fact, any attempts to identify the common list of cultural traditions or foundations inevitably run into the problem of how to accommodate the existing cultural diversity of Europe. In his article "Cultural Identity in Europe: Shared Experience," Michael Wintle analyzes several complications inherent in trying to define European culture. Firstly, it has been argued (e.g. by H.J. Kleinsteuber et al) that the concept of cultural identity in Europe lacks meaning altogether; in fact, as the proponents of this view argue, it would be more useful to focus on cultural diversity, which they conceptualize as opposite to a shared cultural identity.[48] Other commentators, such as Agnes Heller, associate European cultural identity merely with "modernity," which incorporates such concepts as "relentless cumulative progress in knowledge, technology, and wealth, and a politics based on the nation state with ideals of freedom and equality."[49] Secondly, while the EU is essentially an economic and (partially) political union, it constructs itself as representing the entire, true "Europe," thus excluding from the definition the many states, nations, and people who consider themselves European without, however, being citizens of the EU.[50] Nevertheless, there does exist, as Wintle points out, a certain "*something... which brings Europeans together, even if only partially.*"[51] The key components that are usually mentioned in the discussions about European cultural identity are Ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, Christianity (especially

---

[48] Wintle,"Culture and Identity in Europe," 9.
[49] Ibid, 11.
[50] Ibid, 10.
[51] Ibid, 12.

Western/ Latin Christianity), the Enlightenment, and industrialization (see James Joll). At the same time, such conceptions of European identity are, of course, problematic for various reasons, as they not only potentially exclude Eastern European (e.g. Orthodox) cultures, but also disregard the cultural input of minority groups and immigrants of non-European origin. It is perhaps a telling example that at a 1994 Council of Europe conference, where the participants were asked to identify a time period that could serve as a basis for celebrating shared European heritage, the epoch that was selected in the end (with the notable exception of the Basques) was the Bronze Age, when Europeans "might take pride in a common, vaguely Celtic culture."[52] At the end of the day, as some Euroskeptics would argue, the only European identity we may be left with would be a "market-driven, materialistic, functional and utilitarian conceptualization of citizenship."[53] On the whole, as one can easily see, there is no straightforward and unproblematic conception of European culture.

2.1.4. Means at the disposal of the Commission in promoting a European identity on the basis of cultural heritage

Employing the insights borrowed from Hobsbawm and Anderson, we may conceive of the European people as an "imagined community," in Anderson's terms, and look for the "invented traditions" and ideologies that may serve as "artificial, ideational vehicles" aimed at providing the basis for a European political community, to use Hobsbawm's approach. In this respect, it becomes important, first of all, to examine the role of the elites in the process of identity construction. According to Wintle, in the EU, the process of integration and identity formation has been largely driven by "enthusiastic politicians, bureaucrats, and intellectuals,"[54] that is, the elites. This view is in line with the general perception of the project of European integration as an

---

[52] David Lowenthal, "'European Identity': An Emerging Concept." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 46, no.3 (2000): 315-316.
[53] Baykal,"Unity in Diversity?," 39.
[54] Wintle,"Culture and Identity in Europe," 10.

elitist enterprise, which, when it faced the already mentioned problems of the lack of legitimacy and democratic deficit, required a broader popular basis for its existence, and a common European identity could be seen as being able to create such a foundation. Thus it is only logical that EU institutions have engaged into attempts to instill the feeling of "European belonging" in the general population. The instruments that Eurobureaucrats have utilized to achieve this goal reminisce strongly of Hobsbawm's discussion of "invented traditions" and the importance of symbolism and include, among other things, the creation of such symbols as the European flag, anthem, and currency and the promotion of "European" cultural heritage. Also, Smith's and Anderson's insights concerning the importance of the communications system and the system of education in propagating the set of values and beliefs advocated by the elites may be applicable to the EU institutions' actions as well, since the presence of multidirectional information flows, excellent communications systems, and the increasing population mobility in the EU all greatly facilitate the dissemination of "European" values and beliefs. The impact of such policies, manifest in the stronger attachment to European identity, is more evident among the younger population, as the results of the recent Eurobarometer polls testify.[55] Finally, even if at present the feeling of European identity among the population at large does not seem particularly strong, this is definitely not the case among the EU bureaucracy itself. As Shore and Black observe, the Commission staff "share a similar set of experiences and lifestyles, certain distinctive patterns of behaviour, and a common (bureaucratic) language," in other words, a strong organizational elitist culture which may become the driving force behind the consolidation of a new type of broader-based European identity.[56]

---

[55] Walter van Gerven, *The European Union: A Polity of States and Peoples* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), 49-50.
[56] Cris Shore and Annabel Black, "The European Communities and the Construction of Europe," *Anthropology Today* 8, no. 3 (1992): 11.

2.2. Project Analysis

2.2.1. Analyzing the Projects: Methodology and Criteria

Keeping in mind the contestability of the very notion of what constitutes European culture and European cultural heritage, the importance of the elites in constructing an identity, as well as the perceived need to increase public support for the EU, we shall proceed to analyze the projects. In my analysis, I am using a set of quantitative and qualitative parameters aimed at concisely characterizing the projects. The dimensions to be evaluated include 1) the international dimension of cooperation engendered by the project, 2) the types of participating institutions and organizations, 3) the object of cultural heritage and its nature (tangible or intangible), 4) whether the project regards cultural heritage as static, or tries to reinterpret its meanings, 5) the aims and the focus of the projects, 6) the target audiences and the means chosen to achieve the project goals (including the range of specific activities envisioned by the project). Information on the budget of each project is also provided. The results of the classification of the projects are summarized in Table 1 in the Appendix.

Since my analysis focuses on the kind of European identity that the Commission appears to be promoting through cultural heritage projects, the following dimensions deserve a special mention. First, European identity may be either inclusive or exclusive. In the former case, it would rely on a broad understanding of cultural heritage and recognize contributions of various groups and communities. If an identity proposed is rather exclusive, however, then we can expect the projects to focus only on conventional elements of the general understanding of European culture and European identity, such as on their Hellenic and Roman roots. In this respect, it is important to analyze how the projects generally approach the dilemma of the EU's self-proclaimed objective of promoting "unity in diversity." Secondly, the projects themselves may have an explicit goal of promoting a European identity, and the Commission's support of them would signify its acceptance of such a goal. Thirdly, it is important to address the issue that was

21

raised in the first part of the thesis – that is, how to approach the darker aspects of the European past when speaking of cultural heritage. Fourthly, since a European identity may potentially compete with, replace, or complement existing identities such as national and regional ones, I will try to identify, if possible, any tensions between these different types of identity if present and try to answer the question of whether the Commission seems to be in favor of any particular pattern.

2.2.2. Culture 2000 Programme: Overview

The Culture 2000 Programme was initiated in February 2000 with a view "to meet the needs of the cultural dimension in the European Union" and to bear in mind "the need for the Community policies to take greater account of culture."[57] Initially envisioning a four-year funding period (till the end of 2004), the Programme, following the comprehensive review and readjustment in 2004, was extended for another two years. As a result, the funding allocated to the Programme was also augmented, from 167 million EUR to 236.5 million EUR. The Programme is divided into five major fields, including, aside from cultural heritage, multidisciplined creativity; literature, books, and reading; performing arts; and visual arts. Projects funded by the Programme may be one year in length or multi-annual (not exceeding three years); the latter are supposed to be "designed and implemented by cultural operators from at least five countries participating in the programme."[58] In supporting multiannual cooperation projects, the Commission aims to promote cooperation "by supporting networks of operators, culture organizations, culture institutions, etc. with a view to implementing culture projects within and outside the Community."[59] One of the principal goals of Culture 2000 is to

[57] Decision No. 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 Programme.
[58] European Commission, "Culture 2000: Structured and Multiannual Cooperation Agreements (Action 2)."
[59] Ibid.

Promote greater cooperation with those engaged in cultural activities by encouraging them to enter into cooperation agreements for the implementation of joint projects, to support more closely targeted measures having a high European profile, to provide support for specific and innovative measures and to encourage exchanges and dialogue on selected topics of European interest.[60]

2.2.3. Multi-Annual Cultural Heritage Projects, Culture 2000 Programme: Analysis

2.2.3.1. Understanding of cultural heritage

Generally, the projects funded under the Culture 2000 Programme do not lend themselves to an easy conclusion that the Commission is trying to promote an exclusive, essentialist identity. While many projects do focus on the more conventional understandings of European cultural heritage, such as "high culture" and archaeological sites, there are also many of those that are characterized by a broad understanding of cultural heritage, including both tangible and intangible elements. For instance, some examples of such a broader understanding include the projects focused on certain skills, such as the project "People and Potteries" (2005), focusing on pottery as a transnational skill; or "Wooden handwork/ Wooden Carpentry: European restoration sites" (2000). Addressing such intangible elements of heritage that easily cross borders such as handicraft skills allows one to move away from the limited perception of cultural heritage only in ethnic or national terms, associating it with a particular group. Some other interesting examples pointing to a broadened understanding of cultural heritage include projects focusing on industrialization and industrial heritage such as "Sauvegarde et mise en valeur de sites européens de travail ouvrier du début du XXe siècle en France, Espagne et Allemagne » which aims to restore early 20th century workers' buildings ; « Patrimoine industriel entre terre et mer: pour un réseau européen d'écomusees » (2003), which concentrates on the conservation of industrial

---

[60] Decision No. 508/2000/EC, paragraph 9.

heritage sites like ports and coastal areas and aims to underscore the transnational dimension of European heritage, or SteamRail.Net (2003), which focuses on the promotion of heritage railways. Overall, therefore, while official discourses and documents may indeed feature a somewhat static, elitist understanding of European « common cultural heritage », laying emphasis on *haute culture*[61] and the canon of European culture such as Beethoven's music, the Acropolis, the works of the Renaissance period, and so on; the projects themselves engage with a variety of understandings of heritage. Thus such a position is in line with Quaedvlieg-Mihailovic's opinion that the heritage of "European significance " should include not only «prestigious monuments and sites», but also «minor heritage», such as historical buildings, rural landscapes, urban public spaces, and so forth, and, overall, the totality of cultural heritage belonging to the people of Europe.[62]

2.2.3.2. "Unity in diversity"

Judging from the fact that any process of identity construction has to take place through the definition of the « Other », it is important to see how the Commission addresses this dilemma within the framework of the Programme. Since « unity in diversity » is the EU's motto, the Commission in the role of an identity constructor is thus entrusted with a difficult task of finding a delicate balance between these two elements. In terms of country representation, it is clear that project participants from EU-15 Member States far outnumber the new member states. However, this is unlikely to be the result of a conscious policy on the part of the Commission, but rather the fact that during the first years of the Programme (before 2004), when the ten new Member States were still candidates for accession, the information about the Programme has not been as widely circulated yet, and that cultural operators in these countries had not had the chance yet to establish strong connections with their Western counterparts. Overall, the Programme had a very

---

[61] Shore, Cris. "Imagining the New Europe: identity and heritage in European Community discourse." In *Cultural Identity and Archeology: The Construction of European Communities,* ed. Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones and Clive Gamble (London: Routledge, 1996), 109.
[62] Quaedvlieg-Mihailović,"Enlargement-Enrichment," 103.

positive impact on the new Member States[63]. An inclusive European identity would also put emphasis on diversity by acknowledging the contributions of less-conventional groups and actors to its cultural heritage. These may include, for instance, migrant communities or representatives of religions other than Christianity, which is traditionally associated with European culture. The role of migrants is addressed by several projects, such as, for instance, "CROSSINGS: Movements of peoples and movement of cultures - Changes in the Mediterranean from ancient to modern times" (2004), which specifically aims to highlight cultural diversity and the process of cultural dialogue and exchange, or "Migration, Work and Identity: a history of European people in Museums" (2000), whose stated goal is to "contribute to the European debate on cultural diversity" in the hopes that increased knowledge of migrant communities will foster tolerance. The role of minorities, however, is not sufficiently highlighted in the multi-annual projects. One of the few relevant projects is "The Romany/Gypsy Presence in the European Music," which emphasizes the contribution of the Roma to European musical heritage. At the same time, again, this view highlights only one single non-controversial aspect of the Roma culture, while failing to acknowledge the sensitive political and social issues related to the Roma's continued discrimination throughout European history. A project of significance in this regard is titled "Kultur, Mobilität, Migration und Siedlung von Juden im mittelalterlichen Europa" ("Jewish Culture, Mobility, Migration and Settlement in Medieval Europe") (2000), it deals with the controversial history of Jewish communities in medieval Europe. Interestingly enough, however, no multi-annual project addresses specifically the history of Moslem communities or their contribution to European heritage.

---

[63] Nina Obuljen, *Why we need European cultural policies: the impact of EU enlargement on cultural policies in transition countries* (Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation, 2005), 66.

2.2.3.3. Addressing negative aspects of the common European past

One of the debates discussed in the first part of the thesis was whether cultural heritage should address the tragic and bloody events in the European past, and if so, how. The current selection of the projects, however, does not reflect this dilemma in a significant way, which allows one to make a conclusion that within the Culture 2000 Programme, "heritage" is generally understood in positive and non-controversial terms, incorporating the achievements of various cultures throughout the centuries. There is one project, however, that seems to be closer to a critical reinterpretation of heritage. The project's title is "Landscapes of War" and it examines the sites of armed conflicts in the 20th century. The uniqueness of this project lies in the fact that while armed conflicts in Europe are an integral part of shared common memories, these are exactly the memories, which, as many believe, preclude the development of a common European identity, since they symbolize a long history of mutual hostility among European nations. One of the aims of the projects is to promote peace and tolerance; this may be possible only if the project coordinators succeed in approaching sites of war without privileging some narratives while silencing others.

2.2.3.4. Different levels of identity

Next, if the cultural heritage projects within the Culture 2000 Programme are indeed meant to promote a European identity, then it might be interesting to examine whether these projects reflect certain tensions between different types of identity, such as local, regional, national, European, religious, and so on. The first interesting observation that comes to mind is that in the first two years of the Programme the percentage of the projects that were specifically aimed at promoting European identity was significantly higher than in subsequent years. For instance, in the first two years (2000 and 2001), a significant part of the projects directly addressed the idea of European identity: "Migration, Work and Identity: A History of European People in Museums;" "Les Universités et l'identité culturelle européenne », « Euroclio," which

aimed to address the diverse histories and the issues of migration in their relation to the questions of identity in Europe; "Patrimony and History" (2001), focusing on identifying the differences and similarities of the cultural heritages of the then EU-15 countries; "Born in Europe" (2001), focusing on a wide range of issues, including "cultural self-definition, cultural identity, European citizenship, and immigration." By contrast, the later years of the implementation of the Programme feature virtually no projects that directly address these issues.

As for contrasting different kinds of identities, it may be important to note that there is a group of projects that focuses on the promotion of rather regional, than European, identity. For the most part, these projects are geared toward the valorisation of Mediterranean cultural heritage and establishing networks within the region. Some typical examples of such projects include "CROSSINGS Movements of peoples and movement of cultures - Changes in the Mediterranean from ancient to modern times", "GOTHICmed - A Virtual Museum of Mediterranean Gothic Architecture," "TRIMED La cultura del pan, el aceite y el vino », dealing with the broad interpretation of the heritage of the Mediterranean islands ; and « Mediterranea », on the issues of maritime heritage in the Mediterranean area. This, of course, may be explained by the extensive experience of cultural cooperation in this region, as well as by its high economic and tourist potential.

Finally, while we have noted the lesser involvement of new EU Member States in the Programme, it is interesting to note that when they do figure prominently among the participants, the projects are likely to have a regional focus and thus appear to be strengthening a regional identity. Some notable examples in this regard include the project "History after the Fall: The Indeterminacy of the Short Twentieth Century," clearly geared toward Central and Eastern European countries. Aimed at the reexamination of the role of Central European elites in the history of the region and Europe at large, the project is organized and managed exclusively by Central and Eastern European states (even the participating institutions from Germany come from the eastern *Länder*). Another example is TACE (Theatre Architecture in Central Europe) (2006).

The project "Region - Conflicts and Co-operation. Road from the Past to the Future," which explores the history of the Baltic region, is interesting in that it promotes a "Nordic/Baltic" identity and even specifically mentions the necessity of disseminating materials about the history of the Baltic Region in Russian universities. Given the history of hostilities between Russia and the former Soviet Baltic republics, the overall thrust of the project thus appears to be quite politicized. Thus, one may argue that in the implementation of the Culture 2000 Programme the EU is promoting not only European but also regional identities. This is the underlying concept behind the "Europe of the Regions" idea; in fact, some argue that the EU may provide regions with a window of opportunity and a forum to reassert their regional identity – something that they might find more difficult to achieve at the respective national levels.[64]

2.3. Conclusions of the analysis

Overall, the conclusion that one makes on the basis of the project analysis is that of significant diversity and a very broad interpretation of the notion of European cultural heritage. The claim that the EU and the Commission are promoting an exclusive European identity thus seems difficult to substantiate. My interviews with DG civil servants and experts involved in the evaluation of the projects within the framework of the Programme point to the same fact – all interviewees agreed that the diversity of candidate projects has been extremely large; and that no single area, element, or group is excluded. In fact, one of the independent experts who participated in the project selection procedure, mentioned that in her view the guidelines for the selection given by the Commission were too broadly defined and thus at times seemed to lack focus and direction. At the same time, the area that lacks emphasis is the search for ways to

---

[64] G.J. Ashworth, "From history to heritage- from heritage to identity," in *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, ed. G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 21.

address the painful memories and the negative sides of the common European past, as well as the need to find a way to bring together different narratives of the same historical events.

2.4. The Commission's Role in Identity Building: Existing Constraints

In light of the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the projects in the previous chapter, it then becomes useful to examine the idea that the Commission, in assessing the "European significance" of cultural heritage projects, may be guided by considerations other a desire to promote a certain identity. Theoretical literature in the field of EU studies and identity construction also gives a number of insights into why the Commission may not be in the best position to promote a European identity, that is, why the "persuasion" model used in the previous chapter may not be applicable to this institution.

First of all, one of the problematic aspects in the view of the Commission as a European elite promoting a European identity is that, as our theorists would concur, identities can hardly be constructed solely in a top-down fashion; there also has to be, as Hobsbawm argues, a movement "from below," originating among ordinary people and their experiences. Thus, the elites' efforts need to be complemented by grassroots or "bottom-up" initiatives stemming from civil society. Moreover, without such support from the bottom, one may argue that the Commission might rightfully feel wary of being seen as promoting an artificial and contrived identity.[65] This point is acknowledged in the Commission's official discourses as well, such as, for example, in the 2004 Communication saying that the Culture 2007 Programme will contribute to the "bottom-up development of a European identity" and will actively involve various cultural operators and citizens.[66] Such initiatives, although they do exist, are, however, judged to be the weakest elements in identity construction at the European level.[67]

[65] Miller and Yudice, *Cultural Policy,* 181.
[66] EC Communication, "Making Citizenship Work: Fostering European Culture and Diversity through Programmes for Youth Culture, Audiovisual, and Civic Participation," COM (2004) 154 final, 10.
[67] Wintle,"Culture and Identity in Europe," 21.

The second important constraint on the role of the Commission in promoting European identity through the means of culture is the limited budget allotted to cultural policy implementation. For instance, the funding of the Culture 2000 Programme for the entire period of implementation (from 2000 to 2006) amounts to only 236.5 million EUR,[68] which is insignificant compared to the EU's expenditures on such major areas as the Common Agricultural Policy or the Structural Funds.

Thirdly, within the persuasive model of identity building, the "effectiveness of the medium of transmission and the receptivity of the audience" constitute important determinants of whether the institution promoting a certain kind of social identity will be successful.[69] In the Commission's case, however, not only does it operate on a rather limited budget when it comes to cultural policy implementation, but it also has limited access to popular dissemination channels and thus limited visibility. Low public awareness and low interest in the EU, translated into low receptivity to the Commission's activities and efforts, further weaken the latter's potential role in building a European identity.

Fourthly, identities are constructed through the relation to the Other;[70] which has especially been the case with national identity construction. In the words of Sasja Tempelman, "the demarcation of cultural identity inevitably entails processes of inclusion and exclusion," since the construction of collective identities require the "drawing of boundaries that demarcate the collective entity," determining insiders and outsiders.[71] In view of the contestability of the notion of "European culture" and "European cultural heritage" it is not easy to determine which cultures, peoples, or practices are to be included or excluded from a common conception of European culture. The concept of the "Other" as related to European cultures is, too, extremely complex. In different historical periods and in different nations and localities, the Other has

---

[69] Herrmann and Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," 16.
[70] Hall, "Who Needs 'Identity'?," 17.
[71] Sasja Tempelmann,"Constructions of Cultural Identity: Multiculturalism and Exclusion," *Political Studies* XLVII (1999): 17.

varied: from the Turk during the Ottoman domination to the Soviets during the Cold War; in addition, at certain points of time in history, European nations have served as the Other for each other, notably in the example of France and Germany.[72] In defining European cultural identity today, the problem of who could be identified as the "Other" for the EU is controversial to say the least. For some, it may be the Moslems, while for others, it is the US and its perceived overweening influence in the form of ubiquitous Americanization. Certainly, the perceptions of the Other vary from Member State to Member State, and even more so after the recent enlargements: after all, Russia, the perennial Other for small Estonia, is hardly one for France or the UK. Therefore, in the absence of the easily identifiable Other, the presumed efforts of the Commission to construct a European identity are unlikely to succeed.

Closely related to this discussion is the potential conflict between the quest for a culture-based European identity and the EU's strongly embraced political identity, which emphasizes liberal values, such as democracy, freedom, human rights, and so on. The EU's image as a "civilian power" in international affairs also lays an emphasis on the political, rather than cultural, identity. For instance, where a culture-based identity might require drawing a boundary between insiders and outsiders (for example, the minorities), the official emphasis on multiculturalism would imply the necessity to include and integrate groups that may be popularly perceived as cultural "outsiders" in Europe. The importance of political identity can be also traced in the fact that in the General Objectives clause included in the Conditional Call for Proposals for the Culture 2007-13 Programme, the contribution of cultural heritage is described as part of its capacity to "contribute to an improved, intercultural dialogue, mutual knowledge, understanding and respect for each other and, thus, to a stronger sense of European citizenship."[73] As one can see, all the benefits listed in this document are rather connected to political values,

---

[72] Thomas Risse, "A European Identity? Europeanization and the Evolution of Nation-State Identities," in *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, ed. M. Green Cowles, J. Caporaso, and T. Risse (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 210.
[73] European Commission, *Conditional Call for Proposals (DG EAC/55/06) for the Organisation and Implementation of an Annual European Union Prize Scheme in the Field of Cultural Heritage,* 3.

and the ultimate goal is said to be the promotion of European citizenship, which is also a political concept.

Next, the subsidiarity principle enshrined in the Treaties also constitutes a limitation on the Commission's actions. The EU's cultural policy is meant to comprise supportive actions that agreed by the Council on a unanimity basis and does not envision legal harmonization in the domain of culture.[74] If Member States still have such a great say in this policy area, then the Commission's role in building a supranational European identity using cultural policy as a tool is not sufficiently strong.

Finally, identity-building is a long-term, complex process, and given the short history of the EU's cultural policy, it might still be too early to make conclusions concerning the Commission's role as an identity constructor.

All in all, there are a number of factors and limitations which make the Commission an unlikely actor in the area of building a European identity, or would diminish its impact, should this institution decide to engage in such an endeavor. For this reason, the next chapter will examine alternative interpretations of how the Commission may understand the concept of European significance in the field of cultural heritage.

---

[74] De Vries, "Citizenship and Memory," 27.

CHAPTER 3 -   INTERPRETING EUROPEAN SIGNIFICANCE:

THE COMMISSION AS A TECHNOCRATIC BUREAUCRACY

3.1. The Commission as a Bureaucracy: Theoretical Strands

In the previous chapter, the analysis was based on at least two underlying assumptions. The first assumption treated the Commission as a unitary actor: therefore, I spoke about the Commission's understanding of European significance using the Culture 2000 Programme as the basis for analysis. Secondly, it was assumed that the Commission acts in accordance with its mandate as the "guardian of the Treaties"; that is, if the notion of "European significance" is contained in Article 151 of the EC Treaty, then the Commission incorporates it in its administration of the Culture 2000 Programme. Evidently, however, each of these assumptions may be challenged. The Commission may not be a unitary actor and it (as well as its parts) may also be guided by considerations other than the need to "guard the Treaties." These factors, in turn, influence the understandings of European significance present within the Commission, as well as how these understandings are used in the implementation of the Culture 2000 Programme.

First, assuming the unitary character of the Commission may lead one to overlook a number of aspects that are relevant to policy-making within this European institution.[75] As Laura Cram argues, the Commission "can in no way be characterised as a monolithic unit."[76] On the contrary, even within one bureaucratic institution, it is important to pay attention to the internal dynamics of the policy process, since the actors involved in it and the modes of policy-making may vary widely.[77] In Christiansen's description the Commission, too, is pictured as "constantly ripped between national interests, concerns, roles and loyalties and overarching community

---

[75] Hussein Kassim and Anand Menon, "The Principal-Agent Approach and The Study Of The European Union: A Provisional Assessment," 12.

[76] Laura Cram, *Policy-making in the EU: Conceptual Lenses and the integration process* (London and New York, 1997), 162.

[77] Ibid, 167.

interests, concerns, roles and loyalties.[78] In addition, in Trondal's words, the Commission is characterized by internal tensions between various types of governance dynamics, including intergovernmental, supranational, departmental, and epistemic dynamics.[79] Arguably, top-ranking officials are likely to represent the organization as a whole (a supranational role), whereas civil servants in lower ranked positions are more likely to act in accordance with their departmental role and professional expertise (epistemic role).[80]

Moreover, delegated authority, or the explicit mandate from the Member States, constitutes only one category of authority vested in the Commission. Other types of authority, which may have a strong influence on policy- and decision-making within this organization, include "expert authority;" "rational-legal authority," which is based on the bureaucracy's ability to "present [itself] as neutral and objective creators of impersonal rules," and "moral authority," according to which the Commission represents the interests of the Community at large rather than the interests of individual Member States.[81]

The principal-agent dilemma is also present in the case of the Commission. According to the principal-agent-theory, the EU treaties are the so-called "incomplete" or "relational treaties." Phrased intentionally vaguely, they leave much room for interpretation and a considerable degree of discretion for the institutions which are responsible for executing them.[82] Given the extensive sector-specific expertise accumulated by the Commission over the years of its existence, it does not come as a surprise that the Commission is able to engage in "agency drift," that is, the

---

[78] Thomas Christiansen, "Tensions of European governance: politicized bureaucracy and multiple accountability in the European Commission," *Journal of European Public Policy* 4 (1997), quoted in Torbjorn Larsson and Jarle Trondal, "After Hierarchy? Domestic Executive Governance and the Differentiated Impact of the European Commission and the Council of Ministers " in *EIoP* 9, no.14 (2005): 4.

[79] Jarle Trondal, ""Governing at the Frontier of the European Commission. The case of seconded national experts," *West European Politics* 29, no 1 (2006): 151.

[80] Renate Mayntz, "Organizations, Agents and Representatives," in *Organizing PoliticalInstitutions. Essays for Johan P. Olsen*, ed. Morten Egeberg and Per Lægreid (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1997), 84.

[81] Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore, *Rules for the World. International Organizations in Global Politics* (London: Ithaca, 2004): 20-25, quoted in Mark Pollack "Principal-Agent Analysis and International Delegation: Red Herrings, Theoretical Clarifications, and Empirical Disputes," Paper prepared for presentation at the Workshop on Delegating Sovereignty, Duke University, 3-4 March 2006, p. 12-13, www.coleurop.be/file/content/studyprogrammes/pol/docs/wp2_Pollack.pdf.

[82] Angelina Topan, "The resignation of the Santer-Commission: the impact of 'trust' and 'reputation'," EI*oP* 6, no.14 (2002): 2.

process in which the agent (the Commission and its DG's) pursues a different agenda that that of the principal (the Member States who adopt Treaties).[83] Another implication of the principal-agent problem is that even within the Commission, civil servants with delegated tasks may choose their own representational roles rather than relying on those of their leadership, a practice that Pollack calls "shirking."[84] In light of the fact that civil servants working in the Commission are typically highly educated and possess extensive expertise on the issues of their specialization, this makes it easier for them to exercise discretion in their principal-agent relation, leaving them with a substantial degree of freedom in carrying out their tasks.

Finally, one should not ignore the technocratic and bureaucratic nature of the Commission and its subdivisions. As Majone argues, the Commission, like most bureaucratic structures, has its own bureaucratic interest, which consists of the maximization of power. The latter may be understood as increased scope of competencies, a larger budget, improved image of the organization, or of a department within it, and so forth.

3.2. Analysis of Projects and Interviews

3.2.1. Adopting a more technical interpretation of European significance

The implications of the theoretical insights discussed above are manifold. The fact that the Commission is not a unitary actor implies that the understanding of various concepts that are contained in the Treaties may vary from department to department, from level to level, and from individual to individual. This is especially true for the identity-based interpretation of "European significance," since the concept of identity itself is theoretical and highly contested. During my personal interviews with civil servants working in the DG Education and Culture, it appeared that

---

[83] Renaud Dehousse, "Delegation of powers in the European Union. The need for a multi-principals model." Centre d'études européennes de Sciences Politiques, Draft (2006), 9.
www.arena.uio.no/events/LondonPapers06/DEHOUSSE.pdf.
[84] Mark Pollack, "The engines of European integration: delegation, agency and agenda-setting in the European Community," *International organization* 51, no.1 (2003): 99.

each of them had his/her own understanding of what European identity is and what role it should play in the Commission's policy-making processes.

Secondly, the nature of DG Education and Culture as a bureaucratic and technocratic agency may explain why "European significance" interpreted in terms of identity promotion could be judged as too unclear and elusive a concept to use in the evaluation of the cultural projects. Relying on Trondal's analysis of the representation roles of civil servants of different ranks within the Commission, we may argue that the lower-ranking civil servants in the DG, to whom the actual implementation of the Culture 2000 Programme is delegated, are characterized rather by their attachment to the department (departmental role) and their position as experts (epistemic role); as for the "supranational role" (to which the promotion of a European identity would belong), it is more likely to be found among top-ranking officials. This difference may explain why the high-level flowery official rhetoric of the EU often stresses the importance of high ideals and a common European identity, while the lower-level civil servants prefer to operate with more technical concepts that could be evaluated and assessed in concrete parameters. Applying Barnett and Finnemore's theoretical insights, one may argue that using a broad understanding of the term "European significance" for project evaluation would undermine the Commission's "rational-legal authority," that is, its ability as a bureaucratic entity to institute impartial and fair rules, since the interpretation of "European significance" may be considered too subjective. Also, one of the comments received from the interviewees was that the DG's task is first and foremost to "cater to the need of the sector," which testifies to the recognition of another type of authority of DG civil servants, namely "expert authority." In their capacity as experts, DG civil servants then naturally prefer to act within the realm of their expertise, which favours a more technical understanding of their tasks.

In fact, each person interviewed in DG Education and Culture gave a narrower, more technical definition of their view of what would constitute a project of "European significance." For the person working in the policy unit, a cultural heritage project of "European significance"

meant first and foremost a project having a "European dimension," measured in terms of the breadth of cooperation, as well as the geographical locations of the projects to be conducted. These criteria have certainly a more quantifiable nature (such as, for example, the number of participating countries or different types of organizations, or the number of project locations) than the more difficult to define identity promotion dimension. However, when asked a question whether the terms European dimension, European Added Value and European significance were used interchangeably in the Commission, the person noted that the concept of "European significance" as it appears in the Treaties may be understood and applied differently in the day-to-day work of the DG and in the calls for proposals (perhaps, in what goes back to the principal-agent dilemma between the Member States which ratify the Treaties and the Commission which is responsible for policy implementation). In the interviewee's words, a project that was "viable" and "ambitious" would receive funding, even though it may not be considered as being of "European significance." Interestingly enough, the example of a project that this civil servant named as having a European significance was a German-Polish one focusing on the renovation and rehabilitation of the old Jerusalem-Hospital of the Teutonic Order in Marienburg (Malbork, Poland), thereby suggesting a more "conventional" understanding of European cultural heritage. Thus there seems to be a tension between the notion of European significance understood as referring to the cultural value of "major," "important" cultural heritage and the narrower notion of a European dimension, which could apply to a broad range of projects, including those focusing on "minor" heritage.

Other interviewees have identified European significance as the "European Added Value," also a more technical term. Its definition can be found in the updated call for proposals form:

- The actions considered to provide European added value are those where the objectives, methodology and nature of the cooperation involved demonstrate an

outlook that goes beyond local, regional or even national interests to develop synergies at European-wide level;

- The principle of cooperation should be based on the mutual exchange of experiences and should lead to a final result that differs qualitatively from the sum of the several activities undertaken at national level, thus producing real multilateral interaction which promotes the achievement of shared objectives.

- The cultural value of the action from a European point of view: the way in which the activity will have a greater effect and in which its objectives will be better achieved at European level than at national level.

- The potential of the proposed action to result in continued, sustained cooperation, in complementary activities or in permanent benefits and at European level, and to contribute on a long-term basis to the development of cooperation between cultures in Europe.

- The level of cooperation and the multilateral nature of the proposal: the number, commitment, and geographical distribution of the participating organisations.[85]

As one can see, the concept of European added value, like the concept of the European dimension, is also easier to assess and evaluate than what is meant by "European significance." The detailed definition of European added value provided above is included in the award criteria in the calls of proposals and is thus made familiar to all cultural operators applying for project funding, since their projects are evaluated against these criteria. To be more specific, all project evaluators have to fill out a special grid, awarding points for each item (including within the European added value) listed among the award criteria.

Finally, the stress that the DG puts on project-related dissemination activities (with an obligatory mention of the EU as a funding body) among the European public does not have to be

---

[85] European Commission, *Conditional Call for Proposals EACEA No. 09/2006: Support for Cultural Actions (Multi-Annual Cooperation Projects),* 14.

interpreted as part of the Commission's grand effort to promote a European identity through the mass media or education. Instead, using Majone's insights, one may interpret this in terms of the DG's bureaucratic interest in increasing the visibility of its actions, improving its institutional image, and possibly obtaining a larger budget in the future.

3.2.2. European-level cooperation: a key criterion for assessing European significance of cultural heritage projects

However civil servants choose to interpret "European significance," the main thrust of their argument always lies in the quality of cooperation and the creation of synergies when cooperation takes place at European level. One of my interviewees, a Project Manager from the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, stated directly that the objective of the department's activities is to "promote cooperation in [the] sector." Given the salience of cooperation in the civil servants' understandings of the European significance of cultural projects, it will be useful to analyze what kind of cooperation the projects involve.

Cultural cooperation may take a variety of forms, including, but not limited to:

- networking,

- international partnership,

- cultural diversity,

- information exchange,

- bilateral/ multilateral exchange,

- good practice exchange,

- co-funding,

- interculturalism,

- accessibility and democracy,

- creation of a common cultural area,

- co-production,

-   mobility,

-   anti-discriminatory actions,

-   fostering of equal opportunity,

-   transnational dissemination,

-   multilinguism,

-   social stability.[86]

The analysis of the multi-annual projects fully supports the emphasis on cooperation, rather than on identity-building. In fact, with rare exceptions, cooperation in its various forms is a key component of the content of these projects. In addition, the projects I have analyzed contain a number of those that are targeted mostly toward professional audiences and are aimed at research, training, best practice exchange, or dissemination of information. The tangible end products of a number of projects include the publication of a manual containing good practices or of promotional materials, the creation of culture-related media content, an information database or website, or of an educational pack. One of the most popular means utilized in projects are conferences, workshops, and creation of networks; for many of these, it is experts and cultural operators that are targeted and that are supposed to exchange their know-how, techniques, and best practices. Several examples of such professional-oriented projects include ACCU (Archives of European Archaeology), aimed at finding tools and common solutions to increasing the accessibility of European cultural heritage; "European Landscapes: Past, Present and Future," promoting widespread use of non-destructive methods of archaeological investigation; "Translate," focusing on the problems of cultural translation in museums and other art institutions; TAPE, seeking to introduce best technological solutions for audiovisual heritage preservation in Europe, and so forth. Notably, only one project (GAUDI) envisions going beyond the conservation, research, documentation and similar activities to foster creative sustainable co-production in its chosen field (contemporary architecture).

CEU eTD Collection

---

[86] EFAH, Study on Cultural Cooperation in Europe – Interarts and EFAH – June 2003, 29.

3.2.3. European significance in terms of the economic and social benefits of cultural heritage

In addition, the significance of cultural heritage may also be interpreted in terms of its ability to provide responses to challenges of economic and social nature, including sustainable development, social cohesion, job creation or education and environmental protection being some of them.[87] One of my interviewees mentioned that the European significance of a project may also lie in the fact that it envisions the organization of a cross-national event that would be important from a tourism point of view. Several cultural heritage projects financed by the Culture 2000 Programme are indeed informed by such an understanding. Thermae Europae (2006), focusing on European thermal heritage, lists as one of its goals the enhancement of the role of spas as cultural centers. With the project leader being the municipality of Karlovy Vary, a celebrated Czech spa town, it becomes clear that the economic implications of the project in terms of increased attractiveness of spas to tourists, translated into additional revenues for the local budgets constitute a key component of the rationale for project implementation. TRIMED (2004), aimed at promoting the cultural heritage of the Mediterranean region, includes the design of "didactic tourist itineraries" and the publication of promotional materials into the list of means it will rely on for the achievement of its objectives. Another interesting example is the project "Quelles réutilisations pour l'architecture historique aujourd'hui » (2001), which envisioned finding novel uses for historical architectural sites, exploring their capacity to act as sites for activities in the area of education and social inclusion. Overall, such an approach is in accordance with the Commission's understanding of cultural policy as having a social and economic component; however, we may also add that the number of multi-annual projects laying emphasis explicitly on the economic value of heritage was rather small, not exceeding 10% of the total

---

[87] Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, "Enlargement = Enrichment: A Plea for a Europe-wide Mobilisation in favour of Cultural Heritage," 98-99.

number of the projects. In this regard, the Culture 2000 Programme may be a response to Newby's criticism of the European Commission, voiced in 1994 on the ground of the Commission's allegedly excessive preoccupation with promoting tourism, rather than cultural diversity.[88]

3.2.4. Development of European identity as a possible side product: the socialization model

The importance of the more technical interpretations of the European significance of cultural heritage discussed above does not, however, necessarily mean that DG Education and Culture is dominated solely by the technocratic mode of thinking of its civil servants, or that the latter do not have any interest or any stance in the issues related to European identity. On the contrary, DG officials are as a general rule characterized by a sense of attachment toward their DG. For instance, among EU civil servants Shore identifies a "marked shift of loyalties" and a "transfer of allegiances from their countries of origin to the EU and its institutions" as part of the process called *engrenage*.[89] Thus, one may argue that "identification with Europe may be an elite affair,"[90] at least at this moment of time. However, while DG civil servants may welcome the gradual emergence of European identity to complement other identities (local, regional, and national) as a possible consequence and byproduct of EU cultural policy, they may have doubts as to whether it is at all possible or desirable to make European identity promotion the main goal of the Programme. For instance, in one of the interviews, the interviewee demonstrated clear awareness of the existence of many constraints on the Commission's potential role in identity-building, including most of the ones mentioned above: the lack of funds, the risk of launching an artificial process instead of allowing the identity to develop gradually and from the bottom up;

---

[88] P.T. Newby, "Tourism: Support or Threat to Heritage?," In *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe* ,ed. G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham (London and New York: Routledge 1994), 226.
[89] Cris Shore, *Elite Cultures* (London and New York: Routledge 2002), 8.
[90] Herrmann and Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," 15.

the low interest the general public will be likely to have in such policy imposed from above; the long-term and gradual nature of the process, and so on. Interestingly, the person also added that EU actions that would promote the development of European identity would have to involve a process of active learning and mobility on the part of European citizens, citing university exchange programs as an example.

This point has an important implication for my research. That is, even if DG civil servants subscribe to a more technical interpretation of "European significance" (such as the European dimension or the European added value, interpreted mostly in terms of cooperation), they are not necessarily antithetically opposed to any notion of identity development. What it does mean is that the persuasion model of identity building used in the second chapter, with its emphasis on the active, directed efforts on the part of international institutions to build a certain kind of social identity, may not be applicable to the Culture 2000 Programme. At the same time, an alternative model – that of *socialization* – is likely to be more relevant. Socialization models of identity formation and change emphasize the importance of personal experiences with the institution and the group represented by this institution. In the process of interaction with the institution, individuals come to view it as having a real meaning for their own lives; this process is more likely to affect better-educated and more mobile individuals who are able to derive more benefits from such supranational institutions.[91] Most EU civil servants are generally regarded as having developed a European identity through the process of socialization. However, if one applies the socialization model, the intensive European-level professional cooperation envisioned in the overwhelming majority of the cultural heritage projects under the Culture 2000 Programme may then also be seen as conducive to developing a similar kind of identity among professionals in the field of culture. First, cultural operators and other professionals involved in project implementation are usually educated and mobile individuals; secondly, they, too, have many benefits to derive from participating in the Programme and becoming part of European networks,

---

[91] Herrmann and Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," 14.

such as increased mobility and improved professional prospects; thirdly, especially if the Programme does succeed in generating sustainable long-term cooperation networks, the process of socialization will go beyond the time scope of the projects and thus provide a basis for shared experiences, which will contribute to the enhanced group identity[92] among these professionals.

---

[92] Herrmann and Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," 14.

CONCLUSION

Year 2006 was the final year of the implementation of the Culture 2000 Programme, the first comprehensive policy instrument used by the EU as part of its cultural policy. Today is thus the perfect time for taking a closer look at the Programme, at the goals the EU and the European Commission tried to achieve through its implementation, the ideas and understandings that governed their actions, and the means they utilized to do so. The goal of this thesis was to examine the Commission's understanding(s) of the "European significance" of cultural projects, using multi-annual cultural heritage projects funded by the Programme, as well as personal interviews with civil servants working in DG Education and Culture, as the basis for empirical analysis. EU cultural policy has frequently been regarded as aiming at providing, by means of European identity-building, an additional source of legitimization for the European integration project which is being criticized for its democratic deficit. Therefore, this thesis was devoted to analyzing whether the cultural heritage projects under Culture 2000 do bear witness to the Commission's understanding of the "European significance" of cultural heritage in terms of its ability to promote a certain type of European identity for political purposes. The evidence, however, was not conclusive, as relatively few projects focused specifically on identity-related questions and, judging from the selection of the projects and their extreme diversity, no pattern of a projected European cultural identity in the making emerged in the implementation of the Programme. Having analyzed existing constraints and limitations on the Commission's potential role as an identity-builder, the thesis attempted to answer the research question by taking into account the principal-agent dilemma, the bureaucratic and fragmented nature of the Commission and its DG's, the different representational roles of DG civil servants, and the elite culture present within the Commission. As a result, I found that in their work DG civil servants tend to rely on a more technical understanding of the "European significance" of cultural heritage, choosing to

45

interpret it in terms of a "European dimension" and "European Added Value," expressed mostly in European-level cooperation. Such an understanding seems to correspond better to the bureaucratic responsibilities of these civil servants. At the same time, the emergence of European identity, while not viewed as a primary goal of the Culture 2000 Programme, is perceived by many as a possible side effect of project implementation. This is more likely to happen among culture professionals involved in the projects through their personal experiences in participation in Europe-wide cultural networks.

All in all, it appears that the concept of European significance of cultural heritage is poorly defined, with the higher-level official rhetoric emphasizing the ideas of a commonly shared European culture and a common destiny of European people, and DG Education and Culture, responsible for actual policy implementation, interpreting it in more technical, cooperation-related terms. This difference highlights the tension between the Commission's perceived role as the "driver of integration" and its technocratic character as a bureaucratic agency, especially when it comes to policies that are relatively new, contested, politically and culturally sensitive, and which go beyond the Commission's usual scope of competencies in the area of economic integration.

46

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Research Questionnaire DG Education and Culture

1. What are the criteria which, in your view, would classify a project as being of "European significance" (in accordance with Art. 151 EC)?

2. In your view, does the current selection of projects lack diversity/ representative quality? If yes, what could be the possible ways to increase this diversity?

3. In what ways does cultural heritage, in your view, include the cultural heritage of minorities living in Europe (immigrant communities, ethnic minorities such as Roma, etc.)?

4. To your knowledge, has there been a tendency (from the part of the selection committees) to select projects representing a certain historical period/region in Europe?

5. While selecting projects, do experts or officials have a list of ´priorities´ in terms of the type of projects they would like to fund?

6. In your view, what are the main constraints that cultural policy-making is facing today in the EU? (delete those that do not apply)

    a) lack of funds
    b) lack of public/ media attention
    c) lack of a commonly shared understanding of European culture?
    d) other (please specify)

Appendix II: Research Questionnaire Cultural Experts

1.   What are the criteria which, in your view, would classify a project
        as being of "European significance" (in accordance with Art. 151 EC)?

2.   In your view, does the current selection of projects lack diversity/representative quality?
        If yes, what could be the possible ways to increase this diversity?

3.   In what ways does cultural heritage, in your view, include the
        cultural heritage of minorities living in Europe (immigrant communities, ethnic
        minorities such as Roma, etc.)?

4.   In the process of project selection, what priorities guided your
        decisions?

5.   Do you understand "cultural heritage" to be of predominantly material or non-   material
        nature? What qualities would allow one to describe a certain piece of cultural heritage as
        "European cultural heritage" as opposed to solely national cultural heritage?

6.   In your experience, did the Commission/ DG impose any constraints
        (such as certain requirements or criteria) which could potentially limit your freedom in
        choosing projects which otherwise were of good quality?

7.   In your view, is it a feasible and desirable goal that the projects
        should support the creation/ promotion of a European identity?

Name of Project	Cultural Heritage Object	Tangible/ Intangible	Countries Lead organizer Co-Organizers Associate Partners	Institutions Lead organizer + Co-organizers	Budget In €	Re-Interpretation	Aims	Means
MULTI-ANNUAL CULTURAL HERITAGE PROJECTS THAT RECEIVED FUNDING IN 2006								
Connecting European culture through new technology	Italian, German and Polish ancient societies	Tangible and intangible	Italy Italy Italy Germany Germany Poland Spain The Netherlands -	Cultural foundations, media and communication institute, municipality, universities,	520.467	Yes	Sharing and highlighting the common cultural heritage; improving access and participation in culture and in new technologies; initiatives and cooperation activities between cultural operators; archaeological experts will work on providing 3 cultural scenarios, based on Italian, German and Polish ancient societies, and in finding cultural interconnections, economic, cultural and artistic links between the scenarios.	State-of-the-art technology to make European heritage more visible/accessible; improving access and participation in culture and in new technologies; initiatives and cooperation activities between cultural operators.
Thermae Europae	European Thermal heritage	Tangible	Czech Republic Bulgaria Italy Slovenia Sweden Belgium	Municipalities	618.000	No	Studying common approaches in the preservation of the architectural heritage and new methods for the valorisation of the cultural heritage; enhancing the spas as cultural centres.	Analytical study: book; photo reportage; quarterly cultural magazine; series of artistic events based on the theme of water and thermal culture; travelling exhibition; promotion; publication in 8 European languages.
CULT-RURAL Promotion of a Cultural Area Common to European Rural Communities	European rural heritage	Tangible And intangible	Sweden Bulgaria France Greece Greece Hungary Italy Poland	Academy, museums and municipality	762.402	No	Promoting cooperation and networking between ethnographic/rural heritage museums and other public or private organisations who share an active interest in preserving and enhancing the European rural heritage; encourage ethnographic/	Transnational workshops; comparative research; summer school.

49

							rural heritage museums to "open their doors" to transnational joint activities, especially joint exhibitions; highlight and document common and unique cultural heritage of European rural regions, from the pre-industrial era.	
MACHU Managing Cultural Heritage Underwater	**Underwater cultural heritage**	**Tangible**	<u>The Netherlands</u> **Belgium Germany Poland Portugal The Netherlands United Kingdom**	Archeological institute, museums, regional agency	886.503	**No**	To develop, implement and combine techniques to locate, monitor and protect underwater cultural heritage and making it accessible to the people.	**Spatial delineation of research areas and working strategy; building a GIS with applications for use by the research community, policy-makers and public; collecting data with desktop research; on-site sampling and measurements; developing sedimentation-erosion model; assessment of threats at site level & regional level; dissemination of information.**
MM 4 ALL Multimedia for all	**Cultural heritage in museums**	**Tangible**	<u>United Kingdom</u> **Czech Republic Italy Malta Poland**	Academy, cultural foundation, media center	291.898	**No**	**To expand 'Conveyor' multimedia-tool initiative / to engage young people with European cultural heritage / to promote cultural dialogue and highlight issues such as cultural diversity / to encourage cultural operators to embrace conveyor technology and make more multimedia titles about issues of importance to their museums and visitors.**	**Multimedia authoring tools; exhibitions.**
Live Arch	**European history**	**Intangible**	<u>The Netherlands</u> **Germany Hungary Italy Latvia Norway Sweden United Kingdom** **Germany Italy Norway Turkey The Netherlands (5)**	Cultural foundations, museums, universities	816.213	**Yes**	**To further pan-European interest in history by promoting and improving dissemination of history through living history, to encourage "people to people" dialogues between presenters an visitors, to enhance the quality of living history museums through an exchange of experience, best practice.**	**Network focusing on living history to disseminate historic knowledge. Planned activities: 4 training workshops, around 56 staff exchanges, joint exhibition, workshops and web.**

Landscapes of War	Historical sites of armed conflicts in the 20th century	Intangible	Italy France Greece Italy (3) Spain (2) United Kingdom	Italian region of **Calabria,** media company, Italian commune, universities, municipal cultural council, book conservation center	405.815	Yes	Making inventory of the manifestation of the heritage if 20th century conflicts in the EU; guarantee the rediscovery of traces of armed conflicts, examine the means of evaluation of the heritage of conflicts; increase the visibility of the landscapes of war and develop tools for local initiatives, confront war and violence	A study on the conservation of historical sites, landscapes of war; digital inventory
Specialising in traditional craftsmanship for preserving our European wooden heritage	Traditional craftsmanship and European wooden heritage	Intangible and Tangible	Norway Germany Lithuania Poland Slovakia	Academy, conservation and restoration agency, museum, vocational training center	102.544	No	To establish a network with a high level of competence in the field of traditional craftsmanship in relation to old wooden buildings, to recruit young craftsmen as well as experienced craftsmen who want to educate themselves in traditional craft skills, to help to secure our wooden European cultural heritage by practical implementation (restoration and work on historic wooden buildings).	New restoration guidelines putting strong emphasis on the use of traditional materials, craftsmanship and techniques; international network with exchange of experience and practical skills within the field of traditional craftsmanship. two meetings; five workshops research; analyses of building structures
TACE Theatre architecture in Central Europe	Theatre architecture	Tangible	Czech Republic Hungary Poland Slovakia Slovenia	Theatre Institutes, Museums	758.500	No	Presenting existing knowledge and information about the development of theatre architecture in central Europe. Partial development tendencies in individual regions will be put into context and wider European perspective. Increase knowledge about European cultural heritage; support of communication between specialists.	Database of theatre architecture, two architecture workshops, a specialist seminar, two publications, two exhibitions; multimedia CD/DVD, website.

AREA Archives of European Archaeology	**Archaeological sites**	**Tangible**	<u>**France**</u> **Germany Greece Italy Spain United Kingdom** **Czech Republic Germany Poland Portugal Romania Sweden**	**Research centers, museums, archaeology departments**	**900.000**	**Yes**	**Discovery and presentation of European archeological heritage; research and documentation. Issues such as the discovery and presentation of the European archaeological heritage, and the role it has played in the construction and consolidation of identities at regional, national and transnational levels, are of direct concern and interest for all European citizens.**	**To encompass and valorise the history and archives of archaeology: - Action B Research - Action C Documentation - Action E Travelling Exhibition - Action F several diffusion and promotion activities, information leaflets, illustrated catalogue of the exhibition, information technology for bibliographies, biographies, virtual exhibitions etc**
Frontiers of Roman Empire	**Archeological sites**	**Tangible**	<u>**United Kingdom**</u> **Austria Germany Hungary Poland** **Belgium Romania Slovakia (2) Spain The Netherlands**	**Research institutions, museums, municipalities**	**810.000**	**No**	**Database creation on archeological sites, guidelines on best practices in archeology, virtual reconstruction of archeological sites, educational projects targeted at the general public and young people.**	**Expert cooperation, exhibitions**
GAUDI Gouvernance Architecture Urbanisme: Democratie et Interactivite	**Architecture**	**Tangible**	<u>**Belgium**</u> **Finland France Spain United Kingdom (2)**	**Architectural foundations**	**900.000**	**No**	**To promote understanding of European architecture of today, promote cultural production and exchange in the field; to create permanent cooperative structures and tools.**	**Educational, exchange and co-production platform for major cultural products**
OPPIDA The earliest European towns north of the Alps	**Celtic culture**	**Tangible and Intangible**	<u>**France**</u> **Austria Czech Republic France Germany Hungary Luxemburg** **Austria Belgium Czech Republic France (11) Germany (3) Italy**	**Cultural foundations, media municipalities, museums, research institutes, universities**	**318.800**	**Yes**	**To consolidate and collate dispersed European research on proto-urban development north of the Alps; to create public awareness for European Iron Age civilisation; to export and exchange differing national good practise in cultural heritage conversation, interpretation and presentation.**	**The creation of a standardized database and of a trans-European communication network for site managers; exchange of good and innovative practises ; on-site cultural animation involving contemporary artists and promoting links with the regional community (these and other events are separately financed actions but offering high visibility to the project and opportunities for innovative mediation).**

52

			Luxemburg (2) Slovakia Spain (2) Switzerland United Kingdom					
People and Potteries	Pottery as a cross-national craft	Tangible and Intangible	Germany France Hungary Italy United Kingdom	Museums, design center	884.000	Yes	Present a shared cultural heritage;preserve traditions, document information and sources on pottery and potters' lifestyles; do it innovatively.	Educational projects at museums; research in the field, biographical database; exhibitions.
Research Art Nouveau Network	Art Nouveau style	Tangible	Belgium France Italy Norway Slovenia Spain United Kingdom Austria Belgium Cuba Finland (3) France Georgia Germany Latvia Italy Poland Spain (2) Switzerland	Municipalities, cultural foundations, museums, government bodies	827.000	Yes	Increase Europeans' awareness of cultural heritage; present Art Nouveau to broader audience make it a modern day-relevance issue.	Digitizing, innovative methods of interpretation presenting as socially and economically beneficial.
Translate	Art and cultural translation	Intangible	Austria Austria Estonia, Germany Spain The Netherlands Austria (3) France Hungary Latvia Lithuania Poland	Art museums and galleries, cultural foundations, research institutes	900.000	No	To network and develop exemplary contemporary museum practices in the field of cultural translation; Research the connection between cultural heritage and cultural translation (professional networking)	To improve cultural translation through research, workshops, symposiums; working with exhibition space in museums, improving accessibility of art, networking and mobility projects for art historians and other professionals

53

ACCU Access to Cultural Heritage	Cultural heritage sites – issues of social and cultural accessibility	Tangible	<u>Finland</u> Germany Greece Norway United Kingdom Finland (3) Norway (2) Romania United Kingdom	Museums and galleries, sub-federal bureau, national board of education, cultural foundation	424,102	No	To promote cooperation between cultural heritage management operators, find new tools to increase accessibility of cultural heritage; To produce action plans, research on factors influencing accessibility, use a European network to spread information about access-related issues.	Website, conferences, DVD, traveling exhibition of pilot actions. Stresses professional cooperation and networking.
AlpiNet Alpine Network for Archeological Sciences	History of the Alps	Intangible	<u>Italy</u> Austria Austria France Germany Italy Italy Slovenia Switzerland France (2) Italy (3) Switzerland	Universities and institutes	588,116	No	To increase and disseminate the quality and quantity of knowledge of the history of the Alps.	Organization of archaeological summer schools and a webmuseum; comparing different dissemination, research and training techniques.
CROSSINGS Movements of peoples and movement of cultures - Changes in the Mediterranean from ancient to modern times	Movements of peoples and movements of cultures in the Mediterranean region	Intangible	<u>Cyprus</u> France Greece Italy Malta	Historical foundations, superintendence of cultural heritage, research center at university	896,773	Yes	Establishment, promotion and maintenance of cultural dialogue and the advancement of mutual knowledge and understanding of the cultural diversity and common heritage of Mediterranean peoples.	Exhibitions, research.
European Landscapes: Past, Present and Future	European archaeological landscapes	Tangible	<u>United Kingdom</u> Belgium Germany (2) Hungary Italy (2) Austria Bulgaria Czech Republic Estonia Finland Germany Italy	Museums, universities, governmental agencies for cultural heritage	883,055	No	To promote widespread use of non-destructive methods of archaeological investigation; Increase public and official awareness of the importance of cultural heritage within European archaeological landscapes; conserve these landscapes; Enhance professional networks across Europe for the exchange of skills and information.	Creation of a small European Center of aerial survey and conservation; web sites, TV and radio programs, education packs and traveling exhibitions.

CEU eTD Collection

54

			Latvia United Kingdom					
GOTHICmed – A Virtual Museum of Mediterranean Gothic Architecture	Gothic art and architectural landscape in the Mediterranean	Tangible	<u>Spain</u> Greece Italy Portugal Slovenia Spain Greece Italy (2) Portugal	Cultural secretariat in an autonomy, other governmental bodies, institutes Cervantes, a private enterprise	567,304	No	Creation of a Translational Co-operation Network of Mediterranean gothic architecture.	Traveling exhibition and a conference.
History After the Fall: The Indeterminacy of the Short Twentieth Century	European history (especially that of Central Europe)	Intangible	<u>Hungary (CEU)</u> Czech Republic Germany Poland Romania Romania Germany Hungary (2)	Universities and other research institutions, city council	221,900	Yes	Involve students in the reexamination of the role of Central European political elite at the turning points of recent European history; Work on politically sensitive issues without conflict.	Collection, research, and analytical program.
TRIMED La cultura dek pan, el aceite y el vino	Cultural heritage of the Mediterranean region	Tangible	<u>Spain</u> Cyprus Italy Greece France Malta	Municipalities and governmental agencies	886,685	No	To save, interpret and promote the cultural heritage of the Mediterranean Trio on six islands in the Mediterranean by investigating, restoring, promoting and co-operating on activities.	Conduct interviews; text and graphic database, selection of cultural landscapes and restoration, manuals of good practice, exhibitions, production of explanatory and promotional materials, design of didactic tourist itineraries.
La place, un patrimoine européen	European city squares	Tangible	<u>Greece</u> France Italy Poland Spain	University and research institutions, municipalities (Italian communes)	697,500	Yes	To examine, interpret and evaluate the importance and quality of the heritage represented by the squares within European cities, to define different set of problems, to establish a critical overview of the current conditions, to develop a co-operative network, to raise public awareness.	Research and comparative study on European city squares; white paper; charter of European city squares, a traveling exhibition, international colloquium, reference work, multilingual website and illustrated information brochure.
OASIS-Open Archiving System with Internet Sharing	Electronic Arts	Intangible	<u>Germany</u> Czech Republic Germany France	Design academy, art centers, universities, cultural centers,	713,315	No	To establish a complex (preservation, enhanced presentation) system in order to ensure the sustainable availability of	Technological solutions.

			Poland The Netherlands	art museums, media achive			European cultural heritage in the field of electronic arts.	
			Czech Rep. (3) Hungary France (2) Poland The Netherlands					
Our Common European Cultural Landscape Heritage	Landscape heritage	Tangible	Norway Austria Ireland Italy Portugal Spain Sweden	Universities, media company	747,677	No	Transnational dissemination and documentation of common European cultural landscape heritage	Cooperation between scientists, cultural operators and promoters as a network of partners; TV documents; web-site;
Patrimoine, Mémoire, Population locale	Monuments	Tangible	France Belgium Germany France Spain Hungary Poland Belgium France (3) Germany (2) Poland (2) Spain (3)	Municipalities, cultural foundations, museums, government bodies , sub-federal regions	389,110	No	Study the relation between monuments, territories and local populations; Promote the links between local populations and monuments; promote better knowledge of the historical past of local communities as represented in the monuments	Exchange of professional know-how and good practices; creation of a documentation network; multimedia exposition; professional mobility (site visits)
PHAROS	Masonry Lighthouses	Tangble	Greece Cyprus Norway Spain United Kingdom	Municipalities, Universities	718,650	No	Preservation, Restoration and Integration in the life of the modern societies of Old European Masonry Lighthouses	Research; website; Report; laboratory work; CD-ROM
SHPAENA Safeguarding the Historical Photographic Archives of European News Agencies	photographic archives in European news agencies	Tangible	Italy Belgium Hungary Poland Portugal Italy (2)	Municipalities	874,573	No	Safeguard and highlight the existence of photographic archives in five European news agencies	Inventory; catalogue; digitalization; Filing; Exhibition; website
T.ARC.H.N.A. Towards ARChaeological Heritage New	Etruscan culture	Intangible	Italy Denmark France	Museums, Universities	584,200	Yes	Linking the past to the future by facilitating access to Etruscan culture through the creation of the database and	Database;

Accessibility			Germany Greece Ireland (2) Poland Denmark France (2) Italy (3)				the virtual museum; the creation of a model of a new type of professional team, to improve the mobility and specialisation of scholars and students and to promote cultural knowledge of different European cultures through cultural dialogue	
The Romany/Gypsy Presence in the European Music	**Gypsy-inspired music and music pertaining to the Sinti and Romanis'/Gypsies in Europe**	Intangible	<u>Spain</u> Belgium Romania Bulgaria France (2) Germany Hungary (2) Italy Portugal Spain (5) Sweden	Associations, Cultural Foundations, Research institutions, Political organization, Library	522,000	No	Recovery, inventory cataloguing, conservation, coding, archiving, evaluation and dissemination of Gypsy-inspired music and music pertaining to the Sinti and Romanis'/Gypsies in Europe	Research; Musicology; documentation
Training for audiovisual preservation in Europe, TAPE	**preservation of the audiovisual heritage**	Intangible	<u>The Netherlands</u> Austria Finland Italy Poland	University, Private and public agencies, archives	468,977	No	Contribute to actions plans for preservation of the audiovisual heritage; reduce the gap between the cultural sector on the one hand and R&D in technology solutions on the other	laying the ground work for a programme for awareness-raising and training of non specialists
Transformation	**Shared European cultural sphere and regional characteristics**	Intangible	<u>Germany</u> Austria Czech Republic Hungary Slovakia United Kingdom The Netherlands Bulgaria France Hungary Poland Romania Serbia & Montenegro Spain	Museums, Universities	817,340	Yes	Designed to show in detail how one cultural sphere from the Atlantic Ocean to the Black Sea came into being for the first time in European history; The project shall propose that integration does not automatically eradicate regional characteristics	development of a multi-lingual database; supported by explanatory texts and illustrations and a touring exhibition presented in the national language of each member of the project; aims to appeal to as broad an audience as possible through the Internet and an understandable presentation of the database and exhibition

Patrimoine industriel entre terre et mer: pour un réseau européen d'écomusees	Industrial heritage	Tangible	France Greece Italy Romania	Cultural Organizations, Ministries	896.428	No	To work out and test models and methods of conservation and enhancement; emphasize the transnational dimension of industrial heritage; compare different geographical and cultural realities of different countries; provide the opportunity for an exchange of experiences; provide training to professionals.	Constitution and development of a cooperation network for the preservation, enhancement and dissemination of industrial heritage "between land and sea" (e.g. ports, coastal areas). Means of dissemination include publications, website, CD-Rom, itinerant exhibition, organisation of seminars and training.
SteamRail.Net - 2003	Railways	Tangible	Greece France Spain The Netherlands United Kingdom	Universities, Midland Railway Trust Ltd	897.000	No	Exchange of information and experience on restoration and promotion of heritage railways.	Network of steam railway museums. Restoration and conservation of trains and other parts of the railway heritage. Coproduction of touring exhibitions on the restoration and preservation results and methods in Greece, UK and Spain. Production of multilingual books, audiovisual and multimedia products for the general public.

Foreigners in the early Medieval Migration – Integration - Acculturation	European history	Intangible	Germany Denmark (2) France (2) Greece (2) Hungary United Kingdom Slovakia Spain (2) Sweden (2) The Netherlands Hungary Slovakia	Archaeological institutes museums, national foundations Universities.	822.071	Yes	This project aims to explore this period that was important in the formation of Europe, as we know it. Collecting archaeological data from across Europe concerning this period of history and make it available to the public and researchers; to link the past with the present by showing how the past has formed the present, highlighting common cultural heritage and learning lessons.	The archaeological sources as well as the interpretation shall be registered in a database on the internet.
Ubi erat Lupa	Roman heritage	Tangible	Austria Germany Greece Hungary Italy Slovenia Slovakia	Archaeological research institution, research foundations, museums, Universities	538,050	No	To interlink archaeological research on the Roman era systematically and transnationally and to; to exchange expert knowledge compare primary sources on a broad scale and gain new insights into the history and	Archaeologists and IT experts from many European countries will create an innovative internet platform which will improve access to the cultural heritage of the Roman era.

			Spain (3)					the cultural heritage of the Roman era; to save the information from the Roman stones in the form of digital memory and to preserve it according to a uniform standard to be improved by the project; to intensify the co-operation; to make sources available to the public.	

Archives of European Archaeology	Archaeological archives	Tangible	France Greece Ireland Spain Sweden Belgium Germany Spain Poland United Kingdom (2)	Cultural institutions, Ministry of Culture, universities	900,000	No		To undertake and to encourage he protection and promotion of archaeological archives ; to document and to research these archives as essential sources for European history ; to demonstrate the significance of the history of archaeology ; to consolidate an institutional network.	AREA started out as a Heritage Laboratory on the archives of European archaeology in 1999 and then in AREA phase II financed last year by Culture 2000 they designed the database with over 3000 entries. This proposal represents the third stage of AREA in which special emphasis will be placed on stimulating archives-based research on the history of archaeology. The project will also expand the already existing database and launch a survey of archives at risk. It proposes an international conference, and publication of leaflets, CD-ROM.
ARENA	Archaeological archives	Tangible	United Kingdom Denmark Iceland Norway Poland Romania United Kingdom (2) United Kingdom (2)	Cultural institutes, museums, universities, regional authorities	598,730	No		To allow the partners to develop and share expertise in the protection and promotion of digital archives ; to develop archival file format and metadata standards and communications protocols ; to develop a system of interoperable map-based searching which will allow users to cross-search the archives of several partners.	To develop a framework to protect and promote digital cultural archives of European significance.; a programme of European seminars and workshops on the preservation of digital data, guidelines and protocols; each co-organiser will make a number of key archaeological archives and data available to the profession and the general public; map-based searches and web-delivered clickable maps; projects to raise public awareness and disseminate knowledge.
Art Nouveau in Progress	Art nouveau	Tangible	Belgium Austria Belgium	Centre for architecture, Province, Museum,	788,037	No		The network is intended to promote the study and conservation of European "Art Nouveau" heritage, as	Establishment and maintenance of Art Nouveau Network, which will involve general pubic in its activities, while at the same time

59

			Finland France (2) Hungary Italy Norway Spain (3) The Netherlands United Kingdom	municipal agency			well as its promotion and dissemination, by laying the basis for active cooperation and the exchange of experience between the various European actors concerned. It is also intended to arise the interest of the public at large and of the respective authorities in this heritage.	taking a rigorously scientific approach. Activities: exhibition, research, publications (website + catalogue for exhibition + publication for children), education, training, 3 meetings of the members of the network.
Baltic Region - Conflicts and Co-operation. Road from the Past to the Future	**History of the Baltic region**	**Intangible**	<u>Estonia</u> **Estonia Finland Latvia Lithuania Sweden**	**Universities, Publishing company**	576,666	**Yes**	**Improving the participant and neighbouring nations' understanding of their common past; providing a basis for finding better opportunities to advance cultural integration will develop a cross-cultural dialogue and stimulate the study of the history and culture of European nations will make the information available in Russian Institutions of higher learning where the history of the Baltic region is poorly presented.**	**The goal of this project is to produce an encyclopaedic reference work entitled "the Guide to Baltic Sea States' Affairs", a multi-lingual, comparative, historical cultural overview of the history of the Baltic region. International conferences will be developed for presentations on the agreed themes. They hope to share scientists' analyses and explanations of the differences in the outlook of history, culture and environment found in this region of Europe. The gathered research will be disseminated through written form and on CD ROM.**
Born in Europe	**European society, history, and culture**	**Intangible**	<u>Germany</u> **Austria Denmark (2) Germany (2) Poland Portugal Sweden**	**Museums**	216,525	**Yes**	**To provoke reflection and discussion of these questions among a wide public; promote further scientific research on the above subjects.**	**Project deals with the subject of birth in the practical and in the metaphorical sense; the various activities of the project (exhibitions, scientific research and debate, involvement of the public) are focussed on subjects such as cultural self-definition, cultural identity, European citizenship, the role of women in today's society, family structures, reproductive behaviour and immigration; historical and Europe-wide analysis of these subjects.**
Ceramics – Culture - Innovation	**Ceramics**	**Tangible**	<u>Germany</u> **France Hungary (2) Italy Portugal United Kingdom (3)**	**Museums**	816,700	**No**	**To accentuate cultural heritage ; to promote knowledge on ceramics among the public and among experts ; to give impulses to research and creation.**	**Research on the European dimension of the cultural development of ceramics. Documentation of the findings and wide publication by means of different media. Platform for research and scientific work. Exhibition, multilingual publication. Creation of a virtual museum tour.**

Project	Heritage	Type	Countries	Partners	Budget	Co-financed	Objectives	Activities
ACRINET European Acritic Heritage Network	**Acritic heritage**	**Tangible and intangible**	<u>**Greece**</u> **Bulgaria France Greece (3) Italy Spain**	**Universities, ministry of Culture, municipalities**	756,398	**Yes**	**Highlight a European heritage that is based on co-operation between people with different religions, cultures and backgrounds.**	**Creation of a database of artists and designers. Creation of a database of terminology in 6 languages. Concluding symposium. To collect materials from archives and from popular culture in the form of manuscripts, publications, film etc. "virtual museum", documentation centre, exhibitions workshops, 2 international conferences, and 5 popular art performances.**
GAUDI Governance, architecture et urbanisme, democratie et interaction	**Architecture**	**Tangible and intangible**	<u>**France**</u> **Austria Belgium Denmark Germany Finland France Spain (2) The Netherlands (2) United Kingdom** **United Kingdom**	**Institutes for Architecture, cultural institutions, Museums, cultural foundations**	891,791	**Yes**	**- to promote the development of European architectural culture**	**Three phases : 1. research, developing archives of architecture and urbanism, workshops for young professionals ; a data base of public spaces ; 2. education and public dissemination activities, citizen participation in projects, preparing for a European Day of Architecture, 3. strengthening the network of European organizations; creating and developing a common website.**
Monitoring, Safeguarding and Visualising North-European Shipwreck Sites: Common European Underwater Cultural Heritage – Challenges for Cultural Resource Management	**Shipwreck sites**	**Tangible**	<u>**Finland**</u> **Denmark Germany Sweden United Kingdom The Netherlands**	**Archaeological institute, municipality, museums, university**	690,682	**No**	**Pilot the development of a methodology and monitoring protocols that will set a European standard for historic wreck sites ; to improve the understanding of the significance of the individual environmental variables and risk-assessment of wreck sites ; illustration of the European underwater cultural heritage ; development of good practices and management systems and promotion of knowledge and respect for underwater cultural heritage.**	*Management systems and development of good practices and visualisation (methods for the collection and processing of data and the production of different types of images, drawings or models of the shipwreck sites). Images and drawings will be used in the dissemination of the project information in the seminars, meetings, local exhibitions, folders, posters, publications and on the internet site.*
Patrimony and History	**15 European patrimonies**	**Tangible**	<u>**France**</u> **United Kingdom**	**Etablissement Public du Musee et du Domaine National de Versailles,**	459,142	**No**	**To show both the differences and similarities between 15 European patrimonies and countries in order to make people discover their common history.**	*Virtual access to the sites.*

61

				Brussels **International – Tourism and Convention, Historical Royal Palaces, Rosenborg Castle Copenhagen, Schloß Schoenbrunn**				
Quelles réutilisations pour l'architecture historique aujourd'hui	**Architecture**	**Tangible**	<u>Finland</u> **Belgium Finland France (3) Germany Italy (3) Poland Portugal**	**Municipal authorities, cultural institutes, museums, contemporary photography centres**	201,000	**No**	**To share experiences and good practices, conduct experimental work aimed at finding new uses for memorial sites for the purposes of education and social insertion; cooperate on projects aimed at the management of public spaces such as parks an of natural spaces such as landscapes related to the memorial sites.**	**Sharing and diffusion of good practices, promoting research and contemporary creativity related to finding new uses for memorial sites ; creating the basis for future cooperation.**
Rinascimento Virtuale - Digitale Palimpsestforschung	**Palimpsest manuscripts**	**Tangible and intangible**	<u>Germany</u> **Austria Italy Finland Greece Spain Netherlands**	**Libraries, Universities, Research Foundations**	846,220	**Yes**	**To preserve this cultural heritage for future generations and make the public aware of its relevance ; to set a model course for lasting future developments.**	**Rediscovery of written records of a hidden European cultural heritage. Using a combination of established methods of textual research and highly innovative digital imaging and elaboration technology. More than 30 partners are involved in bringing to light again the European heritage hidden in palimpsest manuscripts. Scientific documentation of the findings. Academic and practical training of a new generation of researchers and specialists. New and conventional media, exhibitions and conferences will be used to convey the results of the work to users of libraries and archives and the interested public at large.**

Project	Theme	Type	Countries	Partners	Amount		Purpose	Description
'diARTgnosis' Study of European religious paintings	European religious paintings	Tangible	<u>Greece</u> Germany Greece Italy Spain United Kingdom	Institutes, academy, universities	518,782	No	The purpose of the project is a comparative study of the development of European religious paintings.	To provide an inclusive overview of the contemporary state of affairs in terms of research, documentation and conservation. It will cover the historical study of religious paintings as well as physico-chemical analysis and other conservation and restoration approaches and methods.
D'un finistère à l'autre, entre terre et mer, sur les chemins de l'Europe Celtique	Celtic culture		<u>France</u> Spain (2) United Kingdom (2) France (5)	cultural organizations, county/ borough councils	68,602	No	This project is aimed at establishing and strengthening cultural links between Brittany and other Celtic areas in Europe	Pilgrimage will be made to Tro-Breiz in order to reach for international status and to bring tourists into the region. A walk in Wales in August 2001 will be organised; cooperation and exchange with Galicia in Spain (St Jacques de Compostelle).
Euroclio	European history	Intangible	<u>France</u> Austria Belgium Denmark Finland Germany Greece Ireland Italy Luxemburg Portugal Spain Sweden United Kingdom The Netherlands	Museums	852,387	Yes	--	Three activities visible via the Internet form this project: a colloquium "See the other", "Your history and our history" and a European manifest on tolerance "Everybody is a stranger somewhere
Kultur, Mobilität, Migration und Siedlung von Juden im mittelalterlichen Europa	Jewish culture	Intangible	<u>Germany</u> France Italy Spain United Kingdom	Historical institutes, universities, research institutions	299,730	Yes	The integration of various historical traditions that have hitherto been restricted by national boundaries	It funds a summer school for students and provides research fellowships, thus fostering basic novel historical research. Regular meetings and an international conference are intended to be organised to foster exchange of practice amongst professionals and students of history.
Les Universites et l'identite culturelle europeenne	European identity	Intangible	<u>Belgium</u> France Germany Italy Spain	Universities	614,450	Yes	Building a European identity	Research ; activities centered on the following themes : "Attitudes towards nature in Europe », « Urban structures and European identity », « Imagined Europe », "Culture and living environment in Mediterranean

Mediterrania	Maritime heritage	Tangible	Spain France (2) Greece Italy United Kingdom	Museums, municipalities, UNESCO	761,279	No	Preservation of Maritime Heritage	The project focuses on the constitution of a network of international and permanent co-operation in the Mediterranean area in the field of Maritime Heritage Preservation.
Migration, Work and Identity: A History of European People in Museums			Denmark Austria Germany (2) Sweden United Kingdom	Museums	898,971	Yes	To contribute to the European debate on cultural diversity with the expectation that greater knowledge of the different migrant communities within the European community will improve understanding and tolerance.	Research, exhibitions and an educational workshop. Develop a European perspective on the theme of migration and identity. The collaborative work of the project will be disseminated by means of travelling exhibitions, education programmes for children and adults, a web site, publications and seminars.
Plants in European Masterpieces	European flora in art	Tangible and intangible	Portugal Italy Spain The Netherlands United Kingdom	Cultural foundations, botanical gardens	311,400	Yes	To promote the study of plants in European Masterpieces.	A set of around 200 plants will be selected from the rich collection of plant representation in sculpture, painting, tapestry, tiles and illustrations that the Jeronimos Monastery of Lisbon can offer. Besides, the expertise of the Jeronimos Monastery itself, three botanical institutions (Leiden, Ajuda and Kew) will contribute their know-how for the identification, history and propagation of these plants. The final results will be presented to a wide audience and to visitors by 2002 in form of a multimedia publications (CD-ROM and print), which focusses on botany, history and the artistic expression of plants.
Sauvegarde et mise en valeur de sites européens de travail ouvrier du début du XXe siècle en France, Espagne et Allemagne	Early XXth century workers' buildings.	Tangible	France France (3) Germany Spain (3)	Cultural institutions, a school of fine arts, a habitat forum	147,997	No	The aim is to restore early XXth century workers' buildings	Each city will write a report on the site and its history and new structures and solutions will be devised. The results of the research will be shared at a seminar and will be published (DT, internet and video). The final stage of the project will be an exhibition for the general public to raise awareness of European heritage.
Safeguarding	Photography	Tangible	The Netherlands	Libraries,	715,963	No	To safeguard photographic	Training courses, make information

64

European Photographic Images			Denmark Finland Spain Sweden United Kingdom The Netherlands	museums, public record office, a photo restoration centre.			heritage	available, in print as well as electronically and organize exhibitions, virtual as well as real and related events for the general public. The training events will contribute to the expertise on conservation of originals photographs and on the application of new technology for access to digital copies. The exhibitions will bring the public in several European countries in direct contact with their own photographic heritage, and will provide a European-wide context in which the documentary and/or artistic value of the photographic collections can be appreciated.
Vektor	Contemporary art	Tangible	Austria France Germany (2) Italy United Kingdom	Archival institutions, museum, university	817,693	no	Uses materials of contemporary art in order to develop a scientific and technological foundation.	Aimed at cultural institutes it will develop digitilisation techniques in the context of a new form of diffusion in Europe. Thematic period are the years 60 – 70.
Wooden handwork/Wooden Carpentry: European restoration sites	Wooden heritage	Tangible and intangible	Italy Belgium Finland (4) France Greece Norway Portugal Sweden (2)	County Administration, Universities, Laboratory, technical research institute	355,604	No	Comparison of traditional woodworking knowledge acquired from the different countries on the handworking	Material characterisation, diagnosis, recommendations and guidelines on conservation; practical approach with the realisation of workshops on ongoing working-sites where the theoretical experiences will be put in practice and compared with operational complexity.
Pathways to cultural landscapes	European cultural landscapes	Tangible	Germany Finland Ireland Italy Sweden United Kingdom (2)	state heritage management, scientific institutes, academies, universities, museums and associations concerned with archaeology and heritage management	858.427	No	Deals with the study, sustainable management and communication of cultural landscapes as part of the cultural diversity of Europe and taking in account their vulnerability and need of protection and management as stated in the draft European Landscape Convention and the European Spatial Planning Development.	GIS, Internet research and Cooperation between different European countries. 12 sample landscapes have been selected, representing different cultural landscapes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London, New York: Verso, 1983.

Ashworth, Greg, and Peter Larkham. Preface to *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe ,*edited by Greg Ashworth and Peter Larkham. London and New York: Routledge 1994.

_____. "A Heritage for Europe: The need, the task, the contribution." In *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe,* edited by Greg Ashworth and Peter Larkham, 1-12. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Ashworth, Greg. "From history to heritage - from heritage to identity." In *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe ,* edited by Greg Ashworth and Peter Larkham, 13-30. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Barnett, Michael, and Martha Finnemore. Rules for the World. International Organizations in Global Politics. London: Ithaca, 2004.

Baykal, Sanem. "Unity in Diversity? The Challenge of Diversity for the European Political Identity, Legitimacy and Democratic Governance: Turkey's EU Membership as the Ultimate Test Case." *Jean Monnet Working Paper* 9 (2005): 1-78.

Blokker, Paul."The Post-enlargement European Order: Europe 'United in Diversity'?."*European Diversity and Autonomy Papers EDAP* 1 (2006): 1-32.

Bruter, Michael. "Winning the Hearts and Minds for Europe: The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity." *Comparative Political Studies* 36, no.10 (2003): 1148-1179.

Christiansen, Thomas. "Tensions of European governance: politicized bureaucracy and multiple accountability in the European Commission."*Journal of European Public Policy* 4 (1997): 73-90.

Cosgrove, Denis. "Heritage and History: A Venetian Geography Lesson." In *Rethinking Heritage:Cultures and Politics in Europe,* edited by Robert Shannan Peckham, 113-123. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003.

Cram, Laura. *Policy-making in the EU: Conceptual Lenses and the integration process.* London and New York: Routledge , 1997.

Craufurd Smith, Rachael. "From heritage conservation to European Identity: Article 151 EC and the multi-faceted nature of Community cultural policy." *European Law Review* 32, no.1 (2007): 48-69.

Dehousse, Renaud. "Delegation of powers in the European Union. The need for a multi-principals model." Centre d'études européennes de Sciences Politiques, Draft (2006): 1-10. www.arena.uio.no/events/LondonPapers06/DEHOUSSE.pdf.

De Vries, Gijs "Citizenship and Memory." In *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* edited by Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz, 24-25. Berlin: Maecenata, 2004.

EFAH. Study on Cultural Cooperation in Europe – Interarts and EFAH – June 2003. www.efah.org/pdfcount.php?fln=gov_part1_context.pdf.

European Commission Communication, "Making Citizenship Work: Fostering European Culture and Diversity through Programmes for Youth Culture, Audiovisual, and Civic Participation," COM (2004).

European Commission, "Culture 2000: Structured and Multiannual Cooperation Agreements (Action 2)."

European Commission, Conditional Call for Proposals (DG EAC/55/06) for the Organisation and Implementation of an Annual European Union Prize Scheme in the Field of Cultural Heritage.

European Commission, Conditional Call for Proposals EACEA No. 09/2006: Support for Cultural Actions (Multi-Annual Cooperation Projects).

Hall, Stuart. "Who needs 'Identity'?." In Identity: a reader, edited by Paul Du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman, 15-30. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2000.

Herrmann, Richard and Marilynn B. Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU." In *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU,* edited by Richard K. Herrmann, Thomas Risse, and Marilynn B. Brewer, 15-16. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Jones, Siân. "Discourses of Identity in the Interpretation of the Past." In *Cultural Identity and Archeology: The Construction of European Communities,* edited by Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones and Clive Gamble, 62-80. London: Routledge, 1996.

Kassim, Hussein and Anand Menon, "The Principal-Agent Approach and The Study Of The European Union: A Provisional Assessment." *The European Research Institute,* Working Paper (2002): 1-20.

Koboldt, Christian. "Optimizing the Use of Cultural Heritage", in *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage,* ed. Michael Hutter and Ilde Rizzo (London: MacMillan Press, 1997), 52.

Lowenthal, David. "'European Identity': An Emerging Concept." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 46, no.3 (2000): 314-321.

Mayntz, Renate. 1999. "Organizations, Agents and Representatives". In *Organizing PoliticalInstitutions. Essays for Johan P. Olsen*, ed. Morten Egeberg and Per Lægreid. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press. 81-91

Miller, Toby and George Yúdice. *Cultural Policy*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2002.

Newby, Peter. "Tourism: Support or Threat to Heritage?." In *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe ,*edited by Greg Ashworth and Peter Larkham, 206-228. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
Obuljen, Nina. Why we need European cultural policies: the impact of EU enlargement on cultural policies in transition countries. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation, 2005.

Peckham, Robert Shannan. "The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture." In *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* edited by Robert Shannan Peckham, 1-13.London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003.

_____. "Mourning Heritage: Memory, Trauma and Restitution." In *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* edited by Robert Shannan Peckham, 205-215. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003.

Pirkovič, Jelka. "New Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Cultural Heritage, or How to Give Value to the Common European Heritage?." In *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* edited by Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz, 108-115. Berlin: Maecenata, 2004.
Pollack, Mark. "The engines of European integration: delegation, agency and agenda-setting in the European Community." *International organization*, 51 no.1 (2003): 99-134.

Preston, Peter. "Reading the Ongoing Changes: European Identity." *The Political Quarterly* (2005): 497-504.

Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, Sneška. "Enlargement-Enrichment: A Plea for a Europe-wide Mobilisation in Favour of Cultural Heritage." In *Heritage and the Building of Europe,* edited by Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović and Rupert Graf Strachwitz, 96-107. Berlin: Maecenata, 2004.

Risse, Thomas. "A European Identity? Europeanization and the Evolution of Nation-State Identities." In *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, edited by M. Green Cowles, J. Caporaso, and T. Risse,198-215. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

_____ , "European Identities and the Heritage of European Cultures," in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* edited by Robert Shannan Peckham, 74-89. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003.

_____ . "Social Constructivism and European Integration." In *European Integration Theory*, edited by Thomas Diez and Antje Wiener, 159-176. Oxford und New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Spiering, Menno. "National Identity and European Unity." In C*ulture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*, edited by Michael Wintle, 98-132. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1996.

Ross, Mark Howard, "Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis," in *Culture and Politics: A Reader*, edited by Lane Crothers and Charles Lockhart, 39. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Shore, Cris, and Annabel Black. "The European Communities: And the Construction of Europe." *Anthropology Today* 8, no. 3 (1992):10-11.

Shore, Cris. Building *Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration.* London, New York: Routledge, 2000.

_____. *Elite Cultures.* London and New York: Routledge 2002.

_____. "Imagining the New Europe: identity and heritage in European Community discourse." In *Cultural Identity and Archeology: The Construction of European Communities,* edited by Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones, and Clive Gamble, 96-115. London: Routledge, 1996.

_____. "Inventing the 'People's Europe: Critical Approaches to European Community 'Cultural Policy'." *Man* 28, no. 4 (1993): 779-800.

_____. "The Cultural Policies of the European Union and Cultural Diversity." In *Differing Diversities: Transversal Study on the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*, edited by Tony Bennet, 107-122. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2001.

Stephanides, Stephanos. "The Translation of Heritage: Multiculturalism in the 'New' Europe", in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe,* edited by Robert Shannan Peckham, 45-60. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2003.

Tempelmann, Sasja. "Constructions of Cultural Identity: Multiculturalism and Exclusion." *Political Studies* XLVII (1999): 17-31.

Topan, Angelina. "The resignation of the Santer-Commission: the impact of 'trust' and 'reputation'." 1-14 EI*oP* 6, no.14 (2002): 1-14.

Trondal, Jarle. "An Institutional Perspective on Representation. Ambiguous representation in the European Commission." EI*oP* 10, no.4 (2006): 1-18.

_____. "Governing at the Frontier of the European Commission. The case of seconded national experts." *West European Politics* 29, no.1 (2006): 147-160.

Smith, Anthony D., and Ernest Gellner. "The Warwick Debates." http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/gellner/Warwick.html.

Smith, Anthony D. Nationalism and Modernism: A critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism. London: Routledge, 1998.

_____ . "National Identity and the Idea of European Unity." *International Affairs* 68, no. 1 (1992): 55-76.

_____ . *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

_____ . *The Nation in History*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2000.

Spiering, Menno."National Identity and European Unity." In *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present,* edited by Michael Wintle, 98-132. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1996.

Tempelmann, Sasja."Constructions of Cultural Identity: Multiculturalism and Exclusion." *Political Studies* XLVII (1999): 17-39.

Throsby, David. "Seven Questions in the Economics of Cultural Heritage." In *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage,* edited by Michael Hutter and Ilde Rizzo, 13-30. London: MacMillan Press, 1997.

Van Gerven, Walter. *The European Union: A Polity of States and Peoples.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Wilmer, Franke."Identity, Culture, and Historicity." *World Affairs* 160, no.1 (1997): 3-16.

Wintle, Michael. "Culture and Identity in Europe: Shared Experience." In *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present,* edited by Michael Wintle, 9-32. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 1996.

Wood, Stephen."Building 'Europe': Culture, History and Politics." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 11, no.3 (1998): 397-416.