EU CULTURAL POLICY AND EUROPEAN IDENTITY: A WAY TO VIEW THEIR CORRELATION

M. Stoicheva

Maria Stoicheva, Sofia University St Kliment Ohridski, 15 Tzar Osvoboditel blvd, Sofia, 1504, Bulgaria. E-mail: maria.stoicheva@gmail.com. ORCID 0000-0002-3093-4715

Abstract. The paper considers the extent to which European cultural identity can be shaped through EU cultural policy. It follows the chronology of the EU cultural policy aiming to identify its capacity to build a cultural identity for the Europe of the EU. In the same line of reasoning it attempts to find what its evolution could tell us about European identity and the potential of identification with the EU. Three periods in the historical overview of the EU cultural policy are distinguished from the beginning of the process of European integration to the adoption of the first strategy for culture, which includes a new understanding of the role of culture in the framework of EU policies. Drawing on the assumption that the cultural dimension of European identity is 'bound' with national identity, the dynamics of the formation and outlining of the scope of the EU cultural policy draws the attention to the cultural aspect of the understanding of European identity. The process of shaping of the EU cultural policy in the family of EU policies is inseparable from the dynamics and the awareness of the necessity of application of political instruments for formation of 'cultural identity' of 'Europe of the EU', although the main outcomes of EU action in cultural matters are limited.

Keywords: European identity, cultural identity, cultural policy, EU cultural policy, European integration, EU competences

> Raise the question of Europe's cultural dimension and you also have to raise that of the European identity or, more reasonably, identities, without shrinking from shaking the kaleidoscope and bringing strong, often contradictory, pictures into view.
>
> Is it possible to reunite Europe without pondering on the European identity and without trying to identify what conception Europeans should have of themselves? Frankly, I do not think so, even if this undertaking turns out to be risky and difficult.
>
> Delors 1999
> Reuniting Europe: Our Historic Mission

In the spring of 2002, upon the initiative of the then President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, a group of Europeans with intellectual credentials, political experience and a stature transcending that of the political parties in their countries was set up to reflect on values that are particularly relevant to the continuing process of European unification. They remarked that the Union's expansion brought into the Union 'people who are often much poorer and culturally vastly different from the majority of the citizens in the older member states'[1]. Similarly, Shore (2006) points to a similar ambiguity in whether Europe is conceived as a unified or singular cultural entity in examining the interrelation between EU cultural policy and the governance of Europe.

---

[1] The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe, Reflection Group, Concluding Remarks. (2005) https://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/other_pubs/michalski_091104_report_annexes_en.pdf.

Yet there is something curiously contradictory in the way the concept of culture is conceived and deployed in EU official discourses, a confusion that is perhaps symptomatic of a more profound philosophical ambiguity over the status and definition of the Union and its people(s). (Shore 2006: 7)

In this contribution particular attention will be given to the extent to which a European cultural identity is shaped through EU cultural policy. Why was cultural policy actually introduced? How has it originally been conceived and how can its capacity to build a cultural identity for the Europe of the EU be assessed? How then should we make sense of the evolution of EU cultural policy? What can its evolution tell us about European identity and the potential of identification with the EU?

1. European Identity: a Review

There has been a considerable theoretical interest in speculating about the conceptualization of European identity, as well as empirical surveys exploiting various methodologies to identify existing patterns of identification with Europe and the EU in the past ten-fifteen years. There is also an increasing political borrowing of the term and a wide resorting to the concept of European identity as the 'soul of Europe' and to the values of democracy, rule of law and fundamental human rights. Conceptual and empirical arguments have one significant feature — they are framed by the correlation or/and opposition of European and national identity. They aim at providing an explanation of a possible combination between the two that is derived from the empirical research and complies with the theoretical constructs.

In this paper I argue that in its cultural dimension European identity is 'bound' with national identity, which creates specific limitations. National identity is interpreted as a specific interface between political and cultural identity in which cultural components (myths, customs, symbols, language, religion) have a prominent role. The cultural dimension explains the different intensities and power of collective identities. Identities are viewed as significant factors in making the political regime of the state legitimate (Lucarelli and Fioramonti 2010). Meaning is attached, created and understood along these lines. Smith (1991) and Anderson (1983) clearly acknowledge that cultural components are the critical elements in creating national identity that leads to the clear orientation of the community as not only political but ethical as well[2]. The identification with a community in this sense has a powerful influence in creating meanings about one's understanding of personal achievements in correlation to the values of the community. It gives sense to the concepts of 'good' and 'bad' in terms of individual and collective actions and serves as a point of reference for the moral choices that individuals make. The loss of what we can call a 'moral compass' not only has a corrosive effect on the community but also deprives the individual of making judgements about his or her own life. It is typically associated with feelings of being lost and alienated, which deeply harm and degrade the individual. The nation thus is a community of ethics[3] with specific values that have the power to constantly nurture a sense of belonging and a sense of duty to that community.

The discourse on European identity is rooted in the same line of reasoning. It attempts to find answers to questions such as: is my particular culture really important

---

[2] Briefly we can offer the explanation of a community of ethics as one that creates specific duties to our fellows in the community more than to other people.

[3] The term is borrowed from Habermas (1996).

and can't we all be members of the same culture? Can a political entity, such as the EU, function by maintaining diverse cultures rather than transcending difference and constructing a 'cultural' foundation for social cohesion and solidarity?

Habermas (2006) asks the question, 'Is the development of a European identity necessary, or is it possible?' The conceptual possibility is conceived in the necessary linking of collective identities and European identity. Risse (2010), focusing on ordinary citizens, provides arguments from a variety of disciplines and methodologies about the 'distribution of Europeanized identities across Europe'. Backing these conceptual assumptions, Bruter (2005) argues for the emergence of forms of 'mass' European identity. Fligstein (2009) asks the question 'who are the Europeans', thus famously providing a name for a new empirical survey on the affiliations and attitudes in Europe — 'New Europeans'[4]. Risse (2010) argues that the only relevant objection to the possibility of a European identity is the lack of a common European language and the reality of Europe and the EU as a 'multilingual' space. However, the European perspective of celebrating diversity is not in entire conformity with the situation at national level where there is not that much celebration, but rather a plea for uniformity even in EU countries known for their more relaxed policies and attitudes of recognition of diversity (Stoicheva 2014, 2016, 2017). If we would like to interpret the motto of the EU 'Unity in diversity', we should say that the unity of European culture is not so much seen in the past, rather it is projected into the future as the result of Europe acting as a singular entity. But from a theoretical and practitioner's perspective there is the radical critique of the European cultural identity as unity and stressing on alternative approaches to diversity.

2. EU Cultural policy: general considerations

We start with the question of whether cultural policy is among the policy areas in which the European Union should be 'bigger and more ambitious' or 'smaller and more modest' — an expression used by the current President of the EC in his opening statement to the European Parliament for his election in 2014 (Juncker 2014)[5]. Here we should mention that there is a sector of EU activity which includes culture and three related political domains — education, youth and citizenship. However, the analysis of Juncker's speech shows that the word culture does not have a separate mention through the speech, only in collocation such as cultural diversity and cultural traditions[6]. There are no specific references to intercultural communication, intercultural dialogue as a main instrument for European identity formation and cultural identity. This could be interpreted as an expression of the pragmatic approach undertaken in the policy decision making and policy implementation or as an understanding of political rhetoric effectiveness.

What is the domain of European cultural policy, if we acknowledge its existence? The flourishing of cultures of Member states (as an expression of regional and national cultural

---

[4] Eurobarometer 2010, 2012.

[5] Juncker, J.-C. (2014) A New Start for Europe: My Agenda for Jobs, Growth, Fairness and Democratic Change Political Guidelines for the next European Commission Opening Statement in the European Parliament Plenary Session https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/juncker-political-guidelines-speech_en.pdf

[6] Cultural aspects are mentions twice: 'I will not sacrifice Europe's safety, health, social and data protection standards or our cultural diversity on the altar of free trade' (p. 9) and 'I intend to make use of the prerogatives of the Commission to uphold, within our field of competence, our shared values and fundamental rights, while taking due account of the diversity of constitutional and cultural traditions of the 28 Member States' (p. 9).

diversity) has always been among the major tasks of the EU since the first integration treaties. It is related to the discourse of 'unity in diversity', which has gained itself the status of a motto and goal of the European unification. For a long time, this statement has been interpreted as putting forward the 'common heritage' and the acknowledgement of the contribution of all cultures to our (European) society. Another important aspect is the conviction, which has become a principle of the policy implementation in areas akin to culture, that the way to sustain and preserve cultural diversity is through constant exchange between cultures.

According to Delors (in the beginning of this paper) the question of Europe's cultural dimension inevitably raises the issue of European identity. However, applied to the reality of the European unification, it is more 'reasonable' to use the term in the plural — 'identities'. There is a scholarly debate on the possibility of national and correspondingly on European identity related to the conditions for their emergence and the extent to which political identity (national and European) evokes a feeling of belonging. The evolution of this debate according to Lucarelli (Lucarelli, Cerutti and Schmidt 2011: 200) can be conceived as an 'ideal continuum', with Anthony Smith's ethnosymbolic theory (1991) of national identity as a powerful expression of cultural identity and Juergen Habermas with the theory of patriotic constitutionalism (2001) located at its extreme points. Delanty (1995), Calhoun (2001), Lucarelli and Manners (2006) relate political identity with cultural similarities and its emergence in communities that are necessarily similar to national communities. Gilbert (2010) argues that cultural identities as a form of collective identities, shared by members of cultural groups, are to be treated separately 'since they are, in consequence, freighted with all the importance that culture is meant to have for people' (Gilbert 2010: 2).

The dynamics of the formation and outlining of the scope of the EU cultural policy draws the attention to the cultural aspect of the understanding of European identity. We should clearly acknowledge here the conception of culture and its role in the reproduction of society and ensuring the continuity of identity of the community and of its individual members. In this sense the examination of cultural policy can be considered as the starting point for reflection on overt and covert cultural aspects of the concept of European identity, used in political discourse and in the academic literature on European identity. Therefore, the question arises: whether the concept of culture plays the corresponding central role in conceptualizing European identity and how this is embedded in the political and historical perspective. Can we talk about Europeanisation of the cultural sector — referring by that to development of European policies and supranational governance of the sector?

This paper argues that the process of shaping of the EU cultural policy in the family of EU policies is inseparable from the dynamics and the awareness of the necessity of application of political instruments for formation of 'cultural identity' of 'Europe of the EU'. The steps towards realization, strategic positioning, and engagement with cultural policy or withdrawing from its more comprehensive application could find explanation in the dynamics of the understanding of the identity of the unification 'European Union'. Therefore, cultural policy is not only a direct consequence of the conception of the political elite of the determining features of the European unification as such but is also a marker of the changes in its identity.

2.1. EU cultural Policy? What type of policy?

In the context of the European integration the question is what kind of policy EU cultural policy is and whether we can at all talk about European cultural policy. There

is no doubt that a growing number of initiatives and activities fall within the scope of a field of action, which is studied and realized as European cultural policy. The term has its established place in academic context (Pongy 1997; Ellmeier & Rasky 1998; Esmein 1999; Pantel 1999; Shore 2000, 2006; Littoz-Monnet 2003, 2007; Senelle 1994). There is however, unclarity, ambiguity and even some contradictory aspects in the way the term 'policy' and in particular 'cultural policy' is used in the official discourse of the EU and in academic literature. As cultural policy cannot be situated among the 'classical' European policies in the context of the supranational political regime, the question is rephrased into 'what kind of policy is EU cultural policy?'. The reason for defining cultural activities as well as a series of other domains of political action (education, language policy, research, sport) as 'policies' is their feature of supplementing national policies. Even though sometimes they might compete with national policies, they *do not* replace them. The European integration researchers propose different models of conceptual-ization of different groups of EU policies. Widely applied are the simplified models of Moravcsik (1998; 2001) and Richardson (1996), who distinguish between 'high' and 'low' policies reflecting the extent of integration in the policy domain, going beyond or not sufficiently going beyond domestic issues and with a view on their influence (weak or strong) on the processes of European integration. Wallace (2000; 2005) identifies five policy modes locating culture along with research and development, sport, languages and education under policy coordination. Policy making methods in these areas are pre-dominantly 'light forms of cooperation and coordination, which were initially introduced 'as a mechanism of transition from nationally rooted policy-making to a collective EU regime' (Wallace 2005: 349).

Cultural policy is not among the policies that form the basis of the EU. Since it is outside economic issues, it is not referred to in the Treaties, along with other policy fields such as education, as an independent policy area at European level (Beukel 2001: 126). This means that the regulatory and problem-solving authorities of the Member States are 'high' in the area of culture (and education), while the authorities at European level are 'low'. Cultural policy is with a highest level of national significance, in which the com-petences of the EU and its actions and measures, undertaken at European level, have a rather low regulatory and binding force (Barnett 2001). From this perspective EU cultural policy seems the least Europeanized in its conceptualization and realization, located in the spectrum of 'low' politics or the least integrated political domains. Cultural policy is one of the last bastions of the nation state power and symbolically exemplifies the contemporary opposition between preservation of national culture and the impact of globalization. As such it naturally functions in a context wider than the European one and is a driver for a global reference point.

3. EU culture policy: brief historical overview

We can distinguish three periods in the historical overview of the EU cultural policy: 1) from the beginning of the process of European integration and the setting up of the European Communities to the Treaty establishing of the European Union in 1992, the so called Maastricht Treaty; 2) the process of taking shape of the EU cultural policy after including it in the sphere of supporting competences of the EU till the first Strategy for culture in 2007; and 3) the period after the Strategy covering the current period of the European programmes linked to implementation of a limited but visible cultural policy in the EU, including the new understanding of the role of culture in the EU external affairs.

Transnational cultural policy harmonization has never been among the political objectives of the EU. EU has faithfully stuck with the idea of Europe as being a well-defined mosaic of nations and cultural policies are left to member states themselves. EU has been careful to define in details its cultural motives and programmes. EU culture policy is worded as celebration of diversity of cultures. Culture has been since the beginning of the European Communities an area in which actions at European level have been avoided.

3.1. Culture as a case for exclusion provisions

Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman, as founder of the ideas of the European unification, are often quoted as having the idea that successful cooperation in some core areas would create a *spillover effect*[7]. European integration has been considered as a slow and gradual process of encompassing various key areas of European cooperation and integration. In this process integration in one sector or policy field would generate momentum for integration in others (Haas 1958; Lindberg 1963; Shore 2006). For example, economic integration would gradually lead to political integration, then social cohesion will be embraced as an area for integration and so on. Culture comes last in this series.

The Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community in 1957 and a wider common market covering a range of goods and services, contains only two references to 'culture': one related to 'non-discrimination' and a second reference to 'protection of national treasures possessing artistic historical or archeological value' (Article 36, Treaty establishing the EEC). Theiler (2005: 54) argues that this creates a provision for exclusion, related to culture, to which national governments can refer to, but it does not set a legal basis for community action. However, Community actions were not legally excluded as Article 235 allows 'the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the Assembly to take appropriate measures', 'if action by the Community should prove necessary to attain in the course of the operation of the common market'. It is only with the Maastricht Treaty — the Treaty establishing the European Union, that a legal basis is created for direct engagement with action in the cultural sector.

During the first two decades of the functioning of the European Communities there were no ambitious activities in the cultural domain and in the public relations area. The few activities were concentrated in a small information department, which served as a mediator with the press and journalists and published some brochures for distribution in schools and the general public (Theiler 2005: 55). The historical circumstances, however, inevitably draw the attention of the political elite beyond the common market and economic integration processes. At the end of the 60s this restraint from action in the area of culture and in the public image making of the Community was gradually overcome — first in the political rhetoric and after that by undertaking of concrete political initiatives.

Year 1968 was in many aspects the year that changed history — both in the West and in the East. It was a year of protests and revolutions in Europe, of seismic social and political change across the globe. Students protests in Paris, the Soviet (Warsaw Pact) invasion in Prague and a world shaken by racial protests, civil rights activism and marches — they all marked a year which still echoes in the political landscape of the whole world. It was also the year when it

---

[7] According to modern myth, it was Jean Monnet, who first remarked, when looking back on a lifetime's work dedicated to creating a united Europe, that «if we were to start all over again, we would start with culture.» In fact, Monnet never said anything of the kind, and none of the EU founding fathers had a vision of culture as a binding force for European unity. (Shore 2006: 8)

was remarked in the 1968 Official Declaration on the completion of the Customs Union that a step beyond the economic parameters of the integration should be made.

The issue of culture was becoming integrated in the public discourse on European integration in the 70s together with the discourse on European identity. It is considered that in this period a turn towards identity and culture in EU policy discourse occurred. The opening statement of the 1973 Document on European Identity highlight this feeling of necessity to start a new discourse:

The nine member states of the European Communities have decided that the time has come to draw up a document in the European identity. (Document on European Identity 1973)

This attitude mirrored similar expressions of the need to turn to culture and conceived from a different perspective the European unification. In 1972 J. Duhamel, the French Minister of Culture addressed European Ministers of Culture at the European conference[8], setting a new format of dialogue bringing them together:

There is hardly a country in Europe without an awareness ... of the place of culture as both an agent and an object of the great transformation affecting contemporary societies. (quoted by Naess 2009: 57)

Duhamel argued then that they are entering 'the Age of culture' and urged for more collective action in the area of culture. There is a good reason to argue that in the beginning of the 70s a 'cultural turn', at least in awareness of the widening prospects of the unification process, was under way. The political weight that European politician have come to attach to the idea of "culture" as a key ingredient and a catalyst, in the integration process in the 70s was growing (Shore 2006: 8). To put it in other terms, the invention and expansion of EU-wide policies towards "culture" is in itself a measure of the extent of the self-identification and self-conception of the EU as a political entity standing on its own. This clearly coincided, if not provoked by, with the first enlargement of the European Communities with three countries joining and significantly changing its economic and cultural landscape.

The policy desire to revive the integration process in a new configuration of states and the specific external circumstances of the time led to the political reflection on the Communities own place and identity culminating at the Copenhagen summit of 1973 when EC leaders adopted a communiqué on European identity and pledged to review "the common heritage" of the member states. (Shore 2006: 13). The Document on European identity introduces the topic of European identity on the political agenda, defining the cultural basis for European integration. The main message of the Document is that Europe has identity and the text aims at defining it and bringing it onto the political agenda. The role of the Document is not conceived as a significant change in the approach to issues related to culture in community policies (Kostakopoulou 2001). However, according to Middelaar (2014) although politically with small effectiveness, it echoed in the following 20 years.

The diversity of cultures within the framework of a common European civilization, the attachment to common values and principles, the increasing convergence of attitudes to life, the awareness of having specific interests in common and the determination

---

[8] Naess (2009) refers to this Conference as having some impact on the political climate in Europe and in particular that the distinctively European-minded French Minister Duhamel 'defined the language that would govern not only European, but also global cultural debates' (Naess 2009: 57).

to take part in the construction of a United Europe, all give the European Identity its originality and its own dynamism. (Document on European Identity 1973: 3)

This point does not seem very original, rather it continues a line of thought known since the time of the European enlightenment and the rise of nationalism. John Stuart Mill in mid-18th century answered in a similar vein the question what has made the European family of nations an improving, instead of a stationary portion of mankind and what it is that has hitherto preserved Europe?

> Not any superior excellence in them, which, when it exists, exists as the effect not as the cause; but their remarkable diversity of character and culture. Individuals, classes, nations, have been extremely unlike one another: they have struck out a great variety of paths, each leading to something valuable; and although at every period those who travelled in different paths have been intolerant of one another, and each would have thought it an excellent thing if all the rest could have been compelled to travel his road, their attempts to thwart each other's development have rarely had any permanent success, and each has in time endured to receive the good which the others have offered. Europe is, in my judgment, wholly indebted to this plurality of paths for its progressive and many-sided development. But it already begins to possess this benefit in a considerably less degree. (Mill 2001[1859]: 67)

The main impact of the Document was expected in creating and affirming a recognizable image of the EC as a new, yet not sufficiently emancipated actor in international relations. Its second chapter on the European identity in relation to the world has a considerable weight in the Document. It is developed by the foreign ministers, arguing that it involves 'assessing the extent to which the Nine are already acting together in relation to the rest of the world' (DEI 1973: 2).

The appropriation of the term European goes together with the realization that legal and economic integration alone will not create a united Europe. Then the question arises: should the emphasis be put on European as a cultural unit stemming from the history of the European nations and their long-standing cross-fertilization (Sassatelli 2002: 435). With the reflection on European identity, the space was open to absorb new symbols of unification and new identification references. The most powerful symbol is 'Europe' itself as it is becoming more and more an icon, whose ambiguous content seems to reinforce the possibilities of identification with it. There are as well a set of symbolic initiatives directly aimed at creating a sense of common belonging (European Community Commission, 1987: 2; Fontaine, 1991) that range from the flag to the anthem, to a new ritual calendar, to the creation of the 'European capital of culture'. These initiatives with their symbolic load generated the idea of Europeanising the cultural sector and communicating the principles and values upon which the Community is founded. These were the new European logo and flag: a circle of twelve yellow stars set against a blue background; later the "harmonised" European passport and European driving license in 1988 before the introduction of the citizenship institution in the Treaty of Maastricht[9];

---

[9] Representatives of the governments of the Ten adopted the first standard passport format on 23 June 1981. The prototype of the European passport was presented to the press during the Fontainebleau European Council on 25-26 June 1984 by François Mitterrand, President of the French Republic and President-in-Office of the Community. The first European passports, based on the standard format and burgundy in colour, bearing both national and Community symbols, were issued on 1 January 1985. The European passport nonetheless constituted a sign of mutual recognition and an identity document common to all the citizens of the European Community. It was introduced gradually as national passports expired.

the creation of European car number-plates; and a new European anthem, the "Ode to Joy," taken from the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

This is the moment when the most powerful and long-standing initiatives at European level in the area of culture — European City of Culture (later European capital of culture) — was conceived and realized. One of the best known and long-running programmes launched in 1985 by the Council of Ministers on the initiative of Melina Mercouri, the Greek Minister of Culture. Starting from Athens in 1985 to Leeuwarden-Friesland and Valletta in 2018 more than 50 cities were designated Capitals of Culture highlighting the richness of European cultures but also the features they share. To what extent it actually fosters a feeling of European citizenship and takes a fresh look at European history and heritage and their being shared is not well evidenced.

3.2. The Treaty of Maastricht and setting the legal basis for EU cultural policy

Before the Maastricht Treaty culture was not a recognised area of European Community competence and had only marginal status in the European unification process. In the period after 1987 the Community actions in the cultural sector became more structured. There were regular meetings of the Ministers of Culture of the Member States and in 1988 the Committee of Culture to the European Parliament was established. In the EC Communication 'A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community' the Commission argues that 'increased cultural activity is now a political as well as a social and economic necessity' (European Commission 1987).

In the belief that time has come –without departing from the principle of subsidiarity — to give cultural activities in the Community a higher profile, the Commission proposes to advance simultaneously on all three fronts with a concrete programme involving a series of significant priority measures based the outcome of the conference on the relationship between economy, technology and culture held in Florence in March, 1987. (European Commission 1987: 7–8)

This led to the inclusion of Article 128 (now Article 151 of the consolidated version) on culture in the Treaty of establishing of the European Union (Maastricht) with the following formulation:

(1) The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.')

(2) Action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas:

– improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples;

– conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance;

– non-commercial cultural exchanges

– artistic and literary creation, including in the audio-visual. (Maastricht Treaty, 1992; Council of the EC1992: 13).

The concrete practical dimensions of this political decision are the programmes established in the 90s in these domains, namely cultural heritage, books and reading, audio-visual sector. This gradually led to consolidation of the actions from practical separate measures in some areas of culture to establishing of unified programme — the Culture Programme. Its priorities are linked to the three concepts, representing the vision of the

necessary Community supporting action in the cultural sector — intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and social cohesion[10].

The underlying principles of cultural policy were not changed after Maastricht and transnational cultural policy harmonization was not articulated among the political objectives of the EU. To a large extent the political efforts of the Commission and the Parliament in the 80s were directed towards creating the basis for cultural policy in the treaties. In some sense these attempts attain a paradoxical outcome. When at the end the goal was achieved with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the text of the Treaty actually acknowledges that the Union does not have a common culture (Middelaar 2014: 182). Article 128 lays more content weight and inclination to diversity, not on unity. The term "European culture" is specially avoided although the framework refers to territorial attachment with cultural dimension — culture is attached to states and regions. A main area of realization of the conceived EU cultural policy are actions in support of literary and fine arts, namely awarding of prizes, allocation of grants and subsidies from the Union budget and writing of reports and analyses. We can ask the question whether the provisions of the Treaty give rise to the general reluctance to introduce in the political discourse and goals the concept of 'common European culture'. We can make a step further to say that this political message expresses the reluctance of the Member States to accept that their citizens can identify themselves just as Europeans. Therefore, EU cultural policy (as an emerging policy domain) aims at finding its sense in cultural exchanges and in the narrative of diversity. This policy can be considered as belonging to the low register of policies, which would strengthen the links between citizens of the Member states without any claim of transformation in cultural or other terms.

The Maastricht Treaty clauses mark the outcome of the discourse on culture, which was emerging and engaging the institutions in the 80s. Similarly to other situations of cultural discourse, when there are objections to some cultural content, images or narratives based on universal values and self-identifications come to the fore. Therefore Middelaar (2014) argues that the process of creating a legal basis for the European cultural policy is marked and accompanied by the imposition in use of empty symbolism. Documents and programmes in the area of culture continued to be included in the scope of the Council on the internal market as a practical institutional decision and as a domain in which the products of the European cultural policy can be realized. There is no space for a comprehensive and positive conception of 'European cultural policy'. Rather it is a mixture of centralized supporting schemes, symbolic initiatives and an attempt to harmonise the European law in the perspective of the common market. Therefore, it does not constitute a positive strategy for cultural policy and is marked by fragmentation and lack of completion of the underlying political intentions. The European strategy for culture in a globalizing world is therefore considered as the first strategy for cultural policy at European level (European Commission 2007).

The Treaty of Maastricht formally recognizes culture as a domain of political intervention at European level. This is accompanied with the recognition of limitations in the scope of the policy of identity (European identity formation). As culture is envisaged a subsidiarity role in this process and the actions of the European institutions are secondary, these limitations could be interpreted as an underlining understanding of European identity as based on strategic calculation rather than on affective identification. There is an attempt

---

[10] Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/culture/l29016_bg.htm (31.10.2014).

in the political discourse to normative limitation of European identity to shared tradition of values including their cultural aspect. The discourse of European values was becoming popular in political discourse as well as in normative regulation. Three lines of action seemed as clearly identified in relation to the culture clause of the Maastricht Treaty: first, it is the incentives for enhancing of cooperation of the Member States in the cultural sector. Secondly, it is the provision that cultural aspects should be considered in all EU policies[11]. Thirdly, this is the political argument that cooperation between Member States is of significance because 'cultural boundaries' are not the same as political boundaries.

The formal legal recognition of the EU cultural action does not have the goal of setting the basis for a cultural policy with a European scale. Article 128 (Articles 167 of the Treaty on Functioning of the EU) does not allow for harmonization of legislation in culture. Culture is a subject of subsidiarity policy action, which recognizes the primary competence and responsibility of the individual Member States in the area of culture. Therefore, each activity on European level is supplementary to the Member States policies and serves mainly as a means for supporting their cooperation. The inclusion of the EU competence in the area of culture in the Treaty is a result of a compromise between two opposite positions concerning the scope of the EU competences in cultural matters. According to Forrest (1994: 17) the Article balanced the interests of those states wanting to allow wider community action in the cultural sphere and those wanting to set limits for cultural action.

Shore (2006) argues that 'since the 1990s, EU cultural policy, and the question of European identity more generally, has increasingly been framed around the idea of "unity in diversity." According to Delanty (2003) this policy principle became extremely influential in attempts to define European identity in a way that avoids the pitfalls of both moral universalism and cultural particularism. The EU's "unity in diversity" approach points to a fundamentally different conception of identity politics, and to a European identity based on diversity and "the compatibility of contrasting identities" (Pantel 1999, 46). However, this approach was filled with ambiguities and problematic assumptions, in particular as it hardly allowed for seeking legitimacy in the cultural area (Habermas 1992). The need for a self-identifying "European public" to lend legitimacy to its institutions was becoming a key topic in academic research.

Yet the political discourse still continued the discourse of many cultures or one entity, which was discussed in the line below:

Cultural policy forms part of the European enterprise and, in this respect, is an integration factor within an "ever-closer union between the peoples of Europe's (…) cultural policy must make a contribution to strengthening and to expanding the influence of the "European model of society" built on a set of values common to all European societies. (Council of the EC1996: 102, quoted in Shore 2001: 117)

"The European model of society", of which the statement speaks, is interpreted as 'a consensual idea of culture and society and conspicuously avoids the use of plural nouns. The European Commission's statement reminds us of the "many cultures" that the EU is "keen to preserve" and which constitute Europe's essential cultural unity. (Shore 2002: 7). It also marks strong normative aspects intertwined in the understanding of the cultural policy and its intrinsic value of culture for the European model of society.

---

[11] This became a major concern for the Commission after 1992 and it is articulated as a horizontal priority of EU policies.

Here I referred often to the he avoidance of actions in the area of culture, which is not entirely true. There have been actions such as the EU Culture Programme 2007–2013, MEDIA 2007, the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. The following areas represent the main EU activities in the cultural policy: regulation of free circulation of goods and cultural exchange; cultural cooperation in various areas including audiovisual media; mobility of artists; 'European capitals of culture' — the best-known culture project of the EU; MEDIA programme (1991); 3 culture programmes between 1996–2000; Culture 2000 — support to inter-European collaboration on cultural projects. These activities constituted a basis aiming at broader application of the cultural dimension in the vision of the European integration process. An expectation was harnessed that there could be a more radical change in the EU policy conceptualization.

3.3. New agenda for Culture in the family of EU strategic documents and family of policies 2007

The EU has launched a new agenda for culture (A European Agenda for Culture 2007, which is the first ever European strategy for culture). It marks a change in the policy orientation at European level, which is also preconditioned by a progressively positive attitude of Europeans towards a culture policy at EU level. It is also closely related to certain aspects of globalization with culture becoming part of global politics. It can be viewed as a review and reorientation of the argument why EU should develop a more comprehensive cultural policy.

The Communication on proposing the new agenda argues:

As Dario Fo rightly pointed out, "even before Europe was united in an economic level or was conceived at the level of economic interests and trade, it was culture that united all the countries of Europe. The arts, literature, music are the connecting link of Europe". Indeed, Europeans share a common cultural heritage, which is the result of centuries of creativity, migratory flows and exchanges. They also enjoy and value a rich cultural and linguistic diversity, which is inspiring and has inspired many countries across the world. (European Commission 2007: 2)

The new 'European Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World' of 2007 should be interpreted as 'a signal of change' in the process of careful definition of the cultural programmes and community action of the European institutions (Naess 2009: 65). The Communication was viewed at the time of its publication a 'turning point' for the EU as entering the 'age of culture'. There seems to have been a change in the framework within which community actions in the cultural sector are conceptualized. The Strategy was tabled on the political agenda and there was the expectation of widening of the action in the area of culture. From this perspective it makes some bold statements:

Culture and creativity are important drivers for personal development, social cohesion and economic growth. Today's strategy promoting intercultural understanding confirms culture's place at the heart of our policies. (Council of the EU2007: 1)

The justification of the necessity for strategy of cultural policy, similarly to the manner of its introduction in 1985, is evidenced by surveys and a general awareness of the attitudes and expectation of the citizens. It is specially recognized in Eurobarometer surveys that EU cultural initiatives enjoy a broad public support. A Flash Eurobarometer survey in 2007[12] commissioned by General-Directorate Education and Culture of the EC in the course of

---

[12] Flash Eurobarometer. 2007. No. FL217. *Intercultural dialogue in Europe. Summary Report*.

the preparation of the EU Initiative 2008 — European Year of Intercultural Dialogue asked 27,000 European citizens aged above 15, representing all Members states (then 27), to share their models of interaction with people from other cultures and their general attitudes to cultural diversity and the very idea of dedicating 2008 to Intercultural Dialogue. This initiative comes immediately after the two consecutive enlargements in 2004 and 2007 which led to 12 new countries (mostly East European) joining the EU. As previously (in the 80s) the political need for Community action in the cultural sector finds its explanation in the conviction that 'Europe's cultural identity' (and the sense of being part of European culture) is 'shared pluralistic humanism' based on the values of democracy, justice and freedom, expressed in the diversity of our local, regional and national cultures as the basis for the EU and as a prerequisite for the solidarity. (European Community Commission 1987: 5)

The conceptual basis of the survey continues to express this understanding of political action as codified in the Treaty clauses. The concept of cultural diversity enjoys a central place in the academic and public discourse in the period after the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, while less emphasis is laid on common cultural heritage. It can be argued (with certain limitations) that the dominating framework is the reality of multiple European cultures and identities (Gowland, Dunphy and Lythe 1995; Macdonald 1993). In this framework of understanding common European culture is not considered as an objective basis for intercultural communication. In this sense the European Commission plays the role of some kind of *intellectual shelter*, which protects, adds value and spreads knowledge about European cultures.

There is the question how far the ambitions of the cultural actors could reach at European level. The Communication articulates the background for these ambitions:

> The European Union is not just an economic process or a trading power, it is already widely — and accurately — perceived as an unprecedented and successful social and cultural project. (European Commission 2007: 3)

The new Agenda can be interpreted as an urging need for self-reflection, changing the centre of attention and setting new objectives. Three common objectives are set. Firstly, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue are reaffirmed as policy objectives, which has been at the core of any action or initiative in the area of culture at European level. However, how intercultural dialogue fits the cultural landscape of contemporary Europe can be questioned since most of the discourse of the agenda is about celebrating of diversity but keeping signifiers for cultural difference separate from the notion of diversity. Secondly, culture as catalyst of creativity was articulated, which is related to the new goal of European society as knowledge-based society and enhancing European competitiveness in all aspects, growth in the European cultural sector. This reflects the potential of Europe's cultural and creative sectors considering them as a driver of economic growth and employment. The new EU programme is called Creative Europe. Thirdly, culture is specially identified as a component of international relations thus relating to cultural diplomacy, cultural liaisons, UNESCO and Council of Europe common actions and initiatives.

Although there was a political statement for new priorities, there is hardly evidence that the platform for community action in the area of culture was changed. It seems more like a rhetorical than a content change in the dominating framework of community cultural action. There is still a clash between the creeping liberal understanding of culture, as specific but in its essence economic sector to which economic regulation are to be applied, and the concept of culture as specifically locally and regionally bound, which should constitute an exception of economic regulation.

Despite the new Agenda for Culture 'culture' is still considered a component that disrupts and, in some sense, violates the common logic of the EU policies. It is considered as a multi-layered action, which reflects the understanding of different political actors about the opportunities for governing of the process of European integration. It is evident that culture is not a subject of common political apparatus and remains as a topic in a complex process of policy articulation and implementation. However, we can argue that there is a direct correlation between the political and institutional impulses of this complex and ambiguous process and the reflection on the identity of the European unification.

Conclusion

The paper presents an overview of EU cultural policy, an allegedly significant factor in the formation of any community's political identity as creating bonds for citizens. I argue that there is a link between the self-reflection of the identity of the European unification and the steps towards establishing parameters of EU cultural policy. Despite that some authors argue that EU cultural policy is a shaping factor for European identity formation (both of the EU and of the individual citizen), the main outcomes of EU action in cultural matters are limited and refer to subsidies, sponsorships, exchange programmes and some regulation of the cultural goods market. The underlying aim and rationale that drives that policy remain largely unchanged. They are framed around the idea of 'unity in diversity' (Shore 2006: 10). In a similar line the core of the concept of European identity is diversity in cultural terms and adherence to shared political values. The enlargement process has posed specific challenges to the EU identity formation both in internal and external relations. The identity of the EU as a political entity cannot but take into the framework the cultural aspects as based on diversity and the fundamental principle of its preservation. The eastern enlargement additionally challenges the self-understanding of the EU identity as the compatibility of identities is not easily reconciled wherever the identities are felt as contrasting to the extent related to the dependence on the historical paths. In this context, it can be expected that culture and education can find a more prominent place on the political agenda.

References

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Barnett, C. (2001). Culture, policy and subsidiarity in the European Union: From symbolic identity to the governmentalisation of culture. *Political Geography*, *20* (4), 405–426.

Beukel, E. (2001). 'Educational policy institutionalization and multi-level governance'. In S. Anderson and K. Eliassen (Eds.) *Making Policy in Europe* (124–39). London: Sage.

Bruter, M. (2005). *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of Mass European Identity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Calhoun, C. (2001). The virtues of inconsistency: identity and plurality in the conceptualization of Europe. In Cederman, Lars-Erik, (Eds.) *Constructing Europe's Identity: the External Dimension*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, CO, USA.

Council of the European Communities (1996). *First Report on the Consideration of Cultural Aspects in European Community Action*. Brussels: European Commission.

Council of the European Communities (1992). New Prospects for Community Cultural Action. COM 92 149/Final, 29 April. Brussels: Office of Official Publications of the European Community.

Council of the EU (2007). Resolution of the Council of 16 November 2007 on a European Agenda for Culture. OJ C287, 29.11.2007

Delanty, G. (1995). *Inventing Europe. Idea, Identity, reality*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Delanty, G. (2003). Conceptions of Europe: A Review of Recent Trends. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *6* (4), 471–88.

Delors, J. (1999). *Reuniting Europe: Our Historic Mission*. Aspen Institute.

Document on the European Identity (DEI), published by the Nine Foreign Ministers (Copenhagen, 14 December 1973). Retrieved from http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/02798d c9–9c69–4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf

Ellmeier, A. & Rasky, B. (1998). *Cultural policy in Europe — European cultural policy*. Vienna: Ös- terreicher Kulturdokumentation.

Esmein, B. (1999). 'Les politiques de 1'Union Europerenne dans le domaine de la culture, de l'ed- ucation et des langues'. *Journal of European Integration History*, *5* (2), 75–105.

European Commission (2007). On a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world. COM (2007) 242 final. Brussels.

European Community Commission (1987). A Fresh boost for culture in the European Community (COM (87) 603 final).

Fligstein, N. (2009). Who are the Europeans and how does this matter for politics? In Checkel, J. T., Katzenstein, P. J. (Eds.) *European Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fontaine, P. (1991). *A Citizen's Europe?* Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Forrest, A. (1994). A New Start for Cultural Action in the European Community. Genesis and Im- plications of Article 128 of the Treaty on European Union. *Cultural Policy, 1* (2),11–20.

Gilbert, P. (2010). *Cultural Identity and Political Ethics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gowland, D., Dunphy, R. & Lythe, C. (1995). *The European Mosaic. Contemporary Politics, Economics and Culture*. Pearson Education Limited.

Haas, E. (1958). *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Habermas, J. (1992). Further reflections on the Public Sphere. In Calhoun, Cr. (Ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (pp. 421–461). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (2001). WHY Europe Needs a Constitution? *New Left Review*, Sep-Oct 2001.

Habermas, J. (2006). *The Divided West*. Cambridge: Polity.

Juncker, J.-C. (2014). A New Start for Europe: My Agenda for Hobs, Growth, Fairness and Democratic Change. Political Guidelines for the next European Commission, Opening statement. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/about/juncker-commission/docs/pg_en.pdf

Kostakopoulou, D. (2001). *Citizenship, Identity, and Immigration in the European Union: Between Past and Future*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lindberg, L. (1963). *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Littoz-Monnet, A. (2003). European Cultural Policy: A French Creation? In *French Politics*, 1 (pp. 255–278). Palgrave Macmillan, (255–278).

Littoz-Monnet, A. (2007). *European Policy Studies: European Union and Culture: Between Economic regulation and European Cultural Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lucarelli, S. and Manners, I. (2006). *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.

Lucarelli, S. and Fioramonti, A. (2010). *External Perceptions of the European Union as a Global Actor*. Routledge.

Lucarelli, S., Cerutti, F. & Schmidt, F. (eds.) (2011). *Debating Political Identity and Legitimacy in the European Union*. London: Routledge.

Maastricht Treaty (1992). *Treaty on the European Union. Luxembourg*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Macdonald, S., (ed.) (1993). *Inside European Identities*. Oxford: Berg.

Middelaar, L. van (2014). *The Passage to Europe: How a Continent Became a Union*. Cornwall: International Ltd, Padstow.

Mill, J.S. (2001). *On Liberty*. Batoche Books Kichener.

Moravcsik, A. (1998). *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Powerfrom Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Moravcsik, A. (May/June 2001). Despotism in Brussels? Misreading the European Union. Foreign Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/review-essay/2001-05-01/despotism-brussels-misreading-european-union

Naess, H. E. (2009). *A New Agenda? The Euroepan Union and Cultural Policy*. Alliance Publishing Trust.

Pantel, M. (1999). Unity-in- Diversity. Cultural Policy and EU Legitimacy. In Banchoff, T., Smith, M. (Eds.) *Legitimacy and the European Union* (46–65). London: Routledge.

Pongy, M. (1997). 'Entres mode` les nationaux et eurogroupes d'interreˆ ts professionnels: 1'action de 1'Union dans la culture'. In *Cultures et Conflits* (pp.129–145).

Richardson, J. J. (1996). Actor-based models of national and EU policy-making, In H. Kassim and A. Menon (Eds.) *The European Union and National Industrial Policy* (26–51). London: Routledge.

Risse, T. (2010). *Community of Europeans*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sassatelli, M. (2002). Imagined Europe. The Shaping of a Euroepan Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *5* (4), 435–451.

Senelle, R. (1994). 'The new cultural policy of the European Union'. In Bekemans, Leonce and Lombaert, Ruben (Eds.) *Culture: Building stone for Europe 2002: Reflexions and perspectives*. Brussels: European University Press.

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe. The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.

Shore, C. (2001). The Cultural policies of the European Union and cultural diversity. In Bennet, T. (Ed.) *Differing Diversities: Transversal Study on the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Shore, C. (2006). "In uno plures" (?) EU Cultural Policy and the Governance of Europe. *Cultural Analysis*, *5*, 7–26.

Smith, A. (1991). *National Identity*. University of Nevada press.

Stoicheva, M. (2014). Multiculturalism and Dimension of Identification in Eastern Europe: A Failed Policy or Inescapable Reality? In Kim, N. (Ed.) *Multicultural Challenges and Sustainable Democracy in Europe and East Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Stoicheva, M. (2016). *European Identity. Theoretical Dilemmas and Analytical Approaches*. Sofia University Press.

Stoicheva, M. (2017). The Relative Geography of Identity Conflicts: Modes and Representation in the context of European Integration. *Journal of Conflict and Integration*, *1* (1).

Theiler, T. (2005). *Political Symbolism and European Integration*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Wallace, H. (2000). Studying Anderson Contemporary Europe. *The British Journal of Politics*, *2* (1), 95–113.

Wallace, H. (2005). An institutional anatomy and five policy modes. In Wallace, W., Wallace, H. & M. Pollack (Eds.) *Policy-Making in the European Union*, 5th edition (pp. 49–90). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА ЕС И ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ: СПОСОБ ОЦЕНКИ ВЗАИМОВЛИЯНИЯ

Мария Стойчева

Софийский университет им. Климента Охридского, бульвар Царя-Освободителя, 15, София, 1504, Болгария. E-mail: maria.stoicheva@gmail.com. ORCID 0000-0002-3093-4715

Аннотация. В исследовании рассматривается вопрос о том, насколько культурная политика ЕС (Евросоюза) способна сформировать европейскую культурную идентичность. Статья придерживается хронологии событий в европейской культурной политике с целью определить, насколько эта политика способна сформировать культурную идентичность для европейских стран–членов ЕС. В этом же смысле, автор стремится выяснить, что эта эволюция в области культурной политики сможет рассказать о европейской идентичности и возможности отождествления с ЕС. От начала процесса европейской интеграции до принятия основ политики в области культуры (а этот временной отрезок включает в себя новое понимание роли культуры в рамках политики ЕС), различают три периода. Исходя из предположения о том, что культурное измерение европейской идентичности тесно связано с национальной идентичностью, динамика образования и структурирования масштабов культурной политики ЕС привлекает внимание к культурному аспекту понимания европейской идентичности. Процесс формирования культурной политики ЕС в системе других стандартов ЕС неотделим от динамики осознания необходимости использовать политические инструменты для создания 'культурной идентичности' стран-членов ЕС, несмотря на то, что главные итоги деятельности ЕС в сфере культурной политики связаны с ограничениями.

Ключевые слова: Европейская идентичность, культурная идентичность, культурная политика, культурная политика в ЕС, европейская интеграция, компетенции ЕС.