

EU CULTURAL POLICY AS A TOOL TO COMBAT CRISES - A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
ON THE USE OF CULTURAL POLICY IN DEADLOCK

BY

RAPHAELA BERDING

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in European Union Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017

Urbana, Illinois

Adviser:

Dr. Neil Vander Most

Abstract

This Master's thesis looks at the relationship between crises and European identity, an identity largely built by the EU's cultural policy. I examine where this connection is made by analyzing communication from various EU institutions, as well as EU or national politicians, and newspapers. I hypothesize that the EU is referring to European identity and the common European cultural heritage in crisis situations. After conducting discourse analysis, a connection between crises and European identity or common culture is made at various places and by various people. This thesis contributes to the field of European Union Studies, by looking at how the concept of European identity through cultural policy is utilized. It also makes a contribution to the field of Cultural studies by indicating how culture can be instrumentalized and how culture can transform social relations.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Definitions.....	5
3. Literature Review.....	15
4. Methods.....	28
5. Connection between European Identity and Crises in EU Discourse	32
6. Analysis.....	61
7. Discussion	82
8. Conclusion	88
9. References.....	91
Appendix A: Glossary.....	99

1. Introduction

“If I had to do it again, I would begin with culture” – Even if it is debatable whether those words can be attributed to Jean Monnet, they very well draw attention to a problem, the European Union (EU) is facing. Indeed, the EU started as an economic project, with the idea to create peace and prosperity on the continent. After two destructive wars, establishing strong trade relationships between countries were to be the solution for states to stop fighting each other. However, establishing economic cooperation was not enough to develop deeper relationships between people, provide a space of identification, similar to those within nation states, and to create solidarity and a feeling of belonging to the European Union among citizens. According to the latest Eurobarometer, only 35% of Europeans have a positive image of the EU, which is a 7% decrease since Spring 2015 (European Commission 2016c). Thus, the positive perception of the EU among the people is shrinking, and the EU is more than ever looking for ways to overcome the gaps between the European institutions and the people, and at the same time build stronger support among people for the European project.

The European Union has faced several crises over the course of its existence, and underwent the challenge of finding a common position among 28 sovereign nation states to solve those problems several times. In 2017, the European Union is struggling to present itself as a unified bloc. The leaders of the 28 member states are not in agreement about important questions regarding the migrant crisis, finger point at each other, and thereby also create dissent among the European people. Likewise, during Europe’s debt crisis of 2009, when Eurozone governments could not afford anymore to bail out collapsed banks, fellow EU countries wanted to step in with financial assistance for those countries. However, getting support for those bailout packages in the populations was difficult, and the citizenry was divided (Beardsley 2010). The economy, which was the uniting factor in the beginning of the EU, has become a dividing factor for various actors of the European Union, governments as well as people.

Jean Monnet, as a visionary and founding father of the European Union, wrote in his memoirs that “Europe will be forged in crises, and will be the sum of the solutions adopted for those crises.” (Barroso 2011) However bad the impact of a crisis might be, this quote shows that they can have a positive,

progressive effect on the European Union. Fligstein et al (2012) argue that the EU has solved past crises with a sense of European identity (120). Being probably as old as the EU itself, European identity has been vaguely defined by the EU, and is discussed fervently among scholars from different fields. In difficult, critical times, European identity undergoes an identity crisis itself, forcing the EU to rethink and establish new ways to approach fundamental questions about its existence. With its cultural policy, the European Union has committed itself to always “bring the common cultural heritage to the fore,” thus drawing on people’s common identity and heritage (European Parliament 2004). By creating dialogue and interaction between Europeans, a European public and community, sharing the same values and showing solidarity, should be built.

Based on Fligstein et al’s (2012) statement, this research seeks to establish a relationship between crises and European identity. I want to answer the question whether the EU uses its cultural policy as a tool for crisis management, in order to prevent a possible decrease of support by fostering Europeans’ feeling of belonging to the Union through emphasizing European identity with the help of cultural policy. I hypothesize that the EU is referring more often to European identity during crises, when people become more critical of the European project and their support for it shrinks. The necessity to appeal to the deeper, underlying bonds of the people of the European community, similar to those of citizens of one nation, increases when there is a lot of criticism about the EU which raise fundamental questions about its existence. They also create dissent among the people resulting in a lack of solidarity, and disagreement among the member states’ governments, making it difficult to find a common solution to essential and severe problems. These situations are evident in, for example, the current migrant crisis, or they could be seen in the financial crisis in 2009. Thus, this analysis looks at contemporary crises of the European Union, and how they have influenced the EU’s cultural policies, communication, and discourse.

In order to properly explore the connection between European identity and crises, a number of items need to be established. First, the concepts of crisis and European identity have to be explained. This will be done in the second chapter. Second, it needs to be understood how the European identity concept has developed since the EU started actively engaging with it after the Declaration on European identity in

1973, and how the EU's cultural policy, and its protection and promotion, as it is stipulated by the Maastricht Treaty, relate to this concept. In order to find accurate and authentic results, it is also necessary to review what has been said so far about the relationship between European identity and crises. The third chapter will present a review of the particular literature. The fourth chapter will introduce the methods used for the gathering and analysis of the data. Chapter five will present the links made in the EU discourse which was regarded for analysis. In order to facilitate the understanding of the context of the results, they are categorized into speeches and law texts. Chapter six and seven will analyze and discuss the results and explain the constellation of the relationship between European identity and crises that can be found in EU discourse.

This research found that there is a relationship between crises and European identity and culture in EU discourse. Various events that were mentioned in the analyzed discourse could be categorized under Ross' (2010) typology of crises which is introduced in chapter 2. Furthermore, lawmakers as well as law texts make the connection between crises and identity. The connections between culture and challenges within society were a lot more frequent than the ones between culture and the economy, implying that the EU is more than just economic cooperation. Also the importance of the young or Erasmus generation was highlighted at several points in the discourse.

Political anthropologist Chris Shore, who researched extensively on European integration through the construction of a European identity and cultural policy (Shore and Durão 2010), argued just shortly after the EU started to work in the cultural area in 1985, that European integration was not only a field of study for political scientists, but also anthropologists (Shore 1993, 779). This study shows that the EU relies on culture and identity to solve crises, which underlines Shore's argument. This study also suggests that it is important to study the cultural and social ties that bind societies, and that the EU is more than just economic cooperation between member states.

This research therefore contributes to the field of EU studies. The European Union was established against the background of two destructive World Wars, and with the prospect of creating long-lasting peace. Until today, the EU has become more than the cooperation between governments to secure this

peace. The progressive integration process has also created bonds between the European people, which makes it necessary to take the developing European society into account. A European culture and identity to deepen the bonds between the European people has been established, and is further developing through the EU's work in this area. By focusing on and culture and crises, a comprehensive picture can be created what the European Union hopes to gain from its cultural policy, how it is utilized, and who and what it is aimed at. Ultimately, suggestions can be made about how it can be used more effectively to reach the EU's goal.

This research also opens the question about instrumentality of culture. As the discourse analysis and literature review will show, EU cultural policy has changed over the years, to pursue other, non-cultural goals and objectives, which in the case of this research, is the mobilization of support for the EU, its values, and the European idea, as well as the creation of a European society. Several authors discuss this instrumentalization of culture. Gray (2007) argues that instrumentality has become an important feature of cultural policy, and policy makers use it increasingly because of other developments and changes within society (205). Governments justify the continuation of spending money on cultural policy, primarily on economic and social grounds (ibid. 206). In the age of globalization, and at a time of social and economic changes, cultural diplomacy has received increasing attention, and made international cultural policies more relevant (Zamorano 2016). As Zamorano (2016) argues, cultural diplomacy has also become more important for supranational institutions such as the EU, because states engage in a process of internationalization, and these supranational institutions challenge the monopoly of external cultural policy of central governments (166). One year ago, the EU launched a cultural diplomacy platform which seeks to “strengthen the ability of the EU to engage meaningfully with audiences and stakeholders in third countries, through cultural diplomacy activities,” as well as “promote and facilitate durable cultural exchanges, people-to-people activities and co-creation processes between Europeans and citizens from countries all over the world.” (“New”) This indicates that that EU is pursuing non-cultural goals, and instrumentalizes culture, internally as well as externally.

2. Definitions

In the following chapter, the concepts of individual and national identity, which are both important as individuals form nations, and nations form the European Union, will be presented. The last part of chapter two will explain the term crisis, and will introduce Ross' (2012) typology of crises that the European Union has faced in the past. Ross' framework not only clarifies what crises mean for the European Union, but also forms the foundation for the analysis in chapter six.

a. Identity and National Identity

Societies are formed by individuals, who all possess their own personal identity. Örkény (2011) elaborates on these individual identities: "Personal identity is a psychological phenomenon of definitive significance in the development of a person's image of self." (40) Having a personal identity is essential for social interaction, and integration into social groups (ibid.). This personal identity is not static, but in the complicated environment of relations between groups, it is reshaped progressively (ibid.). Örkény furthermore distinguishes between personal and social or collective identity which is distinct from individual identity. "Social or collective identity is a framework of the interpretations and conclusions of a group including the characteristics of the group, the conditions for membership in the group, and the attributes of separation from other groups." (ibid., as cited in Hamilton-Sherman 1996; Karolewski 2006) Collective or social identities form during the development of the group, which itself is based on collective knowledge, defining the behavioral rules for that group, and demanding that group members accept the rules and norms (ibid., as cited in Tajfel 1982).

Defining personal and collective identity is important for the discussion of national identity because national identity is a representation of those collective and personal identities (ibid.). Collective identity constructs the "self-image framework" of the national identity, whereas individual identity relates to the meaning that an individual gives to such forms of association, and to what degree an individual builds elements of national association into his or her personal identity (ibid.). As opposed to individual identities, which are not static and situational, collective identities "tend to be pervasive and persistent." (Smith 1992, 59)

Identifications on a national level are multidimensional and are composed of ethnic, legal, territorial, economic, and political components, which can be all united by the ideology of nationalism (Smith 1992, 60). It is crucial for national (and a European) identities of a population to have a sense of “shared continuity,” referring on the one hand to the memories of events, or personages that successive generations of a population have, and on the other hand, to the “collective belief in a common destiny of that [population] and its culture,” so that a “mass, standardized public culture” can grow from this (ibid.). A shared memory gives people a common reference of identification, and a shared destiny provides the population with a shared sense of their existence. In addition to Örkény, Zhoujun and Hualin (2014) point out that “national identity is the most important prerequisite for the legitimacy and construction of the nation state.” (140)

The historic importance of identification with the nation came into being as a political concept in the modern era, in which the challenges of modernization, such as the birth of the modern state, the establishment of territories with strictly defined borders, or the development of national capitalism, reinforced “new forms of wide and complex integration on national grounds.” (Örkény 2011, 42) Political and social integration was needed, so that, among other things, all of the political community could be integrated within the borders, and a civil society and a public sphere be established (ibid.). National identity’s role was to provide the institution of citizenship, established by the political state, with political, social, and cultural content (ibid.).

In the post-industrial age, the instability of the identification frameworks outlined by Örkény began to show, as the author points out herself. Because national borders were more easily crossed, nations ceased to exist in isolation, and political separation was replaced by joint policy-making and cooperation; global economic processes took over economic isolation or protectionism (ibid.). The most significant consequences on national identity of these developments, according to Örkény, were the dominance of multiculturalism, the pluralization of identity, and cultural pluralism over traditional cultural homogenization (ibid.). Commonalities that were shared on the national level, such as ethno-history, cultural roots, or language, lost some of their significance (ibid. 42-43). The questions which these

transformations pose, are to what degree national identity can survive the transformation, how will cooperation, solidarity, and cultural life look like in the context of the nation, and on which common values will citizens base the significance of their coexistence (ibid.). These pressures on national identity show how unifying cultural elements are needed in times of globalization and the increased interconnectivity between people beyond national borders.

b. European Identity

The concept of identity is increasingly discussed in the literature on European Union studies. Even though the European identity concept varies, and is difficult to measure because of the lack of adequate empirical data, there is consensus that the study on culture and identity in the European Union matters and that it may not be neglected. The European Union has acknowledged this fact over the last decades, and increasingly considered culture and identity in its policies.

One aspect of European identity, which is widely recognized and increasingly discussed, is the relationship between national and the supranational European identity. Smith (1992), who was a pioneer in the field of national identity studies, claimed in his work on "National identity and the idea of the European Union," that individuals can have multiple identities (59). This idea is continued by Bruter (2003) who says that national and European identities are positively correlated, instead of standing in opposition towards each other (1154). The Commission envisioned the relationship among the various identities an individual can have as a concentric circle, involving a hierarchical relationship, with European identity being in the outer sphere (see chapter 3a). This short insight into the discussion about the relationship between national and European identity gives an impression of the debates which exist regarding European and national identity's relationship. Risse (2010) in his comprehensive analysis on European identity summarizes today's debate about multiple identities in the context of the EU. He underlines the importance of determining the relationship between them, and concludes that the most commonly used model among scholars and practitioners is considering national and European identities

as being nested in each other (Risse 2010, 24). This “onion model” implies that members of a smaller community also identify as being part of a larger community (ibid.).

Smith (1992) in this context comments on the contradiction between European and national identity, saying that they are dependent on the meaning that is ascribed to nationalism. If the nation is romanticized, and viewed as a cultural unit, then the contradiction between European and national identity becomes crucial (ibid. 56). If the nation however is regarded as a “rational association of common laws and culture within a defined territory,” then the contradiction between national and European identity is minimized (ibid.). The latter is the version prevailing in Western countries (ibid.). Therefore, Smith downplays the conflict between these two identities in the European Union, because it is “more situational and pragmatic.” (ibid.) The conflict between national and European identity thus varies within the EU itself, as the Eastern and Western sphere of the EU view their nations differently. This also suggests another conflict for the European Union, as difficulties to address EU identity with one strategy might arise.

The literature also considers European identity formation. Cram (2009) recognizes that “European Union identity should be understood as a process which is banal, contingent, and contextual.” (123) Thus, and as Smith (1992) also implies, developing a European identity is dependent on many factors, such as how the nation is regarded, or the EU’s role in this, which could have important implications for EU cultural policy makers (ibid.). Cram comments on the role of the European Union, saying that rather banal than heroic Europeanism is developing, because of the EU’s encouragement and commitment to allow the flourishing of diverse identities (ibid. 124). Örkény (2011) also addresses an aspect of European identity formation. She raises the question whether the European Union can succeed in offering Europeans an identity that can compete with national identities, that are built based on common historical traditions (33). This emphasizes the idea raised by Smith (1992) who pointed out the necessity of deep connections that people within a population have, based on a common history and memories. The European identity building process is influenced by the European institutions in several ways. Bee (2008) in his social-constructivist based study about the definition of the EU’s identity as it is proposed by the European

Commission, suggests that European institutions' role may not be underestimated in the identity building process, as they shape, create, and manipulate it (435). European identity also must be contextualized within the European integration process. Because this process is changing continuously, also European identity is continuously built, as the Commission, for example, has changed, modified, and re-defined European identity "at different stages of the European integration process" through membership, projecting EU identity externally, or adding EU symbols (ibid. 436).

What is also often considered in the literature is the debate about who will most likely develop a European identity. Scholars are mostly consensual about the answer to this question. "The European identity in some ways seems to be limited to European elites, especially those working in Brussels, rather than other spheres of civil society," argues Bee (2008, 434). Risse's (2010) conclusions convey a similar picture. Important factors influencing the development of a European identity concern the social class and the material interest of an individual, and benefits of the European integration process to that individual (ibid. 47). Being young, well educated, rich, and from the upper middle classes, are indicators that an individual is likely to show a strong sense of identification with the European Union (ibid. 46). Kuhn (2015), based on her study of the effect of individual transnationalism on EU support and European identity, furthermore argues that individuals interacting with people from different member states are more likely to develop a European identity. However, even though transnational interaction has increased in the past decades, it has not led to an increase in people identifying with Europe (ibid. 77). Taking Risse and Kuhn into account, it can be argued at this point, that these groups supported the EU less because they were impacted by especially the economic crisis, which left many, especially young people, in several EU states without employment.

Kuhn moreover explains that interaction across borders is still dependent on the socio-economic status of an individual, and has only spread to upper middle class Europeans (ibid.). Yet, this does not mean that identification with the European Union only comes from the somewhat small societal group fulfilling most of the socio-economic characteristics mentioned earlier. Bruter (2003) in this regard points out that European identity and support for European integration are not to be equated (1153-4). Indeed,

identification with the European Union does not have to be extremely high in order to generate support for the European Union and the integration process (Risse 2010, 181). Risse in this context differentiates between “interest and identity considerations,” and argues that, for example, “economic interests and identification processes seem to be independent sources of support for or rejection of European integration.” (ibid.) Thus, even though it is the elite who most clearly benefits from European integration, overarching support for the integration process among them can nevertheless be generated. However, that support would then not be based on the degree of identification with the European Union but for example on economic benefits of EU membership.

c. Crises

Because ‘crisis’ is a central concept of this study, it is important to clarify its meaning. George Ross, Jean Monnet Chair of the University of Montreal, Canada, made an extensive study of the European Union and its crises. In his book “The European Union and its Crises Through the Eyes of the Brussels Elite,” the author presents analyses by leaders or former high-ranked officials of the EU of the great problems the EU has faced. In the beginning, Ross defines the term “crises”. According to the author, the word ‘crisis’ is nowadays often misused by the media, to dramatize rather small challenges, for example “harsh conflicts between political rivals, [or] governmental deadlock.” (Ross 2011, 1) However, as reported by Ross, the term can and should be approached in a more serious sense:

“the term ‘crisis’ means a turning point in an unstable and dangerous time when decisive but uncertain change is impending. [...] The word is also used to describe unusually dramatic moments of economic and political change, when important routine processes and habits cease to work, opening a situation of great uncertainty where major changes are needed to allow the system to function again.” (ibid. 1-2)

Risse (2010) provides a shorter definition of the term crisis. According to him, crises are “critical junctures.” (Risse 2010, 32) Risse further clarifies this, and gives wars or military defeats as an example of crises as they lead to profound changes in national identities (ibid.). In the European context, the end of the Cold War, and the “transformation of the former Communist political, economic and social systems” were crises because they changed Eastern European countries’ identities by “returning to Europe,” and

applying for EU membership (ibid. 33). Crises are furthermore subjective phenomena, and occur “in the eyes of the beholder,” such as governments, law makers, or the populace, which is important regarding their ability to trigger rapid and deep identity changes (ibid.). This effect thus depends on the way crises are perceived and constructed by the environment in which they occur (ibid.). Risse illustrates his argument with the situations in Germany after World War I and II. Hitler’s reflections on the conditions of the peace treaty of Versailles resulting from World War I led to a strengthening of nationalism and extremism in Germany, whereas the processing after the end of World War II led to a more moderate course of politics, and ultimately to the creation of the European Union (ibid.). This shows how different interpretations of crises can have different effects on the formation of identities.

Both, Ross and Risse define crises as dramatic moments, when current systems cease to work, and a different direction has to be chosen from that moment, which results in a great change of that system. The two definitions also give examples of those moments. Ross (2011) is less concrete and mentions “unusually dramatic moments of economic and political change,” (2) whereas Risse (2010) is more concrete, and mentions the period of transformations after the fall of Communism, or military defeats (33). Ross emphasizes in his definition that a change is necessary when crises occur, whereas Risse includes the power that crises have to change, for example, identities. Both authors also talk about perceptions in the context of crises. Ross talks about misperceptions the media has about what a crisis really is, so that the result can be an overdramatization of a rather harmless situation. Risse on the other hand says that the perception of a crisis is important for the effects it can have. Both definitions do not define crises in the context of the European Union, but give a rather general explanation of the term, which makes them not sufficient enough for this study.

In order to clarify the type of definition of the word “crisis” that will serve best for this study, the following paragraphs will take a closer look at the crises the European Union has faced in its history. Ross (2011) looks more detailed at crises in the context of the European Union. He argues that crises have played a major role and appeared regularly in “key turning points in European integration” throughout EU history (ibid. 2). However, as Ross draws from his interviews with former high-ranked EU officials, they

have had a positive influence on the development of the European project. One former EU official suggested that crises were “endemic” to European integration, and that the member states were always able to overcome them and achieved greater successes after the times of uncertainty (ibid.). Based on this claim, which says that without crises, Europe would not exist as it does today, Ross categorizes four different types of crises the EU has faced throughout its history: crises of design, crises of economic adaptation, crises of enlargement, and crises of member state retreat (ibid. 7). These different types of crises can be identified separately, but can be combined to form large and complex “political knots.” (Ross 2011, 8) They thus can appear connectedly, and leave a difficult legacy.

The first type of crises identified by Ross, crises of design, are caused by member states’ disagreement about important points of the institutional and policy structure of the EU, based on member states’ insistence on their own idea of the basic structure of the EU’s institutions and policies (ibid.7,11). The first crisis of design appeared in 1954, when the French Parliament did not want to ratify the European Defence Community, thereby putting an end to the vision of negotiating a new institution for the European Union (ibid. 9). Other crises of design occurred in the early to mid-1960s, when the then French President Charles de Gaulle vetoed Britain’s application to join the European Economic Community, and the ‘empty chair crisis’ (ibid. 11). Those crises were at the same time the most dramatic ones. Because they appeared in early stages of the European project, they played a significant role in the overall progress and direction of European integration (ibid.). After the dramatic crises in the 1960s, and negotiations about important matters became more routine, “member states and EU institutions together developed better capacities for gathering information and anticipating the consequences of new bargains,” so that the development of a crisis of design became less likely (ibid. 12.) Nevertheless, because the costs of disturbing European cooperation have increased, the stakes in such crises have also risen (ibid.).

The second type of crises that Ross identifies are crises of economic adaptation. As opposed to crises of design, those types of crises do not involve the threat of member states to cease cooperation within the EU, or put European integration to an end generally (ibid. 16). They appear because the EU’s actions and reality depend to a large extent on the development of the economic and political world, in which the EU

developed in itself (ibid.). In the late 1960s, the European Community made plans to widen and deepen itself, by accessing new member states, giving it greater financial powers and begin coordinating foreign policy (ibid. 13). The European Community also developed plans for an Economic and Monetary Union (ibid.). However, an economic crisis starting in 1971 put an end to those plans, and at the same time increased tensions between the member states, so that “by the later 1970s, the EC was in a steep downward economic spiral.” (ibid. 13-14) This crisis, and other crises of economic adaptation, were ultimately solved by common adjustments among member states, and under the leadership of France and Germany at the supranational level (ibid.).

The third type of crises are crises of enlargement, starting in the 1970s and early 1980s, but likely to reoccur whenever the EU again expanded (ibid.). During past enlargements, crises were mostly triggered because negotiating accession states were unsatisfied about the *acquis communautaire* (ibid. 18). However, because they were in a weak negotiating position during the accession process, those states did not have the ability to get what they really wanted from the accession negotiation (ibid.). It was possible only after accession to reconsider the negotiated deals; however, only with tough methods, and thus accompanied by the threat to trigger a crisis for all the EU, could newly accessed member states alter the deal according to their ideas (ibid.).

The fourth type of crises that Ross mentions are crises of member state retreat, during which member states withdraw periodically from cooperation in the European Union, because of changes in their domestic politics, and dynamics in the EU change (ibid. 8). This was for example the case in France in 1995, when Jacques Chirac, known for his lack of enthusiasm for the European project, became new French president, and the French course within and towards the European Union changed (ibid. 20). Other examples of member states who retreated from EU cooperation are Spain and Germany. In 1996, Spain elected a more domestic-focused, center-right leader, and in Germany, the newly elected chancellor in 1998 was rather minimally devoted to European matters (ibid.).

Instead of using Ross’ and Risse’s crises definitions from the beginning of this section, the definition of crisis in the context of this study will rather be based on the four types of crises that Ross identified for

the European Union. In comparison to Ross' definition of crises, his typology takes the European Union context into account. The discourse will be analyzed looking out for rhetoric which indicates that decision-making or policy-making processes cease to function, and there is disunity within the EU, apparent because of disagreement between member states about topics regarding the crisis, and how to solve it.

During the research, I demonstrate the extent to which European Union agencies view European identity as an antidote to crises, and cultural development as a way of cementing identity. The impression was created that Ross' understanding of crises was too narrow, and that often crises that were mentioned could not be placed under Ross' categorization. Many instances were encountered in which crises were mentioned which developed at a society level, and not at an institutional level.

3. Literature Review

After having explained the essential concepts of this study, this chapter will now take the existing literature on the topic into account. First, the European identity concept will be put into a historical perspective, and the role of cultural heritage for the development of a European identity will be explained. I will conclude by reviewing the literature on European identity and crises.

a. Development of the European Identity Concept

Hoping for the spillover effect and assuming that cultural and social integration would follow the political and economic integration, culture was intentionally excluded in the establishing treaties (Sassatelli 2008, 227). However, a reference to culture as a factor capable of uniting people and promoting social and economic development was made in the preamble of the Treaty of Rome (European Parliament 2004). After the economic and monetary integration became gradually stronger and more successful, European leaders focused more on the cultural dimension of the European Community, and the shared attitudes and values of Member States (Shore 1993, 784-7). By signing the “Declaration on the European Identity” in 1973, the then nine leaders of the European Community took a first step in defining the cultural basis for the European Union and agreed that “reviewing the common heritage” was the first necessary step in order to define European identity (ibid. 787, European Communities 2013). The declaration furthermore proclaimed, in anticipation of membership applications from the then still authoritarian Greece, Spain, and Portugal, that the members shared the same values, and were committed to defending democratic principles, as well as the rule of law, social justice and to respecting human rights, as they make up principle parts of democratic structures, which all member states, as well as the EU, have, and which are furthermore a condition for accession (Shore 1993, 787-8, Grillo 2007, 69). Emphasizing the democratic principle was particular relevant at that time because of fascism prevailing in several Western European countries. From September 1973, the EU furthermore began to “assess public opinion and [keep] citizens informed” as the inclusion of European citizens in the European integration process was regarded essential (“A People’s Europe”). The results of the first wave of the Eurobarometer

survey in 1974 revealed a negative public opinion of the European Community. A majority of citizens evaluated the Community's actions in combating problems at that time, for example political unity, differences between regions, or consumer protection as "not sufficient," expressing by that their dissatisfaction and pessimism about the European integration process, and the European democracy (Commission of the European Communities 1974). For Crozier et al. (1975), this is a crisis of democracy. "Contextual threats, societal trends and intrinsic challenges" all present demands, which make it difficult for the European Union to correct the deficiencies noted by the public (ibid. 8-9). The authors call this "the central dilemma of governability of democracy [...] in Europe [...] in the 1970s," which means that the European Union democracy was not capable to meet the demands which European citizens had on it (ibid. 9).

Therefore, and possibly as a reaction to the poor evaluation of the EC's action, work in the cultural field gradually received higher importance. At the Paris summit meeting in 1974, the involvement of the "man-in-the-street in the policy-making process of the Community Institutions" was emphasized (European Commission 2015). However, unlike the leaders of member countries, the Commission itself was not convinced "of the need to market Europe more effectively" until 1979, when only 62% of people casted their ballots in the European elections (Shore 1993, 783, TNS/ScytI). In comparison to that, the average voter turnout in West European countries in national elections at that time was in the range of 80%, which is a significant difference to the turnout in the EU elections (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance 2004, 18).

This indicator of low participation, dissatisfaction, and pessimism of citizens in the European project, which qualify as a crisis of democracy, increasingly triggered new approaches to include citizens more. Interviewing a Belgian official who worked for the Commission's Directorate General for Information, Culture and Communication, Shore found out that after the low voter turnout of the 1979 elections, the Commission realized that Europeans had to become more aware of the presence of the EU in their everyday lives in order to avoid the evolving of a crisis of democracy, and raise the level of citizens' participation (Shore 1993, 783). The Commission envisaged the emergence of a European identity that

would fit into the hierarchy of the feeling of belonging first on a regional, then on a national, and then on a supranational level, which represents Risse's (2010) elaborations of nested identities (ibid. 784).

However, "to change people's consciousness of themselves, including their identity as nationals rather than European citizens" demanded an approach that had to be much more determined than the creation of a common market because it involves not simply the act of removing trade barriers (Shore 1993, 784). The European Union had to be perceived as a "humanistic enterprise," involving the rapprochement of people from different cultural and national backgrounds (ibid.). The consciousness about this problem shows the Community's serious consideration of making the European citizens. This idea made up part of the rationale behind establishing an "ad hoc working party on a People's Europe" after the European Council meeting in June 1984 which was to serve the strengthening and promotion "of the Community's identity" and to aid European cultural integration (ibid., "A People's Europe"). As an echo to Willi Brandt's support for a "Europe with a 'human face' and the endorsement of political rights for Member States' nationals", several proposals regarding the free movement of people, Europe-wide standards and cooperation in education, and traditional symbolic nation-building strategies such as a flag, an anthem, or postage stamps were made for the first time (Laffan 1996, 96, "A People's Europe", Shore 1993, 790). This was the beginning of policy initiatives with the stated objective to create a European culture area and boost people's awareness of a European cultural identity (Shore 1993, 790).

The second report of the People's Europe working party in 1985 presented several stimuli "to give the Community a new political, cultural and social dimension" (European Commission 2015) and educate European people about the advantages of the Community. Several initiatives related to a people's Europe were launched, though not under a legal policy framework, and implemented after the Delors Commission took office that same year (ibid., Shore 1993, 788). Commission reports referred more frequently to the cultural heritage of Europe, the spreading of the European message across borders, and to showing that Europe existed for the people by encouraging for example "non-economic cross-national networks" and mobility through initiatives like Erasmus (Laffan 1996, 96-7). Not only were the stimuli

and new leitmotif for Europe-wide initiatives aimed at bringing the European project closer to the people, but also at the development of a common identity (Sassatelli 2008, 228).

In addition, literature from the 1980s and 1990s examining the innovations of the Community regarding European identity enumerates other reasons for which the European leaders decided to start working on its creation in the first place, and to put culture onto the supranational stage. In accordance with Sassatelli's (2008) claim about the hope of the EU about an emerging European identity, Laffan (1996) argues that the meaning of identity politics at that time increased, and was critical for the "new Europe" because "the Union [...] [was] moving from issues of fundamental problem-solving to fundamental questions about its nature as a part-formed polity." (ibid. 82) He furthermore criticized the EU for having engaged the citizens only as consumers and workers but not as active citizens, for which the low participation in European elections of 1979 is an indicator (ibid. 94, Shore 1993). The results of the first Eurobarometer survey support Laffan's (1996) claim, and indicate that the European institutions had "little appeal and low profile" to the citizens of the Community (Shore 1993, 785). A more meaningful European identity was supposed to be a potential answer to the "Community's self-perceived lack of authority and prestige", or its democratic deficit (ibid.). It was therefore perceived as a tool.

b. The EU's Cultural Policy and the Role of Cultural Heritage for European Identity

Before cultural action was included in the EU treaties, cultural activities were funded through the European Social Fund, the European Regional Fund, and ad hoc initiatives, focusing, among others and based on the Declaration of European Identity of 1973, on the protection of cultural heritage (European Parliament 2004). The Maastricht Treaty of 1992 then enabled the European Community to legally work in the field of culture to safeguard, disseminate and develop cultural heritage (Shore 1993, 784). Article 151 of the Maastricht Treaty states that 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." (The six Member States 1957) The treaty furthermore specifies that Member States should be encouraged to cooperate, and that their actions in several areas should be

supported and supplemented (ibid.). The first two areas that are mentioned are the “improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples” and “conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance.” (ibid.) Just as reviewing the common heritage was the first step in defining a European identity as stated by the nine leaders of the European Community in 1973, so are culture, history, or cultural heritage the first two areas mentioned in the treaty establishing a legal competence for the Union to work in the field of culture. This implies that focus is placed on culture, cultural heritage, and history, and a certain importance of these aspects for the building of a European identity. Several crises accompanied the Maastricht Treaty ratification. The Exchange Rate Mechanism crisis, or the crisis of Yugoslavia, to which the EU was unable to implement a common security and defense policy, coincided with the ratification phase of the treaty by national parliaments (“The Treaty”). Because the EU included culture for the first time in its treaties at a time of crisis, it becomes likely that culture was regarded as a tool to combat crises.

After the EU put culture on its political agenda with the Maastricht Treaty, and hereby established the foundation for European identity formation, it was able to set up initiatives to build a European identity more effectively. In the late 1990s three programs were launched: The Kaleidoscope Programme (1996) for promoting awareness and spreading of the European culture, the Ariane Programme (1997) for promoting knowledge of European history through books, and the Raphael Programme (1997) for promoting cooperation between member states regarding European cultural heritage (European Parliament 2004). In 1998, the Commission proposed the first EU Framework Programme “Culture 2000” which ran until 2006 after it was extended for two years in 2003 (ibid.). With the help of the program, EU action was simplified by using one single financing mechanism. The Commission furthermore wanted to promote a common cultural area which was mainly characterized by cultural diversity and a shared cultural heritage, corresponding to Article 151 of the Maastricht Treaty (European Commission 2016a). Indeed, Sassatelli’s (2008) study on the relationship between the EU’s cultural policy and the process of Europeanization shows that the rhetoric of all the programs circulates around the protection of the common cultural heritage (229).

In 2007, the important role of culture for the European integration process, and the fundamental role of cultural heritage were further recognized. A resolution from the Council on a “European Agenda for Culture” in November 2007 summarizes the cultural goals of the EU and determines several principles for the EU’s work in the cultural field. After careful considerations of culture and its role for the European integration process, three specific strategic objectives were prioritized: cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue, culture as a catalyst for creativity, and culture as an essential part of the international relations (Council of the European Union 2007). These priorities were formed, among others, based on experiences implementing the two previous work plans, and the results of the first Cultural Forum for Europe, and Commission communications (ibid.). The Council agreed that the three priorities would contribute to the building of a European identity, as well as social cohesion, and regional and local development, and also foster the “intercultural dialogue and interaction between civil societies of EU Member States and third countries,” to use culture as a tool for development policy in third countries (ibid.).

This resolution’s principles served as guidelines for the EU’s sequential triennial culture work plans following it, the Work Plan for Culture 2008-10, the Work Plan for Culture 2011-14, and the current Work Plan for Culture 2015-18 (European Commission 2016d). Those priorities show, that unlike in the first initiatives from the mid to late 1990s, the focus shifts from solely the protection and promotion of cultural heritage, to creating cooperation, and including culture on various levels. This suggests that the EU, aiming at building a European identity through culture, extended its focus, to further stress culture’s importance, and make it part of its core policies by integrating it horizontally.

Bee (2008) explains, that by spreading the European dimension of culture, the common culture is mobilized by the Commission for the formation of European identity (ibid.). Since the Declaration on European Identity of 1973, the European Union has not shifted away from regarding the cultural heritage as an important element in the creation of a European identity. Because the cultural policy of the European Union involves its protection, it can help to define a European identity (Tagiuri 2014, 158). Lähdesmäki (2012) who analyzes the rhetoric of unity and cultural diversity in the making of a European cultural identity, recognizes several scholars who have underlined the meaning of culture for the

formation of identity (61). Looking at the civic or political and culturally based or affective dimensions of European identity, she encapsulates the cultural meanings of European identity, critiquing that a political approach is not sufficient to shape a common European identity (ibid.). This strongly suggests the importance of EU cultural policy in the process of European identity formation, not as a political approach, but rather as the place to establish a constant dialogue about culture and identity, and “negotiation and contest of similarity and difference, sameness and distinction,” which is an important aspect in the identity formation process (ibid.). It is at the same time in accordance with the Community’s problem after 1979 which Shore (1993) explains, namely that the European citizens were not involved sufficiently in the European project. On many levels of the EU’s cultural policy, the “rhetoric of European cultural identity [...] [is] intertwined into the ideas and practices of fostering the European cultural heritage.” (ibid. 71) In the rhetoric of the European Culture Capitals program for example, the longest running program of the EU, the common, European cultural heritage is heavily emphasized, and awarded cities are expected to foster this heritage (ibid.).

As early as 1993, Shore realized about the lack of work carried out to answer questions about the cultural policy of the European Union, or the efforts to create a European Identity, and its implications on national identities (Shore 1993, 780). European unification might be primarily political, but by raising questions that concern the conflict of identification on the national or supranational level, it can be seen that European identification goes well beyond the political spheres (ibid.) Common narratives, history or culture are the foundation of identity building (Risse 2010, 25-6). Thus, the European Union is looking for commonalities, and it is for example setting standards of membership with EU treaties, resolutions or criteria by referencing to common values or sets of norms.

c. European Identity and Crises

As it was outlined in chapter 2c by Risse (2010), crises can challenge identities (33). Indeed, various scholars agree that “profound crises – ‘critical junctures’ – are necessary conditions for [...] rapid identity change.” (ibid. 32) Several researchers have looked at the effect of crises on European identity, and

thereby established a relationship between them. Debates about European identity in the EU and the Council of Europe, for example, “usually coincide with periods of enlargement” with the goal to strengthen unity within Europe (Grillo 2007, 70). Because the EU is growing, it becomes imperative to define who and what the Europeans, and the European Union, are (ibid.). The role of the Commission in the identity building process as explained by Bee (2008) in the previous chapter further substantiates the relationship between crises and identity. Depending on the different contexts of crises faced by the EU, the Commission, as the influencer, diffusor, and creator of European identity has to adjust its strategy in influencing it (ibid. 446). Thus, crises do not influence European identity actively, but rather they affect it passively by forcing the Commission to change its identity building strategy. When the identity building process for example started in the 1970s, a direct link was established between European identity and the common market (ibid. 437). Furthermore, “the first definitions of public opinion, culture and common education policy” were directly aimed at increasing the economic area’s performance (ibid.). Then, in the 1980s, deep political and economic crises such as “the petrol crisis, [...] [or the] the highly debated issue of the Common Agricultural Policy” presented situations which did not undermine the “political and economic sense of the European Integration” in the 1980s (ibid. 439-40). The identity question became essential, and some even claimed the necessity of common European cultural roots (ibid. 440). At that time, the motto “United in diversity” was invented by the Commission, and it focused stronger on developing a “new common cultural background.” (ibid.) We can thus observe a shift from defining identity first by the common market, the economy, towards a deeper definition by common cultural roots.

Bruter (2003) likewise recognizes the change of European identity depending on the context. He examined how European civic and cultural identity is affected by top-down messages, whether they come from the media, or the political system, and conducted an experimental design study, comparing the impact of these top-down messages in France, Britain, and the Netherlands (ibid. 1157). Many of the participants were young people, but came from various locations and socio-economic backgrounds (ibid.). Bruter presented the participants with a fake newspaper extract, one version only contained good news about, for example, the economy or international diplomacy, and the other one only bad news (ibid.

1158). Two other newspaper extracts focused on symbols. One showed pictures with symbols of European integration, such as the European flag, and the other contained placebo photographs (ibid.). The participants' level of European identity was measured before and after being presented with the newspaper (ibid.). Bruter found that regular bad news on European integration, or in other words news on crises, diffused for example by the media, threaten the sense of European identity (ibid.). On the other hand, good news, or symbols of European unity spread by the European elite or institutions, have a positive effect on the citizens' identity (ibid.). Taking the Commission's role in the identity building process into account, it can be implied that positive news and symbols of European integration might be spread actively in times of crises to combat the decline of the sense of European identity among Europeans, and also to combat bad news about Europe and its crises in the media.

Some scholars go beyond establishing a passive relationship between crises and identity based on the decline of the sense of European identity influenced by another actor. They deepen this relationship and discuss the power and importance of culture and identity in, among others, combating anti-European sentiments among the citizens of Europe. One of those scholars is Marion Demossier. She served as an expert in the peer review panel of the DG Research of the European Commission on "European Identity: Inner and Outer Dimensions." ("Professor") In 2012, she was invited by the European Commission to partake in FREE (Football Research in an Enlarged Europe), a project which was "designed and launched as a response to a call for proposals about 'The Anthropology of European Integration'." (FREE team) Based on this experience, Demossier has unique expertise in the study on European identity. In her book "The European Puzzle," she contextualizes the need for European identity and the progress of the European Union (Demossier 2007). Demossier first talks about the necessity of "new [polities] based upon values shared by a majority of Europeans" during the crisis of politics because a shared destiny for Europe becomes increasingly common, and major ideologies decline (ibid. 4). A variety of ethnic identities and communities exist within the EU, and it is imperative for the EU to "minimize the importance of ethno-cultural criteria for determining membership in the political community" because of that (ibid.). Crises need to be approached by solutions based on values, and which connect most people on

a deeper level, because of the close interconnectivity between European people, caused by the advanced integration process (ibid.). Demossier further establishes a relationship between the overall development of European integration and European identity. According to her, the necessity for a European identity for the progress of European integration has to be considered (ibid. 60). If more people identified with the EU, and its values, they would engage with it more, by for example participating in elections. Moreover, a common identity would ensure “economic, social, and political stability” should further integration occur (ibid. 61) Demossier thereby agrees with several scholars who argue in favor of a European identity for the European integration process (ibid.).

A conceptual tie is also made by Giacomo Tagiuri, studying and publishing in the area of European Union cultural heritage law (2014). In his essay “Forging Identity: The EU and European Culture,” which was shortlisted for the 2013 Palliser Prize (IISS), Tagiuri claims that

“it might seem unrealistic to look to European culture for a solution [at a moment when the financial and economic troubles of the Union raise doubts about its survival]. But this may be exactly the right time to see culture as a means of revitalising an exhausted integration process [...]. Doing so could make a strong statement about the nature of European identity [...]. A new cultural activism in [...] Europe [...] might not be incompatible with current austerity and shrinking welfare states. It is in periods of crisis that one reconsiders priorities and goals.” (Tagiuri 2014, 172-3)

If the EU’s focus shifts away from its obligation to create growth, towards investing in culture, education, or science, an opportunity could be created, in which the EU could start a process of self-reflection, and approach its lack of identity (ibid.). For this endeavor, it is imperative that European cultural heritage is considered and invested in, as it represents the living proof that there is a common history in Europe (ibid.). Tagiuri thereby agrees with several authors on the importance of a European cultural heritage, and a shared history for the building of a European identity, as they make Europeans aware of what unites, instead of divides, them. Times of crises change priorities and goals, and the European integration process needs to get fresh input. Culture is the gateway to opening a debate about European identity, and investing in it and making it a priority, could ultimately erase the doubts about the EU’s survival (ibid.).

Also for Ioanna Ntampoudi (2014), from the Aston University at the Aston Centre for Europe (“Ioanna”)

“the construction of a commonly shared, transnational European identity came to be seen as the ‘political glue’ that would legitimize and sustain the European project [...] by being an antidote to nationalism and Euroscepticism, widely understood as lack of support for European integration and a remedy for a perceived ‘democratic deficit’ induced by the absence of an active European demos.” (Ntampoudi 2014, 3)

Thus, an established, political European identity can help mobilize support and even fill in gaps created by the passive European public. With critical situations, as for instance the Eurozone crisis, European unity is challenged even more (ibid.). Ntampoudi further contextualizes European identity and crises. Based on Risse’s (2010) elaborations on the formation of identities in crises, Ntampoudi (2014) claims that it is necessary to reflect on European identities “as they are shaped inside the crisis” through reflections and discussions (ibid. 3) In times of deadlock and the threat that it “may only be a politics of solidarity and a cosmopolitan culture of mutual responsibility that could hold the EU together,” it is imperative to reflect upon and discuss European identity, and to possibly redefine it (ibid.).

Chris Shore explains the connection between European identity and crises from an historical perspective. He notes that the fall of communism in 1989, German reunification and the end of the Cold War triggered the creation of a European identity, and made it a central topic in contemporary debates about the future of the European project and for the Community’s policy makers. Because of these three events, “the pace of European integration” was accelerated, because of the deep social changes following those events (Shore 1993, 780). New identities and borderlands were created, as many migrants, workers and refugees moved across Europe, and were categorized as insiders or outsiders which led to “a resurgence of ethnic nationalism and a rise in xenophobia and racism throughout Europe.” (ibid.) Shore notes further that “against this background, the problem of ‘identity’ (ethnic, national, European) has become an issue of growing significance for social scientists, as well as for EC policy-makers.” (Shore 199, 781) Taking Ross’ typology of crises into account, the events described by Shore can be put under the third kind of crises, which are crises of enlargement. However, Shore is not referring to negotiation difficulties, like Ross in his definition, but rather to changes in society, and challenges arising from that. Shore is furthermore saying that the social changes made a faster progression of European integration, as well as the consideration of European identity in EU policies, necessary.

This relationship between European identity and crises, and its potential power in times of crises outlined by Risse, raises important questions: What happens if the European identity is in a crisis itself? How do priorities then shift? Does the uncertainty of the concept cause it to be useless? As reports in media especially over the past few years strongly suggest, the EU does not only face political or economic crises, but also an identity crisis, mostly due to the refugee situation (Szabo 2015, Boyes 2016, Nougayréde 2016). European identity has undergone states of uncertainty several times, for example in the 2004 and 2007 enlargements, and it is a recurring issue in the debate about Turkish accession to the European Union (Ntampoudi 2014, 4). Nougayréde (2016) elaborates on the current crises the EU is facing, a refugee and migrant crises, and an identity crisis. Commenting on the relationship between the two types of crises in an opinion piece for the British newspaper 'The Guardian,' she claims that "Europe isn't confronted with a refugee and migrant crisis. It's the refugees and migrants who are confronted with a crisis of Europe" (Nougayréde 2016) She thus demonstrates the fundamentality of the identity crisis. A "crisis of Europe" is not considered by Ross in his typology; however, a "crisis of Europe" can be considered as a generic term for the EU's current crises. Internally, the EU is currently struggling to find consensus, or finger points at each other. Moreover, extremism is rising. On the other hand, the crises defined by Ross were presented with a solution, whereas the "crisis of Europe" is more fundamental, given the various types of challenges that fall under this generic term.

Scholars have also taken Europe's identity crisis under investigation, and elaborated on its significance for the overall state of the European Union. Pellerin-Carlin (2014) acknowledges that the EU is facing several crises, however, the identity crisis of the European Union is a "key crisis," and its resolution is essential in order to avoid the development of a crisis into a severe political one (74-5). Pellerin-Carlin justifies his claim in relation to the Euro crisis. If a feeling of being European dominates throughout various nation states of the EU, financial transfers within the Eurozone, for instance, will become easier because they will be perceived as a transfer between Europeans, and not between nationals of nation states (83). European identity does thus not only have a value in the context of the European society, but its existence could also be valuable for other policy areas. A crisis of the European identity

could diminish the power it has as a tool to combat crises, as it was elaborated on in the preceding paragraphs. Because of the value of European identity, it should be the first matter to consider, when wanting to exploit it to solve political or economic crises.

4. Methods

As the literature suggests, the concept of European identity can be mobilized to serve various purposes. According to the 1973 Declaration on European Identity, the concept of European identity was established within the context of the Community's relationships with third countries. It was defined primarily by the common heritage, which the EU's cultural policy aims to protect and promote. Instead of looking at European identity as a fundament for the EU's place and actions in the world, I chose to approach the concept from the perspective of creating a space of identification for European citizens because it better addresses the current challenge the EU is facing. Furthermore, the identity crisis, a key crisis, which the previous chapter talked about and which the EU is currently facing, stems from within the EU, and not from its relationship with third countries. Moreover, it is important to take into account that only 35% of Europeans have a positive image of the EU, which is a decrease to previous years. This is another reason why the approach of creating a space of identification for citizens serves this study better than that of establishing a fundament for the EU's relationship with third countries. The original rationale behind the European identity can moreover not be applied because of the progress the European project has made.

Thus, this study looks at culture or cultural heritage, reinforced by cultural policy, as being able to create a feeling of belonging within citizens, or a European identity, similar to a feeling of belonging to a nation and national identity, so that citizens of Europe show more solidarity, and at the same time their support for the European Union increases. I believe that invoking a feeling of belonging within citizens to remind Europeans of their common roots, especially in difficult times, is the objective of EU cultural policy. This belief is based upon Bee's (2008) elaborations on the Commission's identity building strategies, in combination with Bruter's (2003) study of the behavior of European identity in different contexts. Demossier (2007) who argues in favor of new EU polities based upon values, and Taigiuri (2014) who elaborates on culture as a solution to crises further support my suggestion.

This study uses a qualitative research approach. The EU is a unique object of study which is why the qualitative research approach can deliver the most appropriate and insightful results. It allows for the

creation of comparisons, so that trends in thought and opinion can be drawn, which is why quantitative research does not suffice because it does not allow for comparisons, but rather quantifies the problem. Qualitative research furthermore allows for flexibility in the field which can be used to the advantage of this study, as data can be included as it is found, and does not have to be entirely collected before the analysis like in the more structured quantitative approach. Qualitative research is not limited by the structure of the data, but rather it structures the data. Instead of looking at a set of variables, a holistic approach is taken in order to understand the data. In other words, qualitative research gives a certain degree of openness which allows considering new data found in the course of research, issues that weren't considered in the beginning. This is especially important for this study which considers speeches of lawmakers, as they can occur during the research, and can also be included. Furthermore, it can be deeply elaborated on the context of the use of certain keywords, and a detailed picture of emotions, opinions, or experiences can be created.

Based on the conception that qualitative research uses text instead of numbers as empirical material, a corpus of materials composed of video and textual material was constructed to find data that would generate insightful answers to the research question, and which serves as the foundation for a discourse analysis. Discourse is “the entirety of everything that has been said and written by the member of the discourse community to which they owe their identity” and which they use to make sense of people's world and lives (Teubert 2010, 1). Discourse and identity are thus intimately linked. Based on Teubert's explanation, discourse is an essential element in the construction of identities, and it therefore has the power to change or transform them. Because identities are not steady, and can be reshaped according to the environment, as Örkény (2011) pointed out, discourse is an important political tool, to instrumentalize, or manipulate, for example, attitudes.

Discourse analysis focuses on the language use in a certain context (Rapley 2007, 2). It is of interest for the researcher, “what specific version of the world, or identity, or meaning is produced by describing something in just that way over another.” (ibid.) Thus, this study seeks to find key words and concepts based on the literature review, that address “common heritage,” “identity,” or “culture,” and on the other

hand “challenge,” or “crisis” in the data to determine the relationship between them. It was furthermore of significance when references were made to the “European” level or dimension.

In order to get the most insightful answers to the research question, it is necessary to accumulate evidence. The concept of ‘thick descriptions,’ acknowledges the strength of finding a preponderance of evidence, according to Joseph Ponterotto (2006). Thick descriptions are accurately described “social actions within the appropriate context in which the social action took place.” (ibid. 542) In addition, thick descriptions involve the task of interpreting the observed behavior “within its particular context.” (ibid. 543) Because discourse analysis also focuses on the context, it is a very important aspect in the study. It itself is created by the collected evidence, and the preponderance of evidence is essential here, in order to create a detailed picture of the context.

A central part of thick descriptions is the “interpretation of what is being observed or witnessed,” or a thick interpretation (ibid. 542). Readers can understand the actions being reported only through thick interpretation (ibid.). Thus, “assigning motivations and intentions for the [...] social actions” plays a central role for those thick interpretations, as those actions or behavior then become purposeful and intentional (ibid.). Critical discourse analysis seeks to “make power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance.” (Wodak and Meyer 2001, 15) In this study, the discourse was interpreted, taking the context into account, and relationships between what was said and the current situations were built.

The corpus for this study’s analysis includes speeches of EU lawmakers or national politicians who talked in the EU context, and law texts related to programs and initiatives issued by various EU institutions. In addition, online videos which showed conferences, interviews, or speeches were considered for analysis according to their content. This material will allow to get an insight into the “real world” of the EU’s identity discourse. Law texts or official documents on EU cultural policy and initiatives or programs will deliver the strongest evidence for the argument. If the text for an initiative or cultural program mentions a crisis or the objective of the program to create unity between Europeans at a specific time, it will be of large significance, because it suggests that the crisis or the current situation was

the rationale behind the establishment of the program or initiative. Because speeches articulate thoughts and opinions of the speaker, they are a useful object of analysis. Discovering EU lawmakers or officials who establish direct, or indirect relationships between crises and European identity, will give an interesting insight into the direction the EU was taking at the moment the speech was delivered.

Although the results cannot be generalized to a larger population, parts of it can be transferred to a different setting, thereby making the study valuable for other research. While the EU is a sui generis organization, as for example Phelan (2012) discusses by describing the unique relationship between the EU member states, and is unique in its status of integration and sharing of sovereignty, there are various international organizations consisting of geographically and culturally close countries and regions in the world, to which the EU serves as a model. These organizations are regionally integrated, and could provide a space of identification for their citizens. Indeed, the EU has been for instance compared to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as well as the Latin American Mercosur (Wunderlich 2012, Lenz 2012). Policy-makers of Mercosur have for example claimed that they are “engaged in broader processes of Community-building rather than mere trade liberalization,” which makes Mercosur very similar to the EU, in that it goes beyond just a trade cooperation (Lenz 2012, 158). Provided that the same research context and assumptions are present, a similar research on the discourse of those organizations in times of crises could be conducted.

5. Connection between European Identity and Crises in EU Discourse

This section will examine where a relationship between crises and European identity is built into the EU discourse related to culture. It is important at this point of the thesis to reiterate what is being researched. This thesis is looking for the relationship between crises and European identity in EU discourse. It aims to examine whether the EU uses its cultural policy as a tool for crisis management, and refers to concepts such as “European identity”, “common cultural heritage”, or “the bond between Europeans” in the context of challenging situations. If this is true, the observed documents should name a crisis or several crises, and then make reference to the concepts mentioned, and emphasize the importance of culture for the creation of one European society at that particular time.

Thus, the following sections contribute to answering the research question by pointing out where in EU discourse a connection between crises and European identity is made. The section is divided according to the EU lawmaker, and institution that issued the law texts in which a connection between crises and European identity is established. This categorization will facilitate the presentation of the results by giving it an organized structure which furthermore allows for the reader to follow this section more easily.

d. Lawmakers

i. Tibor Navracsics

Discussions and elaborations of speeches given by various EU lawmakers and officials show a relationship between crises and identity. The experience and mission of those officials, to represent the European Union, make these claims highly credible. Furthermore, their involvement in the creation of laws makes them the authors of it, so that the laws bear their fingerprints.

In what follows, connections between culture and crises made in speeches by Tibor Navracsics, the current Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, will be presented. Navracsics’ elaborations are relevant in the context of the European Union because in his role as a Commissioner, he committed himself to promote EU interests. Furthermore, according to his appointment as Commissioner

for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, he is responsible for, among others, promoting culture, which makes his elaborations highly relevant for this study, as he would be the person to make the connection between culture and crisis, should the EU use cultural policy as an antidote to crises. As the literature review has shown, the debate about culture is especially now important, when the EU is faced with several challenges, and internal identity crisis. Because Navracsics is the current Commissioner, he is the person to start these debates, directly driven by the EU's interests.

In a speech at the Kulfest Festival in Zagreb, hereafter referred to as source 1, Navracsics mentions culture in general, as well as concrete initiatives which can help with certain challenges for society. The four parts of Navracsics' portfolio, which are education, culture, youth and sport, "have a crucial role to play in fostering civic values, in promoting freedom of thought and expression, social inclusion and respect for others, as well as in preventing and tackling discrimination in all its forms." (Navracsics 2015b) Thus, culture can help fight challenges which occur in society. Navracsics furthermore underlines the "importance of culture and intercultural dialogue," because they aid in building bridges, and also in creating shared trust and understanding (ibid.). Further along in the speech, two concrete cultural initiatives are mentioned. The Commissioner talks about the European Heritage Label (EHL), and the European Capital of Culture program (ECOC), and how they have brought benefits to society and the European project, by creating connections between the European people on the one hand, and the people and the European project itself on the other. The EHL contributes by explaining the values predicating European integration to European citizens, and providing "recognition for sites that have played a significant role in the European integration process." (ibid.) The ECOC program can help "bring citizens together around culture" and also "create respect for cultural diversity." (ibid.) Both initiatives can thus lie the foundation for a smooth and peaceful interaction between societies, and prevent societal challenges, from which crises can arise. In other words, they can prevent more serious situations.

In his remarks at the European Heritage Awards Ceremony in Oslo, hereafter source 2, Navracsics brings heritage into the conversation, and also confirms the "role cultural heritage has to play in social inclusion and economic development." (Europa Nostra 2015) He also emphasizes the ability of common

heritage to be “a bridge between communities and a path towards personal identity building.” (ibid.) Promoting and protecting cultural heritage is therefore beneficial for the development of people’s European identity. As Tagiuri (2014) has argued, opening the debate about European culture and heritage could not only erase doubts about its existence but also start a process of self-reflection, in which the EU’s lack of identity could be approached. Thus, crises can be prevented.

At the conference “Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe” in June 2015, or source 3, Commissioner Navracsics talks about the benefits of heritage. He mentions the economic crisis because of which “investment in cultural and heritage policies is reduced.” (Navracsics 2015) However, “heritage matters” as it is “the soul of our cities and the source of our identity.” (ibid.) He then mentions several benefits that heritage brings: “benefits for European culture, the environment, the economy and for society as a whole.” (ibid.) Navracsics also talks about “a wealth of studies” which underline the “significant contribution of the heritage sector to economic and social development.” (ibid.) In addition, cultural initiatives like the ECOC, or the EHL, contribute to citizens’ engagement “in a deeper reflection on the roots and the meaning of European identity.” In source 3, Navracsics thus highlights the important role of culture and the heritage sector at the time of the economic crisis, because of their contribution to economic development.

In a speech a month later at Pristina University, hereafter referred to as source 4, the Commissioner talks about the role of culture and education for the Juncker Commission, under which Navracsics works. He begins his speech by talking about the seemingly “uncertain future” for the European Union, and mentions several situations challenging European integration, such as the events in Greece or the United Kingdom, or the rise of Eurosceptic or extremist parties (Navracsics 2015c). These events have “raised fundamental questions about where we want to go, how we want to live and work together in the European Union, what we want this Union to look like,” questions which additionally challenge the EU’s identity (ibid.). Navracsics furthermore mentions several problems the EU has or has had:

“[T]he worst financial and economic crisis since World War II, inequality and the risk of poverty are on the rise, straining the fabric that holds our societies together. In some EU Member States, more than half of young people are without a job. We are running a serious risk of losing an

entire generation. Isolation, exclusion and even radicalization of young people as a result of this are real threats. At the same time, we need to find human and fair ways of dealing with the influx of migrants and refugees. And we need to deal with the various threats to our security.” (ibid.)

After mentioning these challenges, Navracsics begins talking about the essentials of the European project. He believes that “we need to remind ourselves of what the European project is fundamentally about: It is about uniting us. It is about overcoming division by growing closer economically, politically and culturally. About ensuring that we will never live through war again in Europe.” (ibid.) He then underlines the importance of personal relationships, and how they have shaped the European project through, for example, Erasmus (ibid.). In the end of this speech, Navracsics highlights that the EU was going through a “difficult phase,” but that the Commission was working to enable European citizens to continue to come closer together (ibid.). Because of culture’s importance for society in ensuring inclusion and building bridges between citizens elaborated in sources 1 to 4, suggests that culture is supposed to doing this work for the EU.

In a speech at conference about finding more strategic approaches to cultural policies in the EU’s external relations, hereafter source 5, Navracsics establishes a direct connection between culture and crises. He first talks about the economic benefits connected to culture (Navracsics 2015a). He then explains the role of culture for society, which is to “foster citizenship, good governance and democratization,” and for post-conflict management, where culture “is a powerful catalyst.” (ibid.) Thus, the Commissioner highlights culture’s role when crises are overcome, because of its importance for fostering citizenship, good governance, and democratization.

In a speech at the 2015 European Capital of Culture Closure in Pilsen, or source 6, Navracsics again talks about the ECOC program in relation to challenging times. He acknowledges that the European Union “is facing huge challenges.” (Navracsics 2015d) He highlights that the year’s historical programming in the city of Pilsen “has shown how culture can unite people across borders in Europe [...] [which] is more vital than ever,” because of the challenges mentioned (ibid.). Navracsics points out that Pilsen has attracted many visitors, or created spaces for various cultural actors to come together and collaborate, and has therefore contributed to meet the ultimate goal of the ECOC which is to unite people

(ibid.). Reminds his audience of this founding idea of the ECOC program, the Commissioner also points out that “this ideal has lost none of its relevance” because as Europe “grapples with challenges that tear at its social fabric, I remain convinced that culture can be a force for good. It can help unite people around the core values of the EU.” (ibid.) Thus, in the Commissioner’s opinion, culture has a uniting effect in a fragmented society resulting from challenging times, and can help the EU in that time of crisis.

In a meeting with Members of the European Parliament’s Foreign Affairs Committee (source 7), Navracsics talks about culture in the context of the EU’s relations with its neighboring countries. He mentions “major challenges” which have appeared in these states because of the citizens’ call for “more social justice and democracy.” (Navracsics 2016a) Those challenges, which not only can evolve into crises, but also appear in a crisis-facing EU, are “growing conflict, rising extremism and terrorism as well as economic upheaval.” (ibid.) Navracsics then talks about the EU’s focus on empowering its partners, so that these countries would regain stability, and lists reasons for which culture has an important role in this:

“culture is a major factor in political, social and economic development. Culture brings society together; it fosters openness and dialogue, progress, innovation and economic growth. It is an extraordinary powerful tool for supporting citizenship, female empowerment, good governance and democratization - in peaceful times as well as in troubled post-conflict situations.” (ibid.)

Culture thus contributes to a positive development of a state, taking society and economy into account, which allows the EU to handle crises also in its neighboring countries by promoting culture in these states to foster social and economic development, as well as social cohesion, or good governance and democratization.

In a speech in Brussels on the launch of the second phase of the “New Narrative for Europe” (source 8), Commissioner Navracsics emphasizes the need to bring the European project closer to the people of Europe. By recalling the terrorist attack in Paris from January 2016, Navracsics reminds his audience of the “enormous challenges facing Europe today.” (Navracsics 2016d) Those challenges “risk undermining our values and the very foundations of the European project,” and furthermore, “the ideal and meaning of European integration seem to be losing their appeal to European citizens.” (ibid.) To avoid that,

Navracsics seeks a “new vision for Europe.” (ibid.) Not only terrorism poses a threat to the European Union, but also the economic crisis has hit especially the young Europeans “disproportionately hard.” (ibid.) As a consequence, these young people “struggle to find their place in the job market and society,” so that it is necessary to “reconnect Europe with its young citizens.” (ibid.) Thus, Navracsics wants to “deepen our understanding of what ties us together, what are the values underpinning the European project.” He appeals to all Europeans and asks important questions to the audience:

“I invite you all to reflect on the many cultures, traditions, religions and values – the foundations of Europe – which are as varied as the people who live here. How do they matter today? How do they bind us together? How can we preserve them against the backdrop of global challenges, economic realities, security threats and a changing European population?” (ibid.)

Navracsics poses important fundamental questions about the European cultures, its traditions, religions, and values, or in other words, about factors that determine European identity.

In an exchange with the Committee on Culture and Education of the European Parliament, hereafter source 9, Tibor Navracsics addresses the question, how culture can support the integration of refugees and migrants (Navracsics 2016b). The EU is using “Creative Europe to support culture projects designed to promote the integration of refugees,” and is thus “investing in [people].” (ibid.) This is an important step, as it “will [...] be a crucial factor in determining the future of the European project.” (ibid.) Because the Creative Europe is a framework program for cultural initiatives, Navracsics once more highlights how culture helps the EU combating the challenges it is facing. Up until this point, Navracsics has mentioned several challenges, and crises, to which culture can respond to. He mentions the economic crisis, the events in Greece and the UK, the rise of Eurosceptic parties, an increased risk of poverty and unemployment, isolation, exclusion, and radicalization of individuals of society, the influx of migrants and refugees, and, tied to that, the challenge of integrating them, terrorism, the fragmentation of society, and culture’s role in answering to conflicts and crises in EU neighbor countries. This variety of challenges suggests that culture does not only answer to one crises or challenge, which can evolve into a crisis, but that culture plays an essential role in tackling all of the challenges mentioned.

In the opening speech for the opening panel “Quo vadis, Europe? A new beginning or the end of European integration” of another conference, hereafter source 10, Navracsics addresses important aspects on the “crisis of identity – and how to tackle it.” (Navracsics 2016) He asks:

“Can we find consensus on how to resolve the big issues facing us today - economic stagnation, social inequality and exclusion, immigration, violent extremism and terrorism? Can we reconnect with all those who are turning away not only from the European project, but from mainstream politics or even against their own communities? Can we better support and empower the many young people struggling to find their place in the job market and society?” (ibid.)

Navracsics mentions several challenges which affect the European project, as well as the societies of Europe. He then brings up another crisis the EU is facing, which was elaborated on by Nougayrède (2016) in chapter 3: “What we are faced with is a crisis of identity at European level.” (Navracsics 2016) Even though “unresolved tensions surrounding a European identity have always accompanied the process of European integration,” recent developments in the EU, such as the referendum in the UK, have increased these tensions (ibid.). This is important now because “it adds a new dimension to the many questions on the future of the Union facing us today.” (ibid.) Challenging situations therefore test the European project, as they raise doubts about it. Navracsics then talks about the necessity of a European identity in this situation. The European Union needs to adopt an approach that does not impose a European identity from above (ibid.). Navracsics then mentions the Erasmus program and emphasizes the individual. He highlights, how it “has helped mostly young people to develop a European identity that sits comfortably alongside their other identities. [...] Erasmus is an excellent tool for building a European identity.” (ibid.) Erasmus is furthermore beneficial to the European Union because “all of the connections and exchanges that Erasmus makes possible lead to broader change [...] [and] give a push to economic progress.” (ibid.) Furthermore, the “societies at large” profit from Erasmus as they “learn and understand what differentiates us - and what we have in common.” (ibid.) Erasmus is thus important because it contributes to mutual understanding of differences and commonalities, which is important in building a stable society without racism and xenophobia. It is therefore Navracsics’ priority to strengthen the Erasmus program (ibid.). Towards the end of his speech, the Commissioner underlines “how an Erasmus experience enables people to experience Europe and develop a European identity,” and that “this is how

being European becomes a feeling they experience day after day.” (ibid.) Navracsics also emphasizes that “the complementary model of building a European identity works. It can be developed and reinforced with tools just like Erasmus. By bringing up new generations of committed Europeans, we will make the European Union stronger.” (ibid.) The Commissioner thus regards the young generation as an important factor in designing the future of the European project. Some crises and challenges have been mentioned with regards to the young generation, such as unemployment, their exclusion and radicalization.

Navracsics’ hopes and emphasis on the young generation suggests that Erasmus is regarded as a solution to these crises and challenges which are related to that particular generation.

Navracsics also makes frequent reference to crises in the context of European culture during a keynote speech at the Hanns Seidel Foundation conference in Brussels in November 2016, hereafter source 11.

Navracsics begins his speech by underlining the importance of European identity for the European project:

“Having been told for decades that "it's the economy", 2016 will be remembered as the year we realized that, now, it might be all about "identity". No leader, no policy maker can ignore that identity and its implications move millions of voters throughout the world. This is a fundamental change – a change we have to respond to.” (Navracsics 2016e)

Navracsics then mentions several “unprecedented” challenges that the EU has been facing, “none of which compares in intensity and magnitude with previous crises.” (ibid.) He mentions radicalization, and young people disregarding their communities, the arrival of many refugees and migrants which has tested the EU’s ability to find a “common answer to a shared challenge”, or the referendum in UK about leaving the European Union, which has revealed a “worrying lack of emotional attachment to the EU,” which is not seen only in British people (ibid.). Navracsics highlights “that questions of identity and values are at the core of both the root causes and the response.” (ibid.) He questions whether youth radicalization was not caused by failing to transmit and promote European values to “uprooted young people” who were building an identity (ibid.). He also asks whether the failure to provide a “positive, confident and clear social and cultural identity” hinders the successful integration of migrants (ibid.). Navracsics then gives his opinion about the place of European identity in times of crises:

“I believe that one of the clear messages we receive election after election, crisis after crisis, is the unequivocal request to bring our values and our identity back where they belong: to the centre of the political agenda, as a cornerstone of our political project.” (ibid.)

European identity is thus needs more recognition to combat the consequences of crises. Navracsics furthermore thinks that “without [...] [European identity], the European project will not survive – because people will never become sufficiently emotionally attached to it for it to be viable.” (ibid.) In other words, if European citizens don’t identify with the European project, they will not support the EU in times of crisis, but rather develop negative feelings about it, so that without the support of its citizens and rising criticism, it will become difficult for the EU to survive and address crises. Its efforts to create social cohesion would be ignored. At the end of his speech, Navracsics puts again attention to the “difficult social context” and the “times of political turmoil,” and in this context, reminds the people that “we can simply not afford to neglect and forget the value of our values.” (ibid.)

In a speech at the Culture Forum 2016, hereafter source 12, Navracsics elaborates on various aspects of European identity, and thereby establishes a link between European culture and identity and crises. Navracsics begins his speech by explaining the importance of culture for the European Commission, and even talks about the “power of culture,” a theme that reoccurs as “power of European identity and intercultural dialogue” throughout the speech (Navracsics 2016c). He then portrays the EU’s current situation and describes it as challenging:

“This edition of the Forum takes place in very challenging times. A number of issues are testing our ability and will to live together: violent extremism and the threat it poses to our fundamental values, economic stagnation, social inequalities and the unprecedented number of people seeking refuge in Europe are only some of them.” (ibid.)

Right after portraying the EU’s current challenges, Navracsics makes a link to identity. He says that “all these challenges fundamentally touch our sense of identity. They give rise to difficult questions and force us to re-examine how we see the world – and ourselves.” (ibid.) Later in his speech, Navracsics elaborates on the importance of the personal relationships that Europeans have built (ibid.). He illustrates the significance of these relationships by using Germans and French people as an example, and he thereby also mentions one of the greatest accomplishments of the European Union. The hostility between

Germany and France 70 years ago, would have not allowed for the development of friendships, but because of their cooperation within the European Union, it disappeared and created a space of friendship and agreement between the countries, as well as their people (ibid.). Navracsics further elaborates on personal relationships by saying that they are the “foundations of European integration.” (ibid.) But not only are the personal relationships the foundation of European integration, also “our sense of our European identity” is essential to European integration (ibid.)

From there, Navracsics brings culture into the discussion, and further links it with challenging times:

“And this European identity finds its strongest expression in European culture. That is why culture has such a vital role in tackling the challenges facing us today. Culture provides space for freedom. Culture can drive change. [...] Our cultural heritage is a powerful, vital expression of our identities – as Europeans, and as human beings.” (ibid.)

In addition to combating challenges of difficulties the EU is facing, culture can have an impact on the society. Culture can “help us reach out to young people at risk of being excluded and possibly even turning to violent extremism,” and it also can “help newly arrived migrants and refugees find their place in our societies.” (ibid.) At the end of his speech, Navracsics emphasizes again the power of culture by saying that “as Europeans, we have a strong, shared culture that can help us overcome division and build a strong, diverse, inclusive Europe.” (ibid.)

ii. Androulla Vassiliou

The elaborations by Navracsics’ predecessor, Androulla Vassiliou, Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth until November 2014 (European Commission 2014), will also be considered for analysis. Similar to Navracsics’ elaborations, Vassiliou’s opinions count as she is acting in the interest of the EU as a whole. Moreover, also similar to Navracsics, she is able to impact EU policy making because as Commissioner, she partakes in the drafting of laws regarding cultural policies. Her visions and ambitions for the role of culture might thus be regarded in EU law, so that a connection between culture and crises made by Vassiliou is relevant to point out because of that impact on legislation. Following, her discussions about crises and European identity will be presented.

In an interview for Heritage in Motion, "a multimedia competition for the creators and users of films, games, apps and websites on themes related to Europe's heritage, cultural and natural, tangible and intangible," ("About us") or source 13, Commissioner Vassiliou talks about culture and its place in and role for society. She first mentions challenges which the cultural sectors face, which is "fragmentation in Europe, because of the 27 different countries." (Europa Nostra (a)) She then goes on talking about the various levels of the importance of culture and the cultural sector for society. She generally says that "these sectors offer a lot to us, as individuals, for our wellbeing, for society, and of course for Europe and its prosperity." (ibid.) The cultural and creative sectors have an intrinsic value, "because they help for a more cohesive society." (ibid.) Vassiliou also mentions the economic dimension, as these sectors "contribute to the creation of jobs and development in Europe which we very much need these days." (ibid.) Vassiliou then expresses the need to stress the importance of culture more:

"We found that culture and the arts are not given their proper place in our society, in our life. [...] [M]e and 27 cultural ministers of the member states decided to [...] stress the importance that culture has at the heart of Europe. This is the heart of the European project. And reaffirm our determination to have culture [...] very high up in the European agenda. [...] This cultural heritage is important and it's really the link of our people with our past but also with our future." (ibid.)

At a 2014 European Heritage Awards ceremony hereafter source 14, Vassiliou stresses the importance of culture in challenging times. She first mentions several challenges for the European Union:

"Now is the time to act. When public budgets for culture and heritage are being slashed, and when the challenges are many. Growing fragmentation of audiences, globalization, technological change, negative effects of urbanization and rural development, and environmental sustainability." (Europa Nostra (b))

She then talks about the benefits of cultural heritage. Heritage not only contributes to "growth and job creation," but it is also important "for building a shared European identity," and this importance must be "reaffirmed in the current political context." (ibid.) Vassiliou in the end calls for a stronger acknowledgement of cultural heritage in the European Union, referring to crises:

"Europe as a political body needs to recognize the value of cultural heritage. In a time of crisis, it is only natural to be tempted to succumb to self-doubt. A new narrative for Europe reminds us that we Europeans have all the sources to be at the forefront of the knowledge society. [...] It's an invitation to believe in and engage with the European project as a political and cultural project.

[...] Culture and cultural heritage have indeed a place in the European narrative and can indeed shape our minds and our vision for the future.” (ibid.)

The Commissioner points out, that the EU is more than a political project, and underlines how recognizing the value of cultural heritage can lead to a stronger European Union.

iii. Silvia Costa

Silvia Costa, Chair of the Committee on Culture and Education in the EU Parliament, also establishes a relationship between crises, culture, and identity. The following paragraphs will present how this link looks like. The Parliamentary Committees, one of which Costa chairs, examine proposals from the European Commission and the Council, and can also amend them (“What is”). Because of this, MEPs can support, for example, the linking of cultural policies to other policy areas, and thus make culture more influential across EU policy in its entirety. This is important because, if MEPs support the horizontal integration of policies, it suggests the importance of these policies for the EU as a whole. Horizontal integration of cultural policy might thus mean that the MEPs regard culture as an important tool, that needs to be integrated and influence other policies. MEPs’ opinions in the lawmaking process is furthermore important, as they have real legislative impact. The elaborations by Silvia Costa, being an MEP and chair of one committee, can thus support the link between culture, identity and crises.

Like Navracics, Costa also spoke at the European Culture Forum in April 2016. She begins her speech, hereafter referred to as source 15, mentioning a crisis and the role of culture in that: “the European solidarity crisis needs culture for a relaunch of identity.” (Costa 2016) Costa continues her speech, talking about an additional crisis, and says that “the EU is challenged at many fronts in which culture plays an important role [...]. First, the humanitarian crisis [...] posed by refugees to which the EU response is still inadequate.” (ibid.) She thus directly relates culture to the migrant situation in Europe which has been named often as a crisis. Additionally, she explains a consequence of the solidarity crisis, namely that the EU cannot find appropriate solutions due to the lack of consensus and solidarity between the member states.

In what follows, Costa repeatedly mentions the role that she wants culture to have in EU policies in the future. She wants to “give culture a more prominent role in all the policies”, and also claims that “we need to have [culture] in the center.” (ibid.) She then speaks for the European Parliament and says that “we [the European Parliament] expect to hook culture to other policies” (ibid.) Costa also mentions that EU “budgets must be revised.” (ibid.) This confirms the role that Costa wants for culture in the EU policies, which is a more prominent one in all policies. In this regard, she welcomes that culture is a priority of the Juncker Commission (ibid.) Towards the end of her speech, she appeals to the audience by again underlining the intrinsic value of culture. Costa even sees culture as “the new soul, new identity for Europe.” (ibid.) This suggests that Costa considers culture a tool to combat crises.

iv. EU National Politicians

Culture has not only been mentioned in the context of the EU’s current situation. During the Czech presidency in 2009, investing in and emphasis on culture was seen as an alternative solution to the economic crisis. The following paragraphs present a speech from Václav Jehlička, the Czech Minister of Culture, who spoke to the European Parliament in 2009, shortly after the financial crisis hit in 2007, the year the Czech Republic held the presidency of the European Council. The Council Presidency is responsible for driving forward the Council’s work, and also provides direction for the Council’s agenda (European Council 2017). Therefore, if the Czech Culture Minister emphasizes culture’s role, it has important implications on the EU program.

Thus, in his speech, hereafter source 16, Jehlička presents the priorities of the Czech Presidency in the areas of culture and the audiovisual media. He first generally says that the “Czech Presidency aims to make full use of the European Agenda for Culture.” (Jehlička 2011) He then goes on:

“Personally, I believe that this topic has grown in importance of late. At a time of economic crisis, it is necessary to look for new ways and new solutions with long term effects and make use of every available resource within Europe.” (ibid.)

In the following parts of his speech, Jehlička talks about the “Forum for a Creative Europe,” which Prague hosted in March 2009. Like Costa, Jehlička talks about the value and meaning of culture, and that it plays a primary role:

“I am sure that the ‘Forum for a Creative Europe’ will present culture and art and their basic quality - creativity- as absolutely essential for people’s lives and society as a whole, as an irreplaceable source of vitality and positive development. After all, culture is not something secondary, it is not only there to fill our free time when all important things have been done. [...] What is not full of creativity and does not have culture at its core leads to negative phenomena in society and to the stagnation of individuals and society as a whole.” (ibid.)

Culture thus is a necessity for the society, and it contributes to its positive development. Even more, culture has the power to “solve various problems, including social and economic ones.” (ibid.) Jehlička appeals to the MEPs:

“Dear MEPs, I am convinced that it is essential to consider art and culture as the essence of creativity, as a source of new ways of thinking and behaving. A source even more important in connection with the worries raised during the current economic crisis.” (ibid.)

A relationship between the current difficult situation of the EU and European identity is also made by German President Joachim Gauck. Because of Germany’s leadership role in the European Union, as it was elaborated on by Ross, it is relevant what the President of Germany has to say. Furthermore, the President is an important figure within Germany. He is the head of the state, and the most important person for protocol purposes, and represents the state’s legitimacy, unity, and its existence (“Constitutional”). He moreover has important functions for the government. He proposes the chancellor, appoints and dismisses the chancellor as well as the federal ministers, as well as signs and promulgates laws (ibid.).

During a keynote speech about perspectives of the European idea, hereafter referred to as source 17, Gauck makes several links between culture and crises. The President begins his speech by describing the EU’s current situation:

“Never has there been that much Europe – that is how many people especially in Germany feel at the moment, but in a very different manner, when they look into their newspapers, for example. Here, Europe is encountered as [...] a case of crisis. [...] This is a burden. [...] Taking and giving, causing and being liable, responsibility and participation seem to be arranged falsely and unfairly in the European community for many citizens.” (Gauck 2013, own translation)

Gauck thus gets to the heart of the problem. The media report negatively about the EU, and thus people's image of the EU becomes more negative. Gauck thereby explains what Bruter (2003) found in his study on the impact of top-down messages on the European identity of citizens. Gauck further mentions the European debt crisis, and talks about the rescue packages that the member states were debating about at that time in order to help Greece which became bankrupt. This has led citizens to become impatient, exhausted and frustrated which is why the economic crisis, which he also mentions as a problem the EU is facing, is also a crisis of trust in the political European project (Gauck 2013, own translation). Gauck concedes that "people have become more skeptical of the EU within the last years," however, "a majority of people is still convinced that our complex and increasing global reality needs regulations that go beyond national borders." (ibid., own translation) He thus highlights that the increased interconnectivity of people, not just in the EU, requires common regulations, which many people also acknowledge. Gauck then talks about the European values which for him are the foundation of the European identity:

"It is right what people often complain about: there is no common narrative in Europe which can build an identity. [...] However, there is a source for building an identity in Europe. There are timeless values which create a double bond between us, as a confession, and as a program. [...] We are gathering [in the name of Europe] for peace and freedom, democracy, and the rule of law, for equality, for human rights, for solidarity. [...] Our European values are binding, and they combine." (ibid., own translation)

He admits that there the EU is lacking, what nation states build their identity upon, which is the common narrative. However, the "timeless values," such as peace, freedom, or democracy, for him serve as building block of European identity just as well. They even create "double bonds," to the European project as a program, and as a community of values. Gauck further takes characteristics of European identity building into account:

"European identity is not defined by the negative exclusion of the other. European identity grows though cooperation and the principles of those people who say, we want to be part of this community because we share the common values." (ibid., own translation)

The President thus takes up the lacking connection between Europeans he mentioned earlier, because of the non-existent common narrative, and emphasizes that this lack should not be filled by negatively excluding others, and forming European identity by that. He instead underlines the importance of

cooperation in the identity building process, and the confirmation of wanting to be part of the European community because of shared values, which, as he mentioned before, bind and combine people.

e. EU Institutions

The relationship between crises and identity can also be seen in the legal documentation of the EU. Resolutions, common positions, decisions, proposals, and other documents issued by the European Union institutions treat the connection between culture and crises in two different ways. The relationship between culture and crises can be either direct, or indirect, meaning that culture triggers somethings else, that itself helps with crises. The following paragraphs will present where in EU discourse a connection between culture and crises is made. The results will be presented according to the institution that issued the law text. First, the direct connections made by each institution will be explored, and then the indirect ones. This section includes communication from the following institutions: The Council, the Commission, the Parliament, and the Committee of the Regions (CoR) These institutions all play a significant role in the European Union, and their actions and decisions determine the direction of the EU, as they influence its decision-making.

i. Council of the European Union

The Council consists of the heads of state and governments of the EU member states, and is the “steering committee” of the European Union (McCormick 2011, 78). It determines the “strategic policy direction” for the EU, and plays a key role in determining important appointments and nominations within the EU (ibid.). Throughout the EU’s history, for example, the Council has confirmed its important role, and demonstrated its influence and force in the European integration process. A lot of initiatives regarding European integration, such as the introduction of the European Monetary System in 1978, were the result from discussions within the Council (ibid. 79). Furthermore, the outcome of the Council summits, and the level of failure or success, has been symbolic to the overall process of European integration, as well as the success of the European leaders (ibid. 80). Because of the importance ascribed to the Council, and the

evidence that it had a significant influence on the direction of the European project, it is important to take the Council's opinions, resolutions, or common positions into account. This can give an impression about where the Council would like to see the EU, and which direction it should take. This includes decisions that fall under the cultural policy.

As early as 1995, and three years after the European Union established the legal foundation to work in the area of culture with the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, the Council of the European Union issued a resolution on the promotion of statistics on culture and economic growth, hereafter source 18. The importance of culture, and therefore European Union action in this field, was related to the actual circumstances of the EU. Work in the cultural area "must be based on a precise awareness of the actual situation." (Council of the European Union 1995a) Thus, the present state of the Union determines the cultural actions, whether this state is characterized by progression and positive developments, or challenges and negative developments. Source 18 also establishes an indirect relationship between culture and crises, and refers to crises as having an effect on society: "Culture has an influence on both the overall development of society and its cohesion." (ibid.) These two elements are very important when considering crises because they can prevent the outbreak of crises by contributing to the positive development of society, as well as create bonds between individuals, and thereby build a cohesive society, as it was also emphasized by the lawmakers in chapter 5a.

In a common position by the Council to implement the Kaleidoscope program, one of the first initiatives after the Maastricht Treaty, and hereafter referred to as source 19, culture is described as an important component of what defines the European Union. Culture is part of "the most tangible and influential aspect" of the European Union, and furthermore, "the perception of Europe in the world is largely determined by the position and strength of its cultural values." (Council of the European Union 1995) In source 19, culture is also mentioned together with the European Union's geography, economy, and society. Source 19, which creates a direct as well as indirect relationship between culture and crises, also puts the economic dimension of culture into perspective:

“Culture has an intrinsic value which should not be measured primarily by its economic utility but basically by qualitative criteria in the conviction that its value is not diminished by estimating its potential economic dimension.” (Council of the European Union 1995a)

Culture influences the economy, which itself serves as a tool to measure culture’s intrinsic value.

In another resolution, or source 20, the Council describes the role of culture in the development of the European Union. Not only does the Council regard culture as “a very important factor in the development and consolidation of the process of integration of the Community,” but it also appeals to the Member States and the Commission to “regard culture as an essential component of European integration.” (Council of the European Union 2002) Thus, European integration is not only determined by the economy, but also by culture. However, and what ultimately draws the direct connection between challenging times and culture, is that action in the cultural field is important “particularly from the point of view of the enlargement of the Union.” (ibid.) As it was shown in an earlier chapter, enlargements have been challenging times for the European Union, according to Ross (2011). This confirms the important role the European Union has ascribed to culture, and shows that generally, there is a connection between culture and challenging times.

Indirectly, the Council makes several references to crises as well. Building a stronger relationship between Europeans is mentioned for example, as one of the reasons to start the Raphael program, which was also among the first cultural initiatives, which the European Union established. In source 21, it is said that “cultural heritage is [...] the link between peoples [and] [...] it must be preserved and made more easily accessible to members of the public (including those who face particular problems of access) in order to contribute to greater mutual understanding and respect.” (Council of the European Union & European Parliament 1997) Furthermore, “Community action in this field can make a special contribution to the creation of ‘an ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe’.” (ibid.) Both quotes show that, in the opinion of the Council and the Parliament, culture can help to create bonds and relationships between the people of Europe. While source 21 does not mention crises per se, they take account of the society, and emphasize the links between its members that can be created through cultural heritage, which is therefore important to preserve. As previous sources have shown, fragmentation of society has been mentioned as a challenge, which can evolve into a crisis. Source 21 thus makes an important contribution

by emphasizing the opinion of the Council and the Parliament, that culture can create deep linkages between the people of Europe, and thereby prevent society's fragmentation.

In source 21, the European Parliament and the Council also underline that cultural heritage has a "socioeconomic dimension" and, thus, "the preservation of the cultural heritage is an element in a design for society and can contribute significantly to job creation [...] [and] to regional development," both of which can be related to the economy (ibid.).

ii. European Commission

The European Commission acts in the EU's interests and is responsible for developing and proposing laws and policies, which make in an important actor in the policy-making process of the EU (McCormick 2011, 80). It is thus significant, if it puts cultural matters on its agenda in difficult times, as it sets the tone for the entire European Union.

Hence, the European Commission relates culture to crises in the documents it issues. A general connection between crises and culture is established in the Commission's proposal for the European Parliament and Council to decide about the establishment of the Culture 2000 program, the EU's first framework program in support of culture, hereafter referred to as source 22. This program enables the European Union to "respond to today's challenges," and is furthermore a new approach "at a time when the European Union is entering a key period of its history, with the introduction of the economic and monetary union and the prospect of enlargement on an unprecedented scale." (European Commission 1998) As mentioned earlier, enlargements have been challenging, and moreover triggered crises for the European Union (Ross 2012), hence the timing of the new approach to cultural policy suggests that the EU ascribes an important role to culture in addressing or preventing the challenges or crises that might arise from enlargement. Further along in the document, this "role and the place of culture in meeting the great challenges now facing the European Union" is defined (European Commission 1998). The concept of culture today also covers the popular culture, instead of only regarding the "highbrow" culture, such as music, dance, or fine arts (ibid.). This new definition is "a consequence of the fact that culture is no

longer considered a subsidiary activity but a driving force in society, making for creativity, vitality, dialogue and cohesion. It is therefore intrinsic to any response to the major challenges that we face today.” (ibid.) One of these challenges, which cultural action can help overcome, is for example

“the acceleration of European integration, with the decision to introduce the euro and the decision taken at the Luxembourg European Council to start the enlargement process which will eventually lead to a 26-country Union. Faced with this prospect, cultural action must help express a European citizenship based on a knowledge and mutual comprehension of European cultures and an awareness of the features common to such cultures.” (ibid.)

Cultural action to help overcome challenges is mentioned in the context of the enlargement process, a reoccurring theme when defining possible challenges for the Union. Ross considered crises of enlargement in his typology, which were triggered because of negotiation difficulties. Mentioning the prospect of enlarging the Union to a 26-country Union, suggests that the EU has these types of crises in mind. Furthermore, the decision to introduce the euro might trigger a crisis of design, which Ross also defined. Introducing new policies means taking the risk of triggering disagreement among member states, which can evolve into deadlock. However, source 22 also suggests that the Commission is rather focusing on the society than the institutional level, as it emphasizes European citizenship and mutual comprehension. It thus rather aims at the European people, and the changes which the accession of new member states into the EU, as well as taking another step in European integration has for society. Because culture is important “for the future development of the European Union and for the response to today's main challenges, the Community's cultural action needs to be renewed and strengthened.” (ibid.) In the conclusion of source 22, the role of culture with regards to globalization as a challenge of today is mentioned again: “The need to assert and respect cultural identity is felt particularly acutely at a time when our economies are engaged in a process of globalization.” (ibid.)

The Commission also makes indirect links between culture and crises in source 22. The Commission also links problems of the society or economy with cultural activities:

“As a result of unemployment and insecurity, social ties are being loosened and exclusion is becoming a serious issue [...]. In many cases, cultural activities help [...] people [...] to reintegrate into society. The European Union needs to promote integration on the basis of fundamental values such as human rights, freedom, solidarity and tolerance.” (European Commission 1998)

The importance and essential role of culture for the European Union has furthermore been recognized by the member states. They think that “culture is of fundamental value to Europe.” (ibid.) However, there is not enough awareness of the European cultures, so that “such awareness needs to be increased in order to promote European integration.” (ibid.) There is furthermore a general agreement that “culture is able to strengthen social cohesion” and that “culture [...] consolidates peace, which is one of the primary goals of European integration.” (ibid.) Cultural projects should furthermore “strike a significant chord with the people of Europe and help to increase their sense of belonging to the same community.” (ibid.)

In the Commission’s proposal amending the decision establishing the Culture 2000 program just before its termination in order to extend the program until 2006, or source 23, a reason is given for the decision of extension:

“The programme will come to an end at a time of changes of major significance for the future of the European Union. The accession of ten new Member States, the results of the Intergovernmental Conference based on the work of the Convention on the Future of Europe, the election of the European Parliament and the appointment of a new Commission are bound to change the shape of the Union's future action.” (European Commission 2003)

Thus, the at that time prospect of enlarging the Union by ten states, the European elections, as well as the appointment of a new Commission influenced the decision to extend the Culture 2000 program and initiate actions in the cultural field with more efficiency. All of these events bring changes for the EU, and made it necessary to further consider organized cultural actions to prevent crises that could possibly arise from those changes.

The decision to extend the Culture 2000 program because of major changes for the EU is also picked up in a Communication from the Commission on fostering European culture and diversity, hereafter referred to as source 24, and thus the relationship between the challenges and the extension becomes more clear. Source 24 was issued just a few months after source 23, and also establishes a direct relationship between culture and crises or challenges. The big 2004 enlargement is mentioned, which is the “most significant enlargement” in the EU’s history as the “total population of the Union will approach 500 million, representing an immense richness of cultural, social and linguistic diversity.” (European Commission 2004)

Furthermore, the European societies are “undergoing major demographic change.” (ibid.) Therefore, and in addition to the European elections, and the appointment of a new Commission, “pursuing and developing” cultural programs is imperative (ibid.). Those challenging times are further contextualized with how a society remains united: “In such a context, the shared values that hold our societies together, such as freedom, fairness, tolerance, and solidarity, become more important than ever.” (ibid) Thus, not only policy solutions are taken into account in difficult times, but also references to deeper connections based on values which people in a society can have, are made.

Source 24 not only establishes a direct relationship between culture and crises, but also refers to culture as an indirect tool to aid with crises. In the context of the current developments of the European societies, the Commission claims that it is

“more necessary than ever that Europe's citizens have an opportunity to experience a feeling of belonging to the Union and are able to identify with it. The reality is that many citizens experience the Union as merely a distant and remote political and economic entity [...]. The notion of European citizenship must therefore be given concrete meaning through direct, personal interaction [...]. By fostering the mobility of citizens, artists, cultural and audiovisual works and events, European citizens can take advantage not only of the opportunities offered by their rich and diverse cultural heritage but also of common elements in their developing European identity, an identity which complements those - national, regional, ethnic, religious - that citizens already have.” (European Commission 2004)

The European Commission recognizes the need to foster the cultural sector of the European Union in the context of the situation the EU finds itself in, so that European citizens will be able to develop their European identity.

A term which is repeated at many places in the EU documentation presented in this section, and which is mentioned in the context of challenges, is “globalization.” In a staff working document on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world, hereafter source 25, the Commission concludes that “the time is ripe for a new European agenda for culture, which takes account of the realities of today's globalizing world,” which presents the European Union and its neighboring countries with issues such as the forming of stereotypes, xenophobia, or racism (European Commission 2007). To make its standpoint even more clear, the Commission included a quote of Gao Xingjian, Nobel Prize Winner in Literature 2000 who said

that “culture is not a luxury, but a necessity.” (“Gao”, European Commission 2007) This emphasizes the important representation of culture for the Commission even stronger. Furthermore, globalization can be referred back to Ross’ typology of crises, as globalization can be considered a trigger for three types of crises. Globalization, and the increased interconnectivity on many levels, can force the EU to reform its policies, which can cause crises of design because member states don’t agree. Because of the interconnectivity of markets and the resulting interdependence within the economic and political world, crises of economic adaptation can be triggered. Finally, and related to crises of design, crises of member state retreat can be triggered, as countries might change their domestic policies and isolate themselves, withdraw from cooperation within the EU, and thus change the dynamics in the Union, as it can be seen in the UK and the Brexit decision.

A connection between crises and culture can also be found in the Commission’s proposal for the European Parliament and Council to decide on EU action for the EHL, hereafter referred to as source 26. In the beginning, the principal objective of the initiative is described. “The aim of the EHL was to use the potential of cultural heritage to strengthen European citizens' sense of belonging to Europe and promote a sense of European identity.” (European Commission 2010) Then, the underlying problem calling for this initiative is described in the document:

“In 2009, four years after the concept of the EHL was born, it is obvious that the gap between citizens and the EU still exists. This has been demonstrated recently by the disappointing turnout in the European elections in June 2009. This has also been demonstrated by a number of Eurobarometer surveys such as for example the Eurobarometer 70 published in December 2008 which shows that the perception of the image of the EU has not improved over the past few years. On the contrary, the number of Europeans who have a positive image of the EU (45%) is at its lowest level since the autumn of 2005.” (ibid.)

Looking back at the history of European Union cultural policy, the problem described above is a recurring one. The low voter turnout in European elections was the trigger for taking on action in the cultural field in the first place in 1979. As mentioned in chapter 3, Cozier et al. have described low participation of the citizens in democracy a crisis of democracy. In connection to the problem which the EU is facing with its citizens, namely the attitude they have towards the EU, “the ultimate goal of the EHL is to change individual

attitudes, and not just in terms of a person's view on this or that subject, but at a very deep-rooted level, namely their identity.” (ibid.)

Source 26 also refers to the development of the European project in particular. Originally, the EHL was created in order to close the gap between the European citizens and the institutions, particularly among young people (ibid.). When the program was launched in 2006 as an intergovernmental initiative, the main objective was to “foster a sense of belonging to a common cultural space” for European citizens, and to strengthen their “support [...] for a shared European identity” by giving them access to Europeans’ shared heritage (ibid.). By creating awareness of the European cultural heritage with the help of the EHL, the European Commission hoped to reinforce the identification of Europeans with the European Union, and also make them aware of the culture shared by all European citizens. This then prevents crises by creating a greater feeling of belonging and attachment to the EU, and thus generates support among citizens for the European project.

The Commission’s communication about the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008, hereafter source 27, also involves several, indirect links between culture and crises. The year 2008 is an important year in EU history in which the EU faces two severe crises. Not only was the future of the Lisbon Treaty discussed in the EU after it was rejected before by France and the Netherlands, but 2008 was also the year of the economic crisis. In a staff working document, the Commission first outlines the EU’s current societal problems, such as rising xenophobia and racism, and also mentions the “successive enlargements of the Union.” (European Commission 2005) It then observes that increased diversity caused by those enlargements may lead to tensions, and that discrimination exists in the European Union, which particularly the new member states are confronted with (ibid.). The citizens of Europe must therefore “acquire the knowledge, skills and abilities that will allow them to successfully master a more open, but also more complex environment, to manage its difficulties and tensions.” (ibid.) Intercultural dialogue, reinforced by EU cultural policies, can achieve this: “Intercultural dialogue should enable them [European citizens] to explore ways of integrating our common values in the European Union into an active citizenship.” (ibid.) By establishing a space for dialogue between culture, not only the sense of European

identity based on experiencing the EU's diversity can be created, but also stereotypes and tensions between different cultures can be eliminated, a stable, cohesive society created, and crises combated more effectively with the support of the people. It is furthermore one of the pillars of integration (ibid.). Likewise, "culture is an essential element of European integration [...], contributing to the mutual understanding of people, [and] social inclusion, [...] and can thereby help to overcome racism and xenophobia." (ibid.) Culture can therefore be used to combat crises in society.

iii. European Parliament

Because the European Parliament is the most democratic of the EU institutions, as it is directly elected by the people, it is important to take its opinion into account (McCormick 2011, 88). The Parliament has furthermore developed its role, and "has become more aggressive in launching its own initiatives and making other institutions pay more attention to its opinions." (ibid.) It has more power in deciding about which proposals for new laws or policies will be enacted and which will be rejected (ibid. 89). Because of the multiplicity of parties in the Parliament, and therefore multiple opinions and viewpoints, and the debates which can arise from this, the Parliament is an important actor in the EU policy making. The Parliament is the place where debates take place, and arguments are given to support or reject policy proposals from the Commission regarding various areas, including culture. The Parliament's opinion on cultural policies should thus be taken into consideration, as they have to undergo a thorough debate, before they get approved.

A European Parliament resolution on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world, hereafter source 28, explains the relationship between culture and social cohesion. "In the social sphere, cultural identity is an important factor in fostering integration and greater social cohesion in regions and local communities," which shows the role of culture not only in the integration process, as it was also shown in the preceding paragraphs, but also culture's role in creating bonds between groups of people (European Parliament 2008). The European Parliament further explains the uniting effect of culture:

“In the debate on intercultural and cultural dialogue and on what is meant by ‘culture’, it is often understood that culture unites people together rather than being a moderator of differences. In this context, Jean Monnet could be quoted: those young people ‘acquainted with all that is great and good in different cultures, without ceasing to look to their own lands with love and pride, they will become Europeans’.” (ibid.)

Thus, culture also acts as a connector and creator of social bonds, and a tight social fabric can, for example, prevent the exclusion of members of a society. Furthermore, understanding that the European Union, and therefore European identity consists of different cultures and identities is essential for building a European identity. If this feeling of unity is established, crises can be solved by the common will of the people to support the European project, and help steering it out of the crisis. It is furthermore interesting, that the term “young people” comes up, as Navracscics has also emphasized the meaning of the young generation for the EU. Source 28 furthermore mentions that culture can not only foster social cohesion, but also help with the economy and overall development of towns or rural areas (ibid.).

iv. Committee of the Regions

The CoR consists of representatives of local governments, and its main concern are issues that occur on the local and regional level (McCormick 2011, 96). The main reasons why the CoR was established was because it should bring “new expertise to European decision-making” by taking on an advisory role (Peterson & Shackleton 2002, 326-7). The CoR thus gave a voice to the local and regional governments so that they could bring into the conversation, how the accelerated European integration process affected the regions and localities of the European Union (ibid. 330). Since the Lisbon Treaty, the CoR must be “consulted during all phases of the EU legislative process and can bring EU legislation before the Court of Justice,” and has thus gained a stronger role (“Impact”). Furthermore, the relationship between the CoR and the Commission, the Parliament, as well as the Council has been intensified (ibid.). The impact report 2013, which summarizes the “impact of CoR opinions on EU legislation and policies” revealed that the CoR opinions had a significant impact on policies related to culture and education (“Making”). Because of the role and influence of the CoR on decision making in cultural policy, and because crises also affect the smaller regions, it is significant to take the CoR’s opinions into account.

The relationship between EU cultural action and actual circumstances, as established by the Council and the Commission, can also be observed in discourse by the Committee of the Regions. In an opinion of the CoR on culture and cultural differences and their significance for the future of Europe, hereafter source 29, culture is mentioned with regards to “the period we are living in.” (Committee of the Regions 1998) The CoR in this context mentions the citizens of Europe, who have to be able “to transcend cultural frontiers and be capable of living in a pluralistic society.” (ibid.) This presents another legitimation for EU cultural action. The connection between crises and challenging times is strengthened later in the document. The CoR notes that “culture has also assumed a key role in the search for solutions to global problems.” (ibid.) In this context, the CoR mentions the report “Our Creative Diversity” published by the UN/UNESCO World Commission on Culture and Development, which seeks to make cultural questions an essential part of international debates (ibid.). In the UN/UNESCO report, culture is mentioned as an indicator to measure human development. Culture and cultural identity issues have become more important in many societies because of “failures and frustrated expectations of [human] development [...] [and] disillusionment with material progress, high levels of consumption for the privileged amid widespread deprivation and persistently high rates of permanent unemployment,” which are the global challenges the CoR refers to (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996). Thus, considering culture in the development strategies which were so important, and establish a more effective political agenda “had to be the next step in rethinking development.” (ibid.)

Source 29 furthermore makes constant references to culture being a promoter for social cohesion. The CoR says that “most important of all, an understanding of other cultures consolidates social harmony and mutual understanding between peoples.” (ibid.) The Committee seeks to redefine the concept of culture so that local and regional authorities will be able “to design new policies aimed at the integration of every cultural group into local society.” (ibid.) Thus, culture can facilitate the integration of members in a society. Crises that arise at a society level, such as discrimination, and the resulting exclusion of members of society, which can ultimately lead to extremism, are thereby prevented. Furthermore, because of Europe’s multicultural society, a deeper understanding of culture is required in order to prevent the

development of hostile attitudes (ibid.) This can be achieved with the help of Europe-wide networks (ibid.). The CoR further makes reference to the positive effects of a peaceful interaction between differing cultures:

“It is also important to highlight the fact that Europe's cultures have engaged in peaceful interaction for centuries and that this has had an enriching effect on all those involved. Mankind has enough problems to solve as it is. The problems of poverty and exclusion will not be resolved, or the environment saved, by provoking confrontations between civilizations but by increasing interaction between them.” (ibid.)

Because of the fundamental nature of culture for the European Union, problems which concern a variety of states, like poverty, social exclusion, or environmental problems, can be overcome by increasing the interaction between the cultures of Europe, fostered through the EU's cultural policy.

Source 29 also relates culture with the economy, and ultimately with crises: “Cultural understanding is also important in the economic sense as a prerequisite for EU enlargement.” (ibid.). EU cultural initiatives, which aim at creating mutual understanding between different cultures, or the integration of different cultures into society to create acceptance, play an important role in the economy, and can prevent crises which can be caused, for example, by EU enlargements.

The CoR's opinion on the future of the European Capital of Culture initiative, hereafter source 30, also makes a direct reference to challenges. The CoR suggests that “the ECOC programme can contribute to building the Europe of the future. Trends such as nationalism, individualism and consumerism as well as crumbling social infrastructure all require attention.” (Committee of the Regions 2012) The CoR emphasizes that, even though European citizens are “citizens of the world,” it is important to “protect and maintain people's own, local cultures. Europe should be able to allow local culture to blossom at the same time as an inclusive European identity is being developed.” (ibid.) Thus, a Europe of the future includes strong, local cultures and identities and a global identity. The ECOC program can thus contribute to building this Europe by strengthening local cultures. Furthermore, “many of the previous Capital of Culture events have taken place in cities facing challenges of social cohesion and integration.” (ibid.) Thus, in addition to strengthening local cultures and identities, the ECOC program also contributes to the development of

society, as the ECOC “has proved effective in developing programmes which stimulate inclusion and intercultural dialogue.” (ibid.)

In an opinion of the CoR on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world, hereafter source 31, the CoR points out the importance of partnerships for society, thus establishing an indirect relationship between culture and crises. The CoR calls for the Commission to regard the potential of culture in creating urban and regional partnerships, which itself are “so important for society as a whole.” (Committee of the Regions 2007) The Committee thinks that because “partnerships between cities and regions have had — and continue to have — a stabilising effect on society and have made a major contribution to peaceful development and to overcoming the division of Europe.” (ibid.) Thus, to create urban and regional partnerships based on culture bring stability, and it is more difficult for crises to erupt in a stable environment.

6. Analysis

After presenting where in EU discourse a relationship between crises and culture is made, this section seeks to bring the results presented in the previous section together. Connections and relationships are put into context and are clarified.

The results found in EU discourse presented in chapter 5 strongly suggest that EU lawmakers, and institutions are referring primarily to social cohesion when crises are mentioned. The current Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Tibor Navracsics, often establishes a relationship between culture and crises in the speeches. In source 1, he directly says that culture plays an important role in, among others, fostering social inclusion, and also preventing or combating discrimination of all forms. In relation to social cohesion, Navracsics also mentions the importance of dialogue between different cultures. Having Navracsics talk about the EHL and the ECOC program in the context of bringing the citizens of Europe together, strongly suggests that these initiatives are a tool to prevent or combat challenges for society, such as fragmentation. Even though this does not fall under any category of crises as defined by Ross, fragmentation of society is a challenge which the EU is facing, and where culture can be used as a tool to avoid it. Furthermore, fragmentation of society could lead to a crisis of member state retreat. A fragmented society might develop radical standpoints, which would change domestic political situations and thus lead to a withdrawal from EU cooperation. Voter behavior might change, and draw voters into the arms of anti-EU parties, as they might blame the EU for the current situation.

Source 2 tells a similar story. However, instead of mentioning the broad category “culture,” Navracsics is more concrete, and talks about “cultural heritage” as the tool that can support social inclusion, as well as a positive development of the economy, which is thus another dimension that Navracsics brings into focus. Source 2 is furthermore important because Navracsics explains the role of cultural heritage in the identity building process. Cultural heritage can “build bridges” between communities, and knowing about and recognizing cultural heritage can be a way towards building personal identity. Source 2 strongly implies that EU cultural policy aims at the protection and promotion

of cultural heritage, as it was outlined in chapter 2. Cultural heritage is an important aspect in building an identity, which is why it is promoted. And a European identity, or a strong identification with and feeling of belonging to the EU can combat crises, as citizens stronger support the European project. In times of crises, when fundamental questions about the EU arise, a European identity would be the answer to the “Why?” and might thus prevent a crisis of member state retreat.

In source 3, Navracsics builds on the concept of the importance of cultural heritage, and its relationship with building a European identity, and relates it to the EU’s current situation. He refers to challenging times, and mentions a reduced budget for the cultural and heritage policies because of the economic crisis. Similar to source 1 and 2, Navracsics describes the importance of cultural heritage because it is the foundation of European identity. Similar also to the preceding sources, Navracsics talks about the cohesive effect culture has on the European society, as well as the environment, and the economy. As in source 1, the Commissioner refers to the EHL and the ECOC program, as having a positive effect on the citizens of Europe, and by that being able to combat the crises which the EU is facing, and which Navracsics mentions, such as the economy, the environment, and the society.

In source 4, Navracsics describes the EU’s situation more dramatically, and mentions concrete challenges for the European Union, while at the same time emphasizing personal relationships that have been built with the help of a concrete EU initiative under the cultural framework, the Erasmus program. The Commissioner says that personal relationships, built with the help of Erasmus, have shaped the European project. He does that because he also reminds his audience of how important it is to overcome division, so that a peaceful interaction and living together can be ensured. This speech strongly suggest that these elaborations were made in response to concrete challenges the EU was facing at that time. Navracsics mentions the economic crisis, the migrant situation, as well as the events in Greece and the UK. According to the categorization of crises by Ross, the events in the UK fall under the category of crises of member state retreat. They can be classified as such because the domestic political situation in the UK has led to their retreat from the EU, which reached its peak last year, when a majority of British citizens voted to leave the European Union. British politicians turned their back on Europe, and

campaigns for leaving the EU. The UK is thus not retreating temporarily, which a change in domestic policies means according to Ross, but permanently from the EU, as Prime Minister May underlined that the decision to withdraw from the EU will not be reversed. Even though the other challenges Navracsics mentions do not fall under a crisis category, they are significant for the EU being in a state of crisis overall because they all appear and impact at the same time, so that the state of crisis consists of single events. Furthermore, a crisis of member state retreat could develop from these, as member states might be unsatisfied with the EU's answers to those challenges, and thus want to withdraw from EU cooperation.

Looking at sources 1 to 4 altogether, a development can be observed, taking also the dates of the speeches into account. The earliest speech was in May 2015, when for example the migrant crisis was not as severe as it was at the time of the last speech. The more current Navracsics' speeches become, the more dramatic and urgent is he portraying the EU's situation, and the more he emphasizes the importance of culture's role for the EU. This tells us that the EU is using cultural policy as a tool to answer to crises. The more crises proceed, the less satisfied citizens are with the EU's actions, when they see that crises are not being solved, or answers are too slow. By increasingly appealing to culture, the Commissioner emphasizes the deep bonds between Europeans in order to stop fragmentation of society based on opposing opinions, and re-generate support for the EU among them.

Source 5 also strongly suggests that the EU views culture as bringing benefits and helping in several dimensions. First, culture brings economic benefits, second, culture brings benefits to society, and third, culture is of help in post-conflict management. While this is more abstract than the connections made in source 1 to 4, it implies that culture has an effect in multiple areas of the European Union.

Similar rhetoric can be found in source 6, with an emphasis on a different cultural program. Navracsics mentions "huge challenges" which threaten the European society's cohesion. Navracsics highlights the ability of the ECOF initiative to unite the people of Europe. Navracsics furthermore strengthens his opinion by emphasizing his view that culture can be "a force for good." The Commissioner thus first draws attention to the challenge of a fragmented society, and then directly offers a solution for it, which can be found in the EU's cultural policy. As it was mentioned before, a

fragmented society can develop crises in the European Union, and can lead to exclusion and extremism. Crises of member state retreat could thus be triggered, as countries are dissatisfied with the EU's answers to the problems. Emphasizing the fundamental nature of European culture, and its long-lasting, and deep-reaching positive effects on society in a time when society is fragmented supports the hypothesis that the EU uses cultural policy to answer to crises.

Not only can culture be instrumentalized in the EU internally, but also in the EU's neighboring countries. In source 7, the Commissioner mentions culture's influence on social, political, and economic development, its ability to create cohesion within society, and also its capability to serve as a tool for good governance and democratization in third countries. Culture can do these things in peaceful times, but also in challenging times. Navracsics then talks about "major challenges" for the EU's neighboring countries, such as terrorism and changes in the economy. Crises in the EU's neighboring states can also impact the EU by for example migration from those countries. Because of the EU's interest in a peaceful and stable neighborhood, the EU has developed policies to aid these regions. Navracsics in source 7 mentions another dimension of those policies, which is not financial aid, but the support of the EU for these regions through culture. Equipping culture with this ability strongly suggests that the EU is using culture as a tool to combat crises, which are present in the EU's neighboring countries. Culture is seen as an alternative approach to address those crises, when they before have mainly been addressed by supporting civil society, bilateral cooperation, or financial instruments ("European").

In source 8, Navracsics underlines the importance of common values because they are the foundation of the European project. He appeals to his audience to reflect on these values, after having mentioned certain challenges for the EU, such as the Paris terrorist attacks, or the large number of unemployed young people as the aftermath of the economic crisis. He does that because he sees it necessary to reconnect Europe with especially its young citizens, and to create ties within society, which are built on the common European values. Navracsics is furthermore inviting his audience to think about fundamental questions about the cultures, traditions, and values of the EU, which he calls the foundations of Europe. Source 8 strongly suggests that the EU wants to reinforce European identity within its citizens during a

challenging time. It is important to point out, that Navracsics underlines the necessity to reconnect the EU with especially its young citizens. It can be argued that the EU is counting particularly on its “Erasmus Generation” to be the supporting generation for the EU. On the other hand, Navracsics’ attention to the young generation might also mean that the EU wants to prevent radicalization among young people, itself a threat to the EU. While Ross is not mentioning radicalization as a type of crises for the EU, a situation can develop in which member states withdraw from the EU because they are unsatisfied with the EU’s answers to the threat of radicalization, or where member states don’t agree about policy structures addressing this issue. Because of Schengen, it would be possible for those radicalized people to travel freely throughout the EU, thus reaching more people, and posing a threat to several EU member states. We can see these arguments appearing in debates after terrorist attacks happened, such as in Berlin, when Eurosceptics were outraged that Schengen made it not only possible for the attacker to move to another EU state after being asked to leave Italy, but also for “a fugitive to move between countries” after the attack (“Berlin”). Thus, a crisis of design or a crisis of member state retreat can develop from radicalization of young people, based on the insufficient answer from the EU, and the dissatisfaction of member states.

Related to one of the major challenges the EU is facing today, Commissioner Navracsics in source 9 talks about culture’s support in the integration of refugees and migrants. Thus, the EU is using its cultural policy to prevent the challenge of social fragmentation, caused by the exclusion and insufficient integration of the immigrants, and which can develop into a crisis by leading for example to extremism, and then posing a threat to the European society. Navracsics acknowledges the importance of this step, as it will determine Europe’s future. The refugee and migrant situation, which has been describes as a crisis itself, has had significant impacts on the EU’s decision making processes, as member states cannot find a common ground. Thus, the situation described in source 9 could trigger a crisis of member state retreat, as member states do not agree with EU procedures, and develop anti-EU feelings towards a withdrawal from EU cooperation.

In source 10, Navracsics directly relates the necessity for a European identity with the challenging situations the EU is facing. He mentions several challenges, such as economic stagnation, social inequality and exclusion, immigration, violent extremism, and terrorism. He also talks about a crisis of European identity, which has increased recently, because of, for example, the referendum in the UK. The latter can clearly be categorized according to Ross, and as it was mentioned above, as a crisis of permanent member state retreat, because it disturbs cooperation in the European Union. The former can also be categorized under the same type of crisis in so far as they can lead to a crisis of member state retreat, based on the dissatisfaction of countries with EU answers to those problems. In the context of the necessity of a European identity, source 10 furthermore takes the Erasmus program into account, and Navracsics points out, how this program can be helpful in developing a European identity. These elaborations make sense in the context of the Commissioner's speech, in which he emphasizes the need for a European identity in order to tackle the challenges mentioned above. Navracsics in particular mentions the effect of Erasmus on the economy and society. The personal connections and exchanges that are established through Erasmus lead to "broader change" and also boost the economy. While "boosting the economy" is unambiguous, the term "broader change" leaves room for interpretation. Given that Navracsics later in the speech talks about the capability of Erasmus to enable people to develop a European identity, "broader change" is likely to refer to a change in society, and to change people's negative attitudes about the EU into support for it. Source 10 thus strongly suggests that cultural initiatives are used to reinforce a European identity within people in times of crises, to highlight the positive aspects of the European Union, and reverse the fragmentation in society. Source 10 furthermore suggests, that young people represent a focus group of EU cultural policies, as it was implied also by source 8.

Similar to source 10, Navracsics also mentions the importance of European identity in source 11. He does that in a very convincing way, by mentioning the contrast between the economy, which has been described as the engine of the European project for many years, and identity, which has come into focus only recently. Navracsics elaborates on this at a time of challenges which cannot be compared in intensity

and magnitude with previous crises. These challenges are radicalization, immigration, the events in the UK, and the increasing detachment of people from the EU. As previous analyses have suggested, the situation in the UK falls under Ross' category of member state retreat, with the difference that the UK's withdrawal is not temporarily but permanently. Radicalization, immigration, and the increasing detachment from EU citizens to the EU can develop into crises of member state retreat because of member states' dissatisfaction with EU answers, which result in changes in their domestic policies, and ultimately in a departure from the EU. Navracsics then makes a link to identity again and argues that questions about European identity are at the core of the causes and responses to these crises. Similar to source 8, Navracsics also mentions European values, and the importance for policies to focus on them in challenging times. Towards the end of the speech, Navracsics further points out that the European project will not survive without a European identity, and that values are very valuable in difficult times. Source 11 strongly implies that European identity is emphasized by the European Union in times of crises because of the direct connections between crises and identity. Furthermore, Navracsics mentions several events, of which some can be categorized according to Ross' typology of crises, such as the withdrawal of the UK from the EU, as it was explained earlier.

Source 12 contains similar references to identity and culture as source 10. Navracsics talks about the power of culture and European identity at various places. He also mentions personal relationships between Europeans, and ascribes a great significance to them because they are what will keep the people of Europe together, giving an example of friendships between Germans and French. Navracsics describes these relationships as the foundation of European integration, which is an interesting claim, given that the European project started only as an economic project, by establishing trade relationships between countries, and not because the founding nations felt particularly European. Navracsics makes these elaborations in times of challenges which he also mentions in his speech: violent extremism, economic stagnation, social inequalities, and the immigration situation. According to Ross' definition of crises, this examination of the EU's current situation describes one. Rising extremism, slow or no economic growth, the influx of migrants, and, on top of that inequalities in the society signify a dangerous time, instability

and require changes to make the system work again. Looking at Ross' typology of crises, not all of the challenges mentioned fall under one category. However, it can be argued, that these challenges are leading the way towards a crisis of member state retreat. Dissatisfaction within member states about the European Union might lead to new governments, and a change in domestic politics, which could mean a change in the dynamics of the European Union. What is particularly important in Navracsics' speech, is that he directly links European identity with the challenging situation he described. He appeals to the audience's European identity, and directly says that culture is helpful with some of the challenges he mentioned, such as extremism, the arrival of a large number of migrants, or even division in Europe's society.

Navracsics' speeches were all given within a time period of approximately twelve months. It was therefore also interesting to read speeches from Navracsics' predecessor, Androulla Vassiliou, and look at her elaborations. In source 13, Vassiliou establishes a relationship between culture and crises that are similar to the ones Navracsics mentioned in his speeches. Vassiliou underlines the importance and benefits of the cultural sector for individuals, society, and for the European project and its prosperity in general. She furthermore talks about the intrinsic value of culture, a theme which also often appears in the law texts. Commissioner Vassiliou underlines the ability of culture to create cohesion within society, which is important in a Union of 27 member states, as well as its ability to create jobs, and therefore economic growth. She furthermore emphasizes that culture has to become more important in the European project. We can see that in source 13, Vassiliou talks about culture because the EU is challenged with fragmentation. While this is not a crisis as Ross defined in his typology, the challenge of fragmentation can lead to a crisis of member state retreat, as it has been elaborated on in previous paragraphs. Thus, Vassiliou's elaborations strongly suggest that the development of a crisis was to be avoided with the help of culture.

In source 14, Vassiliou again talks about the benefits of culture. Similar to source 13, she mentions the economic benefits of culture, as well as the importance of culture for building a European identity. In source 14, Vassiliou mentions several challenges for the EU, such as reduced budgets, fragmentation,

globalization, or technological changes. Similar to source 13, Vassiliou urges that the European Union needs to recognize culture stronger. She makes an interesting connection by saying that the EU lost some of its confidence because of the crisis, but that Europe's culture can play an important role in regaining this confidence. The events mentioned by Vassiliou could trigger certain types of crises defined by Ross. As the world is increasingly growing together, globalization could trigger crises of economic adaptation. As the EU's reality and actions depend on the larger context of the economic and political world, globalization carries the threat of triggering a crisis of economic adaptation. As it has been explained before, crises of member state retreat could result from fragmentation, as more radical viewpoints could develop, which are enough to change domestic political situations in member states, and lead them to withdraw from the EU.

Also Costa in source 15, which dates to the same time as source 12, establishes a relationship between difficult times and culture, and furthermore makes appeals similar to Vassiliou's, regarding the place of culture in the European project. Costa underlines that culture plays an important role in the many challenges the EU is facing, thereby directly linking culture with challenges. Costa mentions the influx of refugees, and also the solidarity crisis. While the latter is not a crisis according to Ross' typology, Costa's elaborations and choice of words suggest how urgent and difficult she regards the situation at that time in the European Union. Furthermore, as it was outlined earlier, these events could trigger crises of member state retreat. We can see in 2017, that many EU member states are not satisfied with the EU's answers to the migrant and refugee crisis, and thus increasingly develop anti-EU tendencies, and talk about leaving the EU. Similar to source 13 and 14, Costa in source 15 expresses the need to give culture a more central role in EU policies, and also brings the budget into the conversation. Costa also talks about culture's intrinsic value, similar to source 13.

Also EU national politicians recognize the need to pay more attention to culture in the European Union in difficult times. In source 16 for example, the Czech Minister for Culture, Václav Jehlička emphasizes the need to fully use the European Agenda for Culture, because it is necessary for the society, positive development, and has the ability to solve, among others, social or economic problems. We can

see that this was in response to the economic crisis the EU was facing at that time, and which is mentioned directly in Jehlička's speech several times. Ross' categorization includes crises of economic adaptation, so in a broader definition, the economic crisis mentioned in source 16, falls under that category. Towards the end of his speech, the Czech Minister again highlights the importance of culture in times of the economic crisis, because it can trigger new ways of thinking when new worries are raised.

German President Joachim Gauck in source 17 also believes in the importance of European identity, culture, and values in times of crisis, similar to sources 8 and 11. He also adds and acknowledges that there is no common European narrative which can build an identity, but that European values present a foundation for building such identity, because they connect European citizens. This was said in response to the growing challenges the EU is facing on several levels. Gauck mentions the perception of the EU as a case of crisis, caused by the debt and economic crises, and causing skepticism among EU citizens about the EU. Similar to source 16, these crises broadly fall under the second type of crises as defined by Ross, which are crises of economic adaptation. In addition, the events Ross mentioned could all trigger crises of member state retreat.

A relationship between crises and identity is also established in the EU law texts. Already in the early communications regarding culture which the EU institutions issued, references are made which give the impression, that initiatives established under the cultural policy do serve the purpose of aiding the European Union in critical situations, and that cultural policy is thus as important for the EU as is, for example, its economy. The Council in source 18 states that the actual situation needs to be taken into consideration when working in the cultural area. While the words "crisis" or "challenge" are not mentioned directly, this phrasing leaves room for interpretation. Basing work in the cultural area on the "actual situation" or "actual circumstances" implies that the actions the EU takes in the cultural area are determined by the challenges or crises it is facing. Because of this relationship, the EU could regard cultural policies as an antidote to a difficult "actual situation" or an amplification to a positive and progressive "actual situation". Source 18 was issued in 1995, which means just three years after the establishment of the legal foundation to work in the cultural area. The events that took place at that time

suggest that the Council reiterated the original reasons for working in the cultural area from 1985, when the ad hoc working Party on a People's Europe published a report in reaction to the low voter turnout of the European elections in 1979, and presented ideas of how to include the European citizens more in the European project. It can thus be argued that coordinated work in the cultural area was established because the circumstances the EU found itself in required it. Taking Ross' classification of four types of crises into account, the low participation of people cannot be clearly classified as one particular type of crisis. However, it can be regarded as a reaction to a crisis. Looking at the examples that Ross' gives for the various types of crises reveals that the economy of the EU was in a bad state by the Late 1970s. Thus, European citizens felt more negatively about the EU, and were not as much involved. In summary, source 18 does not state a crisis directly. However, looking at the wider context gives a complete picture of the situation, and the phrasing "actual situation" can be related to crises. It is furthermore likely, that even though the Council did not refer to a crisis in source 18, it is referring to future initiatives, leaving therefore the possibility of establishing a cultural initiative as an answer for a future crisis.

Source 19 also does not make a direct reference to a crisis. However, it is important to point out that the Council establishes a certain importance of culture for the European Union, as this sets the stages for culture being used as a tool to combat crises. Culture is mentioned together with the EU's geography, economy, and society, and is also one of the factors that determine how the world perceives the EU. Because source 18 and 19 are both from three years after the legal establishment for cultural action, they can be considered as important, as it can be argued that they provided a direction the Council wanted the cultural policy to go, or which tasks it should fulfil, or which purpose it should serve. The Council in source 19 furthermore generally recognizes the economic dimension of culture, and at the same time warns that this dimension does not decrease culture's value. This connection is important because of the significance of the economy for the European Union. It has to be considered that the EU started as an economic project, however, and as the Council notes, the EU is not only the economy. Even if the economy is visible in various policy areas, it does not diminish the value of that area.

In source 20, the Council further describes the important role of culture, and even extends culture's work to the European integration process. The Council appeals to the European Commission and the Member States to recognize this importance, and culture's role for the integration process. The term "actual situation" becomes more concrete in source 20, and the Council talks about the enlargement of the European Union. Source 20 was published only two years before the "big bang" enlargement, which increased the population of the European Union by almost 75 million people. As Ross has shown, crises of enlargement are one type of crises which are caused by accessing new member states into the European Union. Even though Ross is rather talking about crises triggered by bad negotiation deals for the newly accessed member states, the Council is putting attention on another dimension on which problems can occur. The timing of source 20 suggests that the Council expressed its opinion or will in this resolution in anticipation of the accession of ten new member states, in order to make sure that the consequences of the enlargement for European culture and identity were diminished as much as possible. Many of the states accessed in 2004 were former Communist countries, being thus culturally distinctive from the rest of the European Union. Source 20 furthermore suggests that the Council, having expressed its opinion on culture and its importance from the very beginning of the EU's legal work in the cultural area, related culture to enlargement in anticipation of the challenges arising from it, as the Council recognizes that the enlargement will increase the diversity of the EU (Council of the European Union 2002). This can create tensions that can develop into crises within society.

Similar to the connections the Council is making between culture and crises, also the Commission establishes this direct relationship. In source 22, which was also issued shortly after the Maastricht Treaty such as source 18 and 19, the Commission legitimizes the establishment of the Culture 2000 program, because it enables the European Union to respond to "today's challenges." Three challenges are mentioned that make this new approach necessary. The EU was entering a "key period of its history," as by 1998, with the introduction of the economic and monetary union and the euro approaching, European integration underwent major changes, and was accelerated. Furthermore, by that time and as it is explained in the preceding paragraph, the EU had the vision of accessing ten new member states, and to

enlarge the Union as it hasn't been done before, to a 25-country Union. Third, globalization of the economy is another challenge the EU is facing. Unlike the Council in source 19, the Commission is making concrete references to culture in the context of those challenges, particularly enlargement. The Commission even regards it as necessary to newly define what is meant by "culture," and reasons that culture has become a driving force in society. This at the same time presents another reason for which culture is "intrinsic" to the EU's responses to the challenges it is facing, and that the EU uses it as a tool. This is also suggested by relating renewed and strengthened Community cultural action to a positive future development of the European Union.

The challenges the Commission mentions can be put under the categorization of crises as defined by Ross. Similar to the preceding paragraph, enlargements have in the past turned out to be critical for the European Union, although Ross does not refer to a cultural dimension in his definition. Furthermore, the introduction of the euro and the economic and monetary union mean major changes for the European Union, so that it is likely that member states disagree about important issues regarding this policy. Ross has described this as crises of design. The third challenge that is mentioned, globalization of the economy, falls under the second type of crises, crises of economic adaptation. The economic crisis in the 1970s in the European Union showed the dependency of the European economy on other economies. Increasing worldwide economic integration increases the risk of a repetition of what happened in the 1970s. Source 22 implies, that the European Union relates culture with those crises. One of the fundamental objectives the European Union wants to achieve with its cultural action is evoking European citizenship, bring to the fore what Europeans have in common, and let them develop a cultural identity. It can be argued that the European Union anticipated consequences of those crises for the European society as a whole, and thus, by fostering Europeans' feeling of belonging to the EU through emphasizing European identity through cultural policy, wanted to prevent a possible decrease of support.

The Commission says relevant things about culture and crises elsewhere. In source 23, it mentions again several events of "major significance," which make it important to extend the Culture 2000 program, in order to establish cultural initiatives. The Commission refers to the big bang enlargement, the

results of European Convention conference, elections for European Parliament, as well as the appointment of a new Commission. A pattern can be recognized that enlargement is a reoccurring theme when talking about challenges for the European Union which suggests that times of enlargement present the situations with the greatest risk to develop a crisis. In addition, major changes at the institutional or administrative level of the EU are regarded as challenges. This implies again, that the Commission includes culture in the responses to changes which shape the EU's future direction. As it was explained above, the crises or challenges that the Commission mentions in this document, fall under crises of design, and crises of enlargement. Changes in the institutional structure of the European Union carry the danger that member states do not agree with those changes, insist on their ideas about this structure, and thus they might create disagreement. A dissatisfied people could strengthen these member state attitudes, so awakening and strengthening the people's European identity, and making them feel part of the European project, could aid tackling crises which develop from such situations, as they would support the EU more.

One year later, and in the year of the enlargement, the Commission again puts several challenges the EU is facing into perspective, and relates them to the cultural policy of the EU. In source 24, the Commission underlines that "pursuing and developing" cultural programs is imperative. This was said in the context of certain challenges, the EU is facing: the accession of ten new member states in 2004 which creates cultural, social, and linguistic diversity, and the demographic change of society. Even in the year of the enlargement, the Commission refers to it, and by doing that, emphasizes the consequences it can have, and also supporting the claim that the Commission anticipated negative consequences, which could be avoided or resolved by cultural programs. Both challenges mentioned can be combined under a new theme, namely changes in the society. Taking more the changes for the institutions into account, the Commission in source 24 directly involves the citizens of Europe, showing by that cultural policy should reach the societies of the European Union. Similar to the events that the Commission talks about in source 22 and 23, and which were categorized as crises according to Ross, the Commission in source 24 makes reference to changes. However, in source 24, it does not refer to an institutional change but to societal

changes. That cultural policy should strengthen the bonds between the European people is also shown by the Commission's reference to the "values that hold the [European] societies together," and that these values become more important in the context of the changes, that were outlined earlier. Thus, culture is seen as a tool to aid in situations which change the dynamics of society, through for instance enlargements or demographic changes, and which could disrupt a smooth interaction between people, so that tensions occur, which could ultimately lead to a decrease of public support for the EU, which could then lead to a crisis.

After having started the theme of considering the society and societal problems, it reoccurs in the subsequent communication the Commission issued. In source 25, which dates to 2007, and three years after the big 2004 enlargement, the Commission does not mention enlargement as a challenge anymore, but relates culture with globalization, a term which occurred in source 22 as "globalization of the economy." In source 25, the Commission thinks that "the time is ripe" for a new agenda for culture, "which takes account of the realities of today's globalizing world." (European Commission 2007) As the CoR has noted in source 29, it is necessary that citizens learn to live in a pluralistic society where people are more likely to form stereotypes, or develop xenophobia and racism (Committee of the Regions 1998). Thus, globalization causes changes for the European societies, or can lead to their fragmentation, and culture can help to combat problems that arise from it, such as xenophobia or racism. The quote which the Commission included in its staff working document, "culture is not a luxury, but a necessity," emphasizes the Commission's viewpoint on culture even more, and suggests that it sees culture as an essential part in answering to crises. Similar to the analysis of source 24, it can be argued for source 25, that fragmentation within society can lead to a decrease in people's support for the European Union, and ultimately to a crisis of member state retreat according to Ross. This can be caused by growing individual dissatisfaction, or increasing awareness of inaction or indifference about the (supra)national bodies about the problem. It becomes evident in source 25, that enlargement is not mentioned anymore as a challenge, or crisis for the European Union. A likely reason for that is, that after 2004, the EU no longer anticipated another mass

enlargement. By accessing one or two new member states at a time, the Commission did not anticipate the same consequences, that would occur if ten new states were accessed.

In source 26, one of the more recent communications from the Commission, neither globalization, fragmentation, nor enlargement is mentioned. Rather the Commission says that the European Heritage Label, which is being introduced in this proposal, should “strengthen European citizens’ sense of belonging to Europe and promote a sense of European identity.” By referencing the Commission’s proposal for the European Parliament and Council to decide on EU action for the EHL, it is evident in source 26 that the Commission sees the gap between EU citizens and EU institutions as the reason that called for this initiative. The Commission presents results from a Eurobarometer survey published in 2008, which shows that less than half of Europeans have a positive image of the EU. With the EHL, the Commission’s objective is to change Europeans’ attitude on the identity level. As it was mentioned in chapter 5/b/i/2, the problem the Commission describes in source 26 was the primary trigger in 1979 for the EU to start working in the cultural area. While the citizens at that time were unsatisfied with the European integration process, the EU gave culture more importance. The aim to change European’s identity also originated in this time, which shows that the major objective of the cultural policy has not changed, since work in that area started, even when it was not under the legal framework of Maastricht. In addition, unsatisfied citizens could lead to crises of member state retreat. If people do not support their national pro-EU parties anymore, but are attracted by anti-EU parties, national political situations could change, resulting in a withdrawal from EU cooperation.

The communication of the Committee of the Regions mimics that of the Commission and the Council. In source 29, dated to 1998, culture is mentioned in the context of “the period we are living in,” a term what was referred to in source 18 as “actual situation.” Unlike the Commission, which does not take the European societies into account but until later, the CoR recognizes challenges for the people of Europe, and mentions that they have to develop necessary skills to be able to live in a pluralistic society. Even though the CoR does not mention enlargement specifically, it can be argued that the CoR made that statement with the 2004 enlargement in mind because of the date of the source. As it was explained

before, with the 2004 enlargement, almost 75 million people from different cultural backgrounds were welcomed into the already pluralistic European society. Because of the breaking down of barriers for those 75 million people, and thus the opening of possibilities to interact with a lot of different people, a smooth interaction between the groups of people was desirable for the European Union, so that the European society, and thereby the European project, would progress. Besides relating culture to societal problems, the CoR also mentions that culture has become an important factor in finding “solutions to global problems,” and mentions UNESCO’s report “Our Creative Diversity.” This report emphasizes that culture plays a key role in shaping an individual’s “thinking, imagining and behavior,” and that cultural rights cannot be realized separately from economic and political rights (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996). Hence, instead of mentioning a specific crisis, the CoR rather talks about the overall power that culture has in relation to that which itself suggests that the EU uses culture to answer to crises. Parallels can be drawn to the discourse from that time from other EU institutions, as they as well underline the general importance of culture.

As time progressed, the general statements about culture became more concrete. In source 30, the CoR gives its opinion on the European Capital of Culture program, and thinks that it contributes to “building the Europe of the future.” Then, the CoR mentions several challenges which “require attention,” which the ECOC program can provide. These challenges are nationalism, individualism, consumerism, and a fragmented social infrastructure. It can be implied that the CoR’s opinion was issued in response to the increasing gap between the European citizens and the institutions. The CoR however mentions additional causes for the creation of that gap: nationalism and individualism. The European Union is a place of cooperation between nation states, and it is highly integrated, compared to for example other trade cooperations. If member states start to withdraw from this cooperation, because they are concerned about their national interests then this can influence the nationals of that country, and push them away from the European Union. Furthermore, it can change the dynamics in the Union. Ross has described the temporary withdrawal of member states from the European Union as crises of member state retreat. In order to avoid this and the rise of nationalism, the European Union might thus strengthen its cultural

policy, and try to strengthen the European identity. By doing this, nationalistic leaders might not get to power in the first place.

Also indirect relationships were established, which followed two themes. First, several institutions referred to the role of culture in fostering social cohesion and integration, which can then prevent challenges mentioned above, such as fragmentation, or societal changes caused by enlargements that can cause crises of member state retreat as defined by Ross. Second, the role of culture for the economy and development of the European Union was emphasized. A strong economy and a developed Union can prevent, for instance, crises of economic adaptation. The following paragraphs will closely analyze the indirect connections.

The Council in source 18 and 21 underlines that culture influences the development of society, and social cohesion, promotes social inclusion, equality, and combats discrimination and poverty. 15 years lie between the two sources, but nevertheless the same theme is repeated. As it was mentioned earlier, source 18 dates to 1995, just three years after the legal foundation to work in the cultural area was laid. Similar to the other sources that date back to this time, the EU institutions are showing the general importance of culture, and in which areas it has an influence. Mentioning the society as one of those areas is another argument which legitimizes work in the cultural area, as the European Union has a democratic structure, and thus calls for the participation of the European people. Source 21 on the other hand is more recent, and dates to 2010. By that time, the European Union found itself with the challenge of closing the gap that existed between the institutions and the Europeans, and the resulting negative opinion that EU citizens had of the EU according to the Eurobarometer opinion surveys, as source 26 shows.

Also in source 20, the text regarding the establishment of one of the first cultural initiatives, the Raphael program, the Council emphasizes the effects of the program on society. As the text reads, what connects people, and creates greater mutual understanding and respect, and ultimately an “ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe,” is cultural heritage. As in source 18 and 21, society is in the focus, and the Council believes that close ties between the people of Europe can be created with the help of cultural heritage.

The European Commission is more specific, and mentions concrete social challenges in relation to cultural activities. Source 22 for example talks about unemployment, insecurity, and exclusion. According to the Commission, culture has an important value for the European Union, because cultural activities help to reintegrate people into society, and can thus prevent, or combat, the challenges mentioned. Source 22 also underlines that culture is important because it secures peace which is why culture can prevent crises that could ultimately lead to times of no peace. The Commission further thinks it is necessary for the cultural initiatives to influence the European people so that they develop a sense of belonging to the same community. Source 22 also mentions the ability of culture to reintegrate previously excluded groups.

Source 24 emphasizes the necessity at that time for the European citizens to have a feeling of belonging to the European Union, and identify with it. Similar to the claims of the Council in source 18 and 21, the Commission in source 24 addresses the reality that the European Union was facing, namely the distance between the citizens and the European institutions. Initiatives under the cultural policy were thus supposed to help European citizens to better identify with the idea of Europe by giving direct meaning to what it means to be a European. The Commission furthermore underlines in this communication that a European identity should not replace other identities, but complement them, emphasizing by that also that a European identity can very well be a part of all the other identities, and all-present, as the European Union is in people's everyday lives, whether they are aware of it or not. As explained before, source 24 was issued in the year of the big enlargement, so that the development of a crisis of enlargement was likely. Source 24 contains more evidence that one of the objectives of the European Union is to generate support for the European project among the European citizens. Reference to a feeling of belonging to the Union, or the emphasis on the complementarity of a European and national, regional, ethnic, or religious identity, support this claim. The Commission is making it clear that it is possible for the people to develop a European identity in the first place, and then also, that it does not stand in conflict with other identities.

Source 27, which dates to 2005, addresses some of the assertions and possible explanations made earlier, regarding the challenges that enlargement can have for society. The Commission mentions the “successive enlargements of the Union,” likely focusing on the big enlargement in 2004 because of the date of the source. After the enlargement, the diversity in the EU has increased, causing tensions and discrimination, triggered by problems such as xenophobia or racism. In source 27, the Commission explains the essential role of culture for European integration. According to the source, culture’s role in this is important because it reinforces intercultural dialogue through which Europeans can learn to master the new, diverse, and complex environment, and manage the difficulties and tensions, and because it can end problems such as racism or xenophobia. By establishing a connection between enlargement and societal problems, and mentioning the positive contribution of culture to social inclusion, the Commission strongly suggests that crises can not only be caused on the institutional or member state level, but they can also originate in society. This is important because it reveals a weakness of Ross typology, who looks at crises that stem from the institutional level. It is furthermore important, because it reveals the importance of a functioning and stable society for the EU. In source 24, the Commission highlights mutual understanding between people and social inclusion. By getting access to the European Union, citizens of various countries also received the opportunity, not only to travel freely in the European Union, but also to live and work in a different country permanently. They therefore had to integrate into a new society, which can be difficult. From this perspective derives another implication, why EU institutions were so concerned with the development of a European identity: if all European citizens can relate to a common identity, then the process of social integration would be facilitated.

Source 28 from the European Parliament also relates culture with social cohesion and integration, by outlining that it is important for the European people to be aware of their cultural identity, because it fosters integration and contributes to greater social cohesion. Taking also other sources of this time into account, when enlargement was the current topic, we see that the Parliament’s statement was a reaction to the increase in the EU’s diversity after the enlargement of 2004. As the Commission in source 27 has

elaborated on, this increase in diversity caused growing tensions in the population based on xenophobia and racism.

In source 29, the CoR not only reconfirms culture as the “connecting fabric of the Union,” but also wants to develop a better structured concept of culture, so that people can understand each other more easily. This understanding is important because it leads to a harmonistic society. And a harmonic society provides no space for the development of hostile attitudes. The CoR also highlights the effects of increasing interaction between people, and even claims that these interactions have the ability to solve problems related to poverty, exclusion, or the environment. Source 29 strongly suggests, that the CoR regards interaction between people, which disregards cultural differences, and respects other cultures, but requires the understanding of culture, as the foundation of tackling difficult tasks for society.

In source 29, the CoR furthermore includes enlargement in the relationship between culture and the economy, which has been mentioned a lot in the law texts as a challenge for the EU. In anticipation of this enlargement, it is important for the cultures of Europe to understand each other in an economic sense. Tensions in society caused by misunderstanding and disrespect for diversity and other cultures could impact the economy negatively as it might stop growing during those times of pressure.

7. Discussion

The preceding analysis puts the links between culture and crises that were found and presented in chapter 5, into context. Looking at this analysis, some trends can be identified, which will be outlined and discussed in the following paragraphs.

Generally, the importance of culture is recognized in speeches of lawmakers, as well as in the law texts. It is said that culture in general, as well as concrete initiatives under the cultural policy framework are important with regards to challenges and crises. In various texts, a concrete crisis was not mentioned, but references were made to changes, and how culture can help to either cope with the negative consequences of the changes, or avoid those consequences to appear. Thus, culture appears to not only be used as a tool to combat crises, but also to prevent crises. Culture's "intrinsic value" is also often recognized in the discourse that was considered for analysis. Furthermore, lawmakers as well as the law texts establish direct relationships between culture and crises. They do so not only at specific points in time, but the theme of the importance of culture in challenging times occurs constantly. In relation to the date of the discourse, it is noticeable that despite their different functions, different EU institutions refer to the same challenges, if the relevant discourse is from the same time. This suggests the interconnectivity of the institutions, and their close relationships with regards to the development of cultural policies. Taking only lawmaker's speeches into account, it was noticeable, that first, even though they speak at different times, both Commissioners, Vassiliou and Navracsics, address the relationship between culture and crises, and in their speeches, and this connection was a central theme, and second, they make more concrete connections than the law texts. This suggests that they both follow a culture-focused path, and both want a more central role for culture in the context of crises. Also the German President and the Czech Minister for Culture establish the link between culture and crisis. This is important to point out because despite the seven-year difference between the least and most recent speech, the fact that culture is mentioned with regards to challenging times, has not changed, and is present as a theme over such period of time.

The most evident theme to identify is that the link between culture and society is the strongest one, and one which is made the most often, by lawmakers as well as law texts. Culture can combat or prevent challenges in society, and can thus prevent crises for the EU as a whole by creating a cohesive society. Many aspects can be taken into consideration when talking about society. The lawmakers and law texts for instance talk about discrimination, uniting and connecting the people of Europe, reintegrate excluded people into society, create a space of understanding and tolerance, and fight discrimination, racism, and xenophobia. The speakers and texts highlighted that all the phenomena, of which some are mentioned as challenges in the discourse analyzed, can influence, are born in, and can be restored at the society level. The concern of the EU with its society suggests the importance it has for the EU. Similar to what was argued in chapter 6, a society with a strong European identity will develop better opinions about the EU, which leads to more integration and less fragmentation, which serves as a good foundation for the fight against crisis.

In the context of the society, the enlargement of 2004 is mentioned often with regards to societal problems. Not only do enlargements cause an increase of diversity in Europe's society, but enlarging the Union also means that people from the newly accessed countries can freely travel, work, or even settle down in another EU member state. Thus, not only the European society changes, but also the societies of the member states as different nation states might welcome many new immigrants, which poses a challenge to those societies. Regarding the enlargement, it stands out, that it is mentioned as a challenge only in the years before, and a little bit after the enlargement, and then disappears from the discourse. Furthermore, a cohesive and peaceful society is desirable in order to ensure progress for the Union, and avoid violent outbreaks which could arise from fragmentation.

A link is also established often between culture and the economy. The number of those links, however, is a lot smaller than the number of links between culture and society. This suggests that society, and not economic development is the most important beneficiary of EU cultural policy, which itself underlines that the EU is more than just economic cooperation between member states. It is said that culture can boost the economy, create jobs, or contribute to positive development, and can thus, similar to the indirect

link established between culture and society, prevent crises. Lawmakers as well as the law texts establish this relationship.

Regarding the direct and indirect relationships that are established between culture and crises in the law texts, it is noticeable that the same piece of evidence makes references to both kinds of relationships. This implies that culture through the eyes of EU policy is a multidimensional, flexible concept, which can be used to serve multiple purposes.

Other themes which occur often are the appeal to give culture a more central role in EU policies. Not only lawmakers make this appeal, but also the law texts talk about the necessity to give culture a more central role in EU policies. The importance of values is also mentioned often with regards to challenging times. Similar to the question of the role or place of culture in EU policies, both lawmakers and law texts mention the importance of European values in difficult times, however, lawmakers do this more often than law texts.

There are also certain concrete EU initiatives which are mentioned often in the context of crises, which are the European Heritage Label, the European Capital of Culture, and the Erasmus program. In the majority of the cases they are mentioned because of their ability to bring the people of Europe together, to create cohesion, and to foster understanding and tolerance on the one hand, and to eliminate racism and xenophobia on the other. However, they are also mentioned with regard to their ability to foster the development of a European identity. Related to that is the importance that is placed on the young, or Erasmus generation, which is emphasized in the discourse. The variety of social challenges that is mentioned directly in the texts regarding the cultural initiatives strongly suggest that the European Union uses these initiatives to answer to crises.

It was also noticeable, that the term “challenge” appeared more often than the term “crisis.” The difference in meaning between these two terms has thus to be determined. A “challenge,” according to Merriam-Webster (“Definition”), can for example be “a stimulating task or problem,” whereas the term “crisis,” recalling the definition from chapter 2, describes dramatic moments, when current systems cease to work, and they thus have to be changed in order to function again. A crisis is thus more dramatic than a

challenge. The differences in the definitions, and the fact that the term “challenge” appeared more often than “crisis” make room for various interpretations. First, because of the consequences of crises for the European Union, as it was outlined in chapter 2c, it is likely that the EU struggles to admit that it is facing a crisis because it wants to avoid a repetition of the EU’s crisis-driven history. The EU lawmakers and other officials thus avoid using the term “crisis,” and use “challenge” instead, to avoid upsetting the people and risk a decrease in positive public opinion. Second, it can be concluded that challenges and crises also stand in a relationship, in so far, as that challenges are the pre-stages of crises. Third, the distinction between crises and challenges could indicate that the items discussed and mentioned as a challenge rather refer to specific areas in which the challenges occur, such as the society, whereas the crises that were mentioned rather refer to the EU level.

Furthermore, the situations described by the lawmakers or law texts could not always be categorized according to Ross typology of crises. However, the rhetoric used, which is especially noticeable in the lawmakers’ speeches, strongly suggests that they are either a harbinger of crises, or crises not taken into account by Ross.

From this stems a setback of Ross’ definition. He is basing his typology on the EU’s history. However, not only the EU has evolved, and integrated further, but globalization and the course of time have created new challenges, that can develop into crises, other than the ones that already occurred in its history. The most recent situation that Ross takes into account for his definition, are the events in Germany in 1998, however, the global situation and political relations have changed. With the time, the EU has also developed stronger relationships with third countries. Developments outside of the EU have thus also to be taken into account when defining potential crises for the EU. Ross is furthermore not considering social changes as a trigger for crises or challenges, even though they were present then, but only looks at the institutional, or political level. However, EU cultural policy seems to be directed primarily towards changes within the European society, in order to prevent an outbreak of crises.

It is also important to present the opinion of the media about EU culture, identity, and cultural policy. Media are an important actor, as they can influence the public, but might also look more critical at the

concept of European identity and crises. In an article from 2012, Umberto Eco, Italian novelist and philosopher, emphasized the importance of culture and European identity for the European Union. Eco described European identity as “shallow,” and urged to change this “before the crisis hits.” (Riotti 2012). Thus, similar to the lawmakers and law texts that were analyzed, Eco establishes a relationship between crises and European identity and culture. Eco furthermore talks about the Erasmus program and its ability to create Europeans, and suggests that also “craftsmen and professionals” should have the opportunity to partake in the university exchange program (ibid.). Eco provides a different perspective on this, because the lawmakers and law texts only mentioned Erasmus in the context of the ‘young generation,’ or the ‘new Europeans,’ and the benefits of it to university students. However, Eco’s idea to extend the program, instead of emphasizing its effect on the young generation, appears to be a logical consequence to the discourse about Erasmus as a successful program.

In accordance with this goes the idea that other authors of newspaper articles raise of solving common problems not with traditional reforms or policies, and for the people of Europe to get more involved in the European project by building on culture. In ‘The European’ for example, Kristeva argues, that “our common culture is the antidote for the crisis in Europe” and she proposes an “Academy of European Culture and Cultures” in order to emphasize the history and potential of European culture (Kristeva 2014, own translation). Also Mansfeld claims that the political and economic challenges that the European Union is facing are a reason for Europeans to come closer together and face those challenges together (Mansfeld 2015, own translation). He negatively talks about the return to nationalism, and says that it only is “about moralizing and principles.” (ibid.)

On the other hand, there is also controversy about EU cultural policy. In an article on euractiv.com, Aline Robert calls EU cultural policy “one of the major causes of discord within the EU.” (Robert 2015) The budget for the current framework program for support for the audiovisual and culture sectors, Creative Europe, is 9% higher than that of the preceding programs (“About” 2017). However, five years ago, when the EU leaders negotiated about the new seven-year budget, and an increase of the cultural budget was under consideration, member states were “under pressure to spend as little as possible,”

because of their debts and deficits in the national budgets (Ebels 2012). Even though the MEPs were in favor of an increased budget for culture, member states' opinion was essential because they have to agree to the budget, and can therefore block an increase in the budget for culture (ibid.). The consideration of decreasing the cultural budget suggests that culture at that time was regarded as a less important aspect the EU should concern itself, and spend money on, at least by the member states.

However, budget debates do not take away the importance the Commission gives culture in general. It seems that the European Union is especially now addressing the European people's consciousness about a common identity, and emphasizing the shared history. Hence, and interestingly, the Commission just proposed to make 2018 the European Year of Cultural Heritage "seeking to highlight the role of Europe's cultural heritage in fostering a shared sense of history and identity." (European Commission 2016) Furthermore, the European Union also recently re-launched the "New Narrative for Europe", a project which aims at showing "that the EU is not solely about the economy and growth, but also about cultural unity and common values." (European Commission 2016b). It is furthermore at the core of this initiative to reach out to young people. This is interesting, taking the rhetoric about Erasmus into account, and its emphasis on young people.

8. Conclusion

This thesis has shown that there is a connection between crises and culture in EU discourse regarding its cultural policy. It has done so by first establishing a theoretical foundation through defining identity, national and European identity, and crises, and through putting the research question into context by reviewing relevant literature on the development of the cultural policy of the EU, the European identity concept, and the relationship between European identity and crises. The thesis then presents the relevant evidence that led to the conclusion that a relationship between EU cultural policy and crises can be established.

As several law texts of the EU institutions and lawmakers strongly suggest, the European Union is emphasizing European culture and identity through its cultural policy in times of crises. Especially lawmakers perceive and construct the EU's situation as a crisis, which is, according to Risse (2012), important, as crises are subjective phenomena and need to be perceived as such in order to have an effect on existing identities, and challenge them. The gathering and analysis of results implies that culture is important for the European Union, and lawmakers and institutions even want culture to have a more central role in general EU policy making.

In order to come to judgement about the effectiveness of the EU's cultural policy, it is helpful to look at Eurobarometer surveys which contains several questions which ask about European identity. In the 2015 Eurobarometer survey for example that asked about European Citizenship, 67% of the respondents gave a positive answer to the question whether they feel they are a citizen of the European Union (European Commission 2015a). However, this does not confirm the success of the cultural initiatives, as the question was not aimed directly at a feeling of European identity. The respondents might refer to the ability to travel freely through the Union as the determining factor that makes them feel European. When asked about factors which unite European citizens, culture was the most given answer among the respondents. However, having only 27% of the people mentioning culture disturbs this success of culture slightly. When asked about the closeness of EU member states with regards to values, 51% of the respondents agreed that the member states share common values. This confirms that the European Union

has become more than an economic cooperation, and that a connection, also between the citizens, on a different level exists. Furthermore, 53% of Europeans identify with the European flag. This shows that the European people are to a rather small degree aware of the EU's efforts in the cultural area, and that their effect can be improved.

A more complete picture can be drawn looking at developments of the results of European identity measures determined by the Moreno question. Mendez and Bachtler (2016) note, that a majority of Europeans see themselves as European to a certain degree, compared to a minority who sees itself as only national (8). However, it has to be acknowledged that this majority put European identity after their national identity (ibid.). This dual identity does not show dramatical variations, however, after the economic crisis broke out in 2007/8, it decreased, but then later reached an historical high in 2015 (ibid.). Given the results of this study, these results strongly suggest, that the EU's efforts of emphasizing European identity and culture during crises bear fruits.

Based on the emphasis on the young or Erasmus generation in the discourse analyzed, it is interesting to look at a socio-demographic analysis of the results to see whether citizens from different age groups identify to different degrees with the European Union. When asked what the EU meant to citizens personally, 32% of the 15-24 year old, and 33% of the 24-29 year old answered "cultural diversity," whereas only 23% of the 55 year old and older answered that (European Commission 2016c). When asked whether they trusted in the European Union, there is also a significant difference between younger and older generations. 47% of 15-24-year-old trust the EU, whereas only 28% of the 55 year old and older trust the EU (ibid.). This indicates that the younger generation has a more positive picture of the EU generally. Indeed, 43% of 15-24-year-old have a positive image of the EU, whereas only 29% of the people 55 and older have a positive image (ibid.). Thus, the younger generation does have a more positive image of the EU which could be evoked by their participation in university exchange programs. The older generation does not have this possibility, and as a result has a more negative opinion of the EU. Thus, the EU's future might indeed be the younger generation, as it was mentioned often by the lawmakers.

Jean Monnet's words about the value of culture underline the general importance of culture for the European project, which is recognized in EU discourse issued by lawmakers as well as institutions, ever since the legal foundation was established to work in the area of culture. Opinion polls show, that the EU's efforts to promote one European culture, and thereby reinforce and build a European identity, are somewhat effective. A majority of Europeans identifies itself as European, however, people are still putting their national before European identity. Culture is mentioned by almost one third of Europeans as the factor which unites the citizens of Europe, which is a foundation for the EU to build upon.

This study opens up a number of promising avenues for future research. Even though the analysis suggests that culture is emphasized in challenging times or crisis, it needs to be examined, whether the European Union's efforts are effective, and whether what was said in the law texts or by lawmakers was implemented with the same effectiveness. Surveys could be conducted which study the feeling of belonging and Europeaness over a period of time. Scholars could look at the influence of EU cultural policies and initiatives in various nation states of the EU, and analyze the results comparatively. Based on the emphasis on the young generation in the context of the Erasmus program, and Eco's elaborations, it would be interesting to find an answer to the question why the exchange program that promotes mutual understanding through direct exchange and interaction between Europeans, is not extended to a broader population of Europeans. It would be furthermore interesting to look at the development of the link between culture and crises over time because it would create a more complete picture. Other factors, such as domestic policies, could be taken into account, and their influence on the development of the nationals' European identity determined. As this thesis has shown, many argue in favor of a European identity and culture for the European Union and its future. Further research about the determinants of EU cultural policy making, and the development of European identity in the people of Europe, could help to develop such policies more effectively, and build stronger support for the European project.

9. References

“About.” Creative Europe. *Creating Europe’s Cultural and Creative Sectors*. European Commission, 3 Mar 2017. [ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/about_en] Accessed 6 Mar 2017.

“About us.” *Heritage in Motion*. N.p., n.d.. [heritageinmotion.eu/about] Accessed 2 Mar 2017.

“A People’s Europe.” *CVCE*. Cvce.eu, n.d. [www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/df06517b-babc-451d-baf6-a2d4b19c1c88/95a065c6-38e9-45da-8bbe-66f958a8b005] Accessed 20 Sep 2016.

Barroso, José Manuel Durão. "A Europe for all weathers." Speech at the Meeting with EU Heads of Delegation, Brussels, 30 November 2011.

Beardsley, Eleanor. “Greek bailout divides French and German populations.” *Dw.com*. Deutsche Welle, 29 Apr 2010. [www.dw.com/en/greek-bailout-divides-french-and-german-populations/a-5521605] Accessed 13 Dec 2016.

Bee, Cristiano. "The ‘institutionally constructed’ European identity: Citizenship and public sphere narrated by the Commission." *Perspectives on European politics and society* 9.4, 2008, 431-450.

“Berlin truck attacker Anis Amri killed in Milan.” *BBC News*. The BBC, 23 Dec 2016 [www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-38415287] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

Boyes, Roger. “Merkel must solve Europe’s identity crisis.” *The Times*. The Times, 14 Sep 2016. [www.thetimes.co.uk/article/merkel-must-solve-europes-identity-crisis-hkvzmxhx7] Accessed 10 Nov 2016.

Bruter, Michael. "Winning Hearts and Minds for Europe The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity." *Comparative political studies* 36.10, 2003, 1148-1179.

Commission of the European Communities. “Euro-Barometer No 1. April – May 1974.” Commission of the European Communities, July 1974. PDF. [ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb1/eb1_en.pdf]

Committee of the Regions. “Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on 'Culture and cultural differences and their significance for the future of Europe'.” *EUR-Lex*. Publications Office, 13 Mar 1998. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:51997IR0447] Accessed 30 Dec 2016. Source 29.

Committee of the Regions. “Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on ‘A European agenda for culture in a globalising world’.” *EUR-Lex*. Publications Office, 28 Nov 2007. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52007AR0172] Accessed 8 Jan 2017. Source 31.

Committee of the Regions. “Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on ‘the future of the European Capital of Culture’.” *EUR-Lex*. Publications Office, 15 Feb 2012. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011IR0191] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 30.

“Constitutional Basis.” *Der Bundespräsident*. Bundespräsidialamt, n.d. Web. Accessed 16 Mar 2017. [www.bundespraesident.de/EN/Role-and-Functions/ConstitutionalBasis/ConstitutionalBasis-node.html]

Costa, Silvia. Speech at the European Culture Forum, Brussels, 19 April 2016. [ec.europa.eu/culture/forum/videos/culture-forum-silva-costa_en.mp4] Source 19.

Council of the European Union. “Common Position (EC) No 16/95 adopted by the Council on 10 July 1995 with a view to adopting a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a programme to support artistic and cultural activities having a European dimension (Kaleidoscope).”

EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 Jul 1995. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:51995AG1025(02)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016. Source 19.

Council of the European Union (a). “Council Resolution of 20 November 1995 on the promotion of statistics on culture and economic growth.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 20 Nov 1995. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1480788550537&uri=CELEX:31995Y1207(01)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016. Source 18.

Council of the European Union & European Parliament. “Decision No 2228/97/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1997 establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (the Raphael programme).” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 13 Oct 1997. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:31997D2228] Accessed 9 Jan 2017. Source 21.

Council of the European Union. “Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 21 Jan 2002. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32002G0205(02)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016. Source 20.

Cram, Laura. "Identity and European integration: diversity as a source of integration." Nations and Nationalism 15.1, 2009, 109-128.

Crozier, Michel, Samuel P. Huntington, and Joji Watanuki. The crisis of democracy. Vol. 70. New York: New York University Press, 1975. PDF. [trilateral.org/download/doc/crisis_of_democracy.pdf]

“Definition of challenge.” Merriam-Webster. Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, n.d. [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/challenge] Accessed 6 Mar 2017.

Demossier, Marion. “The Political Structuring of Cultural Identities in the European Union.” The European Puzzle. The Political Structuring of Cultural Identities at a Time of Transition, edited by Marion Demossier, Berghahn Book, 2007, pp 49-66.

Ebels, Philip. “EU Culture Budget: Small and Likely to Get Smaller.” EUobserver. EUobserver, 25 Oct 2012. [euobserver.com/culture/117961] Accessed 2 Feb 2017.

European Commission. “Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a single financing and programming instrument for cultural cooperation (Culture 2000 programme).” EUR-Lex. N.p., 6 May 1998. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51998DC0266&from=EN] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 22.

European Commission. “Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Decision No 508/2000/EC of 14 February 2000 establishing the ‘Culture 2000’ programme.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 16 Mar 2003. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52003PC0187] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 23.

European Commission. “Communication from the Commission - Making citizenship Work: fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for Youth, Culture, Audiovisual and Civic Participation.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 9 Mar 2004. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52004DC0154] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 24.

European Commission. “Commission staff working document - Annex to the Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008) - Impact assessment.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 5 Oct 2005. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52005SC1202] Accessed 9 Jan 2017. Source 27.

European Commission. “Commission staff working document - Accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a European agenda for culture in a

globalizing world - Inventory of Community actions in the field of culture.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 May 2007. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52007SC0570] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 25.

European Commission. “Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 9 Mar 2010. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52010SC0197&qid=1480788550537&from=EN] Accessed 2 Jan 2017. Source 26.

European Commission. “Who is Who – Barroso Commission – European Commission.” European Commission. Commissioners 2010-2014. European Commission, 8 Dec 2014. [ec.europa.eu/archives/commission_2010-2014/members/index_en.htm] Accessed 2 Mar 2017.

European Commission. Press Release Database. European Commission, last update: 22 Oct 2015. [europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-86-292_en.htm] Accessed 20 Sep 2016.

European Commission (a). “Standard Eurobarometer 83. Spring 2015. European Citizenship.” May 2015.

European Commission. “Commission proposes 2018 as the European Year of Cultural Heritage.” European Commission. Press Release Database. European Commission, 30 August 2016. [europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-2905_en.htm] Accessed 10 Oct 2016.

European Commission (a). “Culture 2000 Program.” CULTURE. European Commission, 10 Sep 2016. [ec.europa.eu/culture/tools/culture-2000_en.htm] Accessed 1 Nov 2016.

European Commission (b). “New Narrative for Europe.” Culture. European Commission, 2016. [ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/new-narrative/index_en.htm] Accessed 13 October 2016.

European Commission (c). “Public Opinion in the European Union.” European Commission, 2016. PDF.

European Commission (d). “Strategic Framework – European Agenda for Culture.” CULTURE. European Commission, 20 Sep 2016. [ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm] Accessed 1 Nov 2016.

European Communities. “Declaration on European Identity.” CVCE. Cvce.eu, 18 Dec 2013. PDF. [www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/02798dc9-9c69-4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf] Accessed 1 Nov 2016.

European Council, Council of the European Union. “A rotating presidency.” The Presidency of the Council of the EU. European Union, 20 Jan 2017. [www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/presidency-council-eu/] Accessed 2 Feb 2017.

“European Neighborhood Policy.” *European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations*. European Commission, 6 Dec 2016. [ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/overview_en] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

Europa Nostra. “European Heritage Awards Ceremony, Oslo City Hall, 11 June 2015.” YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 24 June 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=dhOp5xtUp2g. Source 2.

Europa Nostra (a). “EC Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou interview for Heritage in Motion.” YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 25 May 2012, www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfkP8IE8_bw. Source 13.

Europa Nostra (b). "Commissioner Vassiliou at the 2014 European Heritage Awards Ceremony." YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 23 May 2014, www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vs_3kpuqtNs. Source 14.

European Parliament. "European Parliament Fact Sheets." European Parliament. European Parliament, 30 Sept 2004. [www.europarl.europa.eu/facts_2004/4_17_0_en.htm] Accessed 1 Nov 2016.

European Parliament. "Culture in a globalising world. European Parliament resolution of 10 April 2008 on a European agenda for culture in a globalising world." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 Apr 2008. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52008IP0124] Accessed 8 Jan 2017. Source 28.

European Union. "About the Committee." European Economic and Social Committee. A Bridge Between Europe and Organised Civil Society. European Union, n.d. [www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.about-the-committee] Accessed 25 Jan 2017.

Fligstein, Neil, Alina Polyakova, and Wayne Sandholtz. "European integration, nationalism and European identity." *JCMS: journal of common market studies* 50.s1, 2012, 106-122.

FREE team. "Football Research – International, Interdisciplinary, Indispensable!" FREE. FREE Football Research in an Enlarged Europe, n.d. [www.free-project.eu/Pages/Welcome.aspx] Accessed 4 Nov 2016.

"Gao Xingjian - Biographical". Nobelprize.org. Nobel Media AB 2014. [www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2000/gao-bio.html] Accessed 2 Jan 2017.

Gauck, Joachim. "Europa: Vertrauen erneuern - Verbindlichkeit stärken." Rede zu Perspektiven der europäischen Idee. Bundespräsidialamt, 22 February 2013. [www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Joachim-Gauck/Reden/2013/02/130222-Europa.html] Accessed 14 December 2016. Source 17.

Gray, Clive. "Commodification and instrumentality in cultural policy." *International journal of cultural policy* 13.2 (2007): 203-215.

Grillo, Ralph. "European Identity in a Transnational Era." *The European Puzzle. The Political Structuring of Cultural Identities at a Time of Transition*, edited by Marion Demossier, Berghahn Book, 2007, pp 67-82.

"Impact of CoR opinions on EU legislation." European Committee of the Regions. N.p., n.d. [cor.europa.eu/en/activities/opinions/Pages/impact.aspx] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. "Voter Turnout in Western Europe Since 1945." PDF. 2004. [www.nonprofitvote.org/documents/2010/11/voter-turnout-in-western-europe-since-1945.pdf]

"Ioanna Ntampoudi' Details." *Ioanna Ntampoudi*. Euroacademia, n.d. [euroacademia.eu/speaker/ioanna-ntampoudi/] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

Jehlička, Václav. "Speech by Václav Jehlička, Minister of Culture, in the European Parliament – 19 January 2009." Czech Presidency of the European Union. Government of the Czech Republic, 16 August 2011. [www.eu2009.cz/en/news-and-documents/speeches-interviews/speech-by-vaclav-jehlicka--minister-of-culture--in-the-europ-6996/index.html] Accessed 14 December 2016. Source 16.

Kristeva, Julia. "Die unterschätzte Kraft." *The European.eu*. theeuropean.eu, 4 July 2014. [de.theeuropean.eu/julia-kristeva/8583-was-kann-die-europaeische-kultur-leisten] Accessed 1 Mar 2017.

Kuhn, Theresa. *Experiencing European Integration. Transnational Lives and European Identity*. Oxford: University Press, 2015. Print.

Laffan, Brigid. "The politics of identity and political order in Europe." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 34.1, 1996, 81-102.

Lähdesmäki, Tuuli. "Rhetoric of unity and cultural diversity in the making of European cultural identity." *International journal of cultural policy* 18.1, 2012, 59-75.

Lenz, Tobias. "Spurred emulation: The EU and regional integration in Mercosur and SADC." *West European Politics* 35.1, 2012, 155-173.

"Making an Impact: How the CoR influences EU policy." European Committee of the Regions. N.p., n.d. [cor.europa.eu/en/welcome/Pages/module-1-part-4.aspx] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

Mansfeld, Hasso. "Flüche, Streit statt Götterfunken!" *The European.eu*. theeuropean.eu, 10 July 2015. [www.theeuropean.de/hasso-mansfeld/10383-fuer-eine-gemeinsame-europaeische-identitaet] Accessed 1 Mar 2017.

McCormick, John. *Understanding the European Union. A Concise Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.

Mendez, Carlos and John Bachtler. *European Identity and Citizen Attitudes to Cohesion Policy: What do we know?* Cohesify Research Paper 1. European Policies Research Center, 2016. [www.cohesify.eu/downloads/Cohesify_Research_Paper1.pdf] Accessed 6 Mar 2017.

Navracsics, Tibor. "A bigger impact: how Europe can use the full potential of cultural heritage for local economies and society." Speech at the Conference "Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe," Oslo, 12 June 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/bigger-impact-how-europe-can-use-full-potential-cultural-heritage-local-economies-and-society_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2016. Source 3.

Navracsics, Tibor (a). "A hidden gem: the role of culture in making Europe a stronger global actor." Speech at a Conference "Culture and development: towards a more strategic approach to cultural policies in the EU's external relations", 3 September 2015 [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/hidden-gem-role-culture-making-europe-stronger-global-actor_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2016. Source 5.

Navracsics, Tibor (b). "How do we live together? Values and identity in a changing European Union." Speech at the Kulfest Festival, Zagreb, 21 May 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/how-do-we-live-together-values-and-identity-changing-european-union_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2015. Source 1.

Navracsics, Tibor (c). "Political priorities of the Juncker Commission – what role for education and culture?" Speech at Pristina University, 14 Juli 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/political-priorities-juncker-commission-what-role-education-and-culture_en] Accessed 5 Feb 2017. Source 4.

Navracsics, Tibor (d). "Speech at Pilsen 2015 European Capital of Culture Closure." Pilsen, 11 December 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/speech-pilsen-2015-european-capital-culture-closure_en] Accessed 5 Feb 2017. Source 6.

Navracsics, Tibor (2016). "A crisis of identity – and how to tackle it." Speech at the 2nd Industry Conference hosted by the Federation of Austrian Industries, Vienna, 22 September 2016 [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/crisis-identity-and-how-tackle-it_en] Accessed 6 Feb 2017. Source 10.

Navracsics, Tibor (a). "Building blocks of a new EU strategy for cultural diplomacy." Speech at a Meeting with Members of the European Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee on 'Cultural Diplomacy as an instrument of EU Neighbourhood Policy'. 26 January 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/building-blocks-new-eu-strategy-cultural-diplomacy_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017. Source 7.

Navracsics, Tibor (b). "Exchange of views with Committee on Culture and Education of the European Parliament." Brussels, 17 February 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/exchange-views-committee-culture-and-education-european-0_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017. Source 9.

Navracsics, Tibor (c). "Keeping the dialogue going - the role of culture in overcoming Europe's challenges." Speech at the European Culture Forum Brussels, 19 April 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/keeping-dialogue-going-role-culture-overcoming-europes-challenges_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017. Source 12.

Navracsics, Tibor (d). "Launch of the Second Phase of the 'New Narrative for Europe'." Brussels, 9 February 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/launch-second-phase-new-narrative-europe_hu] Accessed 7 Feb 2017. Source 8.

Navracsics, Tibor (e). "The Value of Our Values." Keynote speech at Hanns Seidel Foundation conference 'New societal challenges and Europe's search for identity'. Brussels, 30 November 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/value-our-values_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017. Source 11.

"New European Cultural Diplomacy Platform Launched." *Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI)*. European Commission, 7 Jul 2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/fpi/announcements/news/20160401_1_en.htm] Accessed 5 Apr 2017.

Nougayréde, Natalie. "Refugees aren't the problem. Europe's identity crisis is." *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 31 Oct 2016. [www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/31/refugees-problem-europe-identity-crisis-migration] Accessed 10 Nov 2016.

Ntampoudi, Ioanna. "The Eurozone Crisis and the European Union's Multiple Identity Crises." Paper presentation, 2014. [euroacademia.eu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Ioanna_Ntampoudi_EUs_Multiple_Identity_Crises.pdf] Accessed 10 Nov 2016.

Örkény, Antal. "European identity and national attachment: harmony or dissonance." *Corvinus Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 1, 2011, 33-61.

Pellerin-Carlin, Thomas. "EU 10 years after its biggest enlargement: Europe's identity crisis Looking in the black box of European cultural and political identities." *The Poznan University of Economics Review* 14.3, 2014, 73-83.

Phelan, William. "What Is Sui Generis About the European Union? Costly International Cooperation in a Self-Contained Regime." *International Studies Review* 14.3, 2012, 367-385.

Peterson, John & Michael Shackleton. *The Institutions of the European Union*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.

Ponterotto, Joseph G. "Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept thick description." *The Qualitative Report* 11.3, 2006, 538-549.

"Professor Marion Demossier. PhD in Social Anthropology and Comparative Sociology (Paris, EHESS)." University of Southampton. University of Southampton, n.d. [www.southampton.ac.uk/ml/about/staff/md1e11.page?] Accessed 4 Nov 2016.

Rapley, Tim. *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, 2007. Print.

Risse, Thomas. *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. New York: Cornell University, 2010. Print.

Riotti, Gianna. "Umberto Eco: 'It's culture, not war, that cements European identity.'" *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 26 Jan 2012. [www.theguardian.com/world/2012/jan/26/umberto-eco-culture-war-europa] Accessed 1 Mar 2017.

Ross, George. *The European Union and its Crises*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.

Sassatelli, Monica. "European cultural space in the European cities of culture: Europeanization and cultural policy." *European societies* 10.2, 2008, 225-245.

Shore, Cris. "Inventing the 'People's Europe': critical approaches to European Community's cultural policy." *Man*, 1993, 779-800.

Shore, Cris, and Susana Durão. "From a political anthropology to an anthropology of policy: interview with Cris Shore. By Susana Durão." *Etnográfica. Revista do Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia* 14.3, 2010, 595-614.

Smith, Anthony D. "National identity and the idea of European unity." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944, 1992)*, 1992, 55-76.

Szabo, Stephen. "Europe' identity crisis." *The Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 12 Nov 2015. [www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/11/12/the-european-identity-crisis/] Accessed 10 Nov 2016.

Tagiuri, Giacomo. "Forging Identity: The EU and European Culture." *Survival* 56.1, 2014, 157-178.

Teubert, Wolfgang. *Meaning, Discourse and Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.

The six Member States: Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands. "Treaty establishing the European Community (Amsterdam consolidated version) Part Three: Community policies, Title XII: Culture, Article 151, Article 128 - EC Treaty (Maastricht consolidated version), Article 128 - EEC Treaty." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 25 Mar 1957. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:11997E151] Accessed 1 Nov 2016.

"The Treaty of Maastricht." *The History of the European Union. The European Citizenship*. Historiasiglo20.org, n.d. [www.historiasiglo20.org/europe/maastricht.htm] Accessed 16 Mar 2017.

TNS/Scytl. "Turnout." *Results of the 2014 elections*. European Parliament, n.d. [www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/turnout.html] Accessed 16 Mar 2017

"What is a parliamentary committee?" *The European Parliament in Action*. Totaleurope.eu, May 2011. [europarlament.touteurope.eu/follow/what-is-a-committee.html] Accessed 24 Jan 2017.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to Cda." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. 1st ed: SAGE Publications, Ltd, 2001. 14-31. *SAGE Research Methods*. Web. *Introducing Qualitative Methods*. 12 Nov. 2016.

World Commission on Culture and Development. "Our Creative Diversity." Paris, 1996. PDF. [unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105586e.pdf]

Wunderlich, Jens-Uwe. "The EU an actor sui generis? A comparison of EU and ASEAN actorness." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50.4, 2012, 653-669.

Zamorano, Mariano Martín. "Reframing Cultural Diplomacy: The Instrumentalization of Culture under the Soft Power Theory." *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research* 8.2 (2016): 165-186.

Zhuojun, Wang, and He Hualing. "National Identity in the Era of Globalization: Crisis and Reconstruction." *Social Sciences in China* 35.2, 2014, 139-154.

Appendix A: Glossary

Source Number	Source Title
1	Navracsics, Tibor (b). “How do we live together? Values and identity in a changing European Union.” Speech at the Kulfest Festival, Zagreb, 21 May 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/how-do-we-live-together-values-and-identity-changing-european-union_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2015
2	Europa Nostra. “European Heritage Awards Ceremony, Oslo City Hall, 11 June 2015.” YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 24 June 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=dhOp5xtUp2g
3	Navracsics, Tibor. “A bigger impact: how Europe can use the full potential of cultural heritage for local economies and society.” Speech at the Conference “Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe,” Oslo, 12 June 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/bigger-impact-how-europe-can-use-full-potential-cultural-heritage-local-economies-and-society_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2016
4	Navracsics, Tibor (c). “Political priorities of the Juncker Commission – what role for education and culture?” Speech at Pristina University, 14 Juli 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/political-priorities-juncker-commission-what-role-education-and-culture_en] Accessed 5 Feb 2017
5	Navracsics, Tibor (a). “A hidden gem: the role of culture in making Europe a stronger global actor.” Speech at a Conference “Culture and development: towards a more strategic approach to cultural policies in the EU’s external relations”, 3 September 2015 [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/hidden-gem-role-culture-making-europe-stronger-global-actor_en] Accessed 10 Oct 2016
6	Navracsics, Tibor (d). “Speech at Pilsen 2015 European Capital of Culture Closure.” Pilsen, 11 December 2015. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/speech-pilsen-2015-european-capital-culture-closure_en] Accessed 5 Feb 2017
7	Navracsics, Tibor (a). “Building blocks of a new EU strategy for cultural diplomacy.” Speech at a Meeting with Members of the European Parliament’s Foreign Affairs Committee on ‘Cultural Diplomacy as an instrument of EU Neighbourhood Policy’. 26 January 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/building-blocks-new-eu-strategy-cultural-diplomacy_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017
8	Navracsics, Tibor (d). “Launch of the Second Phase of the ‘New Narrative for Europe’.” Brussels, 9 February 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/launch-second-phase-new-narrative-europe_hu] Accessed 7 Feb 2017
9	Navracsics, Tibor (b). “Exchange of views with Committee on Culture and Education of the European Parliament.” Brussels, 17 February 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/exchange-views-committee-culture-and-education-european-0_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017
10	Navracsics, Tibor (2016). “A crisis of identity – and how to tackle it.” Speech at the 2nd Industry Conference hosted by the Federation of Austrian Industries, Vienna, 22 September 2016 [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/crisis-identity-and-how-tackle-it_en] Accessed 6 Feb 2017
11	Navracsics, Tibor (e). “The Value of Our Values.” Keynote speech at Hanns Seidel Foundation conference ‘New societal challenges and Europe’s search for identity’. Brussels, 30 November 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/value-our-values_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017

12	Navracsics, Tibor (c). “Keeping the dialogue going - the role of culture in overcoming Europe’s challenges.” Speech at the European Culture Forum Brussels, 19 April 2016. [ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/navracsics/announcements/keeping-dialogue-going-role-culture-overcoming-europes-challenges_en] Accessed 7 Feb 2017
13	Europa Nostra (a). “EC Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou interview for Heritage in Motion.” YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 25 May 2012, www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfkP8IE8_bw
14	Europa Nostra (b). “Commissioner Vassiliou at the 2014 European Heritage Awards Ceremony.” YouTube, uploaded by Europa Nostra, 23 May 2014, www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vs_3kpuqtNs
15	Costa, Silvia. Speech at the European Culture Forum, Brussels, 19 April 2016. [ec.europa.eu/culture/forum/videos/culture-forum-silva-costa_en.mp4]
16	Jehlička, Václav. “Speech by Václav Jehlička, Minister of Culture, in the European Parliament – 19 January 2009.” Czech Presidency of the European Union. Government of the Czech Republic, 16 August 2011. [www.eu2009.cz/en/news-and-documents/speeches-interviews/speech-by-vaclav-jehlicka--minister-of-culture--in-the-europ-6996/index.html] Accessed 14 December 2016
17	Gauck, Joachim. “Europa: Vertrauen erneuern - Verbindlichkeit stärken.” Rede zu Perspektiven der europäischen Idee. Bundespräsidialamt, 22 February 2013. [www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Joachim-Gauck/Reden/2013/02/130222-Europa.html] Accessed 14 December 2016
18	Council of the European Union (a). “Council Resolution of 20 November 1995 on the promotion of statistics on culture and economic growth.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 20 Nov 1995. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1480788550537&uri=CELEX:31995Y1207(01)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016
19	Council of the European Union. “Common Position (EC) No 16/95 adopted by the Council on 10 July 1995 with a view to adopting a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a programme to support artistic and cultural activities having a European dimension (Kaleidoscope).” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 Jul 1995. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:51995AG1025(02)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016
20	Council of the European Union. “Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 21 Jan 2002. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32002G0205(02)] Accessed 30 Dec 2016
21	Council of the European Union & European Parliament. “Decision No 2228/97/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1997 establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (the Raphael programme).” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 13 Oct 1997. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:31997D2228] Accessed 9 Jan 2017
22	European Commission. “Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a single financing and programming instrument for cultural cooperation (Culture 2000 programme).” EUR-Lex. N.p., 6 May 1998. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51998DC0266&from=EN] Accessed 2 Jan 2017
23	European Commission. “Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Decision No 508/2000/EC of 14 February 2000 establishing the ‘Culture 2000’ programme.” EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 16 Mar 2003. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52003PC0187] Accessed 2 Jan 2017

24	European Commission. "Communication from the Commission - Making citizenship Work: fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for Youth, Culture, Audiovisual and Civic Participation." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 9 Mar 2004. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52004DC0154] Accessed 2 Jan 2017
25	European Commission. "Commission staff working document - Accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world - Inventory of Community actions in the field of culture." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 May 2007. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52007SC0570] Accessed 2 Jan 2017
26	European Commission. "Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 9 Mar 2010. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52010SC0197&qid=1480788550537&from=EN] Accessed 2 Jan 2017
27	European Commission. "Commission staff working document - Annex to the Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008) - Impact assessment." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 5 Oct 2005. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52005SC1202] Accessed 9 Jan 2017
28	European Parliament. "Culture in a globalising world. European Parliament resolution of 10 April 2008 on a European agenda for culture in a globalising world." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 10 Apr 2008. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52008IP0124] Accessed 8 Jan 2017
29	Committee of the Regions. "Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on 'Culture and cultural differences and their significance for the future of Europe'." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 13 Mar 1998. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:51997IR0447] Accessed 30 Dec 2016
30	Committee of the Regions. "Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on 'the future of the European Capital of Culture'." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 15 Feb 2012. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011IR0191] Accessed 2 Jan 2017
31	Committee of the Regions. "Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on 'A European agenda for culture in a globalising world'." EUR-Lex. Publications Office, 28 Nov 2007. [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52007AR0172] Accessed 8 Jan 2017