CHAPTER **8**

Anthropological Studies of European Identity Construction

Lisanne Wilken

The integration processes in Europe are creating the largest legally and economically integrated political system in recent times. Starting as an economic cooperation between six countries in the mid-1950s, today the European Union (EU) has 27 member states and a population of almost 500 million people. Since its inception in 1957, and through several political reforms, the member states of the EU have negotiated their way toward the abolition of internal borders, the creation of a single market with free movement of money, goods, and people, and the implementation of a common currency.

The processes of integration have raised several questions regarding culture and identity. It has, for instance, been debated whether popular identification with the EU and its institutions is necessary for integration, or whether a European identity can be engineered "from above" through cultural policies; it has also been asked whether European identities will eventually evolve "from below."

Anthropologists are well-positioned to contribute to discussions about identity in relation to European integration. Anthropology has a long history of contributing to social science research in identity construction and identity politics. For a long time anthropologists primarily studied identity construction at the subnational level, but since the 1980s – with the historic turn in anthropology, and the emerging interest in identity politics and the nationalization of states – anthropologists in Europe have also contributed to our understanding of identity construction at the supralocal level. Perhaps more importantly, anthropology has a unique perspective on identity construction: anthropologists often strive to understand the social world from the perspective of the people they study. In the case of EU studies, this translates into an interest in the ways that various actors engage in, make sense of, and position themselves in relation to the integration processes. Furthermore, anthropology has a distinct methodology – participant observation – which leads to a different kind of

analysis than those produced with the more conventional methods of neighboring disciplines (European Commission 2008:14). In this way anthropology can make genuine contributions to our understanding of European integration.

In this chapter I will discuss three very different anthropological approaches to the discussion of identity construction in the European Union. The first approach focuses on the attempts to "engineer" a European identity through cultural policies: since the early 1980s EU institutions have adopted various symbols and launched several campaigns in order to "boost people's awareness of a European identity" (European Commission 1988). These institutional attempts to construct a European identity have been the subject of several anthropological analyses.

The second approach considers identity construction among officials in EU institutions. Since the early 1990s several anthropologists have done fieldwork in EU institutions, where, among other things, they have explored whether the officials who work together to make integration happen are themselves becoming EUropeans.

These two approaches focus on identity construction "from above." The third approach I want to examine discusses the possible construction of European identities "from below." Rather than focusing on cultural policies, this research suggests that the unification processes in Europe provide a new frame for identity construction locally and across Europe. It explores how people and organizations increasingly define themselves in relation or opposition to the European Union and demonstrates how this creates identities that may or may not be in compliance with the official cultural policies, but which are nevertheless European.

I will start with a brief discussion of how European integration became relevant to anthropology, and then I will turn to the discussions of the possible construction(s) of Europeans.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Anthropology is a latecomer to the interdisciplinary field of EU studies: the first anthropological studies of EU-related events were published approximately 30 years after the Treaty of Rome came into force in 1957 (see Wilken 1999). Looking back, this is not surprising. As stressed in several critical reviews of anthropological research in postwar Europe, anthropology was for a long time oddly out of sync with the macropolitical and macroeconomic developments taking place on the continent. During a time when societies were being rebuilt after a devastating war, when several international organizations were founded in order to secure peace, prosperity, communication, and cooperation, and when a divided Europe was coming to terms with a new world order, Europeanist anthropology was by and large mimicking regional anthropologies elsewhere. By focusing on small-scale local communities and attempting to identify the cultural rules that regulate local life, anthropology created an image of a "tribalized continent" (Boissevain 1975), where local communities appeared to be only remotely connected to or affected by the forces of states, nations, and markets (see, e.g., Macdonald 1993).

In the 1970s this focus on local communities was increasingly being criticized from within anthropology itself. The critique was linked to the emerging discomfort

with the "classical concept of culture" which tended to equate "cultures" with local communities and to define them as static, closed, and bounded entities (Eriksen 1996:73). In Europeanist anthropology this discomfort was related to the growing awareness that anthropology might be missing the exact aspects that are most European about Europe, such as supralocal identity and culture (the "nation"), specific ways of organizing the public domain (the "state"), specific ways of sharing and discussing information (the "media"), specific ways of organizing socialization (the "education system") and particular ways of organizing production and consumption (the "economy") (Macdonald 1993:6). As a consequence, anthropologists increasingly turned their attention to the study of nations, both as the cultural foundation of the political community of states and as the cultural foundation of the "stateless nations" of minorities.

The anthropological interest in nations was to a large extent inspired by the simultaneous historic interest in the nationalization of European states and the *construction* of nation-states in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Benedict Anderson's book (1983) about the development of imagined political communities in the form of nation-states has inspired many anthropological analyses of culture in Europe since the 1980s, and Eric Hobsbawm's (1983) notion of invented traditions has often been employed to explain how cultural traditions, that were presented as having defined a given nation or people "forever," were in fact often fairly recent inventions. It was within this analytical framework, which focused on identity politics that an anthropological interest in European integration emerged.

When discussing why anthropologists have been so slow to develop an interest in the European Union, it is relevant to recall that up until the mid-1980s the EU (at that time the European Economic Community) was still fairly small, and only a few of the original member states (France and Italy) were objects of anthropological research in any significant way. Also, the community's image as an economic club for the richer countries of northwestern Europe with a growing legitimacy problem did not fit the traditional anthropological research agenda. The southern enlargements of the 1980s that admitted the former dictatorships of Greece, Portugal, and Spain made the community more relevant to anthropology, as it brought in more Mediterranean countries.

Furthermore, at this time the EU was changing. Preparations for the Inner Market, with the free movement of people, money, and goods, necessitated harmonization of legislations and practices in the member states. This harmonization was accompanied by a number of cultural policies aimed at boosting popular identification with the community and its institutions. This development of cultural policies was, as Cris Shore has pointed out, practically an invitation to anthropology to get involved. While anthropologists may previously have felt estranged from the EU due to the focus on macrolevel economics, politics, and law, the "cultural turn" in the integration processes of the 1980s made European integration relevant for anthropology, both theoretically and empirically (Shore 2000).

In the following sections I will introduce the development of cultural policies in the European Union and discuss some of the analytical approaches to the attempt to construct a European identity "from above."

EU CULTURAL POLICIES

The EU's cultural policies were officially introduced with the Maastricht Treaty in 1993. In this treaty it is stated *inter alia* that the EU "shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bring their common cultural heritage to the fore." However, political discussions about the necessity of a cultural dimension to the integration processes started much earlier. According to Maryon McDonald, it was in the late 1960s that politicians and officials within EU institutions began to stress the need to create a cultural foundation for the integration processes. At this time it was realized that the legitimacy which the European Community had held in the 1950s as a supranational organization to create peace in Europe was disappearing as new generations grew up in the western part of a divided Europe in relative prosperity and with a new set of hopes, fears, and limitations. In order to move the integration processes forward it was considered necessary to create feelings of communality among the participating countries (McDonald 2006:220). The first step in this direction was the adoption in 1973 of a "Declaration on the European Identity" in which the fundamental values of the European cooperation were defined. According to this declaration the member states are defined by shared political values such as democracy, rule of law, market economy, social justice, and respect for human rights.

During the 1980s, cultural policies were increasingly being discussed as a political necessity in order to create the Single European Market and the Economic and Monetary Union (McDonald 2000:57). Official reports from both the European Parliament and the European Commission argued that it was necessary to strengthen the solidarity between the people of the member states and to enhance their knowledge of European culture (Shore 1993). Heads of states and governments approved the introduction of common symbols and cultural policy measures in order to boost popular awareness of the EU and facilitate integration. Over the years the EU got a passport, a driver's license, a flag, an anthem, a motto, a memorial day, and a common currency. Events and rituals were invented to celebrate the community's existence, like European Years, European Decades, and European Cities of Culture; and programs regarding arts, architecture, music, film, student exchange, and minority languages were launched in order to preserve and promote what was perceived as the cultures of the member states and to secure the interaction between them.

In the 1990s the EU elaborated on its foundational values; the Amsterdam Treaty (1999) included an antidiscrimination paragraph, and official documents and declarations increasingly stressed that the European Union was build on values such as tolerance, multiculturalism, antiracism, anti-antisemitism, anti-islamophobia, gender equality, and respect for minorities.

Anthropological analyses of the EU's cultural politics differ in their approaches and in the questions they ask. Some focus on the political purpose of the EU's cultural politics and discuss whether their aim is to create a European *demos* for an emergent European superstate. Others focus on the discursive construction of European culture and identity in the various policies that have been created over the past 20 years. And

others again analyze their interpretation and practical implementation in the member states. Below I will discuss some of the most prominent approaches to the EU's cultural politics.

Creating "*Homo europaeus*"?

British anthropologist Cris Shore, who is one of the first and, without rival, the most productive scholar of the EU's cultural politics, has suggested that the introduction of cultural politics can be understood as an attempt to artificially create a European people. Shore has argued that European integration is an elite project to create some sort of European state (Shore 2001:55). Initially it was expected that popular identification with this emerging superstate would automatically develop as "spillover" from economic and legal integration. However, during the 1980s it became clear that, "despite making impressive legal, economic and institutional advances toward a united Europe, EU elites [had] failed to create a 'European people'" (Shore 2001:55). Instead they had created "an embryonic state without a nation" (Shore 2001:57). According to Shore this is why EU institutions launched a series of cultural policies: in order to create Europeans (Shore 1995:217).

Cris Shore defines EU cultural politics as "the various cultural strategies, discourses, and political technologies that function to make certain ideas about Europe authoritative while alternative ideas are rendered marginal and muted" (2001:54). With reference to this definition he has analyzed a wide range of campaigns, reports, documents, and speeches in order to understand how officials in EU institutions perceive Europe. Shore's analyses are grounded in a discursive and cognitive approach to culture. He sees the culture political initiatives as reflections of the way elites perceive European culture, and many of his analyses focus on linguistic categories, systems of classifications, discourses, metaphors, and symbols, which as he has argued may help us understand how political actors in Brussels and Strasbourg understand "Europe" and "the Europeans" (e.g. Shore 1993, 1995, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2001).

Shore relates the EU's cultural politics to discussions about what political scientists refer to as the EU's "democratic deficit" (Shore 2001, 2006; see also Abélès 2004). Discussions of the democratic deficit refer both to the political discussions about whether the institutions of a union of democracies need to be democratic, and to the normative discussions about whether the EU can be democratic without a *demos* (e.g. Habermas 2001). According to Shore, the democratic deficit is in fact a "cultural deficit": political regimes, especially democracies, customarily seek legitimacy in the cultural domain and thus presuppose shared cultural values between rulers and ruled (2001:56). In the case of the European Union, Shore claims that there are no shared values and no *demos* to be ruled democratically (Shore 2006:714).

In his early work Shore appears to be open to the possibility that the EU's cultural politics may eventually promote a sense of common identity in Europe. As he points out (Shore 1993:790–791), anthropological theories often stress that the political reality is symbolically constructed and that it is through symbols that people come to know about the structures that unite and divide them. Symbols do not simply enable individuals to interpret the political reality, they largely create it. Therefore, Shore argues, "it is reasonable to assume that with a steady consolidation and expansion of

the European tier of authority the more recently created European political reality will herald a gradual but steady undermining of authority of existing nation states." At the same time Shore maintains that the culture political initiatives are based on a conceptual naïveté which resembles the concept of identification in Evans-Prichard's structural-functionalism (Shore 1993:790–791). Later he claims that the EU's cultural policies were unlikely to ever be embraced by people in Europe. Comparing the cultural construction of the EU to that of nation-states, Shore claims that:

> the nation-state may well have been arbitrarily constructed, but its existence – and social meaning – is anything but arbitrary today. The factors that give it substance and legitimacy are historical and social, and embedded in the fabric of everyday culture. Because of its history, and because its institutions have been adapted and reformed by successive generations, it has succeeded (where the EU has signally failed) in getting closer to its citizens and winning their consent to be governed. That process took many decades to achieve. (Shore 2004:40)

Nationalizing Europe?

Shore's approach to the EU's cultural policies may help us understand how EU officials perceive European culture and culture's role in the forging of identities. But they tell us very little about the practical effects – if any – of the EU's cultural policies. In order to assess what they mean outside the institutions we need to analyze in detail how EU cultural policies are communicated to people in the member states and how they are interpreted and implemented locally.

If we assume that the attempts to construct a cultural foundation for the integration processes in Europe are comparable to the creation of a cultural foundation for nation-states (e.g. Shore 1993, 1996), it becomes obvious that the EU lacks the institutions that have been most instrumental in forging national identities, especially schools and media (e.g. Anderson 1983). Aside from a handful of elite schools related to EU institutions (Shore and Baratieri 2006) and a couple of failed attempts to create European media (Neveu 2002; Llobera 2003), the EU suffers from a communication and enculturation deficit which has consequences for the institution's abilities to communicate with citizens and to install a sense of belonging to the union. As has been pointed out in several studies, people in the member states get most of their information about the EU from national media, which means that the information they get varies and almost always has a national angle (Peter and de Vreese 2004).

Over the years, EU institutions have attempted to create various platforms for direct communication with people. They have, for instance, published numerous information pamphlets about the rights and opportunities of citizens in the member states: materials that are available in all official languages and sometimes in some of the minority languages, and made available from public libraries and EU information offices in the member states. But this way of communicating is not very efficient, as it requires that people seek out the information themselves.

In recent years the most important platform for institutional attempts to communicate with its citizens and the wider world has been the Internet. Central to the EU's Web presence is the Europa site (europa.eu) which makes information available

to citizens and other actors and which attempts to engage people in various forms of interactions. The Europa site features among other things a "kids' corner" with interactive games, a "teachers' corner" with educational resources, as well as debate forums, blogs, a shop, and a media center. The European Commission has also established an EU channel on YouTube (EUTube), where infomercials about EU politics are made available and where one can find videos where the president and vice-presidents of the European Commission address "the public." But like the pamphlets, the Internet is not a very efficient tool for communication. The availability and demographic use of Internet in Europe varies widely, and people still have to actively seek to be informed by the EU – which the majority does not necessarily do. Looking at the EU channel on YouTube, one can note that at the time of writing it has fewer than 11 000 subscribers and that most of the available videos have fewer than 5000 views. Rather than relating the EU's information politics to that of nation-states, it is almost tempting to recall the late Pierre Clastres' (1977) theory of the institution of power in primitive societies, in which he claimed that it is the duty of the chief in primitive societies to speak, but that "the words of the chief are not spoken in order to be listened to . . . nobody pays attention to the discourse of the chief." According to Clastres this made sure that the institution of power would (and could) not be assumed by an individual.

Grasping the EU's cultural politics

Not all of the culture-related initiatives discussed in EU institutions reach the European public. However some have been implemented in the member states. Studying those may help us understand what EU cultural politics can accomplish.

In a recent article, ethnologist Johan Fornäs (2009) addressed this issue with regard to EU symbols. In order to understand how the symbols work Fornäs has suggested that it may be helpful to distinguish between two different types of symbol. The first type includes symbols that have a purely discursive or symbolic application – the flag, the anthem, Europe Day, and the motto, for instance. These symbols signify the EU in an abstract way and are not (yet) embedded in people's everyday life. The other type of symbol has a double function, as both a symbolic expression of identity and a material tool of integration; this type of symbol includes the passport, which is a personal document of belonging that literally distinguishes "us" from "them" – for instance when "we" stand in other lines than "them" in EU airports. It also includes the euro, which was introduced in 2002 and which is currently used by 300 million people in 15 member states in their daily economic transactions. Drawing on Michael Billig's theory of banal nationalism, in which he included money among the "unwaved flags" that construct our perceptions of who we are (Billig 1995:41), Fornäs has identified the euro as a symbol of EU identity which is simultaneously a practical tool in the making of everyday life and a medium which enlightens us as to what EUrope is (Fornäs 2009:126). Fornäs has for instance argued that the design of the euro notes and coins creates a narrative about unity and diversity, which is reinforced by the way that money is circulated. The fact that nationally distinct euros can be used in any and all of the countries in Euroland represents a form of intercultural interaction beyond economics (Fornäs 2009:137).

Similarly, in her analysis of the European City of Culture program, Monica Sass-atelli (2002, 2008) has analyzed the actual making of Cities of Culture in Europe rather than the policy decisions to make them. The promotion of European Cities of Culture was initiated in the mid-1980s as one of the EU's cultural policies. According to the EU Web site, European Cities of Culture is the brainchild of the late Greek Minister of Culture, Melina Mercouri, who allegedly argued that, "culture, art and creativity are no less important [to European integration] than technology, commerce and economics."

Each year a European City of Culture is elected as a way "to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, and promote greater mutual acquaintance between European Union citizens" (Sassatelli 2002:441). While the European City of Culture was thus invented by EU institutions, it is in the implementation by officials and artists in the cities in question that notions of European culture are being created. The European Council selects the cities and supports them with a small sum of money, but each city is free to determine its own cultural program (Sassatelli 2002:436). In practice this means that representatives of local communities co-construct the notion of the European culture which is promoted with this initiative. This suggests that the outcomes of EU cultural politics cannot be reduced to the intentions of the policies.

The EU's "Others"

Anthropologists who have studied the official attempts to create a common European identity have paid particular attention to the simultaneous co-construction of one or more "Others." As Shore (2006) has pointed out, the discussion of Others in relation to the EU – and the politics of defining them – is complicated. The EU itself may be defined as a union of Others; practically all member states are or have been the significant Other to one or more of the other member states. Furthermore the EU's borders are not final. Therefore it is difficult to point to those on the other side of the borders as EU's Others, since they, too, may become part of the EU one day.

In the 1960s and 1970s EUropean identity was officially defined in terms of common political values such as democracy, human rights, market economy, and so on. In relation to these values the significant Others were the totalitarian regimes south and east of the European Community. In the 1980s the community opened for a renegotiation of its southern and eastern borders. The admission in the first half of the 1980s of Greece, Portugal, and Spain moved the EU's southern borders to the Mediterranean, which made it increasingly relevant to discuss exactly how far south the EU would eventually stretch. The rejection of Morocco's membership application in 1986 on the grounds that Morocco is not a European country indicated that it is in fact possible to draw a boundary between Europe and non-Europe (Eder 2006). The most pressing question was then whether this boundary would include or exclude Turkey.

The changes in Eastern Europe in the 1980s also made it relevant to consider the possible "homecoming" of Eastern European countries. During this period community discourse increasingly defined the EU culturally in opposition to the United States. The EU and the United States were still "the West" in opposition to "the

East," but at the same time Americanization was presented as the most immediate threat to European culture (Shore 1993).

In the 1990s the EU faced two enormous political challenges. Internally, there was a growth in neonationalism, antisemitism, and islamophobia (Holmes 2000; McDonald 2006); externally, the EU was preparing southeastern enlargements. These challenges fed into a new identity discourse which focused on the necessity to overcome the past. A European past of war, conflict, division, repression, and discrimination exemplified with references to colonialism, racism, warfare, holocaust, communism, totalitarianism, and xenophobia was juxtaposed on an EUropean present, which was defined with reference to values such as peace, tolerance, multiculturalism, antiracism, anti-antisemitism, anti-islamophobia, and respect for minorities. This positioned "Europe of the past" and in particular "Europe of the nation-state" as the EU's most significant Other.

These official attempts to define the EU's Other do not necessarily reflect commonly accepted Others. Some scholars have pointed out that the most popularly accepted Others in the EU at the moment are Muslims and Islam (e.g. Klausen 2005; Meinhof and Triandafyllidou 2006). What they do reflect are the official attempts to give the EU an identity.

OFFICIALS INTO EUROPEANS?

When discussing if the integration processes in Europe will lead to the creation of a common European identity or perhaps even to the creation of EUropeans, one group has been singled out as particularly interesting: the EU officials who work together to make integration happen. Questions regarding their identities have fuelled a small interdisciplinary research field which has developed since the early 1990s. What marks the literature in this field "is the dominance of the anthropological approach" (Cini 2001). In this section I will look at some of the contributions to this field. I will start with a brief discussion of the anthropological interest in Eurocrats and some of the methodological challenges that this interest entail. I will then introduce studies of identity construction in the European Commission, and finally I will discuss the possible emergence of transnational European identities.

Studying Eurocrats

Anthropological interest in EU institutions developed in the early 1990s when a number of anthropologists did fieldwork inside EU institutions. One study was undertaken by a French–British team consisting of three anthropologists: Marc Abélès, Irène Bellier, and Maryon McDonald, who had been invited by the then President of the EU Commission Jacques Delors to explore "the existence or not of a specific Commission culture, plus the weight of the different languages and national cultural traditions and their impact on working relationships and how a European identity might emerge in such a context" (Cini 2001:4). This team also did fieldwork in the European Parliament.

Another study was carried out by Cris Shore who had worked as a *stagiare* in the European Parliament in the mid-1980s (Shore 2004:27) and who later did fieldwork in the Commission. Shore's work has primarily focused on EU cultural policies (see above) but he has also contributed to the analysis of identification and cooperation in various institutions (e.g. Shore 1995, 2000).

Other anthropologists have also contributed to our understanding of identity construction in EU institutions: for example Danish anthropologist Signe Ejersbo (1993) and American anthropologist Stacia Zabusky (1995, 2000), who have both studied the processes of cooperation and identification among scientists in EU-related organizations, and Swedish anthropologist Renita Thedvall (2006, 2007), who has studied Eurocrats in motion between national and European political institutions.

Anthropologists doing fieldwork in EU institutions face a number of challenges. These are especially related to methodology. By now there is a solid tradition in anthropology for "studying up" (Nader 1972) and for having elites and bureaucrats as informants (e.g. Herzfeld 1992; Shore and Nugent 2002). It is also generally accepted that the anthropological research methods which were originally developed for data collection in small-scale societies, do in fact produce valuable insights when applied to larger-scale societies. Still, in the context of EU institutions, where many of the informants have a background in the social sciences, and therefore specific expectations of social research, both the methods and the results they produce are often questioned by informants, who may find the research design "fuzzy" and the results "unrepresentative" or even "anecdotal" (Ejersbo 1993; Zabusky 1995; Shore 2000:11). Anthropologists doing fieldwork in EU institutions thus often find themselves involved in "a struggle" concerning the production and interpretation of data (Bourdieu 1990:21–22). This struggle is embedded in the relationship which already exists between anthropology and other social sciences, and it creates a situation where the informants are not simply co-constructing data but competing for their interpretation.

Making Europeans

A majority of the research on identity construction among EU officials has focused on the Commission. One argument for this is that the Commission is "an unusual social entity" staffed with people from different countries who have sworn allegiance to the EU and its interests over and above their national governments (McDonald 1996:52; Bellier 1997:92). Another argument is that it is officials in the Commission who design the cultural policies, and who maintain that the creation of an EU identity is imperative (Shore 1995, 2000).

The Commission is often perceived as having a moral obligation to be both the promoter and the exemplar of European unity. According to Marc Abélès (2004) this perception frames the way that officials talk about themselves in relation to culture and identity. Officials in the Commission often state that they are above stereotypes, that they don't think in terms of national differences and that there is an *esprit européen* and a European identity in the Commission. Similarly Cris Shore has argued that there is a self-perception among officials of having moved past the Europe of the nation-states and of being the vanguard in an evolution toward a unified Europe (Shore 1995:225).

At the same time, however, officials also stress that cultural diversity is fundamental to the integration processes in Europe and that cultural differences should be recognized and respected. This sometimes leads to a distinctive way of classifying differences: there are "benign" cultural differences that are part of "Europe's rich cultural heritage," and then there are "negative" differences which are often attributed to people's personalities (Abélès 2004:15).

Despite this official rhetoric of unity and (benign) diversity, officials in the Commission make distinctions regarding culture and identity all the time. At the most basic level they distinguish between the EUropean bureaucracy and national bureaucracies (Abélès 2004:16). Here the distinction regards those who are working for EUrope and those who (still) work for their own national interests. Within the EU bureaucracy, officials tend to identify with specific Directorates-General and institutions. Both Shore and McDonald have shown that officials identify with various units in the organizational structure, for example: "we in the Commission," "we in the court," or "we in the translation section," and so on (Shore 1995:224; McDonald 2000:53).

Another distinction which more clearly refers to perceived cultural differences is the one which is made between the North and the South (and with the latest enlargements also between the East and the West). The distinction between North and South refers to a widely held mutual classification where the North considers itself modern in opposition to the backward South and the South considers itself civilized in opposition to the barbarian North (Eder 2006:262). "North" and "South" do not refer to a simple geographical division in Europe. Rather they are metaphors referring to moral and political distinctions (McDonald 2000:115; Abélès 2004:18–19).

The distinction between North and South became relevant after the first enlargement in 1973. This enlargement is often described as particularly traumatic, because it marked a transition from "a single Europe" working together to create peace after World War II, to a diverse Europe where the member states had different perceptions of Europe and different expectations of the cooperation (McDonald 2000:65–70). The transition is most clearly marked by the shift in the de facto working language from French to English, but it involved a wide range of "surprises and irritations relating to the different ways of doing anything from writing memos to managing meetings" (McDonald 1996:52). This disruption of the "culture of compromise" (Abélès and Bellier 1996) which has evolved in the Commission is repeated with every new enlargement and constructs new distinctions between "us" and "them."

Despite the intention of "being above it," nationality does play a significant role in the way that people make sense of interactions in the Commission. Irene Bellier explains this with reference to the national organization of the political scene in EU institutions: there are signs of nations everywhere, so it is difficult to escape this particular way of classifying differences (Bellier 1997:93). Maryon McDonald explains it with reference to a language trap: cultural differences in Europe are structured by a language where "nations and nationalities provide the conceptual boundaries by which difference is most easily constructed and recognized" (McDonald 2000:113). Like most Europeans, officials in the Commission habitually classify differences in terms of nationality, and therefore such differences are experienced as being very real and confirmed in everyday interaction (McDonald 2000:113; Abélès 2004). One way

of attempting to escape the trap of national identification is to refer to regional identi-ties. Bellier has argued that officials in the Commission sometimes identify as Catalan or Scottish instead of Spanish or British (Bellier 1997).

Identity construction in trans- (or post-?)national Europe

While the early work on identity construction among officials in EU institutions primarily focused on identification within the institutions, recent work has focused more on the increasing overlap between national and European institutions and discussed the possible emergence of a transnational (or perhaps postnational) political space as a new frame for identification (e.g. Shore 2006; Thedvall 2006, 2007).

Shore has argued that cooperation at the European level has led to the emergence of a transnational space which expands into the realm of the national through webs of networking between a growing number of transnational agents; European politicians and officials are linked to transnational lobby organizations, to journalists working in the European sphere, to international networks of professionals, and so on. According to Shore, these transnational networks are forming an intimate insti-tutional microcosm which is governed by its own informal rules and norms and has its roots in the "insular and detached cultural space in the Brussels environment" (Shore 2006:715). He maintains that there still is a clear and important division between the national political spaces and a transnational European political space where people of many different nationalities socialize and cooperate in networks that are increasingly detached from the European nation-states (Shore 2000:715). Shore compares EU officials to expatriates and colonial officials who are characterized by having high salaries, professional autonomy, and being excluded from the societies within which they live, which promotes a sense of internal solidarity and distinction (Shore 2002:7, 2006). In this respect EU officials are portrayed as just another tribe or culture in a world of cultures.

In another study, Renita Thedvall (2006, 2007) has focused on the blurring of boundaries between the political spaces of the EU institutions and that of member states. Thedvall has followed Swedish bureaucrats as they move between the political institutions in Sweden and the European institutions in order to negotiate politics which will have implications not just in Sweden but in the entire European Union. She has paid particular attention to the ways that these "EU Nomads" as she calls them (2007) shift in and out of identity categories. Characteristic for "EU Nomads" is that they have to represent national and European interests simultaneously: the governments who employ them expect them to represent national interests in political negotiations "in Europe," but in the negotiations they still have to compromise in order to create results that all the different member states can live with. In this process the contours of "the national" and "the European" is constantly being negotiated. The blurring of boundaries in Thedvall's analyses refer both to the blurring of the national and the European political decision-making processes, and to the blurring of the national and the European as identity categories. It is not entirely clear whether these EU Nomads are European or national, or when they are European and when they are national. According to Thedvall (2007) this blurring is leading to some sort of postnational political space as a framework for identity construction.

Bringing in the People

So far I have focused on anthropological contributions to our understanding of European identity construction from above. In the following sections I will briefly consider contributions to our understanding of the construction of European identities from below.

Since the late 1980s, several anthropologists have studied how EU integration affects life in the member states and how membership of the EU (or not!) increasingly frames identity construction in various localities in Europe. Many of these studies have focused on people and places with ambiguous relationships to Europe and the EU, like Herzfeld's (1987, 1997) studies of Greece and Mitchell's (2002) study of Malta. Over the past couple of years there have also been studies that explore how some people – one way or another – increasingly identify themselves as Europeans.

Becoming Europeans

People belonging to the category of autochthonous minorities were among the first to be systematically studied by anthropologists with reference to construction of European identities "from below" (e.g. Jaffe 1993; Wilken 2001, 2008; Nic Craith 2005; Adrey 2009). The context for these studies has been the proactive approach that many of the movements and political parties representing autochthonous minorities took to the integration processes in the 1970s and their involvement in European politics since the 1980s.

Autochthonous minorities include "kin-state minorities" that found themselves stranded on the wrong side of national borders after centuries of war between powerholders in Europe; linguistic minorities that have kept languages alive despite nation-states' attempts to wipe them out; and "micronations" that have nations but not states. To them – or at least to some of their political representatives (Wilken 2008) – European unification has presented an opportunity to reframe questions of culture and identity. In a Europe of nation-states, autochthonous minorities have been perceived either as victims of nationalization who struggle to survive against all odds or as traitors who forsake their "own culture" for that of the majority. In a European Union stressing unity in diversity as the cultural ideal for cooperation and integration, autochthonous minorities have the opportunity to become co-creators of a new political reality. They can reconstruct themselves as "Welsh Europeans" or "Catalan Europeans" and gain cultural recognition within a broader European context.

Representatives for autochthonous minorities have participated actively in various forms of European cooperation. They have set up EUrope-wide institutions (for instance the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages) that function as NGOs in relation to European and worldwide institutions. They have even created a Europe-wide political party (the European Free Alliance) which represents autochthonous minorities in the European Parliament. Active minority participation in European cooperation has changed the perspective on minority culture and languages in a number of ways; representatives of autochthonous minorities increasingly embrace

bilingualism rather than fight for minority monolingualism; more minority languages have become officially recognized as part of the "European cultural mosaic"; some minority languages have even obtained the status of co-official languages in EU institutions.

There are significant differences between various groups of autochthonous minorities and their commitment to European integration. But as a category they are represented as the prototype of a new kind of multilingual and multicultural European which fits well into the cultural vision of "unity in diversity" (Wilken 2001).

Competing visions

Anthropologists have also expressed interest in the Europeanization of radical nationalism in Europe. In the 1980s and 1990s political movements and parties were formed across Europe with the intention to protect national or regional cultures against perceived threats from immigrants, elites, and Eurocrats in Brussels (Holmes 2000; McDonald 2006). In recent years radical nationalist parties have emerged in Eastern Europe as well. According to political scientist Christina Liang (2007:295) there are currently more than 100 radical nationalist parties in Europe.

The growth in radical nationalism has been the subject of a number of anthropological studies in relation to European integration (e.g. Holmes 2000, 2008; McDonald 2006). While official EU discourse increasingly stresses tolerance, intercultural dialogue, respect for diversity, and nondiscrimination as core values of the integration processes, radical nationalists usually stress intercultural incompatibilities between native and "foreign" cultures and advocate assimilation or even expulsion of people from "foreign cultures." Radical nationalism is therefore often defined as diametrical opposition to the EU (McDonald 2006).

However, as pointed out by Holmes (2000, 2008) among others, most radical nationalist parties do express a belief in a common foundation for the various national cultures of Europe. In radical nationalist discourse, European nations are often referred to as a "family of cultures" that share a common heritage and have roots in Greek and Roman civilization and in Christianity. European nations are therefore presented as having similar moral values and social norms. The idea of a common foundation for European cultures is often used to differentiate between those who do and those who don't belong in Europe.

Radical parties do not have the same ideas about what Europe is or where it begins and ends, but practically all of them agree that Islam is not European, which means that Turkey is excluded from Europe. Some subscribe to Samuel Huntington's idea of an essential difference between the West and the Orthodox East, which exclude most of Eastern Europe and Russia from "the real Europe." Some define certain philosophical and political ideas, for instance communism and socialism, as non-European, and some define globalization as external to Europe.

Radical nationalist parties often come across as EU-rejectionists but their rejection is usually directed more at the "elitist, corrupt bureaucrats in Brussels" than at Europe or European cooperation as such (McDonald 2006). In fact most of these parties belong to one or more transnational European networks, like for instance the European National Front or EuroNat. They also join forces in the European Parliament, where they usually are members of the same political groups (McDonald 2006;

Holmes 2008). In 2007 radical nationalist parties even formed their own group in the European Parliament. It only existed for a few months and demonstrated grave incompatibilities between radical parties in Europe; nevertheless radical nationalists operate with reference to an imagined community of European cultures and contribute to the practical and discursive construction of Europe.

Unlikely Europeans

Since the mid-1990s sociologists and political scientists have discussed how European integration affects immigrants and their descendants living in the member states. On the one hand these discussions have concerned EU politics that affect immigrants in Europe – EU citizenship, racism, immigration laws, and so on (Soysal 2002). On the other hand they have concerned the engagement of immigrant representatives in European politics through participation in transnational European NGOs or representation in the European Parliament (Favell 2003). Some years ago political scientist Riva Kastoryano (1997) coined the term "non-European Europeans" in an attempt to conceptualize the ambiguous position of these immigrants as simultaneously included in and excluded from EUrope.

Recently, anthropologists have also begun to discuss immigrants with reference to a broader European framework. Christina Moutsou (2006) has, for instance, studied the relevance of the EU in relation to identity-construction among Turkish and Greek immigrants in Brussels. This identity-construction is on the one hand framed by the specific Brussels context, and on the other hand by the relationship that Turkey and Greece have with the EU, and that the immigrant communities have with EU institutions.

In another study Máiréad Nic Craith (2009) has explored how intellectuals of immigrant background – primarily from Eastern Europe, Turkey, and Maghreb – make sense of their lives in Europe and as Europeans. Starting from an analysis of autobiographies and memoirs she has analyzed how these intellectuals "talk about and interpret their experience of Europe, what emotions the notion of Europe arouses and how they portrait their experience of liminality" (Nic Craith 2009:198).

Nic Craith defines these intellectuals as "liminal" because they live between cultures without being rooted in any particular culture or place. Most are able to speak several languages fluently, and all have families, histories, and social relationships in several geographical locations (Nic Craith 2009:202). In this way they may be defined in opposition to the stereotypical European national, who have one mother-tongue, one nationality, and one set of roots. In many ways these immigrant intellectuals are constructing the same kind of multilingual, multicultural European identity as the one constructed by various groups of autochthonous minorities, but they generally feel that their approach to European identity is unappreciated by nationals and the EU bureaucracy alike.

CONCLUSION

Anthropology is a rather late addition to the interdisciplinary field of EU studies; it is only within the past 20 years that anthropologists have contributed to our

understanding of European integration. Anthropological interest in the EU was among other things inspired by "the cultural turn" in the integration processes during the 1980s, which made discussions about culture and identity relevant. In this chapter I have discussed three different anthropological approaches to questions regarding culture and identity in relation to EU integration.

The first approach focuses on EU cultural policies and the attempts to create popular identification with the EU and its institutions "from above." This approach was introduced in the early 1990s and is primarily identified with Cris Shore. Shore has contributed to a critical discussion of EU cultural politics in relation to the alleged democratic deficit. His analyses focus on the ways that culture is perceived by officials in EU institutions and the ways that it is used to forge a European identity. In recent years there has been some discussion of how to approach the practical aspects of cultural policies through analyses of their incorporation in everyday life; this is a research area where there is great potential for further development.

The second approach discusses identity construction among the officials in EU institutions. Since the early 1990s, several anthropologists have done fieldwork in EU institutions and contributed to the interdisciplinary discussions of identity construction among EU officials. These studies focused initially on identity construction in relation to the intercultural interactions in the EU's institutions. Analyses in recent years have focused more on identity construction in relation to the blurring of boundaries between national and European political spaces. This has led to discussions of the possible creation of a transnational or postnational political space in Europe as a new framework for identity construction.

The third approach I discussed focuses instead on the possible construction of European identities "from below." Such analyses discuss how the integration processes in Europe have occasioned a recontextualization of identity construction among various groups of Europeans. Anthropological analyses have, for instance, shown how representatives of autochthonous minorities have engaged in various forms of political cooperation in Europe and how they have used this cooperation to reposition themselves in relation to European nation-states and to reframe their identities in a European context. Anthropologists have also discussed how radical nationalists who often define themselves in opposition to the EU are at the same time defining themselves as part of an imagined European family of cultures which creates a different kind of European identity. During the last couple of years there have also been a few studies which analyze how various groups of immigrants – the proverbial Others to culture in Europe – define themselves in relation to the integration processes and sometimes even create European identities.

The three approaches discussed illustrate how anthropology so far has contributed to our understanding of European integration, and in particular to our understanding of the implications for identity construction in Europe.

REFERENCES

Abélès, Marc

2004   Identities and Borders: An Anthropological Approach to EU institutions. Twenty-First Century Papers: On-Line Working Papers from the Center for 21st Century

Studies. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin. Electronic document. http://www4.
uwm.edu/c21/pdfs/workingpapers/abeles.pdf (accessed November 5, 2011).

Abélès, Marc, and Irène Bellier
    1996   La Commission Européenne: du compromis culturel à la culture politique du com-
           promise. Revue Française de Science Politique 46(3):431–455

Adrey, Jean-Bernard
    2009   Discourse and Struggle in Minority Language Policy Formation: Corsican Language
           Policy in the EU Context of Governance. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson, Benedict
    1983   Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.
           London: Verso.

Bellier, Irène
    1997   The Commission as an Actor: An Anthropologist's View. *In* Participation and Policy
           Making in the European Union. H. Wallace and A. R. Young, eds. Oxford: Oxford
           University Press.

Billig, Michael
    1995   Banal Nationalism. London: Sage.

Boissevain, Jeremy
    1975   Introduction: Towards an Anthropology of Europe. *In* Beyond the Community:
           Social Processes in Europe. J. Boissevain and J. Friedl, eds. pp. 9–17. The Hague:
           Department of Educational Science of the Netherlands.

Bourdieu, Pierre
    1990   In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology. Cambridge: Polity.

Cini, Michelle
    2001   Reforming the European Commission: An Organisational Culture Perspective.
           Queen's Papers on Europeanisation, No. 11. Belfast: Queen's University.

Clastres, Pierre
    1977   Society Against the State: Essays in Political Anthropology. New York: Urizen
           Books.

Eder, Klaus
    2006   Europe's Borders: The Narrative Construction of the Boundaries of Europe. Euro-
           pean Journal of Social Theory 9(2):255–271.

Ejersbo, Signe
    1993   Visionerne fra Babel: om sprog og nationalitet i euro-europæisk kontekst. Institut
           for Kultursociologi, Københavns Universitet.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland
    1996   Opplysning og romantikk: Nittitallets håndtering av kulturbegrepet. Norsk antro-
           pologisk tidskrift 2:73–8.

European Commission
    1988   A People's Europe: Communication from the Commission to the European
           Parliament. COM (88) 331/final. Luxembourg: Bulletin of the EC, Supplement
           No. 2.
    1998   What? Me? A Racist? Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European
           Communities.
    2008   Anthropological Perspectives in a Changing Europe: Bringing People In.
           Electronic document. ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/ssh/docs/ssh_seminar_
           anthropological_perspective_en.pdf (accessed November 5, 2011).

Favell, Adrian
    2003   Games Without Frontiers? Questioning the Transnational Social Power of Migrants
           in Europe. European Journal of Sociology 44:397–427.

Fornäs, Johan
    2009   Meanings of Money: The Euro as a Sign of Value and of Cultural Identity. *In* We
        Europeans? Media, Representations, Identities. William Uricchio, ed. pp. 123–140.
        Oxford: Intellect.
Habermas, Jürgen
    2001   Why Europe Needs a Constitution. New Left Review 11:5–26.
Herzfeld, Michael
    1987   Anthropology Through a Looking Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of
        Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
    1992   The Social Production of Indifference: Exploring the Symbolic Roots of Western
        Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
    1997   Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State. London: Routledge.
Hobsbawm, Eric
    1983   Introduction: Inventing Traditions. *In* The Invention of Tradition. E. Hobsbawm
        and T. Ranger, eds. pp. 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Holmes, Douglas
    2000   Surrogate Discourses of Power: The European Union and the Problem of Society.
        In An Anthropology of the European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the
        New Europe. I. Bellier and T. M. Wilson, eds. pp. 93–115. Oxford: Berg.
    2008   Experimental identities (after Maastricht). *In* European Identity. J. T. Checkel and
        P. J. Katzenstein, eds. pp. 52–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jaffe, Alexandra
    1993   Corsican Identity and a Europe of Peoples and Regions. *In* Cultural Change and
        the New Europe: Perspectives on the European Community. T. Wilson and E. Smith,
        eds. pp. 61–80. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Kastoryano, Riva
    1997   Participation transnationale et citoyenette: Les immigrés dans l'Union europeéne.
        Culture et Conflit 59–75.
Klausen, Jytte
    2005   The Islamic Challenge: Politics and Religion in Western Europe. Oxford: Oxford
        University Press.
Liang, Christina Schori
    2007   Europe for the Europeans: The Foreign and Security Policy of the Populist, Radical
        Right. *In* Europe for the Europeans: The Foreign and Security Policy of the Populist,
        Radical Right. Christina Liang, ed. pp. 1–32. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Llobera, Joseph
    2003   The Concept of Europe as an Idée-forcé. Critique of Anthropology 23(2):
        155–175.
Macdonald, Sharon
    1993   Identity Complexes in Western Europe: Social Anthropological Perspectives. *In*
        Inside European Identities: Ethnography in Western Europe. S. Macdonald, ed.,
        pp. 1–26. Oxford: Berg.
McDonald, Maryon
    1996   Unity in Diversity: Some Tensions in the Construction of Europe. Social Anthro-
        pology 4(1):47–60.
    2000   Accountability, Anthropology and the European Commission. *In* Audit Cultures:
        Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy. M. Strathern, ed.
        pp. 106–132. London: Routledge.
    2006   New Nationalisms in the EU: Occupying the Available Space. *In* Neo-nationalism
        in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology. A. Gingrich and M.
        Banks, eds. pp. 218–236. Oxford: Berghahn.

Meinhof, Ulrike, and Anna Triandafyllidou
    2006   Transcultural Europe: Cultural Policy in a Changing Europe. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Mitchell, Jon P.
    2002   Ambivalent Europeans: Ritual, Memory and the Public Sphere in Malta. London: Routledge.
Moutsou, Christina
    2006   Merging European Boundaries: A Stroll in Brussels. *In* Crossing European Boundaries: Beyond Conventional Geographical Categories. New Directions in Anthropology 24. J. Stacul, C. Moutsou, and H. Kopnina, eds. pp. 120–136. Oxford: Berghahn.
Nader, Laura
    1972   Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. *In* Reinventing Anthropology. D. H. Hymes, ed. pp. 284–311. New York: Pantheon.
Neveu, Erik
    2002   Europe as an Unimaginable Community? The Failure of the French News Magazine *L'European* (March–July 1998). Journal of Contemporary European Studies 10(2):283–300.
Nic Craith, Máiréad
    2005   Europe and the Politics of Language. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
    2009   Writing Europe: A Dialogue of "Liminal" Europeans. Social Anthropology 17(2):198–208.
Peter, Jochen, and Claus H. de Vreese
    2004   In Search of Europe: A Cross-National Comparative Study of the European Union in National Television News. Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics 9(4):3–24.
Sassatelli, Monica
    2002   Imagined Europe: The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy. European Journal of Social Theory 5(4):435–451.
    2008   European Cultural Space in the European Cities of Culture. European Societies 10(2):225–245.
Shore, Cris
    1993   Inventing the "People's Europe": Critical Approaches to European Community "Cultural Policy." Man 28:779–800.
    1995   Usurpers or Pioneers? European Commission Bureaucrats and the Question of European Consciousness. *In* Questions of Consciousness. A. Cohen and N. Rapport, eds. pp. 217–326. London: Routledge.
    1996   Imagining the New Europe: Identity and Heritage in European Community Discourse. *In* Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities. P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones, and C. Gamble, eds. pp. 96–115. London: Routledge.
    1997   Metaphors of Europe: Integration and the Politics of Language. *In* Anthropology and Cultural Studies. S. Nugent and C. Shore, eds. pp. 126–159. London: Pluto.
    2000   Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration. London: Routledge.
    2001   Inventing *Homo europeaus*. The Cultural Politics of European Integration. *In* Europe: Cultural Construction and Reality. P. Niedermüller and B. Stoklund, eds. pp. 53–66. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.
    2004   Whither European Citizenship? Eros and Civilization Revisited. European Journal of Social Theory 7(2):27–44.
    2006   Government without Statehood? Anthropological Perspectives on Governance and Sovereignty in the European Union. European Law Journal 12(6):709–724.

Shore, Cris, and Daniela Baratieri

2006   Crossing Boundaries through Education: European Schools and the Supersession of Nationalism. *In* Crossing European Boundaries: Beyond Conventional Geographical Categories. J. Stacul, C. Moutsou, and H. Kopnina, eds. pp. 23–40. Oxford: Berghahn.

Shore, Cris, and Stephen Nugent, eds.

2002   Elite Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives. London: Routledge.

Soysal, Yasemin

2002   Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas in Postwar Europe. *In* The Postnational Self: Belonging and Identity. U. Hedetoft and M. Hjort, eds. pp. 137–151. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thedvall, Renita

2006   Eurocrats at Work. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, 58. Stockholm: Almund and Wiksell.

2007   The EU's Nomads: National Eurocrats in European Policy Making. *In* Observing Government Elites: Up Close and Personal. R. Rhodes, P. 't Hart, and M. Noordegraaf, eds. pp. 160–179. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilken, Lisanne

1999   Antropologien og den Europæiske Union. Tidsskriftet Antropologi 39:219–232.

2001   Enhed I Mangfoldighed? Eurovisioner og Minoriteter. Aarhus: Århus Universitetsforlag.

2008   The Development of Minority Rights in Europe. *In* The Tension between Group Rights and Human Rights: A Multidisciplinary Approach. K. De Feyter and G. Pavlakos, eds. pp. 89–104. Oxford: Hart.

Zabusky, Stacia

1995   Launching Europe: An Ethnography of European Cooperation in Space Science. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

2000   Boundaries at Work: Discourses and Practices of Belonging in the European Space Agency. *In* An Anthropology of the European Union. I. Bellier and T. Wilson, eds. pp. 179–200. Oxford: Berg.