



Bridge over troubled waters?

The link between European historical
heritage and the future of European
integration

Insights from Social Sciences and Humanities

Research on Reflective Societies



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation
Directorate B – Innovation Union and European Research Area
Unit B.6 – Reflective Societies

Contact: Zoltán Krasznai

E-mail: Zoltan.Krasznai@ec.europa.eu
RTD-PUBLICATIONS@ec.europa.eu

European Commission
B-1049 Brussels

Bridge over troubled waters?

The link between European historical heritage and
the future of European integration

Insights from Social Sciences and Humanities Research on
Reflective Societies

HORIZON 2020 Workshop

17 October 2014

Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (National Research Council - CNR)
Rome

Organised by the Reflective Societies Unit of the European Commission's Directorate General for
Research and Innovation in cooperation with FLASH-IT and APRE

**EUROPE DIRECT is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union**

Freephone number (*):

00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers
or these calls may be billed

LEGAL NOTICE

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://europa.eu>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015

ISBN 978-92-79-46908-4

ISSN 1831-9424

doi 10.2777/534076

© European Union, 2015

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Table of contents

Background	6
Questions and themes	7
Introduction to the workshop	8
Theme 1: History	9
François Hartog, Towards a new historical condition	9
Discussion	12
Conclusions of Round Table	12
Theme 2: Cultural Heritage	14
Gábor Sonkoly, Cultural Heritage	14
Discussion	18
Conclusions of Round Table	18
Theme 3: Identity	20
Jitka Malečková, Researching European Identity and History	20
Discussion	26
Conclusions of Round Table	27
Key insights gained through the workshop	29
Workshop Agenda	30
List of participants	32
Thematically relevant EU-funded research projects	36
Brief description of Flash-IT	37

Background

Without a doubt, historical experience played a crucial role in European integration. The integration process initially evolved around a strong cultural, history-centred element that was based on real and cultural memories, historical interpretations of Europe's past and, most saliently, the two World Wars and the Cold War. The role of the past as a guiding force for present efforts toward a better future is clearly enshrined in the European Treaties. As the latest of these, the Lisbon Treaty on European Union clearly states at the beginning of its Preamble that the signatories of the treaty draw "inspiration from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe" and they recall "the historic importance of the ending of the division of the European continent and the need to create firm bases for the construction of the future Europe". The historical perspective of European integration has been symbolically recognised by the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union in 2012.

Today these historical considerations have been diluted as a result of generational changes and the lack of an adequate *reflective* or European approach for culture, history and heritage. Faced with mounting euro-scepticism and the so-called "democratic deficit of the European institutions" – tendencies that were confirmed by the European elections of 2014 – more and more voices are calling for the reinvigoration of European integration by putting more emphasis on Europe's past, its culture and its cultural heritage. (See most recently the "New narrative for Europe" declaration of European intellectuals: http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/new-narrative/pdf/declaration_en.pdf).

The Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation provides funding for research that aims "to contribute to an understanding of Europe's intellectual basis, its history and the many European and non-European influences, as an inspiration for our lives today". This research domain is located under the "reflective societies" part of *Societal Challenge 6: Europe in a changing world – Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies*.

According to the definition given in the Horizon 2020 framework programme, "reflective societies" is an encompassing term for research in the following fields:

- “(a) (...) European heritage, memory, identity, integration and cultural interaction and translation, including its representations in cultural and scientific collections, archives and museums, to better inform and understand the present by richer interpretations of the past;
- (b) research into European countries' and regions' history, literature, art, philosophy and religions and how these have informed contemporary European diversity;
- (c) research on Europe's role in the world, on the mutual influence and ties between the regions of the world, and a view from outside on European cultures.”

Defined this way, the "reflective societies" domain is supposed to cover a vast array of social sciences and humanities dealing with the past and the present, from history to geopolitics through cultural heritage studies and practically all fields of the humanities.

The expression and research field "reflective societies" seems to be a new element when compared to definitions of research fields in the previous research framework programmes. Closer scrutiny of the term – introduced by the German delegation to the Council of Ministers – reveals

that it is strongly inspired by philosophies (especially that of Jürgen Habermas) about the crucial role of enlightened deliberative communication of citizens in a modern public sphere aiming at mutual understanding.

Finally, taking into account the ambitious framing of this research agenda, strategic choices have to be made with regard to the selection and definition of new “reflective” Horizon 2020 research topics for the period 2016–2020.

All these epistemological, practical and political considerations point toward the necessity to launch a discussion about the potential meaning of “reflective societies” as a societal challenge for current European societies in general and for setting the European research agenda under Horizon 2020 in particular.

Questions and themes

Against this background, the Reflective Societies Unit of the European Commission’s DG Research and Innovation, in cooperation with FLASH-IT and APRE, organised the FLASH-IT workshop on “reflective societies” around the problematic of the interconnectedness of the past, present and the future in contemporary European societies. The results of the workshop are being integrated into the process of defining future research topics on European history, heritage and identities that will respond to the needs of European societies and that will reinvigorate the link between interpretations of the past and the willingness to share common European objectives.

The workshop brought together specialists of history, cultural heritage and identity studies – fields that cover a large and intimately related part of the research area under “reflective societies” as defined under H2020. The participants also included policymakers and managers from the European Commission and national funding bodies.

From the 19th century until the last decades of the 20th century (and the decline of the so-called global interpretation theories like Marxism or structuralism), history was the dominant research field on the past. It occupied solid institutional positions and enjoyed high public acceptance in European societies. Since then, other conceptual approaches to the past have emerged as leading research fields, most notably the studies of memories, memory places (*lieux de mémoire* in French) and identities. Lately, the concept of cultural heritage has been gaining widespread acceptance. From its modest origins as a term describing the practices for preserving tangible monuments, it has established itself as an all-encompassing term for research, management, exploitation and dissemination activities dealing with both tangible and intangible phenomena related to the past.

The evolution of European research agendas over time clearly reflects these changes, although it is an open question whether these changes occurred as a passive reaction to impacts from the research community and politics or as a result of a critical analysis of societal needs and of the development of social sciences and humanities. However, as the European research programmes play an increasingly pronounced normative role in structuring the European research landscape (with the definition of research topics and the attribution of important research grants), it would be beneficial for research policymakers – together with the research community and stakeholders of the wider society – to have a closer look at the knowledge creation practices about the past of all these competing research fields and institutional approaches.

Introduction to the workshop

Pointing out Europe's need to adapt to historical change, Riccardo Pozzo, Director of Italy's National Research Council (Department of Social Sciences and Humanities), kicked off the workshop by challenging the notion of a European intellectual identity. Speaking of identity in such terms, he argued, has become anachronistic because Europe has evolved beyond its Greco-Roman intellectual roots, becoming something much more diverse. When talking of ancient luminaries such as Aristotle who profoundly shaped European thought, we can correctly describe them as forming part of Europe's intellectual *basis*, Mr Pozzo suggested. European intellectual *identity*, on the other hand, is now much broader in scope, enriched through historical change, particularly immigration.

Before noting how history, identity and cultural heritage are anchored in the European treaties, Zoltán Krasznai of the European Commission (Reflective Societies Unit, DG Research and Innovation) outlined one of the key questions that the workshop was intended to address:

How can European research “contribute to an understanding of Europe’s intellectual basis, its history and the many European and non-European influences, as an inspiration for our lives today” according to the highest current standard of scientific rigour, without falling into the trap of politically biased “wishful thinking” about European integration?

With that in mind, he then reviewed the changing roles that history, identity and cultural heritage have played in EU-funded research over time, observing that these topics were not yet on the Commission's agenda when social sciences and humanities first became part of the Framework Programme (FP4) in 1994. Since then these topics have gained greater currency, as exemplified by numerous projects financed within the Seventh Framework Programme. Moving forward, Horizon 2020 includes at least 10 research topics under “Challenge 6” dedicated to reflective societies. According to Zoltan Krasznai, the reflective societies research strand in Horizon 2020 offers an opportunity to “create a new narrative of European identity”. He stressed that, in order to take advantage of this opportunity, “constant dialogue, transparency and sharing of ideas are crucial”.

Zoltán Krasznai, Policy Officer at DG Research and Innovation, led the workshop proceedings. This report was prepared by Terry Martin, executive director of the Science-Policy Interface Agency (SPIA), who served as rapporteur for the event.

Special thanks to the Italian Research Council, especially to its director Riccardo Pozzo who hosted the meeting, and APRE that made this event successful and in particular Diassina Di Maggio and Natalia Morazzo.

Theme 1: History

Keynote speech

François Hartog, EHESS, France

Towards a new historical condition

Under the name of the present, the contemporary has become a societal and political imperative – something so obvious it cannot be discussed. As it happens, the media, publishers, and private and public funding agencies exert pressure that is both diffuse and steady to turn the human and social sciences more resolutely toward the contemporary, to make them respond better and faster to social demand, to the urgency of situations, emotions, and misfortunes by knowing how to put such concepts into words and statistics. To deal with this demand and with the sense of urgency it engenders, these media professionals appeal to experts. The historian is solicited as such. On ad hoc committees, the expert historian is supposed to give the facts, and nothing but the facts or, during certain court cases, to be the person who takes the place of the witness. An expert in memory, an expert to say what really happened, an expert on the context at hand.

Of what is this contemporary woven? It is at once comprised of and represented by a series of words whose use has become apparently obligatory. These words sketch out the main motifs of the contemporary and constitute its reality. There may no longer be any *grands récits* [master narratives], but there are certainly master words that function to undergird all kinds of fragmentary tales whose formation they make possible. Such words authorize certain forms of speech; thanks to them, wrongs can be articulated, crimes denounced, silences named, and absences noted. These words authorize at the same time that they create: there is the quartet of memory, commemoration, patrimony, and identity, to which one must at least add the crime against humanity, victim, witness, and still others. Historians cannot ignore these terms any more than anyone else can. In fact, they must, more than others, question them; they must seize their histories, their uses and misuses, before taking them up as the categories that might organize meaningful inquiries into narratives of the past.

The fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 did not “liberate” the future. Time was certainly unfrozen in the East, but everyone was vaccinated against any radiant future. The future is still here, and even though our means of acquiring knowledge have increased in incredible proportions with the information revolution, the future has become more unpredictable than ever. Or, rather, we have renounced it: plans, prospects and futurology have all fallen by the wayside. We are completely concentrated on an immediate response to the immediate: we have to react in real time, to a point of caricature in the case of politicians.

There is another, apparently opposite attitude that nonetheless brings us back to the present: the future is all too predictable, if not already played out. Catastrophe, in the guise of its many faces, is already almost here. We have entered, as we read more and more often, into the time of catastrophes. But this is because we are confronted with an irreversibility that we ourselves have initiated. Literature has explored the post-catastrophic, in particular in post 9/11 America. And, of course, there are many movies that explore this as well.

The incredibly rapid development of the principle of precaution over the last twenty years and

its inscription in the French Constitution also testify to this transformation of our relation to the future. Through its use, first by politicians and, ultimately, by anyone responsible for anything, this principle—which expresses an uncertainty that, in the state of available knowledge, cannot be removed—can be transformed into a straightforward and easily embraced principle of abstention: a justification not to do anything, in the name of the fact that “you never know” and in a quest for “zero risk.” Far be it from me to try to simplify these complex questions, but they are at the very least impossible to separate from a profound transformation of the category of the future.

We can find another expression of this displacement in the increasingly important place accorded to prevention, particularly in criminal matters. On the basis of a calculation of probabilities, authorities evaluate the “dangerousness” of a person and make decisions, for example, as to whether or not to keep someone imprisoned even after a sentence has been served, thus potentially depriving that person of a future. Here again, the questions are not simple, but one can see how these approaches lead to seeing the future as a threat and, in a sense, to the suppression of history in the name of an emergency and so the need to protect the present at the cost of both past and future. The future, in short, has become a burden, if I may put things this way, one that neither businesses nor institutions want to take on. Though new computer models operate faster and faster—anyone who can buy or sell a fraction of a second before someone else gains from this—we who operate these machines have renounced the task of understanding. The only plans people seem to talk about anymore are restructuring plans [*plans sociaux*], plans that accompany what is declared to have already happened, a business’s bankruptcy, for example. Provisions attempting to alter the future are thus strictly limited to the very short term. One has to be reactive, ever more mobile and flexible. We must make a blank, or almost blank, slate of the future!

Historians have not yet been able to measure these rapid transformations. They struggle to deal with them as best they can, one at a time, one day after the next and as dispersed instances, without daring to hand down any grand verdict on the task of the historian. They are far from being the only ones to act this way. All the constituents of our societies find themselves in the same situation, whether it is a question of politics, economics, or art. For the historian, to desire to be the present’s guardian or watchdog or sentry—and, in my view, this is indeed an appropriate desire—in no way implies that he cedes to the injunctions of the present, to the ambient presentism, starting with one quite prevalent in universities that now holds that the only history is the history of the contemporary or very contemporary era. As if through a rapid reversal of the situation, there were no longer any salvation or legitimacy to be found outside of this immediate present.

Yet it is important for every historian to endeavor to understand as a professional how and, if possible, why the contemporary has come to predominate to this degree. What were and what are the repercussions for the historical discipline of the profound changes that see Europe leaving under our very eyes what Fernand Braudel called great history [*la grande histoire*]? History, that is the modern concept of history on which Europe lived for two centuries, has only barely grasped the new way of the world. History is certainly still here and is still familiar, but it has nonetheless lost its obviousness: called into question, it has lost its strength, its majesty and, concretely, its signature operational efficacy. In forging his historical semantics, Reinhart Koselleck identified the formation of the modern concept of history starting at the end of the 18th century. A comparable study bearing on the end of the 20th century would show a crumbling or an eclipse of this modern concept (or perhaps an even more dramatic change), while a series of terms, signature motifs of the present, have come to preoccupy our societies and our minds.

This study must start with the quartet mentioned earlier—memory, commemoration, heritage, and identity, along with their accompanying terms—and with the way the present has come to conduct this particular orchestral piece.

The future is apprehended as increasingly constrained, if not closed, owing in particular to the irreversibility generated by an entire series of our actions. One immediately thinks of global warming, nuclear waste, genetic modifications, etc. In an increasingly accelerated and precise manner, we discover not only that the future stretches further and further before us, but also that what we do or fail to do today carries repercussions for so distant a future that it no longer represents anything on the scale of a human's lifetime. In the other direction, facing upstream, we have learned that the past came from afar, further and further away (the era of the first hominid's appearance has not ceased to recede, whereas henceforth the age of the universe draws close to fourteen billion years.). Confronted by these upheavals of our bearings and of our experiences of time, we are tempted to say 'stop,' to advocate a return backwards, to recover a lost paradise. As for the historical past, we tend to "deal with" or "manage" it in precise places (the courts) and by means of specific actions (the politics of memory). That means in the present and for the present: under the authority of memory.

Memory, commemoration, heritage, identity have gradually become the keywords of the end of the twentieth century, even though history with a capital 'H'—the great goddess of Europe since the nineteenth century—has seen her magisterium vanish. In fact, the shift from history to memory over the course of the nineteen-eighties reveals an epochal change. This also holds true for heritage, which is a notion for times of crisis. When the landmarks crumble, when the acceleration of time emphasizes disorientation, one looks to preserve places, objects, gestures in order to render liveable a present in which one no longer finds oneself. Commemoration is the public expression of the phenomenon of memory. It gives rise to the politics of memory (on the European level), even to "memorial laws." As for identity—the central organizer of these notions—it is doubly the bearer of anxiety: about the past (what is, in truth, the past of France?), about the future (what can be our common future?). Of what good news Europe could still be the bearer?

Within that which I term the ancient regime of historicity (before seventeen eighty-nine, to take a symbolic date), the actors certainly had their present, lived within this present, tried to understand and to master it. But in order to gain their bearings there, they began by looking amongst the past with the idea that it carried intelligibility, offered examples and lessons. Within the futurist regime, or the modern regime, it was the inverse: one looked amongst the future; it was this which illuminated the present and explained the past; it was towards the future that one had to go as fast as possible. And history was teleological: the end revealed the course already traveled and that which remained to be accomplished. Every modern national history has been conceived and written on this model.

The singularity of the presentist regime maintains that, in the end, there is nothing more than the present. Each person experiences it in everyday life, personally just as professionally. In this regime, one no longer knows what constitutes the past because one no longer even sees it, and one no longer knows what constitutes the future which one does not see any more. Now there are only the events that succeed one another or collide with each other, to which one must "react" in an emergency to the incessant rhythm of the "breaking news." On the Internet, they are henceforth established in real time, the simultaneity of everything with everything, and this continuously. Everything appears on the same plane within a present as extensive as the network itself. In this new "digital condition," articulating past, present, and future becomes more

problematic than ever before, but appears all the more necessary, which seems to diminish the possibility of a common account (to each their memory, their website and their blog according to an ever-increasing proliferation).

A first step will be to finish ridding ourselves of a history which no longer has currency: that which launched and imposed Europe, that which marched with a capital 'H', that which claimed to be the engine of the modern world and which saw itself as the final tribunal. Holding us to the declarations of intention, it is largely accomplished. Drawing up an inventory of the variety of historical experiences and duly recording the transformation of the temporal charge of the concept itself of experience is a second step. Only then can we ask ourselves whether the very old word 'history' (with all its history) might return to use, but in order to designate a new manner of articulating these three categories of the past, the present, and the future—which humans have always had need of for ordering their lives together—yet in such a way that none of them imposes its tyranny upon the other two.

Discussion

"The past is a much more comfortable place than the future; having the future as part of our identity is psychologically difficult." This was among the many interesting insights offered by archaeologist Marie Louise Stig Sørensen (University of Cambridge, UK) in her formal response to François Hartog's speech. History is susceptible to abuse, she observed, and the past can "interfere" with the way we understand the present. It is the job of historians, therefore, not only to reflect on the past and the present, but also to help us realize that "*the past is not over*". Speaking from her experience as coordinator of the EU-funded CRIC project (Cultural Heritage and the Re-construction of Identities after Conflict), Marie Louise Stig Sørensen suggested that "the challenge of European identity is not the future, but rather to develop a common understanding of the past, especially in terms of atrocities – of who did what to whom". During the ensuing plenary discussion, one participant argued that the European Union should do more to gain recognition for cultural diversity as a positive value. Another reminded everyone of the elastic nature of the workshop's subject matter, noting that "history has always been interpreted and identity has always been constructed".

Conclusions of Round Table

The afternoon round table (break-out session) dedicated to European history research explored three main topics:

- Utility and transmission of knowledge
- Interdisciplinarity
- New challenges

Excerpts from the chair's summary of round-table discussions on history

Moving forward, the main challenge will not be adapting our strategies to people needs, but rather learning how to connect with those necessities. We must pay attention to them and question our role in society as scientists and the role of history in the lives of real people.

History can be a powerful tool to empower the people, a way to strengthen their sense of dignity. It can also be a source of pride and can help create identity, even local identity.

New challenges - not only related to new technologies, but also to global change - should be an important part of our research strategies. Europe should be built without destroying or forgetting its own history and heritage. Traditional knowledge, local and regional identities and cultural diversity must be preserved.

Priorities and issues:

- Socialisation of historical knowledge
- Connecting with people (e.g. community archaeology)
- History as an empowerment factor for communities
- History and biodiversity
- History and new challenges: global change, climate change, migration, new technologies and digital humanities
- Interdisciplinarity a useful value in research projects only when justified (not automatically)
- Historical diversity (not just diversity resulting from migration) a positive value
- Importance of rural areas in Europe usually not sufficiently considered in research and heritage.

Theme 2: Cultural Heritage

Keynote speech

Gábor Sonkoly, ELTE, Hungary

Cultural Heritage (CH)

I. What is CH?

The concept of CH belongs to a **set of concepts** that are typical of contemporary tendencies to define and mobilize current social, cultural and even spiritual attachments to a given community as well as to its place in a **functional, inclusive and non-conflictual** manner. To a certain extent, CH is replacing (1) and/or institutionalizing (2) the other fuzzy concepts of the presentist set, since CH is the only presentist concept that has a legally and administratively comprehensive origin (“heritage or patrimony”):

(1) CH is replacing **“culture”**, a term that was too academic (i.e. elitist, top-down) and was definitely put into plural (“cultureS”) (i) by the various emancipatory movements from the late 1960s onwards, (ii) by the academic recognition of these movements from the 1970s onwards, and (iii) by the institutionalized notion of “cultural diversity” from the 1990s onwards. CH is also replacing **“identity”**, the catchword of postmodern Academia (1970s-2000s), of supranational politico-economic formations such as the EU, and of subnational community self-expressions such as multicultural urban neighbourhoods. Given these multiple uses, the notion of “identity” has become too vast and hollow for practical purposes. Moreover, both “culture” and “identity” inherited some conflictual and exclusive connotations from their very inception.

(2) From the 1970s, **“memory”** (belonging to the individual, to a community or to a group) has been challenging the time-honored identity construction of SSH. Remembering at all levels of the society (local, regional, national and global) has become a wide-spread social practice and form of expression. Its diverse manifestations have been exploited by political actors belonging to all the different levels of society to propose a new festive and inclusive character through the multiplication of the events of **“commemoration”**. The CH of a community can be considered as the institutionalized aggregate of the community’s selected pieces of memory and those of the memory-bearers. CH is not just a bottom-up form of identity-construction, but it can also include its marketing and branding procedures both for the inner and for the outer communities. These implementing acts of identity often take the form of commemorations.

CH is the administrative response to the social and cultural novelties of identity constructions, what SSH were trying to understand and interpret within their own conceptual framework. Therefore, CH (Studies) is still lacking an overall academic definition. The first and the most influential institutionalization of CH has been taking place at UNESCO, which has had an impact on the concept of CH at national, regional and continental levels, including the concept of CH as it is used by the EU.

The evolution of the concept of CH at UNESCO reflects the juridico-theoretical attempts of defining the ever-expanding nature of CH, which gradually incorporates monuments, neighbourhoods/zones, cities, natural landscapes, all kinds of species, cultural landscapes, social and

cultural activities and groups. This integrative process yields the **conceptual twins of tangible/intangible heritages**. They linguistically suggest a unity of two (otherwise) significantly different approaches to CH:

- (1) tangible CH is a successor of the monumental approach of the static conception of cultural and natural heritage (from the 1970s); whereas
- (2) intangible CH stems from the critique of tangible CH (from the 1990s) and it is used to safeguard social and cultural practices dynamically.

The construction of **European CH** follows a similar logic to UNESCO's, first by defining CH in various standard-setting documents of the Council of Europe as Architectural CH (1975, 1985) and Archaeological CH (1992) in harmony with the European tradition of monumental protection; then, by offering a broader definition of CH as "a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time" (Faro Convention, 2005). This broad definition that includes social and cultural practices is instrumentalised in the Horizon 2020 work programme for 2014-2015 of Societal Challenge 6. Herein, CH appears for the first time to this extent as a key concept incorporating the role of culture as one of the main pillars of sustainability as well as the new conceptual bridge between society and nature expressed in the European Landscape Convention in 2000.

The **academic institutionalization of CH** has started rather late because of the term's administrative nature. There is still some bewilderment concerning the meaning of CH. For instance, it can refer to any process of knowledge transmission in history or, following the rules of conceptual history, it can also be analysed as a concept that appeared in the late 1960s to indicate new social and cultural realities. In addition, different disciplines feel the need to reflect on CH when its continuous expansion reaches their domain. During the previous decades of the rise of CH, two types of institutional intrusion have taken place:

- (1) sciences and academic fields directly linked to the conservation of those past objects that represent a historical identity, which have gradually been referred to as "tangible heritage", were often regrouped under the label of heritage, as in the case of the establishment of the *Institut national du patrimoine* in France in 2001;
- (2) CH studies departments appeared in Faculties of SSH, which often baffled other academics who were not certain whether this new discipline aims to describe new social realities created by cultural heritage or to assist in the creation of new identities expressed through cultural heritage.

The ambiguous notion of **CH management**, indicating that cultural heritage is also linked to political and financial realities, could mean both or neither.

2. Why is CH successful?

CH is a contemporary concept to express contemporary social and cultural practices and identity constructions that are:

- (1) much more based on the **present** and on the **management of change** than on modernist

projects aiming at the future;

(2) **not founded on great** (19th and early 20th century) theories and **ideologies** explaining or expecting social development;

(3) rather **critical of SSH** and even of urban planning, which have undergone a set of paradigm shifts commonly labelled as “turns” leading to a certain credibility loss;

(4) closely linked to the **democratization** processes expressed by participatory legislation and, later on, by the concepts of social and cultural inclusion;

(5) open to the **multiplication of identities** and to the permeability between different levels of societies;

The logics of CH to define and to interpret the **components of social and cultural appropriation** is unusual from the modernist point of view because:

(1) its **territory** is not divided between “the old” (prestigious, historical, protected) and “the new” (constantly developing), but is instead delineated by the use and by the interpretation of the concerned communities, which can select their significant places by their current practice from a space conceived as **continuity**;

(2) its **community** gradually gives up the modern division between **public and private spheres**, (which was determined in the early modern centuries in Europe) and places itself on the edge of this division to promote, to market and to brand itself and to satisfy the double (theoretically contradictory) expectation of (local) knowledge transfer towards its own future generations as well as towards the greater public including tourists;¹

(3) its relationship to **time** is based on the prevention of loss, i.e. the future is conceived as a probable scene for an ecological, natural, demographic, social and economic catastrophe that must be managed with precaution. The present of CH absorbs the past and extends itself in order to avoid the unknown future under the label of **sustainable development**.

3. How to handle CH?

CH is a novelty in the academia, therefore its **methodology** needs to be developed. Out of several possible models of analysis, it is worth starting with the following three to establish an analytical framework:

(1) The model of Regimes of Historicity² shows why the present aspect of time has replaced the future-based modernism in the last third of the 20th century and what the consequences of this newly-born **presentism** on politics and on SSH are;

(2) Michel Foucault’s theory of the biopower explains how the new mechanisms of power had started working in the dawn of modernization and lead to **security-based societies**. One of the great advantages of this model is its permeability to our contemporary societies where “cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity for nature”.³ In this context, the changing role of culture can be understood through the evolution of the notion of CH.

(3) The inner conceptual conflicts of World CH lead to the unsolved problem of **Authenticity**, which is inherent to the interpretation of CH by its different stakeholders. The model of Regimes

1 As the Faro Convention states, “a heritage community consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations”. (Article 2.b.)

2 It was developed by François Hartog and inspired by Reinhard Koselleck.

3 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2005.

of Authenticity⁴ can contribute to the comprehension of contradictory recognitions of the elements of CH by the concerned members of society.

The academic institutionalization of CH Studies has started in various ways across countries and disciplinary backgrounds. Since CH tends to be the new conceptual framework of a desired European identity, the institutionalization of **European CH Studies** should be coordinated for the following reasons:

- (1) a network of comparable, **similarly structured CH Departments** could promote the new EU concept of cultural and social appropriations;
- (2) CH as a participatory means of identity construction could be the academic instrument of **social and cultural inclusion**;
- (3) the exceptionally **rich tradition of European SSH** could be mustered for the **interdisciplinary** organization of European CH Departments.

Though the interpretation of “built”, “natural” and “intangible” CHs differs from one discipline to another, all disciplines agree that CH determines the relationship between **Place and People** or Culture(-bearers) and Environment. Through the coordinated establishment of CH Departments, this essential relationship could be analysed not only according to new methodologies that surpass those of traditional national sciences and area studies, but also by linking SSH to Natural Sciences through CH sites and communities.

For any academic, juridical or political conceptualization of European CH, a set of **particular European problems** should also be considered and examined. The list of these problems should be established through the participation of varied stakeholders and could refer, among others, to the following issues:

- (1) The notion of CH is the result of an inner (organic) development in France, the UK and the USA. Hence, while there is a **historical necessity for this concept in French and in English** (which happen to be the two most influential official languages of EU and UNESCO), CH is a **loanword** in every other language. As a result, the borrowing of this seemingly international concept does not necessarily reflect the same realities or follow the same evolution in the adoptive societies;
- (2) CH in Western Europe was partially canonized to replace pre-world-war national identity construction with its participatory, inclusive and consensual approach. Several Central and Eastern European societies, however, could not experience the same democratic and multicultural tendencies because of Communist dictatorship and hermetically closed borders. The return of nationalism since the mid-1990s paired with the mystical (non-critical) aspect of CH can result in identity constructions in the name of **national CH** that end up demonstrating opposite tendencies to the original CH implications;
- (3) The contradictory interpretations of CH clearly indicate that European CH Studies should not be descriptive (as it can be sometimes seen in the case of World CH Studies), but truly **critical** based on the rich methodological traditions of European SSH;
- (4) The inclusive and participatory nature of CH also requires the establishment of **CH hermeneutics**, which takes into consideration the interpretations and preferences of the largest number of stakeholders;
- (5) The past five decades of different stages of monument, nature and CH protection engen-

4 This model was developed by Lucie K. Morrisset.

dered **CH communities**, which are the forerunners and the laboratories of presentist identity constructions. These communities should be **mapped** and compared systematically within the network of European CH Departments.

Discussion

Responding to Mr Sonkoly's keynote, the architect Luca Basso Peressut (Politecnico di Milano, Italy) observed that cultural heritage is a broad ecosystem. It does not lend itself to localization, he asserted, and can indeed reflect a global perspective as evidenced by the British Museum. People may be located in specific places with which they identify, but they may also be understood (and understand themselves) as part of a more global development. He appealed for the creation of cultural "infrastructures" that together could form a network integrating cultural institutions, places and researchers. In this context, Luca Basso Peressut urged the creation of temporary traveling exhibitions to link cultural institutions and places. Such exhibitions, he suggested, could use the same objects to address tough issues such as war that are of interest to all Europeans.

Conclusions of Round Table

The afternoon round-table discussion on cultural heritage yielded clear suggestions on how to approach the topic in a European research context. Among the recommendations:

- Recognize cultural heritage contributions from outside EU
- Devote attention to "local" cultural heritage
- Utilize potential of web-based technologies
- Exploit links to creative industries.

Conclusions from the round table on history, as compiled by the group chair:

- Research should explore new and innovative ways to involve ethnic minorities and recent immigrant communities in the exhibiting and curating of cultural heritage from outside of the EU, in order to facilitate the re-appropriation by such communities of relevant cultural heritage.
- Make 'local' cultural heritage a focus of research and, thereby, give more recognition to the importance of communities that are on the way to creating their own, distinctive types of cultural identity.
- Europe's rich cultural heritage is closely associated with the historical growth of major cities, but this important relationship remains a somewhat neglected research area. Cities are, self-evidently, places of deposit for collections of tangible cultural heritage. They have also been and continue to be repositories of various forms of intangible cultural heritage such as the ideas, influences and practices that have accompanied successive waves of immigrants over the *longue durée*. In this respect, museums and similar institutions may have an integrationist and participatory role to play.
- Research on cultural heritage should fully exploit the opportunities provided by new and emerging web-based technologies by harnessing knowledge that is derived from all forms of social media, citizen science and crowd-sourcing.
- Within the overall domain of SSH research on cultural heritage, disciplinary approaches that are rooted in the humanities should be given equal prominence to those based in the social sciences. Enquiry into the construction of European identity could, for example, examine the historical role of imagination in literature (both fiction and non-fiction) or

the role of creative expression in the visual arts. Similarly, a humanities-based approach to understanding issues related to 'sustainability' is no less important than research that utilises the methodologies of the social sciences.

- Where appropriate, new research projects should seek to build directly on the outcomes of completed EU-funded projects in order to derive maximum benefit from previous research findings.
- To facilitate the creative exchange of ideas and practice, cultural heritage programmes should consider ways to bring together, in new collaborative spaces, researchers as practitioners and practitioners as researchers who share common interests.
- Explicit links between research on cultural heritage and the creative and cultural industries should be encouraged with a view to developing employment opportunities, including more flexible forms of employment, and facilitating knowledge exchange.

Theme 3: Identity

Keynote speech

Jitka Malečková, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Researching European Identity and History

'Identity' is a name given to the escape sought from that uncertainty. Hence 'identity', though ostensibly a noun, behaves like a verb, albeit a strange one to be sure: it appears only in the future tense. (Bauman 2013: 19)

But identity is also connected to at least two other words that have also become highly fashionable in the last twenty years. These words are: memory and heritage. This fact seems to point out to a strong connection of identity with the past. And indeed there is such a connection... European identity is a historical fact. More and more, it is also becoming a political problem. (Pomian 2009)

Identity is a notoriously ambiguous and contested term. *European identity* is seemingly more specific, yet it not only shares the conceptual ambiguity of *identity*, but also confounds it even further by including in the concept the problematic definition and oscillating borders of "Europe". Although referring to *European identity* is often considered meaningful only with respect to the European Union (Schmale 2007), the source of identification is searched for in common history and cultural heritage rather than in the political dimension of the Union. Is *European identity* a fact whose history should be investigated, is it a goal to be pursued – possibly with the help of history – or both? The *European Council Decision* from 2013, establishing the Specific Programme implementing Horizon 2020, hints at this ambiguity when it notes that "[a]n intensified European integration process has underlined that a wider European identity *sphere* exists [emphasis added]", while also referring to a *European identity* that "can be traced, constructed or debated".

The aim of this reflection is to show possible implications of the conceptual inconsistencies regarding *European identity* for efforts to formulate a research agenda at the intersection between *European identity* and history/cultural heritage. It suggests that, in order to help strengthen the feeling of belonging to Europe among the European population, research in history should not be conceived as "serving European identity". The essay briefly outlines the conceptual problems associated with *identity*, shows their impact on past research on the history of Europe, and then suggests possible pathways towards a new research agenda.

Identity: an ambiguous concept

At the heart of the problem is the distinction between *identity* as a "category of practice" and "category of analysis". In their crucial critical piece *Beyond 'Identity'*, Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper draw attention to the tension between the constructivist language prevailing in academia and the foundationalist and essentialist content required in order to make appeals to identity effective in practice: In its strong, political meaning, identity emphasizes sameness over time or across persons, which is considered problematic today. At the same time, in the weak, academic understandings of identity – used with numerous qualifiers such as identity in flux, multiple, unstable, fragmented, constructed or negotiated – the term has lost its potential

to do any useful analytical work (Brubaker and Cooper 2000: 2-14).

In the European and specifically EU context, this tension is reflected in the dual use of the idea of *European identity*: on one hand, as a political tool for ending divisions and conflicts and promoting European integration and, on the other hand, as a tool for researching and writing “European history”. Within this framework, history and cultural heritage are viewed as subservient to the goal of constructing, promoting or strengthening identification with Europe. Outlining the relationship between identity, history and cultural heritage, the *Horizon 2020 Work Programme for 2014-2015. Europe in a changing world – inclusive, innovative and reflective Societies* mentions that the history of Europe, its cultural heritage, values and institutions are “crucial”, “serve as a source of inspiration” and “constitute a basis” for a sense of European belonging. In brief, they “contribute to an evolving European identity today”. It is undoubtedly a role of history to help us understand the present, including our present selves. Nevertheless, when the scrutiny of the past is circumscribed by demands such as “to contribute to integration”, the resulting historical mirror runs the risk of being somewhat crooked.

The competing “essentialist” and “constructivist” approaches to *identity* singled out by Brubaker and Cooper interestingly seem less contradictory in the European context. For example, Ettore Recchi (2014: 119-133) distinguishes a “culturalist” and a “structuralist” model of collective identity formation, the former stressing identification as an outcome of messages inscribed in discursive processes and the latter as a result of socio-spatial interactions. These models, or the “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches, are considered complementary rather than mutually exclusive (Miller 2012: 33-38). One might ask whether this conciliatory tendency allows for a multifaceted depiction of European identification processes or, instead, reflects a murkiness of the theoretical bases of inquiries in European history.

Already in 1996, Stuart Hall pointed out that “though they seem to invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not ‘who we are’ or ‘where we came from’, so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves... not the so-called return to roots, but a coming-to-terms-with our ‘routes’” (Hall 2013: 4). In academic research, the constructivist approach is recently prevailing to such an extent that in some disciplines essentialism has become unacceptable. However, this is certainly not the case of political and social practice, which, in turn, has consequences for research: thus, for example, the search for common European roots and values, whether found in Christianity, the legacy of Greek and Roman antiquity or the ideas of the Enlightenment, results in exclusive narrations of European past.

Europe, defined by its essence, is concurrently open inwards and closed outwards. In other words, the openness among individual European *nations* is accompanied by a closure of Europe as a continent against non-Europeans. Moreover, the inward openness of Europe is rather limited in respect to such groups as immigrants or various types of minorities.

The emphasis on relations among nations and nation-states betrays the lasting grip of nationalism on European identification, which is also visible in the inability to envisage a sense of belonging to Europe that is not an extension of and does not copy national identity (although, at the same time, it is seen as being in competition with national identity).

Approaches to European history

The above mentioned conceptual weakness and ambiguity had an impact on the ways in which “histories of Europe” have been written. Multi-authored syntheses conceived as representative of the EU member states resembled – and sometimes still resemble – a mosaic of national histories. Sections on the past of new member states or regions previously neglected in overviews of European history have simply been added to existing narratives without changing these narratives and without challenging their underlying concepts and interpretations. Furthermore, in the general overviews (textbook-types) of European history, the inclusiveness ends at the level of nations, while limited attention has been paid to gender and hardly any to other social or ethnic groups such as immigrants or the Roma. The resulting volumes are traditional in their approaches to history, which they view through the main trends represented by Western (and, depending on the period, Southern or North-Western) Europe.⁵

Likewise in many monographs on European social, cultural or intellectual history, Europe still tends to be represented by the more extensively researched experiences of French, German and British men (and sometimes women). Earlier studies explicitly or implicitly identified Europe with its Western part. Today, historians include examples from the past of various European countries in their historical overviews; yet, these examples often serve as mere illustrations of a general trend, which is in fact understood through the analyses of the most-researched Western European countries.⁶ Although Russia and the Soviet Union have been increasingly incorporated in European histories, Western Europe still serves as the standard for comparison and evaluation. South Eastern Europe (‘the Balkans’) in particular, with the exception of Greece, is absent in many volumes on European past and is excluded from most European gender histories.

Trends and phenomena that arise from Western experiences, such as colonialism, are then presented as “typically” European. To be sure, colonialism is an important part of European history that certainly should not be overlooked and still awaits full incorporation in both European and many national histories. However, the experience of Europe with colonialism was far from unanimous. In multinational empires, the situation of a substantial part of the population resembled in many respects the position of colonial objects more than that of the imperial rulers. Some individuals or groups participated in the colonial enterprise of the empires while being in an unprivileged and semi-colonial position themselves. In addition, a large part of Europe was not *directly* involved in the colonial enterprise, but was nonetheless affected by colonialism and racial theories connected with colonial projects. Although this situation hardly fits the same pattern as the more direct colonial experiences, it still deserves historians’ attention.

The relationship with the non-European world more generally belongs among the problematic aspects of research on European history. It is undeniable that common identity is best realized

5 This is most explicit in earlier volumes; see for example Carbonell (1999) or Delouche, Aldebert et al. (1992), written by fourteen historians from thirteen countries. Among popular historians, Norman Davies in his earlier works (*Europe: A History* 1996) made a deliberate effort to include Eastern Europe, but paid no attention to gender or ethnic minorities. His more recent work, e.g. *Europe East and West* from 2006, views Muslims and Jews in Europe as contributing to the creation of European history, but gender is absent.

6 The Longman Handbook of Twentieth-Century Europe (Cook and Stevenson 2003), for example, devotes pp. 78-101 to events in Western Europe, while only seven pages (pp. 102-109) to the Cold war and Eastern Europe in the same period. The part devoted to women’s emancipation, added as a special brief section of the volume (pp. 232-238), mentions Russia and the Soviet Union seven times and Hungary once; the rest of the events are either “general” or concern West-European women’s histories.

and strengthened in encounters and, in particular, conflicts with others. What is questionable though is whether in order to foster *European identity* it is necessary – or desirable – to present an image of Europe surrounded by enemies, as it often appears (not only) in European histories. Eurocentrism as a common characteristic of studies in European history is another problematic issue. In fact, “the idea of Europe is one that is often self-confident and even imperialist, and historians are beginning to recognize that more and more” (Wintle 2013).

The conceptual ambiguities mentioned above also affect Europe’s self-perception vis-à-vis its Others. The depiction of the characteristic features of European history depends, among other things, on how Europe is defined. In practice, this mainly means asking whether Russia and Turkey (or, for the earlier period, the Ottoman Empire) are included in notions of Europe and whether Christianity, or more specifically Western Christianity, is considered as one of the roots of European civilization. Krzysztof Pomian, for example, oscillates between including and excluding Russia from Europe and starts his overview of the characteristics of Europe with the presence of crosses as the most obvious feature distinguishing Europe from Muslim North Africa, the Middle East and China (Pomian 2009).

In modern European histories, particularly general political history overviews, Russia usually gets much more attention than the rest of Eastern Europe based on its status of great power and the logic of the Cold War. Yet, paradoxically, Russia’s place within Europe or in relationship to Europe remains rather ambiguous. Even more conspicuously, the Turks appear in political histories of Europe mainly as sworn foes and fighters. The Ottoman Empire is mentioned in connection with Ottoman conquests, its rule over the Balkans, long wars with its Habsburg and Russian rivals and the dissolution of the Ottoman state. This in itself is not surprising, but the language employed is worth noting: ‘danger’, ‘oppression’, ‘defeat’, ‘threat’, ‘conquest’ and ‘impose’ are, for example, among the most common words referring to the Turks and the Ottoman Empire in one European history narrative (Blockmans 1997). Similarly, the index of a recent overview of European history mentions the Ottoman Empire *only* in relation to the following three topics: ‘conflicts with Western nations’, ‘decline in influence’, and ‘internal unrest’ (Dukes 2004). Other aspects of Ottoman history, including the nature of political power and the relationship between the state and its subjects or the Turks’ many-sided relationships with Europe, are completely missing. For the twentieth century, the neglected topics include migration and migrant cultures that have become a part of the European reality, as well as analyses of the uneasy relationship between Turkey and the European Union going beyond the description of the steps and problems in the process. Consequently, the Ottoman Empire and the Turks are mainly presented as alien, dangerous and contradictory to Europe and Europeans.

As a result of the various exclusions, combined with attempts to include at least nominally all European nations or EU member states, the history of Europe presented to students and the general public is often lifeless and sterile. Consequently, it can hardly inspire identification with Europe’s past. This is the case even of well-intended large cooperative projects on European history that try to cover all Europe as well as deal with gender, ethnicity and race (though often somewhat superficially). In the end, these projects seem equally doomed to catch dust on the shelves of university libraries across Europe.

To be sure, the shortcomings of European history-writing emphasized here tend to become somewhat less pronounced with time and the last decade has brought various alternatives to the traditional exclusivist works. Among such positive examples, it is possible to mention *Les musulmans dans l’histoire de l’Europe*, edited by Jocelyne Dakhliya and Bernard Vincent, which views Muslims as an integral part of European history – despite the marked exclusion of Eastern

Europe and of gender, at least in the first volume.⁷ Margaret Hunt's *Women in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (2010) in turn is an extraordinarily successful attempt at an integrative approach to European women's history. Hunt includes European colonies, Eastern Europe and Russia, as well as the Ottoman Empire, both in Europe and in the Middle East. The Ottoman Empire is not just an appendix to an otherwise unchanged European gender history, but figures prominently in the book. For instance, Hunt begins her narrative from the Ottoman/Muslim/Middle Eastern point of view, which alters the image of European history. As a result, it becomes clear that North-Western Europe has not always been the most progressive region as far as the position of women is concerned. Hunt's book indicates how much the story can really change when various parts of Europe are fully integrated into European history as independent starting-points for the establishment of reflections on gender history, rather than when they are just add-ons to an essentially Western Europe-based narrative.

Implications for future research

Given the conceptual weakness of *identity* and lessons from past research on European history, what conclusions can be drawn for future research on *European identity* and history?

First, it would undoubtedly be useful to clarify the main concepts and aims of the planned research agenda. Is it trying to improve our understanding of the past of Europe or is it looking for material that would help in the construction/strengthening of a common European *identity*?

If the aim is to support *identity* in the sense of *groupness* (Brubaker and Cooper 2000), which would make people ready to do or sacrifice something for the benefit of the group – Europe or rather the EU – the example of nationalism would apparently suggest that history can strengthen the attachment to the community and make people more ready for sacrifice in its name. However, even in nationalism, groupness is conditioned by a perceived interest: identifying with the nation is expected to bring potential advantages. Furthermore, the sense of belonging to Europe does not necessarily have to fit in the mould of nationalism. In any case, research in history is not the most appropriate tool for strengthening European groupness.

The Policy Review on research projects funded by the European Commission, *The development of European Identity/Identities: Unfinished Business* (Miller 2012), shows how much interesting research has already been carried out on this topic. It also points out the policy implications of a variety of projects touching on the issue of *European identity*. The report emphasizes that, on the one hand, “much of what is having the most positive effects upon the growth of an identification with Europe or the EU for the majority of the population – football and other popular sports, pop music (including Eurovision), relationships with someone from far away – is beyond the EU's immediate control. On the other hand, in some areas where the EU could make a difference, it may already have implemented the policies that will be most effective” (Miller: 37). Perhaps this could be read as suggesting that research should not be expected to solve the problems of European integration.

Instead of looking to history for solutions to the “crisis of Europe” (including *European identity*), a possible aim of future research could be to find better ways of writing and teaching European history as a history with which more people can identify. This does not mean including an ever

⁷ Georges Corm's *L'Europe et le mythe de l'Occident: La construction d'une histoire* (2009) specifically focusing on the Middle East and critical of the West-Eurocentrism, though perhaps too obviously political in its intentions, speaks to the same issue.

increasing number of national histories, but *shifting the center* and telling the story from different perspectives and starting points (How does European history look when it is presented from Bulgaria or Scandinavia? Or when it is seen through the eyes of a wandering minority?)

A consistently inclusive history, both vis-à-vis Europe's internal others (new immigrants) and the outside world, would show how Europe and the world around it have been mutually influencing and learning from each other. In the process, the Enlightenment concept of progress with its belief in spreading (Western) European civilization from the most advanced nations to the rest would be left behind. Indeed, when comparative history does not start from the assumption that the previously neglected histories should follow similar paths as the better-known examples of Western Europe, it can greatly help strengthen the feeling of a shared past.

Future research might take into account the relevance of education and reflect on how to write history textbooks that would foster an understanding of European history as something in which a student is interested, with which she can identify, of which he can be proud – not because dark periods and conflicts in European past have been left out from history textbooks, but because of how Europeans have been able to deal with them and learn from them.

References

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2013. From Pilgrim to Tourist – or a Short History of Identity, in Hall, Stuart, and du Gay, Paul, eds. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 18–36.

Blockmans, Wim. 1997. *A History of Power in Europe. Peoples. Markets. States*. Antwerps: Fonds Mercator.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Cooper, Frederick. 2000. Beyond "Identity", *Theory and Society* 29, 1–47.

Carbonell, Charles-Olivier. 1999. *Une histoire européenne de l'Europe: d'une Renaissance à l'autre? (XVe-XXe siècle)*. Toulouse: Privat.

Cook, Chris, and Stevenson, John. 2003. *The Longman Handbook of Twentieth-Century Europe*, London-New York: Pearson/Longman.

Corm, Georges. 2009. *L'Europe et le mythe de l'Occident: La construction d'une histoire*. Paris: La Découverte.

Council Decision of 3 December 2013 establishing the specific programme implementing Horizon 2020 – the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014–2020) and repealing Decisions 2006/971/EC, 2006/972/EC, 2006/973/EC, 2006/974/EC and 2006/975/EC, *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 347/965, 20.12.2013.

Dakhli, Jocelyne and Vincent, Bernard eds. 2011. *Les musulmans dans l'histoire de l'Europe I: Une intégration invisible*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Davies, Norman. 1996. *Europe: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, Norman. 2007. *Europe East and West*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Delouche, Frédéric, Aldebert, Jacques et al. 1992. *Histoire de l'Europe*, Paris: Hachette.

Dukes, Paul. 2004. *Paths to a New Europe: From Pre-modern to postmodern times*. Houndmills: Basingstoke.

Hall, Stuart. 2013. Who Needs Identity? In Hall, Stuart, and du Gay, Paul, eds. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 1-17.

Horizon 2020 – Work Programme 2014-2015. Europe in a changing world: inclusive, innovative and reflective societies.

Hunt, Margaret. 2010. *Women in Eighteenth Century Europe*. Harlow: Pearson.

Pomian, Krzysztof. 2009. European identity: Historical fact and political problem, *Eurozine*, 24.8.2009. <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2009-08-24-pomian-en.html>
[First published “De Europese identiteit : een historisch feit en een politiek probleem” in L. Ornstein and L. Breemer (eds.), *Paleis Europa. Grote denkers over Europa*, as, De Bezige Bij: Amsterdam 2007, 29-54].

Recchi, Ettore. 2014. Pathways to European identity formation: a tale of two models. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 27/2, 119-133.

Schmale, Wolfgang. 2007. A History of European Identity. *Eurotopics*. Published 31/12/2007. http://www.eurotopics.net/en/home/presseschau/archiv/magazin/geschichte-verteilerseite-neu/europaeische_nationalgeschichten_2008_05/apuz_schmale_eu_identiaet/1

Miller, Robert. 2012. *The Development of European Identity/Identities: Unfinished Business. A Policy Review*. Directorate-General for Research and Innovation.

Wintle, Michael. 2013. The History of the Idea of Europe: Where are We Now? *Perspectives on Europe* 43/ 1, pp. 8-12. https://councilforeuropeanstudies.org/files/Perspectives/Spring2013/s3_Wintle.pdf

Discussion

Addressing the distinction between essentialist and constructivist approaches to identity, sociologist Patrick O'Mahony (University College Cork, Ireland) suggested that some popular versions of European identity are little more than folk paradigms. Though the essentialist description of identity is “consistent with the dominant narrative”, he asserted, “a European background culture cannot be envisaged for many reasons”. Interpreting Jitka Maleckova's arguments in positive terms, Patrick O'Mahony perceived an aspiration to cultivate “fully inclusive discursive co-responsibility for shaping a defensible European identity”. This, he surmised, would depend on the creation of a European public sphere that is both inclusive and democratic, one capable of mediating between commercially driven European popular culture on the one hand and technocratic normative culture on the other. Ascertaining “how to assist the formation of European publics must be an imperative goal of European research”, he suggested.

Conclusions of Round Table

The problematic nature of efforts to accurately describe and positively shape European identity was reflected in the round table session devoted to this thematic thread of the workshop.

The chair summarized the round-table discussions on identity as follows:

Research on European identity is a shared ground on which civilizational/historical, normative/philosophical and descriptive/sociological-anthropological studies converge. These three broad approaches must be acknowledged as separate perspectives on the issue, none of which must prevail on the others. They must be rather viewed as complementary. In particular, in the latter realm, the sociological one, which focuses more on 'identification' (of the population or specific social groups or categories) than 'identity', there is a need to overcome the latent tension between 'culturalist' and 'structuralist' explanations, assuming that they are not mutually exclusive. 'Socialization/exposure' to European symbols and discourse as well as 'significant cross-border activities' are both relevant to foster identification with Europe. Further research should indeed be targeted to assessing the relative explanatory power of the two, as distinct but converging pathways to European identity formation.

Starting from these premises, participants in the roundtable raised the following issues and potential research goals:

- How does Europe's identity differ from Europeans' identity? In particular, the image of Europe from outside can feed back on Europe's self-image and Europeans' self-perception as a collective. Examples of this are the widespread mistrust of Europe as former colonizer in Africa and, on the contrary, the hopefulness of Ukrainians aspiring to their country's association with the EU;
- How do EU policies affect European identity? Under which conditions they reinforce identification or, reversely, when and why do they backlash? In other words, what are the 'identity externalities' of EU policy-making? Examples of likely significant policies are the Cohesion funds, the CAP, but also maybe the ESM and the troika actions in debt-ridden member states;
- How is European identity related to feelings of insecurity or, even, fears that have particularly spread with the euro-crisis? It has been argued that much of the nation-states historical legitimacy has been garnered through welfare state provisions. Would the Europeanization of social policies enhance European identity? Macro- and micro-level studies could be envisaged to tackle this issue;
- European identity has been proved to be compatible with national and local identities – as 'marble-cake' or 'matryoshka' nested identities. However, confrontational discourses on nation versus Europe are increasingly popular. They show up not only in the political realm, as an effect of the success of Eurosceptic political parties, but also in less visible domains. For instance, a roundtable participant with an expertise in copyright highlighted the on-going resistance of national legal traditions to harmonization. Do these apparently apolitical stances end up thwarting European identity?



Key insights gained through the workshop

- **The participatory potential of historical heritage research is underestimated; implemented properly, it can play an integrationist role in Europe and contribute to Europeanization.**
- **“European historical heritage” would be a useful overarching term to cover inter-related areas of research on history, cultural heritage and identity.**
- **Within the research community there is strong support for a reinforced anthropological perspective in research and for community involvement. This perspective can be useful for studying identification patterns and forming new cultural heritage communities and management models. It is also relevant for organising historical research (including archaeological excavations) with local community involvement.**
- **European diversity discourse – both in public and political spheres – is fixated on the present. European-funded research offers an opportunity to reinforce a more historical perspective on diversity.**

Workshop Agenda



HORIZON 2020 Workshop

Bridge over troubled waters?

The link between European historical heritage and the future of European integration

Insights from the social sciences and humanities research on Reflective Societies

17 October 2014

**Aula Marconi, CNR,
Piazzale Aldo Moro 7, Roma**

Organised by the Reflective Societies Unit of the European Commission's DG Research and Innovation in cooperation with FLASH-IT and APRE

8.30 – 09.00 Registration/Welcome coffee

09.00 – 09.15 Welcome by Host

Prof. Riccardo Pozzo, Director, National Research Council of Italy (CNR) - Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Cultural Heritage: Social innovation, Cultural innovation

09.15 – 09.55 Welcome by Organisers

Introduction to the Workshop and objectives – Stocktaking of EU funded activities – Zoltán Krasznai, Reflective Societies Unit, DG Research and Innovation, European Commission

Facilitating access to socio-economic research – FLASH-IT project – Natalia Morazzo, Agency for the Promotion of European Research (APRE)

09.55 – 10.45 Panel 1 “History”

09.55 – 10.15 Keynote speech – François Hartog, EHESS, France

10.15 – 10.25 Discussant – Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, Department of Archeology, University of Cambridge, CRIC “Identity and conflict. Cultural heritage and the reconstruction of identities after conflict” project coordinator

10.25 – 10.50 Q&A / Comments

10.50 – 11.10 Coffee Break

11.10 – 12.05 Panel 2 “Cultural heritage”

11.10 – 11.30 Keynote speech – Gábor Sonkoly, ELTE, Hungary

11.30 – 11.40 Discussant – Luca Basso Peressut, Politecnico di Milano, MeLa “*European museums in an age of migrations*” project coordinator

11.40 – 12.05 Q&A / Comments

12.05 – 13.00 Panel 3 “Identity”

12.05 – 12.25 Keynote speech – Jitka Maleckova, CERGE-EI, Czech Republic

12.25 – 12.35 Discussant – Patrick O’Mahony, UCC, Ireland

12.35 – 13.00 Q&A / Comments

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch Break

14.00 – 16.00 World café sessions

Round table on History

Host: José Civantos, Granada University, MEMOLA “Mediterranean Mountainous Landscapes” project coordinator

Round table on Cultural Heritage

Host: Neil Forbes, Coventry University, RICHES “Renewal, Innovation and Change: Heritage and European Society” project coordinator

Round table on Identity

Host: Ettore Recchi, University ‘G. D’Annunzio’ of Chieti-Pescara, EUCROSS “Crossing borders, making Europe” project coordinator

16.00 – 16.30 Summarising the results of the Round tables

Speakers: Hosts of the 3 Round Tables

16.30 – 17.00 Wrap-up (Terry Martin) & Next steps (Zoltán Krasznai)

List of participants

Surname	Name	Organisation	Round Table
Alferi	Luca	Sapienza Università di Roma	History
Andina	Tiziana	Università di Torino	Identity
Antonucci	Micaela	Università di Bologna	Cultural heritage
Basso Peressut	Luca	Politecnico di Milano	Cultural heritage - speaker
Bertoni	Aura	Bocconi University	Cultural heritage
Campofredano	Anna		
Caradonna	Marta	CNR - ILIESI	
Carli	Maddalena	Università di Teramo	
Cerquetti	Mara	Università di Macerata	Cultural heritage
Chiodi	Sillia	CNR	Cultural Heritage
Civantos	José	Granada University	History - host
Colella	Silvana	University of Macerata	Cultural heritage
Conti	Cesare	Università La Sapienza Roma	
Curtis	Catherine	Trinity College	
Curulli	Antonella	CNR - ISMN	Cultural heritage
De Caro	Stefano	ICCRUM	Cultural heritage
De Martin Pinter	Albina	Università degli studi di Udine	Cultural heritage
Di Bella	Daniela	Regione Lazio	Cultural Heritage
Di Gangirolamo	Gianluigi	University of Bologna	Cultural heritage
Escande	Aubery	EUROPEANA	History
Forbes	Neil	Coventry University	Cultural heritage - host
Gera	Calogero	ISPRA	History
Giuliani	Stefano	Geo4Map	Cultural heritage
Hartog	Francois	EHESS	History - speaker
Kirk	Tim	Newcastle University	History
Krasznoi	Zoltan	European Commission	Cultural heritage

Surname	Name	Organisation	Round Table
Lacagnina	Maria Cristina	Ministero dei Beni Culturali - MIBAC	Cultural heritage
Lagdaf	Souadou	Università di Catania	
Lana	Maurizio	Università del Piemonte Orientale	
Longo	Monique	APRE	Identity
Lorenzetti	Edoardo	CNR - CERIS	Cultural heritage
Maffia	Elena	APRE	Cultural heritage
Maggiolino	Mariateresa	Bocconi - Dip. studi giuridici	Cultural heritage
Magnelli	Adele	ETT Srl - Sede Roma	Cultural heritage
Maleckova	Jitka	CERGE-EI	Identity - speaker
Maroccia	Zaira	Istituto Superiore di Sanità	Identity
Martello	Sara	MIC - Marconi Institute for Creativity	Cultural heritage
Martin	Terry	SPIA	Cultural heritage
Massari	Elisa		Identity
Milano	Monica		Identity
Morazzo	Natalia	APRE	Cultural heritage
Moroni	Alice	Sapienza Università di Roma	Cultural heritage
Nilsson	Karin	The Uppakra Foundation	Cultural heritage
Nucifora	Melania	Università di Catania	History
Padeletti	Giuseppina	CNR/ISMN	Cultural heritage
Paternò	Maria Pia		Identity
Perani	Tomaso	Università di Milano - Servizi per la Ricerca	History
Petrosino	Silvia	Zètema Progetto Cultura s.r.l. - Progetti europei	Cultural heritage

Surname	Name	Organisation	Round Table
Pichillo	Giancarlo	Università degli Studi di Siena e di Teramo	Identity
Pierotti	Claudia	Promoter Srl	Cultural heritage
Piovene Porto Godi	Alessandra	Università degli studi di Padova	Cultural heritage
Porffrion	Helen	ICVBC	
Pucci	Marina	CNR	Cultural heritage
Raccanelli	Renata		Cultural heritage
Ramini	Fabrizio		Cultural heritage
Rampioni	Patrizia	Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna	Identity
Recchi	Ettore	University G. D'Annunzio of Chieti-Pescara	Identity - host
Ribichini	Sergio	Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico	Identity
Rosano	Claudia		Cultural heritage
Rossetti	Chiara	Fondazione Ugo Bordini	Cultural heritage
Rossi	Lidia	Redinn	Cultural heritage
Rubera	Giorgia	CNR ISMA	Cultural heritage
Rusconi	Maddalena	Compagnia di San Paolo Sistema Torino	History
Russo	Monica		Identity
Salerno	Daniele	University of Bologna	Cultural heritage
Sánchez	Alberte		Cultural heritage
Sangalli	Laura Ester	Università degli Studi di Milano_Divisione ricerca	Cultural heritage
Sonkoly	Gabor	ELTE	Cultural heritage - speaker
Spina	Maria		Cultural heritage
Sorensen	Marie Louise S.	University of Cambridge	History - speaker
Tucci	Walter	Cliomedia Officina sas	Identity

Surname	Name	Organisation	Round Table
Varriale	Teresa		Identity
Vitiello	Daniela	LUISS Guido Carli	Cultural heritage
Zanella	Francesca	Università di Parma	Cultural heritage

Thematically relevant EU-funded research projects

(funded under the 7th Framework Programme for Research)

Research on identities and citizenship:

[beEUcitizen](#) – All Rights Reserved? Constraints and Contradictions of European Citizenship

[EUCROSS](#) – The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross- Border Practices and Transnational Identities

[MYPLACE](#) – Memory, Youth and Political Legacy and Civic Engagement

[ENACT](#) – Enacting European Citizenship

Research on museums and cultural heritage

[CRIC](#) – Identity and conflict. Cultural heritage and the reconstruction of identities after conflict

[EUNAMUS](#) – European national museums: identity politics, the uses of the past and the European citizen

[MELA](#) – European Museums in an age of migrations

[RICHES](#) – Renewal, Innovation & Change: Heritage and European Society

[MEMOLA](#) – Mediterranean Mountainous Landscapes: an historical approach to cultural heritage based on traditional agrosystems

Research on history

(In the framework of ERA-NETs – EU co-funded cooperation between national research funders)

[HERA JRP \(2009-2013\)](#) – Humanities as a Source of Creativity and Innovation and Cultural Dynamics: Inheritance and Identity

[HERA JRP CE \(2012 –2016\)](#) – Cultural Encounters

Brief description of Flash-IT

FLASH-IT (Facilitating Access to Socio-economic Research through Information and Communications Technologies) is a dissemination project funded under the 7th Framework Programme of the European Union. It supports evidence-based policy-making connected to Europe 2020 priorities through effective dissemination of results emerging from EU-funded SSH research projects.

FLASH-IT facilitates the uptake of policy-relevant results produced by EU-funded research through a variety of tools and activities:

- FLASH-IT Publications - Policy Snapshots and Policy Research Alerts - offer valuable insights on European Union policy priorities and how they relate to Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities research;
- ICT Platform: An innovative website featuring an interactive database giving access to selected research results of more than 100 EU-funded SSH project;
- Policy-dialogue Workshops: bringing together different stakeholders at one table and providing opportunities for dialogue and networking among multiple target groups (Researchers, Policy-makers, Industry and Civil Society Organisations and the Media).



European Commission

EUR 27159 - Bridge over troubled waters? - The link between European historical heritage and the future of European integration

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2015 — 37 pp. — 17,6 x 25 cm

ISBN 978-92-79-46908-4

doi 10.2777/534076

ISSN 1831-9424

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- one copy:
via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or
calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

Priced subscriptions:

- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union
(http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm).

What Europeans are we? What makes us Europeans? Sure, history played a crucial role in European integration. The integration process initially evolved around a strong cultural, history-centred element that was based on real and cultural memories, historical interpretations of Europe's past and, most saliently, the two World Wars and the Cold War. In some way, what makes us Europeans is our heritage of war surmounted by peace. This has been symbolically recognised by the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union in 2012.

However, being European is also being able to live in diversity and engage into demanding intercultural exchanges and sustainable compromises that respect diversity, belonging to various communities or places but also enhance dialogue and understanding. The European cultural heritage is a nexus for our capacity to be and become Europeans.

The European Commission's DG Research and Innovation, in cooperation with the FLASH-IT FP7 dissemination project and APRE, organised in October 2014 a successful workshop on history, cultural heritage and identities.

The workshop formulated policy recommendations on how to make Europe a desire for being together rather than a burden to share and stated strongly that the participatory potential of historical heritage research, although still underestimated, should play an integrationist role in Europe and contribute to Europeanisation.

Studies and reports

