

BRIDGING THE COMPETING VIEWS OF EUROPEAN CULTURAL INTEGRATION: THE TRANSFORMATIVE VIEW OF CULTURE AS A MEANS TO PROMOTE GROWTH, EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL COHESION

María Luz SUÁREZ CASTIÑEIRA*

Abstract

The concept of a European culture became very complex with the enlargement of 2004 towards the East, when the EU, as Delanty pointed out, moved “beyond postnationality to an encounter with multiple civilizational forms,” multiple histories and competing visions of European integration. The “unity-in-diversity” paradigm turned into a huge challenge for the European institutions. On the one hand, achieving a European image of cultural unity without excluding all the local, regional and national cultures is a very complex, if not impossible, task. On the other hand, culture remains an ambiguous term in European institutions due to the lack of a full-fledged European cultural policy. This paper focuses first on how in the early 1970s the EC/EU started to be concerned with defining the role of culture, and second on how since the year 2000 culture has progressively acquired a new status with potentially transformative powers to bridge the competing views of cultural integration. Programmes, such as the “2014-2020 Creative Europe” programme, focus on culture as a creative accelerator and promotor of different forms of cultural participation and production. Culture generates “smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, and contributes to “high employment, high productivity, and high social cohesion.”

Keywords: *Employment, European Culture, European identity, European integration, Unity-in-diversity paradigm.*

1. Introduction

Abundant research has been carried out on the complex relationship between culture and European integration¹. The concept of European integration itself carries multiple competing meanings,² depending on the theoretical perspective applied to it (federalism versus intergovernmentalism, functionalism versus constructivism, etc.). When the adjective cultural is added to European integration, the latter becomes highly controversial, as it deals with the societal level³.

With successive enlargements, the cultural factor was seen as an essential tool to bring the European project closer to the citizens, an instrument capable of creating a sense of belonging to the EU. However, there are multiple meanings of culture. Apart from culture defined as a normative model focusing on universal norms of democracy, freedom and human rights, culture can also be understood as communication⁴, i.e. what we communicate through language and symbols

whose meanings are learned and inherited from one generation to the other. With the process of enlargement, the EU is faced with with a multiplicity of meanings and symbols that are communicated in multiple ways. Furtehr, culture can refer to social behavior as social relations⁵. Culture understood a social construction would entail the construction of a new order on the basis of a new vision of European society. The problem is that there are multiple visions of European society and this explains the ambiguity of the concept of culture in EC/EU documents from the 1970s onwards.

In this paper we will demonstrate that there is another dimension of culture which has been the target of a number of supranational initiatives. This dimension is the area of cultural or artistic production, the cultural sector, defined by the European Commission in 1977 as “the socio-economic whole formed by persons and undertakings dedicated to the production and distribution of cultural goods and services⁶”. We will see how the EC/EU institutions

* Associate Professor, PhD, Deusto University, Bilbao (e-mail: mariluz.suarez@deusto.es)

¹ Delanty, “Integration through Culture? The Paradox of the Search for a European Identity,” in *European Citizenship: National Legacies and Transnational Projects*, ed. Klaus Eder & Bernhard Giesen (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001).

² Thomas Diez indicates that there is a number of competing meanings of integration, due to the “proliferation of names, and conceptualizations of what the name ‘EU’ means.” Thomas Diez, “Speaking ‘Europe’: The Politics of Integration Discourse”, In *The Social Construction of Europe*, ed. Thomas Christiansen, Knud Erik Jørgensen and Antje Wiener (London, Sage, 2001), p. 289; see also Thomas Diez, “Europe as a Discursive Battleground: Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies”. *Cooperation and Conflict* no. 36 (1), pp. 5-38. Interesting is also Vogt’s idea according to which “different conceptualizations of European integration find support only through the national domain of discourse. Support for the integration process is formulated in terms of advancing the national interest and not in European categories of thought”. Carlos R. Vogt, “Reconsidering the Normative Implications of European Integration: Questioning the Optimism about Post-National Communities in Critical International Theory. Conference Paper, Danish Network on Political Theory, Aarhus, May 22-24, 2003, p. 13.

³G. Delanty, “Social Integration and Europeanization: The Myth of Cultural Cohesion,” in *Europeanization: Institutions, Identities and Citizenship*, ed. Robert Harmsen and Thomas M. Wilson (Amsterdam, Atlanta, 2000).

⁴ G. Delanty, “Integration through culture”, pp. 76-86.

⁵ See Clifford Geertz, *Interpretations of Culture* (New York, Basic Books, 1973).

⁶ “Community action in the cultural sector”, Commission Communication to the Council, Bull. EC, supplement 6/77, 1977, p. 5.

have evolved in their approach to culture from an application of the EC Treaty to the cultural sector to culture as a creative accelerator; culture as capable to promote “smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, and contribute to “high employment, high productivity, and high social cohesion”, in an effort to build a cultural space including the local, the regional and the national dimensions.

2. A cultural space in the making

2.1. Pre-Maastricht initiatives

Member States have traditionally been reticent to the intervention of the Community in cultural affairs, which explains the lack of a clear European cultural policy. The EC/EU had to wait until 1992 to introduce the so called article on culture in the Treaty of Maastricht, now article 167 of the TFEU⁷, allowing the development of cultural action at supranational level.

Before that, however, increasing awareness that the economic, social and political goals were not sufficient basis for the creation of a European Polity led the institutions to publish resolutions and declarations about the potential of culture to unite people, as well as to promote social and economic development. In 1973, at the Copenhagen Summit, the European Council approved a declaration on European identity, defined as “the diversity of cultures within the framework of a common European civilization, the attachment to common values and principles, the increasing convergence of attitudes to life, the awareness of having specific interests in common and the determination to take part in the construction of a United Europe.” Democracy, the rule of law, social justice, respect for human rights, and the wish to participate in world affairs were other principles included in the definition of European identity⁸.

In 1974, the European Parliament, in an effort to materialize the Unity-in-diversity paradigm, adopted a broad resolution⁹ for the protection of Europe’s cultural heritage, including other areas of action such as harmonization of copyright legislation and in the field of tax laws relating to culture. It also advanced action in the fight against theft and illicit trafficking of works of art. A year later, in 1975 Leo Tindemans’ Report on the European Union¹⁰ encouraged greater Community involvement in people’s everyday life. Statements reflected the self-imposed distance from culture and the awareness of the difficulty to achieve a balance

between the objectives deriving from the application of the EEC Treaty and those relating to the protection of national heritage. As the member States resented the Institutions’ involvement in matters of culture, the Commission limited the scope of their involvement in culture to “the socio-economic whole formed by persons and undertakings dedicated to the production and distribution of cultural goods and services”, the objective being to create “a more propitious economic and social environment in support of cultural activities at the European level¹¹.”

In 1976 and 1979 the Commission formally submitted proposals¹² for the treatment of culture at the invitation of the European Parliament. In January 1976 the European Commission submitted a document articulating the need for coordination of cultural activities, and at the end of 1977 it published a communication insisting on the Community’s economic and social responsibilities towards the cultural sector as a socio-economic whole, facilitating the free movement of cultural goods and the improvement of the living and working conditions of cultural operators. The activities on heritage protection were also justified on an economic basis, culture being a great potential capable of generating economic activity in fields such as tourism, art publishing, monument maintenance and scientific research. As for cultural exchanges a “natural area” to the Community’s action, they were legally justified on the basis of the last objective set in Article 2 of the EEC Treaty, which is to “quicken the will to unite the nations of Europe¹³.” The Unity-in-diversity paradigm was seen as fundamental for integration, and the concept of national heritage gradually transformed into a new concept of “Community heritage,” expanding to new domains.

In 1983 the Heads of State signed a Solemn Declaration on the EU¹⁴, encouraging the ministers of culture to promote cultural cooperation in the areas of cultural heritage, as well as cooperation between artists and writers from the Member States. The Declaration called for the integration of cultural activities within the framework of cooperation with third countries. For the first time, the audio-visual media was particularly stressed, and the possibility of introducing some kind of legal framework was envisaged. The Council discussed more and more cultural related issues and the Ministers of culture affairs adopted a series of resolutions within the Council in order to support ad hoc cultural and artistic actions. This context

⁷ Art. 128 TEC, until 1999, and Art. 151 EC from 1999 to 2009.

⁸ See Declaration on European Identity, Bull EC no. 12, 1973.

⁹ See Resolution of the European Parliament of 13 May 1974 on measures to protect the European Cultural heritage, OJ C79, 5/4/1976.

¹⁰ Leo. Tindemans, “Report on the European Union”, Bull EC, supplement 1/1976

¹¹ “Community action in the cultural sector”, Commission communication to the Council, Bull EC, 1977, supplements 6/77.

¹² Resolution of the European Parliament of 8 March 1976 on *Community action in the cultural sector*, OJ C79, 5/4/1976; Resolution of the European Parliament of 18 January 1979 on *literary translation in the Community*, OJ C 39, 12/2/1996.

¹³ “Stronger Community action in the Cultural Sector” Commission communication to the Parliament and Council, Bull EC, 1982, supplement 6/82.

¹⁴ SOLEMN DECLARATION ON EUROPEAN UNION European Council Stuttgart 19 June 1983 Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 6/1983. http://aei.pitt.edu/1788/1/stuttgart_declaration_1983.pdf

favourable to culture finally led to the creation of the European Council of Culture.

In spite of the previous efforts, the 1984 European Parliament elections stressed a weak public attachment to the political project. This lack of public support led to the 1985 Adonino Report for a People's Europe suggesting symbolic measures such as the promotion of European sport competitions and literary awards, the creation of a European Youth Orchestra, the selection of an emblem and flag, the organisation of a Euro-lottery and circulation of stamps with designs inspired by the Community. The launch of programmes in education and the establishment of a common audio-visual area with a European multilingual television channel were also suggested.¹⁵

The Single European Act did not assign any cultural powers to the Community, but the Commission published *A fresh boost for culture in the European Community*¹⁶, in an effort to convince the Member States that Community cultural activity was necessary both politically and economically in order to complete the market by 1992 and to progress from a people's Europe to EU. Whereas the Commission stressed the European construction through unity of European culture as shown by the history of regional and national diversity, the Parliament focused on diversity and on the efforts needed to move toward the creation of a European Culture or a culture of cultures¹⁷.

From 1984 to 1986 the European Council adopted a number of resolutions including piracy fighting, European films distribution, audio-visual products treatment, the establishment of the European cultural capital, networking of libraries, youth participation in cultural activities, the creation of international cultural itineraries, protection and conservation of heritage, and the promotion of literary works translation. 1987 saw another important advance: the European ministers of culture officially established the Council of Ministers of Culture and the ad hoc Commission for Cultural Issues, and the European Parliament adopted another important document, "Initiating cultural activities in the EC"¹⁸.

2.2. Post-Maastricht initiatives

In 1992, the Treaty of Maastricht introduced the so-called "culture article", which brought culture fully into the action scope of the EC/EU. It is the first real attempt at defining common cultural policy, though it does not aim at any harmonization of the cultural identities of the Member States, one of the main objectives being the protection of national and regional diversity. It has become Article 167 of the TFEU and is formulated in the following way:

1. The Union shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.
2. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas:
 - improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples,
 - conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance, — non-commercial cultural exchanges,
 - artistic and literary creation, including in the audiovisual sector.
3. The Union and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the sphere of culture, in particular the Council of Europe.
4. The Union shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of the Treaties, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures.
5. In order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article:
 - the European Parliament and the Council acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure and after consulting the Committee of the Regions, shall adopt incentive measures, excluding any harmonization of the laws and regulations of the Member States,
 - the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt recommendations¹⁹.

It is worth stressing that this Article stated that the Community should take cultural aspects into account in all its actions under other provisions of the Treaty, and that all decisions about culture should be adopted unanimously. It is also the only Article of the Treaty that explicitly refers to the audio visual sector as part of the artistic and creative arts in general, the plurality of which is to be safeguarded with a view to protect the Members States' democratic, social and cultural needs.

There was a positive response to the inclusion of this article on culture. It encouraged the Commission in 1996 to publish a document presenting all existing instruments and activities of the Community in the field of culture; it benefitted cultural networks and professional organizations as well as cultural communities, and contributed to the promotion of cultural cooperation. Moreover, the fact that culture

¹⁵ See Second P. Adonino Report for a People's Europe, Bull. EC (1985), Supplement 7/85.

¹⁶ European Commission, *A fresh boost for culture in the European Community*. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/cee0214a-9caa-406f-a399-fd540b7793ac/language-en>

¹⁷ See Resolution of the European Parliament of 17 Feb 1989 on a fresh boost for Community action in the cultural sector, OJ C69, 20/3/1989.

¹⁸ Initiating cultural activities in the EC, Adopted by the European Parliament on 17 November 1989.

¹⁹ Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=FR>

should play a role not only in the context of EC policy itself but also in society in general increasingly engaged legal and economic experts in cultural activities.

In the years following 1992 a number of papers and studies analyzed the importance of the inclusion of Article on culture in the Maastricht Treaty²⁰. The cultural sector was becoming increasingly important, as the new international reality was favouring a new economy based on intense trade of cultural goods and services, though some scholars like Niedobitek²¹ or Schlinder²² insist that, on the one hand a clear definition of culture is still lacking, and on the other that the practice of the EU institutions is still far from meeting the needs of European citizens, particularly those of the workers of the cultural sector.

In the year 2000, Ruffolo Report on cultural cooperation²³ came at a key moment in the debates about the role of culture and cultural policies in the EU after the inclusion of the Article on culture in the Maastricht Treaty. He defended a movement beyond economic interests toward a clear political goal, i.e he supported a cultural policy model that would give all Member States the same equal opportunities for the promotion of cultural diversity. The unity-in-diversity paradigm was stressed as a tool for cohesion rather than a ground for division.

In spite of all the debates on culture at different levels, the 2005 Constitutional Treaty proposal, though it did not add any radical changes to the treatment on culture, was rejected by two of the founding members, France and the Netherlands. It was obvious that the EU was not ready to become a real Union. The Draft Constitution actually made clear the Member States' willingness that Culture should remain only marginally present in the EU Treaty and the *acquis communautaire*.

2. Cultural cooperation and the economy sector

As seen before, the Maastricht Treaty represented a real attempt to define the role of culture in the process of European integration. Nevertheless it was not able to generate a real European cultural policy. But the institutions elaborated strategies to provide cultural institutions and cultural operators throughout Europe

with financial resources for projects aimed at fostering creativity and promoting dissemination of cultural content throughout Europe. Cultural cooperation at European level between Member States was becoming strategic, and to this end the European Commission's Directorate General Education, Audiovisual and Culture (DG EAC) elaborated support instruments. The will to give access to and enable participation of a greater number of citizens in cultural activities led the Council and the Commission to support the creation of major cultural networks and cultural events on a large scale.

The first large-scale cultural projects supported by European funding to give concrete visibility to the contents of the article on culture in the Maastricht Treaty were adopted between 1996 and 1999: Kaleidoscope²⁴, Ariane²⁵ and Raphaël,²⁶ all three concentrating on tangible aspects of culture. With a total budget of ECU 36.7 million, Kaleidoscope was designed to promote awareness and dissemination of European culture, particularly in the fields of the performing arts, visual arts and applied arts. This project included important actions such as support of events and cultural projects carried out in partnership or through network: large-scale cooperation actions involving third countries; the European city of culture and European cultural month; and actions aiming at improving cultural cooperation between professionals in the cultural sector. Ariane aimed at increasing knowledge and dissemination of literary works and European history, as well as improving the citizens' access to these. With a total budget of ECU 11.3 million, it included funding support for the following actions: translation of literary works, cooperative projects, on-going training for professionals, particularly translators, and European literary and translation prizes. Raphael, with a budget of ECU 30 million, concentrated on European cultural heritage protection, comprising events and dissemination initiatives of a European dimension in favour of the preservation and increased awareness of a European cultural heritage, cooperation in developing thematic networks between European museums, further training and mobility of professionals in the field of European cultural heritage preservation, cooperation in research, preservation and enhancement of decorated facades in Europe, and cooperation proposals to study, preserve

²⁰ See for example Kaufman and Raunig's detailed analysis of the Culture Article. T. Kaufman and G. Raunig, *Anticipating European cultural policies* (European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policy, Vienna, 2002).

²¹ M. Niedobitek, *The cultural dimension in EC law* (Kluwer Law International, New York, 1997).

²² Jörg M. Schlinder, *Culture, Politics and Europe: en route to Culture-Related Impact Assessment*, 2012, p.2, [http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/222/en/Culture_Politics_and_Europe\(1\).pdf](http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/222/en/Culture_Politics_and_Europe(1).pdf).

²³ See Report: on cultural cooperation in the European Union (2000/2323(INI)), Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, Rapporteur: Giorgio Ruffolo,

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?jsessionid=730677AFCB8F09FE473261E87C97DFD2.node2?language=EN&pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A5-2001-0281+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>.

²⁴ Decision 719/96/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 29 March 1996 establishing a programme to support artistic and cultural activities having a European dimension (Kaleidoscope), OJ L 99, 20/4/1996.

²⁵ Decision 2085/97/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 6 October 1997 establishing a programme of support, including translation, in the field of books and reading (Ariane), OJ L 291, 24/10/1997.

²⁶ Decision 2228/97/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 13 October 1997 establishing a Community action of support in the field of cultural heritage (the Raphael programme), OJ L 305, 8/11/1997.

and enhance the European pre-industrial heritage. Raphael “supported nearly 360 projects involving more than 1,500 operators from throughout Europe. European heritage laboratories were also supported²⁷.”

Apart from the cross-border element, i.e. the implication of operators and organizations from several Member States, other important eligibility criteria for all three projects included the innovative nature of the activities, their capacity to spread Member States’ cultures and the creation of economically sustainable cultural resources. The financial focus of these projects continued with the “Culture 2000” programme²⁸, which supported cooperation projects in all artistic and cultural sectors (performing arts, visual and plastic arts, literature, heritage, cultural history, etc) between cultural institutions in the EU states and accession candidates. With a budget of €236.5 million for a 5-year period, it aimed at promoting a common cultural area characterized by both cultural diversity and a common cultural heritage. In doing so, it also aimed at promoting social integration through arts. From 2000 to 2006, funding also addressed special cultural events with a European or international dimension.

After the “Culture 2000” programme, the “Culture 2007-2013” programme²⁹ represented a more coordinated approach to cultural cooperation. With a budget of € 400 million, it aimed at encouraging and supporting cultural cooperation at a European level with a view to encouraging the emergence of European citizenship. The programme mainly promoted “transnational mobility of cultural players, transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products and intercultural dialogue and exchanges³⁰,” and co-financing around 300 different cultural actions per year.

In the “Culture 2007-2013” programme, culture gained a significant role in an advanced, knowledge-based economy across the EU, particularly at regional and city levels. It meant not only is a new form to encourage the relationship between forms cultural production but also its relationship with the generation of economic value. The stress is laid not only on enhancing access of audiences to cultural products and experiences, but also on highlighting productive and entrepreneurial capacities in order to contribute to the macroeconomic level of activity.

3. Culture as a creative accelerator and promotor of new forms of experimentation and participation

Considered a new attempt at policy making³¹, the “2014-2020 Creative Europe” programme³² is economic in nature and supports supports the European cultural and creative sectors, becoming itself part of the goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy. Based on the concept of “cultural and creative industries”, the new programme is meant to foster “smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, and to contribute to “high employment, high productivity, and high social cohesion³³.”

Creative Europe includes ten wide-scale projects:³⁴ “Should I stay or should I go? - A collective storytelling project,” is a two-year interdisciplinary programme drawing together five theatre companies from Germany, Sweden, France, Austria and Slovenia to establish collective storytelling as a model of international cooperation and cultural exchange. The “European Citizen Campus” (EEC) aims at promoting student art projects carried out by 10 universities and student service organizations from six different countries. “The Uses of Art - on the legacy of 1848 and 1989” is a 5-year project aiming at developing a new European model for content-driven, sustainable collaboration in the field of museums. “Frontiers in Retreat”, co-organised by eight art organizations working across eight European countries, encourages a multidisciplinary approach with a view to broadening the understanding of global ecological changes and their local impacts on European natural environments. In the project “Visualize the Invisible” organizations aim at implementing participatory art projects in Sweden, Croatia, Albania and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Artists rely on different art techniques and forms to encourage co-operation with people in residential areas and places such as prisons and schools in order to provoke wider discussions on the role of arts in societal change. All participants, the artists and people they interact with, become part of an integrative artistic creative process. Another project within the “Creative Europe” programme is “LOCIS, an Artist-in-Residence Programme”³⁵ involving a rural local authority in Ireland, an arts centre in a large town in Poland and an arts organization in a suburb of a

²⁷ <http://cordis.europa.eu/ist/ka3/digicult/non-research-programmes.htm#raphael>

²⁸ Decision 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 Programme, OJ L 99, 3/4/2004.

²⁹ Decision No 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013), OJ L 372, 27.12.2006.

³⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/tools/culture-programme_en.htm

³¹ Cornelia Bruell, *ifa-Edition Culture and Foreign Policy Creative Europe 2014–2020 A new programme – a new cultural policy as well?*, Ifa, 2013, http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/edition/creative-europe_bruell.pdf

³² Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020) and repealing Decisions No 1718/2006/EC, No 1855/2006/EC and No 1041/2009/EC Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 221–237

³³ Cornelia Bruell, *op cit.* p. 13

³⁴ For more details see María Luz Suárez Castiñeira “The Role of Culture in the Construction of European Identity”, In *Democratic Legitimacy in the EU and Global Governance. Building a European Demos*, ed. Beatriz Pérez de las Heras (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 195-219.

³⁵ See <http://www.creativeeuropeireland.eu/culture/projects/case-studies/locis-european-artists-in-residence-programme>

capital city in Sweden. The project “CUNE Comics-in-Residence (CiR)” is an exchange programme for European comic artists. “Promoting Cultural Network SEE and connecting local projects in South-East Europe” aims at continuing and expanding the work of the project started in May 2012. The project “Outreach Europe” aims at encouraging social inclusion through cultural participation focused on researching the way museums, galleries and cultural institutions across Europe engage with an audience beyond the traditional means of outreach. Finally, “European Prospects” is a 24-month project involving collaboration between key arts organizations in Wales, Germany, Lithuania and France to create new platforms for photographers and lens-based artists from across Europe where they can produce and exhibit their work, articulating the idea of diversity of identity and experience in an enlarged EU.

These ten ongoing wide-scale projects-encourage the development of two main objectives: (a) to protect, develop and promote European cultural and linguistic diversity while promoting Europe's cultural heritage, and (b) to encourage the competitiveness of the European cultural and creative sectors, in particular of the audiovisual sector. In its turn, the Culture Sub-programme is based on a number of priorities such as (a) supporting actions providing cultural and creative actors with skills, competences and know-how with a view to strengthening the cultural and creative sectors, and actions aimed at encouraging adaptation to digital technologies, testing innovative approaches to audience development and testing new business and management models; (b) supporting actions encouraging cultural and creative players to cooperate internationally, where possible on the basis of long-term strategies, which in turn will contribute to internationalizing their careers and activities within the Union and beyond; and (c) providing support in order to strengthen European cultural and creative organizations and encourage international networking in order to facilitate access to professional opportunities.

These objectives also reveal that the “Creative Europe” programme, unlike previous programmes, is fundamentally economic in nature, though the definition of the regulation states that “cultural and creative sectors” means all sectors “whose activities are based on cultural values and/or artistic and creative expressions, whether these activities are market- or non-market oriented³⁶.” The promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue is still an important idea but now “culture” is seen as “a catalyser for creativity” which should lead to growth and employment. Even the language has changed: the former cultural sector is now called the “cultural and creative sector”. There is an emphasis on competitiveness, on growth, on artists as producers of

works which must be distributed as widely as possible, on international trade and increased revenues for the sector, and on reaching wider audiences in Europe and beyond.

Thus the Creative Europe programme is characterized by innovation that not only leads to an expansion of the demand possibilities, but also, and mainly, an expansion of the creative potentialities. Access to production technology entails an increase of the number of producers, making it difficult to distinguish between cultural producers and cultural consumers. Traditional cultural markets are gradually challenged by new “communities of practice where members interact on the basis of non market-mediated exchanges – a change that is made possible by the scale and speed of connectivity among players that is being made possible by online platforms.”³⁷

Apart from promoting new forms of cultural and creative exchange, and new forms of experimentation and of project design, as well as structural inter-dependences between the cultural and creative sectors and the economic and social ones, this new programme fosters other key dimensions such sustainability, social cohesion, new models of entrepreneurship, lifelong learning, soft power and local identity³⁸.

4. Conclusion

This paper has shown that despite the problematic nature of culture for European identity and European integration, significant steps have been taken to bring culture into the scope of the European institutions. Introduced at the Supra-national level in the early 1970s, culture achieved a turning point with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 with the introduction of the Article on Culture that enabled the institutions to address culture in two ways: first, through the application of the EEC Treaty rules to the cultural sector, and second through the implementation of a series of cultural actions, which, viewed through the unity-in-diversity paradigm, focused primarily on heritage protection and cultural interaction, encouraging support for architectural and archaeological preservation, conservation of works of art and artefacts, sponsorship of cultural activities and translation of books, educational projects developed by the EU in Central, Eastern and Southern Europe as well as the Balkans since the 1990s.

The financial focus of the promotion of culture, however, developed in the late 1990s with the first wide-scale programmes, “Kaleidoscope”, “Ariane” and “Raphael”, which and merged with the “Culture 2000”, a programme to support cooperation projects between cultural institutions in the EU states and accession candidates. From 2007 to 2013, the focus in cultural

³⁶ See Article 2 Definitions, p. 225

³⁷ EENC

³⁸ Pier Luigi Sacco, Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU2014-2020 structural funds programming. EENC paper, April 2011. <http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2577.pdf>

support was on fostering the development of a European citizenship, encouraging cross-border mobility of cultural operators and works of art as well as intercultural dialogue. Funding was also allocated to literary translation, culture festivals and cooperation projects with third countries. In the 2014–2020 “Creative Europe programme”, though the promotion of culture is still important, the emphasis is on culture

as a catalyst for creativity and culture’s potential for growth and employment within the 2020 strategy. Current developments show that the emphasis of the EU on cultural programmes is moving towards integrating the regions around the cities, and moving to new forms of non-market mediated exchanges where the cultural consumer and the cultural producer become blurred due to the development of high technology.

References

- Bruell, Cornelia. ifa-Edition Culture and Foreign Policy Creative Europe 2014–2020. A new programme – a new cultural policy as well?, Ifa, 2013, http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/edition/creative-europe_bruell.pdf
- Declaration of the European Identity (Copenhagen, 14 December 1973), http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/02798dc9-9c69-4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf
- European Commission. Communication, A fresh boost for culture in the European Community, <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/cee0214a-9caa-406f-a399-fd540b7793ac/language-en>
- European Commission. Communication to the Council, *Community action in the cultural sector*, Bulletin EC, supplement 6/77, 1977
- European Commission. Communication to the Parliament and Council, *Stronger Community action in the Cultural Sector*, Bulletin EC, 1982, supplement 6/82
- Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, *Cultural cooperation in the European Union* (2000/2323(INI)), Rapporteur: Giorgio Ruffolo, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?jsessionid=730677AFCB8F09FE473261E87C97DFD2.node2?language=EN&pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A5-2001-0281+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>
- Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=FR>
- Crawford, Smith, R. “Article 151: status quo or unexplored potential?” Paper given at Annual Congress of the Academy of European Law, 3 - 4 December, 2004
- Decision 719/96/EC, European Parliament and the Council of 29 March 1996 establishing a programme to support artistic and cultural activities having a European dimension (Kaleidoscope), OJ L 99, 20/4/1996
- Decision 2085/97/EC, European Parliament and the Council of 6 October 1997 establishing a programme of support, including translation, in the field of books and reading (Ariane), OJ L 291, 24/10/1997
- Decision 2228/97/EC, European Parliament and the Council of 13 October 1997 establishing a Community action of support in the field of cultural heritage (the Raphael programme), OJ L 305, 8/11/1997
- Decision 508/2000/EC, European Parliament and the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 Programme, OJ L 99, 3/4/2004
- Decision No 1855/2006/EC, European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013), OJ L 372, 27.12.2006
- Delanty, Gerard. “Integration through Culture? The Paradox of the Search for a European Identity,” In *European Citizenship: National Legacies and Transnational Projects*, eds. Klaus Eder & Bernhard Giesen, Oxford, Oxford: University Press, 2001
- Delanty, Gerard. “Social Integration and Europeanization: The Myth of Cultural Cohesion,” in *Europeanization: Institutions, Identities and Citizenship*, eds. Robert Harmsen & Thomas M. Wilson, Amsterdam, Atlanta, 2000
- Diez, Thomas. “Europe as a Discursive Battleground: Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies” in *Cooperation and Conflict*, no. 36, 2001
- Diez, Thomas. “Speaking ‘Europe’: The Politics of Integration Discourse,” in Thomas Christiansen, Knud Erik Jørgensen & Antje Wiener, Eds., *The Social Construction of Europe*, London: Sage, 2001
- European Parliament. Resolution of 13 May 1974 on measures to protect the European Cultural heritage, OJ C79, 5.4.1976, p. 6
- European Parliament. Resolution of 8 March 1976 on *Community action in the cultural sector*, OJ C79, 5.4.1976
- European Parliament. Resolution of 18 January 1979 on *literary translation in the Community*, OJ C 39, 12.2.1996
- European Parliament. Resolution of 17 Feb 1989 on *a fresh boost for Community action in the cultural sector*, OJC69, 20.3.1989, p. 180
- European Parliament. Regulation No. 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020), OJ L 347, 20.12.2013
- Geertz, Clifford. *Interpretations of Culture*, New York: Basic Book, 1973
- Kaufman, T. and G. Raunig, *Anticipating European cultural policies*, Vienna, European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policy, 2002
- Niedobitek M. *The cultural dimension in EC law*, New York: Kluwer Law International, 1997
- Second Adonino Report for a People’s Europe, Bulletin EC, Supplement 7/1985

-
- Schlinder, Jörg M. *Culture, Politics and Europe: en route to Culture-Related Impact Assessment*, 2012, [http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/222/en/Culture,_Politics_and_Europe\(1\).pdf](http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/222/en/Culture,_Politics_and_Europe(1).pdf)
 - SOLEMN DECLARATION ON EUROPEAN UNION in the European Council Stuttgart, 19 June 1983. Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 6/1983, http://aei.pitt.edu/1788/1/stuttgart_declaration_1983.pdf
 - Suárez Castiñeira, María Luz, “The Role of Culture in the Construction of European Identity”, In *Democratic Legitimacy in the EU and Global Governance. Building a European Demos*, ed. Beatriz Pérez de las Heras, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 195-219
 - Tindemans, L. “Report on the European Union”, Bulletin EC, supplement 1/1976
 - Vogt, Carlos R. “Reconsidering the Normative Implications of European Integration: Questioning the Optimism about Post-National Communities in Critical International Theory. Conference Paper, Danish Network on Political Theory, Aarhus, May 22-24, 2003