

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00535.x

European Cultural Policy and Migration: Why Should Cultural Policy in the European Union Address the Impact of Migration on Identity and Social Integration?¹

Karsten Xuereb*

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to examine why European Union cultural policy does not address the issue of migration of people from non-European countries to Europe with sufficient recognition of the major impact it has on European cultural identity, and what are some of the advantages of doing so. It is important to note that a strong cultural policy common to all members of the European Union does not exist and may be said not to be in the interest of European nation states. Nevertheless, the impact of European Union cultural policy on various aspects of cultural and social life in Europe is growing and is therefore assessed both in terms of its official description as stated by Article 151 of the Treaty of European Union and with regard to the variety of programmes it establishes.

The remit and implementation of cultural policy are found to be constricted by various supranational and national issues, and their relation to the impact of migration, while in existence, is limited. Cultural initiatives already being run within the framework of European Union cultural policy and which address issues related to migrant cultures and European citizenry are assessed. This analysis leads to suggestions and recommendations, the aim of which is to foster a greater recognition of the importance of the value of cultural difference due to the influence of migration on European

* The author is the Culture Attaché at the Permanent Representation of Malta to the EU, Brussels.

social settings, and to encourage the formulation of European cultural policies that aim at more reciprocity and mutuality. This paper joins a growing number of calls for a change in the perspective of policy-making to reflect the transnational reality of migration and its impact on and contribution to culture in Europe. It does this while at the same time acknowledging the fact that nation states play a largely determining role in the ideation and implementation of European Union cultural policy.

This research is based on a theoretical framework that provides the discussion with a foundation from which to assess contemporary models of multiculturalism and integration as well as grapple with the implications of cultural policy on European self-identification and representation. This analysis roots its critical perspective in a close reading of Ziauddin Sardar's propositions of "mutually assured diversity" and "transmodernism" which are applied to the context of cultural policy.

This paper is based on research carried out through the collection of secondary data, with resources that provide information which is recent and relevant to current issues of migration, social integration and European culture and identity.

INTRODUCTION

Individuals across all social and political borders are shaped by their histories, memories and cultures. These powerful elements influence the interaction between groups of people of different cultural identities, and pose difficult challenges to policy-makers in culturally diverse societies such as many of those within the European Union (EU). Various patterns of intercultural communication are played out between migrants from outside the EU and European citizens in EU Member States, both within and more often outside structured policies aimed at managing issues dealing with migration, citizenship and cultural identity successfully.

This paper is out to find out how cultural policy can address the demographic, social and cultural changes brought about by the migration of people from non-European countries into the EU. It is driven by an interest to research how European cultural policy has encouraged cultural actors to respond to migration and what it can do further in the near future. EU cultural policy can prove to be one of the ideal tools with which to address issues of European citizenship, including the integration of migrant individuals and communities into a diverse yet socially inclusive Europe.

In this light, migration may be seen to contribute in no small way to opening up new spaces for dialogue, mutual understanding and integration. An

important expression of this perspective comes from Kevin Roberts, editor of “The challenge of transcultural diversity”, the third and last in a series of reports by the Council of Europe on diversity in Europe. He states that:

Global migrations present a fundamental challenge to European social and cultural policy. There are clear indications that these [...] migrations will bring with them new dangers of social tension, antagonism and conflict. But perhaps there might also be new possibilities for confronting these threats [...] we might suggest that there is now no alternative – that the new complexities of the European social space now make it imperative that we take up this latter challenge (Robins, 2006: 24)².

This study tries to put such observations into practice by doing three things:

1. it asks whether existing EU cultural policy, as described by Article 151 of the Treaty of European Union (TEU), addresses the issue of migration, especially from non-European countries into Europe, with sufficient recognition of the major impact it has on European cultural identity
2. on finding this is not the case, it argues in favour of why this should be so by highlighting the need to address the impact of migration on issues of European identity, citizenship and integration
3. finally, it assesses a few of the main cultural initiatives being run within the framework of European cultural policy on the basis of how they address issues related to the impact of migration on European society, arguing in favour of such initiatives being supported and developed to meet contemporary complexities.

The EU does not have one comprehensive cultural policy that can be implemented in all its Member States since it functions on the principle of subsidiarity, which advocates that higher authorities should not interfere in matters that can be dealt with effectively at a lower, national, level. However, it does have a common cultural goal as expressed in Article 151 of the TEU.³ This document states that the “Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore” (CEC, 1997). This single phrase that opens Article 151 poses a number of important questions, such as:

- does the phrase “national and regional diversity” include that of new EU citizens such as migrants?

- are the cultures of non-European migrants considered as belonging and contributing to contemporary European culture, both at a regional and at a national level?
- are migrants' cultures considered strictly in relation to particular migrant ethnic groups, and therefore 'below' or 'outside' the regional and national levels?
- with regard to the "common cultural heritage", one needs to ask 'common to whom?'
- and is the heritage invoked of a contemporary, or "horizontal" kind, as well as historical, or "vertical"?⁴

One other question worth asking deals with how possible is it to secure the implementation of particular policies in individual Member States when the basic principle underlying EU cultural policy is that of subsidiarity, hence allowing nations to guard their sovereignty with regard to cultural identity. While the Article itself does not address these questions in an effective way, this paper tries to do that. One further issue to be highlighted is the fact that ironically, an allocation of competence based on subsidiarity allows various regional authorities to go far beyond the guidelines set out by Article 151 and to address the fields of migration and culture through a combined effort.

This paper adopts a broad understanding of culture by including general manifestations of human behaviour together with artistic expression. Hence, this perspective is greatly interested in social developments brought about by or in combination with migration in contemporary Europe. There are real benefits to cultural understanding and action to be gained by striving for an affinity between culture and migration policies, since migrants and their communities provide Europe with some of the most creative cultural expressions. Choosing to acknowledge this element of European culture brings culture and migration very close indeed.

This paper will try to challenge the reader to consider what kind of EU cultural policy is one which stays away from addressing social issues related to migration. It will argue that such policy is limited because unrepresentative of the diversity within Europe due to migration. In the first of the two reports on diversity in Europe published by the Council of Europe, Tony Bennett argues that all cultures are in fact diverse and policies that encourage unitary and homogenous cultures, particularly related to the safeguarding of nationalism, are a negation of this reality (Robins, 2006: 15).

Transnational migrants

One current challenge cultural policy in Europe needs to adapt to is the transnational nature of many contemporary migrants, and the sense of belonging they share with more than one country. In cultural terms, this means that migrants may have cultural affiliations to more than one country, be it their country of origin, the country of their family's origins, a country they might have migrated to earlier, one they have come from, or the one they live in.⁵

As Kevin Robins points out, many migrants who have travelled to Europe since the 1990s do not share the pattern of earlier migrants. Many of the latter group might have travelled to the homeland of the coloniser or close to the "imperial centre" (2006: 25). More recent migrants try to travel to those countries which would accept them and hence patterns are far more arbitrary. The result is a "more random logic of migration" and a "relatively wide distribution of particular groups" across Europe (2006: 25). This has led to a "new kind of dispersed and cross-border migration pattern" giving rise to migration flows, connections and networks that are very flexible and diverse (2006: 25). Developments in communication technology have made building or maintaining relationships across most borders relatively cheap and easy, and have been crucial in facilitating this phenomenon.

Chouki El Hamel's view is more binary, as he sees migrants inhabiting a double space: one national, defined by the local borders, and the other transnational, involved in the act of migration itself (El Hamel, 2002: 305).

El Hamel observes that the concept of citizenship as belonging to the national collective has been greatly challenged by migration. He comments on the "negative citizenry" which religious groups like Muslims face, since the model of citizenship adopted in many European countries does not include the cultures of migrants' experience (2002: 306). As a consequence, when migrants feel that they cannot integrate within their new society, they may focus more on their background and assert distinguishing characteristics. El Hamel describes this process and the result as "divisive diversity", which European cultural policy should strive to avoid or curtail (2002: 305).

Expanding on the issue of Muslim migrant communities in Europe, El Hamel points out that they may look for legitimacy in the migratory

space that lies between the country of departure and that of arrival, and which exists more as an experience shared by the migrants than an actual place. This space of diaspora, which Chris Barker describes as “a dispersed network of ethnically and culturally related peoples” (Barker: 255), helps Muslim migrants transcend national belonging and create “a category outside the formula ‘us vs. them’” (El Hamel, 2002: 306). However, this may ironically increase the rigidity of cultural categorization by the dominant culture, and lead to resentment on either side.

The ensuing discussion of migration and culturally diverse societies needs to engage with a brief overview of contemporary thoughts about multiculturalism which, in its vastness, can be described as addressing cultural difference and celebrating it (Barker, 2003: 414). A succinct framework is provided by two Western approaches, namely liberal and postmodern multiculturalism, which will be described briefly hereunder and provide the ground for a critique based on Ziauddin Sardar’s views.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism debates and practices have been topical in Europe over the past forty years with varying results in different countries and social settings. The European Commission defines multiculturalism as the acceptance of immigrants and minority groups as distinct communities whose languages and social behaviours and infrastructures distinguish them from the majority (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006: 8). Moreover, multiculturalism advocates members of such groups should be granted rights equal to each other and, more importantly, to members of majority groups.

With regard to citizenship, the 1990s saw a growing realisation that the classical dimensions of citizenship in terms of civil, political and social as identified by T.H. Marshall in 1950 may need to include cultural entitlements. Turner argues that there rose the recognition of the value of cultural empowerment and participation of citizens, including migrants, within diverse, yet strongly national, cultural life (Robins, 2006: 31).

Within the discourse on multiculturalism, traditional liberalism promotes the idea that individuals should be viewed as equivalent to each other, irrespective of ethnic, religious, sexual or other characteristics or affiliations. In the light of this equating perspective, which may have had a negative impact by homogenising different individuals, the last decade has seen the reappraisal of the liberal view of cultural difference.

M. Walzer, for example, tries to do this by referring to two types of respect that can be shown towards citizens, who should be treated equally. The first form calls for “the strongest possible commitment to individual rights and [...] to a rigorously neutral state, that is, a state without cultural or religious projects or, indeed, any sort of collective goals beyond the personal freedom [...] of its citizens.” The other “allows for a state committed to the survival and flourishing of a particular nation, culture or religion [...] so long as the basic rights of citizens who have different commitments or no such commitments at all are protected” (Wang, 2004: 302).

Bhikhu Parekh goes further by stating clearly that “a politics of citizenships which both promotes the rights of communities with regard to each other, as well as the obligations of communities to each other is an essential precondition of the pluralist vision.” He suggests ways of promoting cultural difference in citizenship, such as giving cultural diversity public status and dignity, and encouraging minority groups to accept the obligations associated with citizenship at their own pace and in ways congruent with their own sense of identity (Wang, 2004: 303).

Therefore, liberal multiculturalism tends to focus on the relationships between state, groups and individuals, and provides the theoretical background for group rights. However, whether cultural communities can be viewed as groups with their own special rights or as citizens with particular cultural characteristics whose rights and duties are part of those of the larger community remains unclear. This is mostly due to the complexity involved in defining concepts that deal with issues of cultural difference and cultural identity and, as noted above, the changing relationship between migrant members of the community and the state.

Some of the main problems raised and not resolved by liberal multiculturalism are the notions of origin, ethnic purity and exclusion to be faced when trying to define what forms an identity and what makes one identity different to another. It is important to be aware that the interrelation of people across cultures over hundreds of years might allow one to subscribe to the belief in an “anterior pure” preceding any cultural and ethnic mixing (Hutnyk, 2005: 81). However, one should also challenge the value of shaping current cultural and social policies based on distinguishing (and, to recall Maalouf, predominantly vertical) features, rather than those that different people have in common and which are currently (and therefore, horizontally) in the process of sharing.

As has been shown, liberal multiculturalism seeks to establish a balance between difference and equality and freedom and culture, while dealing with issues of citizenship and cultural policy. Nevertheless, it is still far from providing any clear guidelines that target ethnic and cultural integration in a satisfactory way. On the other hand, post-modern multiculturalism focuses on the possibilities of difference and the shifting relationship between people and their identities and cultures. This approach is even less amenable to feed policy since it makes the link between cultural identity and particular ethnic or social groups less tenable and direct. The identities of members of such groups are seen as lying outside such categorization. However, in terms of power relations, individuals may feel less able to represent themselves and assert their citizenship rights because of an inability to act upon the cultural links with other people within these same groups (Wang, 2004: 303).

While discussions of multiculturalism have brought great progress to intercultural dialogue, cultural policy in Europe should not simply promote multiculturalism and celebrate difference. The dangers of doing that include the development of “parallel societies” that neither share close intercultural communication nor try to transcend difference and achieve integration through mutual dialogue (Schiffbauer, 2005: 30). As has been seen in various European states such as the Netherlands, France and the UK to mention but three, multiculturalist approaches may lead to having people who resent the rapid cultural change and call for assimilationist and possibly racist policies, on the one hand, and on the other reactionary and extremist behaviour among migrants that has become a major unsettling and confrontational feature of various European societies. Rather, policy should encourage the acceptance of cultural difference in order to transcend divisions with an aim to create a community whose members can work closer together. One of the main problems caused by multiculturalist policies that stop at promoting ethnic and cultural multifaceted societies is the occlusion of power differences that do not allow different cultural groups and individuals within those groups to have an equal opportunity to contribute to the outcome of society’s policies.

It is therefore opportune to turn to Ziauddin Sardar, a British Muslim thinker and writer, and the way he looks at current social structures. His writing lies within the field of cultural relations, and stresses the need to keep relations across different cultures open to change, in a process that is more equal and mutual. For the purpose of this study, his

thoughts are applied to cultural policy and migration, and possible insights are sought.

Sardar on common histories

Sardar states that contemporary cultural relations “is as much about building the future on a specific set of core values as it is about understanding the past and present of people other than ourselves” (Sardar, 2004a: 5). In order to promote the values he supports, based on the concepts of “transmodernism” and “mutually assured diversity”, discussed further below, Sardar challenges the double-bind created in the West as a result of narrow-visioned modernism and self-satisfied multiculturalism.

Sardar argues that there sometimes is a common past which is ignored in the fabrication of history, thus keeping peoples apart, or in conflict, on false (pre)texts. With regard to the negation of Britain’s common history, Sardar claims this is an artificial act that helps maintain a false sense of divided identity. He points out that since Europe engineered a cultural identity based on a common descent from the supposed traditions of ancient Greece and Rome and 2,000 years of Christianity, British history books always began with the arrival of the Romans. Therefore, “British history begins by submerging, barbarising and differentiating itself from Celtic history” (Sardar, 2004b: 15).⁶

Sardar argues in favour of adopting a more inclusive version of history, one which looks at what binds people rather than divides them. One could try to adopt the same approach to that of the “European peoples”, if there is such a thing as a common history to bring them together (CEC, 2001).⁷ The next step would be to extend such an approach to include migrants, since migration has always been part of Europe’s history, and the intermingling between people of European and non-European cultures and the ensuing cultural enrichment are common to either side.

By extending the argument to take into consideration the West, of which the EU forms an important part, and Islam, the two may also be seen to share a lot, historically, as well as not being opposite, homogeneous units, but rather, diverse in themselves. A document published by the German Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA) makes this case:

What is the West? Is it supposed to be a world inhabited by pure Europeans of common Christian tradition in opposition to the ethnically

and religiously different Muslim world? Since Western countries are home to many millions of Muslim migrants from Asia and Africa – many of them holding European citizenship – this division loses its edge. Many of these immigrants have assimilated themselves to the Western way of life and have become part of it. Moreover, Muslim immigrants have influenced Western societies as well (IFA, 2004: 105).

Before expanding on the relevance of Sardar's views to this discussion and in particular with reference to the concept of "mutuality", one needs to reflect on a point raised earlier which queried the existence of a history common to all Europeans. While advocating research into the common roots that underlie European identity, one should balance efforts trying to recognise proximity in the past with looking forward towards a sense of convergence or at least, of collaboration and community between people of European and non-European origin. In accepting that, together with the similarities they share, citizens of European origin and migrants have different pasts, one should move forward to seek ways how they can share a common future.

In trying to address this particular issue, Article 151 of the TEU does not seem to offer much of a way forward. This is so because it focuses on a sense of "common heritage" even though it has proved difficult to establish what lies in common not only between Europeans and migrants, but also between Europeans themselves. Therefore, speaking of "common heritage", without addressing issues of migration and their consequences for European integration, is problematic.

Such awareness may encourage one to balance attempts to bring about a European "common heritage" with a clear realisation that Europeans are all very different from each other. This may lead one to say that including non-European migrants in this scenario should not reduce European diversity into a homogenous, and opposite, unit. In such a light, the cultural differences that do exist between the two matter less than when one depicts a monolithic, Christian and unitary 'European people' exclusive to others.

Mutuality

Sardar refers to Martin Rose and Nick Wadham-Smith's definition of mutuality, which is described as the quality of a two-way relationship, with overtones of benefit distributed between the two parties, and of ownership shared. Furthermore, "there are implications of equality in

the relationship and there is certainly a strong sense of movement in both directions between the parties” (2004a: 9). It is a process of joint ownership and implies equality and a two-way relationship where “trust arises not from unequal relationships and conversations based on asymmetrical distribution of power, but from relationships built on respect, openness, and a preparedness, where appropriate, to change one’s own mind” (2004a: 10).

However, Sardar is also aware of the limits of mutuality, which cannot work if a culture has accepted its “backwardness” in relation to modernity and postmodernity and if it is ambivalent and hostile to both new influences (as in the ‘host’ country’s culture) and possibly even its own tradition. Sardar goes on to say that mutuality can be unconditionally good in its own right, but wonders what good is it when faced with “a culture of resistance whose very reason to be is to disengage itself from dominant modern forms of cultural expression?” Within a European context, a cultural policy should try to engage with (and ‘bring on board’) all those who it is supposed to be working for and influencing, meaning both established citizens and migrants, irrespective of the groups’ cultural identities or attitudes towards the cultural scenario, but with a great deal of sensitivity. In discussing EU cultural policy matters it is important to widen the focus from the policy-setting side of things to include the migrants’ responses and identity structures themselves (2004a: 10).

Sardar finds great fault with the postmodernist model of multiculturalism, which he believes “fetishes difference” by emphasising and celebrating it for its own sake while dismissing inequality based on identity. Equality is seen only as “equality before the law and the delivery of homogeneity within a capitalist framework [...] in other words, we assume that there is only one and the same way of being human.” He goes on to say that multicultural relations that emphasise difference and promote sameness are not conducive to mutuality, which

is not about difference for the sake of difference; or about promoting a western framework of sameness. Mutuality must be about acculturation – where both sides of the cultural relations equation change, transform and transcend their own limitations (2004a: 14).

Susan Bassnett echoes Sardar’s point about challenging the notion that all cultures can be subsumed within the dominant culture (and treated the same). She adds a warning against feelings of superiority while

promoting the message of cultural difference in a positive manner, in a way that abandons “the misleading idea that all cultures are fundamentally the same, but not falling into the trap of claiming the superiority of one cultural system over another” (Bassnett, 2004: 61).

Transmodernism and mutually assured diversity

In contrast to postmodernism, outlined above, Sardar proposes his view of transmodernism, which sees “tradition as dynamic, amenable, capable of changing and eager to change; and it sees traditional cultures not as pre-modern but as communities with potential to transcend the dominant model of modernity” (2004a: 18). In words that recall Maalouf’s description of vertical and horizontal heritage, Sardar says that transmodernism encourages Western cultures to see non-Western cultures “on their own terms, with their own eyes (ideas, concepts, notions) and as (part of) the common future rather than the past of humanity.” Transmodernism “focuses one’s eyes on the signs of change, and attempts to make visible what is often shrouded from the gaze of the outsiders” (2004a: 19). Sardar gives the example of contemporary Islam, which might not seem to be changing much from a Western point of view, when in fact it has gone through several changes partly due to events like the attacks in, among others, New York, Madrid and London, the outcry over the cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed in European newspapers and general misgivings about the link between terrorism and the Muslim faith.

Sardar challenges multiculturalism’s limits with his concept of mutually assured diversity. Once again focusing on what different human beings have in common, Sardar points out that

[w]hat is mutual is that the human condition is a cultural condition and that culture is an essential relational attribute, an enabling feature of knowing, being and doing [...] It is the acceptance that for all people everywhere identity is not formed in a vacuum but within a cultural realm that comes with values, history, axes to grind and a variety of perplexities, conundrums and perennial questions (2004a: 21).

In contrasting one with the other, Sardar states that while multiculturalism is ready to acknowledge that everyone has their own history, mutually assured diversity is nourished by the vision that all identities have futures. In this case, identity is envisioned as a “cultural aptitude to seek a better future fashioned out of all the possibilities and predicaments

offered by contemporary times and circumstances and in the light of histories that shape those circumstances” (2004a: 23).

Such a complex envisioning of identity cannot easily inform a cultural policy that can deal with issues of migration and integration effectively. However, the views expressed by Sardar are earnest, and seek to establish an open and inclusive framework for cultural interaction between people of different cultures. In spite of historical and practical obstacles that lie in the way of the implementation of policies inspired by such visions, policies that are informed by a quest for inclusivity, both in formulation and implementation, are to be pursued since they have the potential to contribute greatly to more integration among the citizens of Europe. This is so especially at a time when social dynamics are changing rapidly and reactionary policies are limited in the social cohesion they may lead to.

The evolution of EU cultural policy

Although cultural policy in Europe is not a recent phenomenon, European institutions have mostly ascribed it importance in recent years. The TEU signed in Maastricht in 1992, and the subsequent amendment in Amsterdam in 1997, is an important point in the formal inception of cultural policy in Europe as it contained a title on culture. Before that, the European Cultural Convention signed in 1954 by the member states of the Council of Europe and the interest shown in culture by the European Economic Community (EEC) from the 1970s onwards had put culture as a minor item on the agenda of collaboration between European states. Documents like the Declaration on European Identity published in 1973 and the influential Tindemans Report of 1976 helped establish a much-needed link between culture, identity and the need of a political commitment by the nations of Europe.

During the last ten to fifteen years the member states of the EU have shown growing interest in European cultural policy. The expansionary and integrationist movements within Europe have highlighted the important role European cultural issues have to play. On the one hand, the integrationist agenda pushed for common cultural spaces and particularly markets such as the audiovisual sector. On the other hand, the regionalist agenda tried to raise the profile of the different identities within a united Europe. The national framework, already responsible for the inception of cultural policies for nation states, underpinned both these movements and drove many of Europe’s cultural initiatives. As

argued by Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, Anna Triandafyllidou and Kevin Robins among others, the contemporary cultural imaginary in Europe has undergone such changes as to find exclusively national frameworks wanting and unable to cope with current demographic and social trends and their effects on the cultural scene (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006; Robins, 2006). Migration is one of the major influences to challenge traditional conceptions of Europe structured on nation states, and the increased flux of people across European borders has encouraged critics and policy-makers to re-assess the impact of cultural policies in Europe.

There is one irony in the relationship between EU cultural policy and its rise in profile and issues of social cohesion which is worth noting. As Bennett points out, policy makers in the EU have long known “that to forge a united Europe requires not simply economic and monetary union or a shared legal and political architecture, but also the creation of a more palpable sense of European consciousness and shared identity among the peoples of Europe.” With this aim, they “have sought to harness culture as a vehicle for promoting solidarity and social cohesion among Europeans” (Bennett, 2001: 108). Unfortunately, national considerations and budgetary constraints have not allowed cultural policy to act with the wide-ranging influence it might otherwise have had.

An EU cultural policy to deal with citizenship *and* migration

One of the key concerns related to migration, and which this paper will focus on here, is the impact of migration into and within the EU on national states and their citizens. Janine Brodie says that “the cornerstones of modern governance, especially the symmetries forged largely in the past two centuries between national states, national territory, and national citizenship rights, have been progressively fractured by transnational networks, flows, and identities” (Brodie, 2004: 323). This particular time is an opportune moment for making the best use of migration. Policies that aid the European integration project through the establishment of encounters based on open dialogue between ‘national’ and ‘global’ or ‘transnational’ citizens should be adopted over ones that encourage divisionary nationalism.

The cultural action supported by the EU with the intention of promoting European citizenship is one of the main ways in which the EU can engage with migrants’ cultures while addressing issues of citizenship for all Europeans. Rather than deal with both aspects of citizenship

separately, the cultural programme in favour of European citizenship can engage with both, possibly channelling the benefits of having migrants go through the citizenship-integration process to feed the current and planned programmes in the areas of youth, culture, media and civic participation (CEC, 2004).

The beneficial impact on raising awareness about migration issues and fostering a sense of common citizenship among all people residing in Europe is particularly attainable through the EU's commitment to cultural exchanges, initiatives and participation projects directed at young people. For example, between 2007 and 2013 the Commission plans to implement 40,000 such projects and involve 70,000 young people in voluntary schemes. This vast number of young people makes the potential socio-educational benefits to European society by combining cultural perspectives with an awareness of migration in Europe significant.

With regard to the general objectives of cultural programmes beyond 2007, including the current Culture programme and the European Capitals of Culture programme, those expressing the "transnational mobility of people working in the cultural sector" and "intercultural dialogue" augur well for an approach that should try to encompass more migrants and their interaction with Europe within the general cultural framework (CEC, 2004: 11).

The Culture programme

The current Culture programme does not specifically target cultural issues related to migrants in Europe. However, since it goes beyond the "purely sectorial approach" which previous generations of culture programmes took and encourages an interdisciplinary approach, there may be more room for cultural work which encourages dialogue and collaboration involving migrant cultures (CEC, 2006a: 5).

The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency of the Commission's Culture Unit says that this approach aims at promoting increased cooperation between cultural players by encouraging various types of cooperation projects between different sectors. It also points out that the programme encourages participants to propose cultural activities and means of cultural co-operation that can "build bridges between diverse ethnic and social groups" with an aim to "foster intercultural dialogue" (CEC, 2006a: 5).

Nevertheless, it is not clear how this will be aimed for while concurrently encouraging projects to “build on commonly shared European values and encourage the sense of collective identity in the context of the richness and diversity of cultures in Europe” (CEC, 2006a: 5). In other words, the inherent tension that lies between an inter-cultural perspective which potentially includes migrant cultures and the importance ascribed to striving for a sense of European unity is not seriously addressed.

The ‘good intentions’ that inform this programme are also expressed in its Specific Objectives: they call on participants to promote the transnational mobility of cultural players and to encourage the transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products. Furthermore, “particular attention will be paid to actions promoting intercultural dialogue where some or all of the actions are intended to be carried out in 2008, *European Year of Intercultural Dialogue*” (CEC, 2006a: 6). One may notice that cultural collaborations involving migrant cultures could play a major role in achieving these objectives, even though no direct reference is made to such initiatives.

2008: European year of intercultural dialogue

The initiatives supported by the EU with regard to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue come closer in addressing migrant cultures more directly. However, there are inferences rather than direct references to the role of migrant cultures. Furthermore, a budget of €10 million to fund three types of activity, namely information campaigns, grants for actions at Community level and co-financing of actions at national level, was not very substantial. Nevertheless, it is worth acknowledging the efforts the European Community made to set up this action. One should note that when presenting the Proposal⁸ in October 2005, Ján Figel, European Commissioner with responsibility for Education, Training and Culture, stated:

Over the past few years, Europe has seen major changes resulting from successive enlargements of the Union, greater mobility in the Single Market, and increased travel to and trade with the rest of the world. This has resulted in interaction between Europeans and the different cultures, languages, ethnic groups and religions on the continent and elsewhere. Dialogue between cultures would therefore appear to be an essential tool in forging closer links both between European peoples themselves and between their respective cultures.⁹

Moreover, the Proposal itself speaks of intercultural dialogue as “an instrument which could facilitate the implementation of a series of strategic priorities of the Union” (CEC, 2005b: 2), particularly those addressing “the renewed Lisbon strategy for growth and employment and the Union’s commitment to solidarity, social justice and greater cohesion” (CEC, 2005b: 4). In striving to create coherence with other policies and objectives of the EU, the Commission views intercultural dialogue as being “part of the new approach to dialogue and communication desired by the Commission, by contributing to the dialogue with European citizens and all those living in the European Union.” Such a statement is very positive; however, it does not say whether migrant cultures are included with those belonging to “European citizens” or rather with “those living in the European Union”, and whether the cultures of the former include influences that have come from beyond European shores.

To conclude this brief look at the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, one should add that the same text states that numerous Community actions engage with intercultural dialogue, and initiatives that “have been launched or planned” lie also in the fields of “policy on asylum and the integration of migrants” (CEC, 2005b: 4). A case in point is the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals programme which supports projects seeking to assist the setting up of transnational cooperation networks or pilot projects designed to identify, exchange and evaluate good practice and new approaches in the field of integration; to increase the knowledge base for the development of integration policies across the EU; and to support transnational dialogue and awareness of the impact of integration on society.¹⁰

European capitals of culture

One aim of cultural policy in Europe has been the development of a common European identity. This is attempted by those actions often defined as ‘symbolic’, such as the European Capitals of Culture programme (ECOC). Although its organisation is still very much done through national competence and it has generally had marginal effects on highlighting issues related to migration and integration, its potential to do this is worthy of note due to its relative public appeal and sometimes local and cosmopolitan, rather than nationalistic, approach. Up till 2005 the ECOC was an intergovernmental action. However, following the new competence on culture established within Maastricht, from 2005 the programme became a direct action of the Commission’s DG Culture within the Culture programme.

The ECOC is one of the principal ways with which EU cultural policy attempts to awaken a European sense of belonging, albeit mostly symbolically. The intention consists of “diffusing its [Europe’s] symbols, while respecting the contents of national and local cultures” (Sassatelli, 2002: 436). The designation of the ECOC helps highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share and facilitates greater mutual acquaintance between EU citizens (CEC, 2005a). The ECOC initiative can be used to heighten culturally diverse cities as microcosms of a diverse Europe, and Sassatelli points out that the “Europe referred to by the EU can be envisaged as an ‘imagined community’ in the making” (Sassatelli, 2002: 436). However, if the project were more practical in nature, the image of the community created through such symbolic binding would be related more closely to the EU’s more political undertakings that promote mutual understanding and equality across cultures.

The objectives outlined by the Commission with regard to the ECOC programme are various.¹¹ They encourage cities to highlight artistic movements and styles shared by Europeans which it has inspired or to which it has made a significant contribution; to promote events involving people from other cities in Member States and leading to lasting cultural cooperation, and to foster their movement within the EU; and to generate long-lasting social impact by ensuring the mobilisation and participation of large sections of the population, among others. Yet another objective aims “to promote dialogue between European cultures and those from other parts of the world and, in that spirit, to optimize the opening up to, and understanding of others, which are fundamental cultural values”. Once again, this programme offers cultural practitioners room to engage with migrant cultures while not directly acknowledging the impact doing so might have on the European cultural scene.

The following two examples are intended to show the potential that lies in having this action engage with social integration and shared European-ness in more practical terms that can hopefully have an impact in the long term. The first refers to Copenhagen, which was selected as the European Capital of Culture in 1996. This proved a good opportunity to organize a cultural programme involving artists from culturally diverse communities but more could have been done to achieve the aim of addressing issues about cultural difference in what was (and still is) a culturally challenging and somewhat narrow scene (Skot-Hansen, 2002: 201). Eight years later in Genoa, European Capital of Culture in 2004, over forty films were screened, all related to the theme of migration and

crossing borders, both physically and culturally. Genoa in particular, and Italy in general, were seen in the light of their long history of travelling, discovery, migration and related events that have led to the diversification of culture within societies worldwide (Mercati, 2005). Unfortunately, not many (documented) long-term effects have been recorded. Also, in both cases, the immediate environments of the neighbourhood and the school could have been more of a major focus for efforts aimed at responding constructively to cultural difference.

With regard to film, the Commission itself has outlined “the high cultural and social impact of the audiovisual media [which] offer a unique platform for intercultural dialogue and for promoting mutual knowledge and understanding.” It is hoped that the new MEDIA programme, MEDIA 2007, will encourage “Europeans to watch stories [...] that reflect the reality of their own lives and histories” in such a way as to include the migratory trends and the growing cultural differences with society (CEC, 2004: 3). In its quest to address the “insufficient circulation of non-national audiovisual works”, migration may provide both funders and producers with the right cross-border and cross-cultural stimulus to work at themes, values and ideas that go beyond national borders (CEC, 2004: 14).

Incorporation of culture into wider policy action

Trying to make of cultural policy a comprehensive tool with which to tackle society’s ethnic and cultural problems is very daunting. Two of the main reasons for this are: (i) the complexity of issues involved which go far beyond a cultural policy’s remit and well into other related, but politically different, social fields such as employment, education, housing and health; and (ii) the traditionally relatively low political and financial commitment cultural policy receives to be implemented. Although the Commission does say it aims at combining cultural policy with other policies in order to contribute towards achieving fuller social cohesion and a shared sense of citizenship which is not based on cultural divisions but a common aim to flourish together, it is difficult to see how the present political disposition of the EU’s member states will help achieve that (CEC, 2004: 9).¹²

With regard to the formulation of its cultural policy, it is important for the EU to develop an agenda which promotes ideas and values about being European that go beyond establishing strict norms of what distinguishes communities from others, thus separating European and

non-European people on the basis of ethnicity, race, religion and other cultural differences. Policy makers should seek to implement views like Sardar's about mutually assured diversity through the adoption of coherent cultural and social policies that give the necessary weight to the type of cultural approaches informed by the ideas supported in this essay. Such policies can lead to a sentiment of shared citizenship of Europe. This would not simply be based on positive proclamations and symbols of unity, but find a true home in action which instils social structures and dynamics that can live long into the future.

On the other hand, and outside the direct remit of cultural policy, it is heartening to see that the EU has been introducing more of the discourse related to intercultural communication and cultural difference in policies directed at integration and migration. Following the European Council in Tampere in 1999 there have been positive developments such as the recommendation of addressing the education and language skills of migrants and thus aid the process of integration (CEC, 2003). Moreover, the process is not a one-sided one and, as mentioned above in relation to initiatives promoting intercultural dialogue, efforts seeking mutual understanding and intercultural collaboration have been launched in various fields, including those of lifelong learning, youth, citizenship, combating discrimination and social exclusion, combating racism and xenophobia and research (CEC, 2005b: 4).

CONCLUSION

In observations about European cultural policy, the European Cultural Foundation (ECF) highlights the importance of dealing with migration directly and says "Migration should be approached in a way which stresses mutual benefits. Intercultural competence should be valued in cultural policies and programmes" (ECF, 2004: 26).

The choice of the right policies should help turn feelings of loss and frustration on behalf of contemporary European citizens into gains, encouraging the letting go of identities that have escaped anyway. Instead, the focus should be shifted to the crucial question of *who* these citizens want to be in the future. One consequence of this type of social commitment can be the creation of a cultural milieu where Europeans realise they find themselves in the same territory as the many newcomers: torn between clinging to past identities and exploring new ones.

The cultural agenda in Europe is of relatively minor importance yet ideologically highly charged. Culture is a thorny issue particularly when the division of competencies between the EU and its Member States is considered. The conflicts of interest and power between Member States contributes to culture not being given a high place on the European agenda. A narrow and impoverishing interpretation of subsidiarity, whereby the potential of the Europe-wide implementation of policies is contained by national self-interest, restricts the reach of cultural action to what Therese Kaufmann and Gerald Raunig, writing for the European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies (EIPCP), describe as “‘harmless areas’ such as cooperation and exchange” (2002: 5). However, those actions that have been taken on an across-the-border level have thrived and should be followed, and have their impact increased, by others that introduce more migrational issues in the current remit of EU cultural policy.

Nevertheless, one should not overlook the fact that the development of cultural policies by the EU is also a reflection of its changing identity concept. From before the conception of a cultural policy in the early days of Europe-building, to the growing interest in the media and the cultural industries in the 1970s and 1980s, and the developments in relation to European identity and integration in the 1990s, cultural issues have been looked at differently and given more importance in direct relation to the way the EU envisaged its priorities and sense of identity. Hopefully, the trend towards a greater recognition of the importance of the element of diversity in terms of cultural difference, and the influence of migration on European social settings, will grow and lead to cultural policies and their implementation in combination with other social policies that aim to make EU cultural policy more inclusive and mutual (Mokre, 2003: 2). In spite of this shift in policy-making and the acceptance of multiple identities related to migration and the flux of populations, which type of culture gets what type of political support is still “subject to a hierarchy of importance” (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006: 61). This situation will not be significantly changed within the foreseeable future unless it becomes “possible to envision other scenarios for the European future, ones that are responsive to the new transcultural developments” which migration has played a part in creating and cultural policy can make creative use of (2006: 184). By addressing issues related to migration through cultural policy one may also achieve more topical ways of envisioning contemporary European societies and the relationships that give them their diversity and complexity (2006: 56).

NOTES

1. This article is based on research done by the author while reading for an M.A. in European Cultural Policy & Management at the University of Warwick 2004-2005. The author is grateful to Prof Oliver Bennett, Dr Jonathan Vickery, Egil Bjørnsen and the staff at the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies and Dr Martin Rose, Nick Wadham-Smith and Ginny Marriott at the British Council.
2. This report by Kevin Roberts brings to an end the Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity project of the Council of Europe which includes the reports *Differing diversities* (2001) by Tony Bennett and *Differing diversities: Eastern European perspectives* (2005) by Andrea Ellmeier and Béla Rásky. These publications build on previous texts of the Council of Europe, chiefly *In from the margins* (1997) and its Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001).
3. The full text is found in the Appendix.
4. In order to explain the concept of vertical heritage Maalouf says “[...] we are all infinitely closer to our contemporaries than to our ancestors” recalling historian Marc Bloch’s words “Men are more the sons of their time than of their fathers.” He goes on to write that each one of us has two heritages, a ‘vertical’ one that comes to us from our ancestors, our religious community and our popular traditions, and a ‘horizontal’ one transmitted to us by our contemporaries and by the age we live in. It seems to me the latter is the more influential of the two [...] yet this fact is not reflected in our perception of ourselves, and the inheritance we invoke most frequently is the ‘vertical’ one. Thus, Maalouf highlights the “gulf that exists between what we are and what we think we are” (Maalouf: 18).
5. Recent and relevant research on this theme has been collected by Ulrike Hanna Meinhof and Anna Triandafyllidou in *Transcultural Europe: Cultural Policy in a Changing Europe* (2006).
6. One main way of distinguishing and dividing people is a nationalistic approach towards culture. Stuart Hall points out that “[i]nstead of thinking of national cultures as unified, we should think of them as a discursive device which represents difference as unity or identity. They are cross-cut by deep internal divisions and differences, and ‘unified’ only through the exercise of different forms of cultural power” (Barker: 253).
7. This particular point is expanded below.
8. *Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008*.
9. IP/05/1226.
10. Agence Europe No 9253.
11. Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019.

12. With regard to the implementation of the EU's cultural policy, the Commission itself stresses the need to "build bridges between programmes of different types, irrespective of whether they are in the field of culture, sport, training, education, and justice and home affairs, and to support cooperation programmes with third countries." In so doing, "[t]his [cultural] programme will thus complement other Community instruments." Adjacently, in the draft 18-month Programme of the German, Portuguese and Slovenian Presidencies issued on 4 December 2006 (16158/06) the Council of the European Union noted that "[t]he forthcoming Commission Communication on the role of culture in Europe, including the cultural compatibility of other actions and policies of the E.C. as foreseen in the Treaties will be thoroughly analysed, giving rise to a possible political declaration on the political, economical and social significance and added value of culture in Europe."

REFERENCES

- Barker, C.
2003 *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*, SAGE, London.
- Bassnett, S.
2004 "Intercultural dialogue in a multicultural world", In R. Bechler (Ed.), *Intercultural Dialogue*, British Council, London.
- Bennett, T.
2001 *Differing diversities: cultural policy and cultural diversity*, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Brodie, J.
2004 "Introduction: Globalization and Citizenship Beyond the National State", *Citizenship Studies*, 8(4): 323–332.
- CEC
1997 "Article 151 of the Treaty of European Union", *Consolidated Version of the Treaty Establishing the European Community* http://www.europa.eu.int/eurlex/lex/en/treaties/dat/12002E/htm/C_2002325_EN.003301.html#anArt152.
- 2003 *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on immigration, integration and employment*, COM 336 final <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c10611.htm>.
- 2004 *Communication from the Commission: Making citizenship work: fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for Youth, Culture, Audiovisual and Civic Participation*, COM 154 final <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l29013.htm>.
- 2005a *Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019*, COM 209 final <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l29005.htm>.

- 2005b *Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008*, COM 467 final.
- 2006a “Draft” Conditional Call for Proposals No XX/2006, Specifications Support for Cultural Actions, Strand 1.2.1 Cultural Cooperation Measures.
- Council of Europe
1954 European Cultural Convention, *European Treaty Series*, 18.
- Council of the European Union
2006b *Draft 18-month Programme of the German, Portuguese and Slovenian Presidencies (16158/06)*.
- ECF
2004 *On the Road*, ECF, Amsterdam.
- EEC
1973 Declaration on European Identity, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 12: 118–122.
- 1976 European Union: Report by Mr Leo Tindemans, Prime Minister of Belgium, to the European Council, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 1/76.
- El Hamel, C.
2002 “Muslim Diaspora in Western Europe: The Islamic Headscarf (Hijab), the Media and Muslims’ Integration in France”, *Citizenship Studies*, 6(3): 293–308.
- Hutnyk, J.
2005 “Hybridity”, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1): 79–102.
- IFA
2004 *The West and the Muslim World: A Muslim position*, IFA, Berlin.
- Kaufmann, T., and G. Raunig
2002 “‘Anticipating European Cultural Policies’ Position Paper on European Cultural Policies”, EIPCP, retrieved 1 September 2005, <http://www.eipcp.net>.
- Lucchi, C.
2005 “Salvadori: ‘Il Meeting antirazzista per una nuova cultura sui migranti’”, Prima Pagina, retrieved 10 August 2005, <http://primapagina.regione.toscana.it/?codice=11014>.
- Maalouf, A.
2000 *On Identity*, The Harvill Press, London.
- Marshall, T.H.
1950 *Citizenship and social class*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mercati, C.
2005 “L’avventura necessaria: cinema tra emigrazione e immigrazione dall’Ottocento ai giorni nostri”, *Genova 04*, retrieved 3 June 2005, <http://www.genova2004.it/default.asp?id=1609&lingua=ITA..>

- Meinhof, U.H., and A. Triandafyllidou
 2006 *Transcultural Europe: Cultural Policy in a Changing Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mokre, M.
 2003 “Identity matters. On European cultural policy”, EIPCP, retrieved 1 September 2005, <http://www.eipcp.net>.
- Robins, K.
 2006 *The challenge of transcultural diversities: Transversal study on the theme of cultural policy and cultural diversity*, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- Sardar, Z.
 2004a *Beyond Difference: Cultural Relations in the New Century: A lecture for the British Council's 70th Anniversary*, British Council, London.
 2004b “What does it mean to be a ‘British Muslim?’”, in R. Bechler (Ed), *What is British?*, British Council, London.
- Sassatelli, M.
 2002 “The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy”, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(4): 435–451.
- Schiffbauer, W.
 2005 “Parallel Societies and Integration: German Turks and their Communities in Germany”, *Kulturjournal of the Goethe-Institut*, 1: 30–33.
- Skot-Hansen, D.
 2002 “Danish Cultural Policy – from Monoculture towards Cultural Diversity”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(2): 197–210.
- Szaybo, P.
 2004 “From negative to positive: Roma and the transformation of images”, in R. Bechler (Ed.), *Growing a bigger Europe*, British Council, London.
- Turner, B.S.
 2001 “Outline of a general theory of cultural citizenship”, in N. Stevenson (Ed.), *Culture and citizenship*, Sage, London.
- Van Ham, P.
 2001 *European Integration and the Post-Modern Condition*, Routledge, London.
- Wang, L.
 2004 “Multiculturalism in Taiwan: Contradictions and challenges in cultural policy”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(3): 301–318.

APPENDIX

Title XII

Culture

Article 151

1. The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.
2. Action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging 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 Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organisations in the sphere of culture, in particular the Council of Europe.
4. The Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of this Treaty, 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 Council:
 - acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 251 and after consulting the Committee of the Regions, shall adopt incentive measures, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States. The Council shall act unanimously throughout the procedure referred to in Article 251,
 - acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt recommendations.