<CN>**Chapter 2**

<CT>**The 'European Significance' of Heritage**

<CST>**Politics of Scale in EU Heritage Policy Discourse**

<CA>Tuuli Lähdesmäki and Katja Mäkinen

<FL>Postmillennial Europe has faced various political, economic, social and humanitarian crises that influence how Europeans deal with the past, present and future of Europe. These crises have also shaken the foundations of the European Union (EU) and strengthened criticism of its legitimacy and integration process. Simultaneously, the ideas of European cultural roots, memory, history and heritage have gained a new role in European politics and policies. The EU's increased interest in a common cultural narrative can be perceived as the EU's attempt to tackle some of these recent crises – including identity crises – in Europe. As a response to the rise of new nationalism, right-wing populism and a Eurosceptic and anti-EU atmosphere in Europe, the EU has actively sought to construct and establish a new European narrative based on common values, political ideas, heritage and selected events of the European past upon which Europeans could build their European identity. Memory and heritage have become powerful vehicles for shaping the EU's identity politics (Littoz-Monnet 2012).

The idea of a common European cultural heritage was brought forth already in the 1970s in the official policy discourse of the EU integration. Heritage has also been referred to at the

treaty level: the Maastricht Treaty, a founding agreement in the creation of the EU and a deeper European integration, included a treaty article explicitly focused on culture, aimed at 'bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore' (TEU 1992: 24). In the 2000s, the idea of a common cultural heritage was brought out in several EU resolutions, agendas and work plans for culture; it has become a common element repeated in EU cultural policy discourse. Both the European Commission (EC) and the European Parliament (EP) have recently launched several cultural initiatives that explicitly seek to foster and promote a common cultural heritage in Europe and make the idea of it more concrete.

The notion of a common European cultural heritage is extremely problematic. It faces various challenges in Europe, where national narrations of history and cultural memories differ greatly and where global cultural flows and movement of people within and across borders have increased the inner pluralism of the continent. It seems to be impossible to reach any comprehensive definition of a European cultural heritage, as even within a single society, pasts, heritages and identities should be considered as plurals (Delanty 2010). Besides views on the rupture of the grand narrative of nationalism, several heritage scholars have emphasized how nation states still commonly form the fundamental ideological basis, territorialized political sphere, and institutionalized forum of practice for fostering, preserving and meaning making of cultural heritage (see Lähdesmäki, Zhu and Thomas in this volume).

In EU policy discourse, the idea of a common European cultural heritage can be, however, referred to as an unproblematic entity without further discussing the conceptual, ideological and political limitations that the idea entails. References to the idea in the EU's policy documents and official communication material of the EC and the EP form EU-level 'Authorized Heritage Discourse' (AHD) – in Smith's (2006) terms. This discourse is thoroughly

political in its attempts to create its objective, a common European cultural heritage, by ignoring the ambiguity and controversy included in the idea and simultaneously retaining its flexibility for various political purposes. Politics of scale has a major role in the formation of the EU-level AHD and the efforts included therein. In EU heritage policy, notions of a European cultural heritage are produced in relation to various scales – local, regional, national and global – either by including these different scales in the European dimension of heritage or by defining it as distinguished from other scales. EU heritage policy discourse includes discussions in which the meanings of heritage are, thus, multilayered or 'multi-scalar'. Such politics of scale can be used in the EU's identity building processes.

This chapter focuses on the politics of scale in the making of a European cultural heritage in EU heritage policy discourse and the implications of the politics of scale for the EU's identity politics. The chapter theorizes the heritage-scale relationship in this discourse by answering the following questions: What kinds of scales are discussed in EU heritage policy discourse? How is the 'European significance' of heritage created in this discourse? What kinds of scalar relationships does this discourse produce? How is scale used as a political tool in it? The chapter seeks to answer these questions by examining the policy documents of the EC's most recent heritage initiative, the European Heritage Label (EHL). Since 2014, the EC has awarded twenty-nine sites with the EHL. In the awarding process, the labelled sites are first preselected by national panels, and the final selection is made by a panel of heritage experts appointed at the EU level.

The data of this study consist of panel reports produced in the final selection process of 29 EHL sites during the first three selection rounds. For each site, the panel reports have a section titled 'European significance' describing the site's relevance for highlighting European

cultural heritage. These reports enable a critical exploration of what is considered the 'right' type of Europeanness in EU heritage policy discourse and how this is presented and justified. The documents were analysed with qualitative content analysis, utilizing the theoretical framework of linguistic turn and social constructionism in the EU and European Studies that emphasize the use of language, concepts and rhetoric as locations in which meanings are both consciously and unconsciously produced (Checkel 2006; Christiansen, Jorgensen and Wiener 2001; Paasi 2001; Risse 2004; Wiesner et al. 2018; Wiesner, Haapala and Palonen 2017). The chapter, thus, scrutinizes how language produces a European cultural heritage and a heritage-scale relationship in the EHL documents. The chosen method and its linguistic emphasis enables exploration of both explicit and implicit politics and power relations involved in EU heritage policy discourse.

<A>**Scales in the Meaning Making of 'European Significance'**

<FL>Europe and 'European significance' are the explicit scalar focuses of the EU heritage policy discourse. This focus determines the discourse also in the EHL policy documents. According to the decision of the initiative, the EHL shall aim at:

> <EXT>… strengthening European citizens' sense of belonging to the Union, … stressing the symbolic value and raising the profile of sites which have played a significant role in the history and culture of Europe and/or the building of the Union; increasing European citizens' understanding of the history of Europe and the building of the Union, and of their common yet diverse cultural heritage. (EP 2011: 3)

<FL>The aims of the EHL focus on the citizens' relationship to the EU. In the policy discourse, the EHL sites assume a function of providing this relationship. To fulfil this function, the sites are expected to have a tight connection to Europe and the EU.

The proposal for the decision of the initiative emphasizes that the main selection criteria for the EHL sites do not include esthetic or architectural values, nor is the point to conserve or preserve the sites (EC 2010a: 2). Instead, the selection criteria are for example, how well the sites represent 'their place and role in the development and promotion of the common values that underpin European integration', and in 'European history and European integration, and their links with key European events, personalities or movements' (EP 2011: 4). What is central is the 'European narrative of these sites and their symbolism for Europe' (EC 2010a: 2). No matter how interesting or significant a site is, if it does not succeed in meeting the criteria, such as describing its 'cross-border or pan-European nature' (EP 2011: 4), it cannot be awarded the label. This is underlined also on the EC's website: 'the European Heritage Label focuses on the European narrative and how the sites have contributed to the progress of European history and unity' (EC 2016).

The entire EHL initiative is about scaling cultural heritage into a European framework, and its key aim of highlighting 'European significance' (EP 2011: 3) is extended also and above all to the sites that apply for and eventually are awarded the status of EHL sites (EC 2010a: 2). To understand the politics of scale in the AHD of the EU, it is crucial to explore how the idea of 'European significance' is produced in relation to scale in EU heritage policy discourse.

Common to almost all EHL sites is that their 'European significance' is primarily justified in the panel reports with arguments about the plurality of territorial entities or population groups involved in the site's history. For example, Hambach Castle (Germany) is

described as commemorating the Hambach Festival, with participants from Germany, France and Poland advocating for unity in both Germany and Europe. The panel report conceptualizes its 'European significance' through references to the calls for a unified Europe by different national groups and to the cross-border action and context of the site. Indeed, border crossings and cross-border contexts are commonly referred to in the descriptions of the labelled sites. Similarly, Museo Casa Alcide De Gasperi (Italy) has, according to the panel report, a 'transboundary history and location between the Italian and German cultures' (EC 2014: 18). The Historic Gdańsk Shipyard (Poland) is presented as the birthplace of political transformation, first in one country and later in several countries in Central and Eastern Europe. The Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park (Hungary) as a venue of processes that led to the collapse of the Iron Curtain in Europe is presented in the report as a symbol of the end of the Cold War and of a 'borderless Europe' (EC 2014: 20).

Although cultural heritage and its 'European significance' are mostly attached to the plurality of territories – entities that have explicit administrative boundaries that emerge and exist in various social practices, such as culture, governance, politics and economy (Paasi 2009: 467) – the plurality discussed in the panel reports is not only territorial. For example, World War I Eastern Front Cemetery No. 123 (Poland) is described as a cemetery for soldiers from 'different linguistic and religious backgrounds … where all soldiers, winners or defeated, were treated with equal respect regardless of the nationality, religion, or military affiliation' (EC 2015: 13). The description of The Imperial Palace (Austria) states that '[t]he Habsburg Empire included a wide range of ethnicities and religions' (EC 2015: 9). As these examples indicate, the reports also refer to linguistic, religious and ethnic plurality, which does not necessarily organize itself along territories.

The panel reports link the 'European significance' of some EHL sites to unions between states, and some of these unions are presented as early models for European integration. For example, Archaeological Park Carnuntum (Austria) is framed as part of the Roman Empire, which is called a 'predecessor of Europe', combining 'different cultures, religions, and geographic areas under one administrative system' (EC 2013: 7). Here Europe seems to be a synonym for the EU. This kind of equating belongs to the political agenda of the EU heritage policy discourse: the rhetoric seeks to naturalize the connection between Europe and the EU as a polity by paralleling them. In the description of the Great Guild Hall (Estonia), the interaction between two economic unions – the Great Guild and the Hanseatic League – is seen as a predecessor of European integration. The Olomouc Premyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum (Czech Republic) is introduced as part of Carolingian Europe, and The Imperial Palace as the centre of the Habsburg Empire. National and transnational scales are dominant in these unions and empires, which consist of several states or state-like entities. These sites make it explicit that state unions have existed in the history of Europe, thus making the EU seem a 'natural result' of history. Three sites – Robert Schuman's House (France), Museo Casa Alcide De Gasperi and The European District of Strasbourg (France) – are directly about the history of EU integration, a transnational process that has been predominantly about cooperation between states, with national-scale actors as key players.

In the case of several sites, such as the Archive of the Crown of Aragon (Spain), The Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum (Croatia), Archaeological Park Carnuntum, Mundaneum (Belgium), and The Heart of Ancient Athens (Greece), 'European significance' is described through their place in intellectual history. In them, 'European significance' is constructed through non-territorial international exchange that does not locate itself in scales but

rather thematically around different spheres of intellectual life. Intellectual history and exchange are also referred to in the descriptions of scholarly sites such as the General Library of the University of Coimbra (Portugal) and Residencia de Estudiantes (Spain). The Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu (Estonia) is said to have been a 'part of a pan-European network of scientists and participated in cultural exchanges' (EC 2015: 10). Franz Liszt Academy of Music (Hungary) is described as a centre of an international music community, developing 'a living European cultural tradition' (EC 2015: 11).

Although values as such are non-territorial, they can be easily attached to territorial entities and used in producing and imagining territorial communities, such as Europe and Europeans. Indeed, one way to conceptualize the 'European significance' of the EHL sites is to emphasize values that are frequently repeated in EU policy discourse. According to the panel report, Hambach Castle focuses on the Hambach Festival in which liberty, equality, tolerance and democracy were called for. The description of The Historic Gdańsk Shipyard highlights the role of the Solidarity movement 'in the development of freedom, justice, democracy and human rights' (EC 2014: 19). Democracy is brought to the fore in the descriptions of several sites and linked to the emergence of the EU, such as with Museo Casa Alcide De Gasperi and The European District of Strasbourg. Similarly, peace is a recurrent value. For example, Mundaneum is described as both a peace project and an archive that promotes peace through culture and knowledge sharing, and Peace Palace (The Netherlands) is described as having gained its 'European significance' by being the venue of the First World Peace Conference in 1899 and later peace conventions and international institutions. A discussion of values is a way to attach a site to the European scale, as these values are often said to underpin the European integration project. In the decision on the EHL initiative itself, democratic values and human rights are

8

explicitly linked to European integration (EP 2011: 2). However, the emphasis on values in the panel reports is also a means to bring to the fore a micro-scale of heritage; European values are explained as being manifested in the actions of various important European figures. For example, The Heart of Ancient Athens is presented in the report as a venue of the birth and upbringing of persons 'whose intellectual achievements made an indelible mark on the definition of European common values' (EC 2014: 5). Hence, values are used in EHL policy discourse to connect spatial micro- and macro-scales of heritage.

The panel reports describe and contextualize several EHL sites through the processes of establishing or transforming political systems or political institutions and principles. Political systems and institutions produce and are based on their polity that entail defined political borders. These political borders commonly align with territorial borders, such as borders of states or municipalities. The emphasis on political systems, institutions or principles in EU heritage policy discourse can be interpreted as an attempt to create new territorial constructions or rearrange territorial borders, but also as an attempt to affix abstract political ideas to Europe (within or crossing existing borders) in order to present Europe as a cradle of these positive innovations. For example, Sites of the Peace of Westphalia (Germany) concentrates on the Peace of Westphalia (1648), in which 'peace was agreed through diplomatic negations, not force' (EC 2014: 9). As a result of the peace treaties new principles of a political system and international law were adopted, such as sovereign rights for peripheral states. Union of Lublin (Poland) is described as establishing a new political system between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with democratic principles and practices. The 3 May 1791 Constitution (Poland) is highlighted as 'the first constitution democratically adopted in Europe' (EC 2014: 11) with the adoption of division of powers. Hambach Castle is called the 'symbol of the pursuit of

democracy in a cross-border context' (EC 2014: 12). The historic Gdańsk Shipyard and Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park tell about moves away from a socialist regime. In the panel report, the Archive of the Crown of Aragon 'possesses one of the oldest testimonies of the creation process of a European state and rule of law including its parliamentary system' (EC 2014: 7). According to the description of The Imperial Palace, the entities included in the Habsburg Empire 'developed an evolved status of citizenship including religious freedom and access to education' (EC 2015: 9). The description of the transformation of political systems and political principles in the reports mainly focuses on the national scale history but also includes a strong transnational emphasis, since the transformation processes entail various kinds of cross-border contexts and focus on different kinds of historical state unions and empires.

The analysis of the panel reports indicates how 'European significance' is constructed by connecting different scalar dimensions. Both the idea of distinct global, national, regional and local scales and their interwoven combinations are used to argue the 'European significance' of several EHL sites. For example, The Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum is located on the global scale in the panel report by highlighting how the site brings to the fore human development and the genesis of humankind. The global scale also characterizes The Sagres Promontory (Portugal), which is introduced through the history of discoveries. Its scale expands out of Europe; the site is explained to show how European civilization has contributed to 'the global projection that came to define the modern world' (EC 2015: 8). At some of the sites, global or universal phenomena, such as the promotion of peace and human rights in Mundaneum and Peace Palace, are explicitly framed as European projects. Also, several sites, such as The Historic Gdańsk Shipyard and Charter of Law of Abolition of the Death Penalty (Portugal), which have particular national importance, are narrated as European. Numerous

references to the sites' cross-border contexts, such as in Hambach Castle and Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park, bring to the fore the regional scale on which the crucial events and action at these sites have taken place. However, the regional scale of these sites focuses on transnational rather than subnational regions, which implies that the political agenda of the EU heritage policy is to produce 'the European' through 'the transnational'. The transnational cross-border regions simultaneously highlight the national scale, as the regions in question are situated on state borders. Residencia de Estudiantes, The Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu, Great Guild Hall, and Kaunas of 1919–1940 (Lithuania) are examples of sites that focus on a local scale but are presented as a European cultural heritage by emphasizing their international relationships rather than their local meanings. For instance, Kaunas of 1919–1940 is described in the panel report as a 'gateway to contemporary dynamic currents of interwar Europe … reflecting European interwar modernism' (EC 2014: 15). Here, local and European scales are intertwined: architecture in the city of Kaunas is local, but in the panel report the focus is on the international architectural connections of the city. Obviously, the sites themselves are above all local; a European cultural heritage is pinpointed to very specific local places, thus bringing together a European and a local micro-scale of cultural heritage.

According to the EHL criteria, sites can focus on 'key European … personalities' (EP 2011: 4), which brings in a personal scale. These criteria were used in justifying the 'European significance' of several sites in the panel reports. For example, the 'European significance' of The Heart of Ancient Athens was emphasized by listing various influential historical personalities known from the city. Also the EHL home museums focus on a personal scale. In addition, a private, intimate or personal scale is evident at sites comprising a hospital, cemetery

or student residence. However, the themes tackled in the descriptions of the 'European significance' of these sites mainly concern their official and institutional history.

A crucial scalar dimension inherent in cultural heritage is time. Cultural heritage is always temporally multilayered. Different temporal layers increase the ambiguous nature and complexity of heritage sites and enable the formation of various kinds of interpretations of their meanings. Although the EHL sites include various temporal layers, these layers nevertheless lose their temporal distance from each other and to the present day in EU heritage policy discourse. Various historical processes and phenomena that took place in the past are commonly interpreted in the panel reports as anticipating similar processes and phenomena that occur in the present EU. Particularly historical and present day transnational cooperation, democratic political processes, political integration and societal and political values and principles are paralleled. The past and the present intertwine: in this process the history of the EU (as a process of international cooperation and as a political value community) seems to reach far into the past.

The panel report analysis brought to the fore the relationality of scale and dynamic scalar relations in EU heritage policy discourse. The relevance of different scales varies in the discourse: sometimes, for example, 'the global' is emphasized, while sometimes 'the local' receives more attention. Since the EHL initiative concentrates on 'European significance', different scales are narrated in the discourse as European. At some EHL sites 'European significance' is attached to territorial relations, while at others it is formulated with non-territorial factors, such as values, political principles or intellectual activity and exchange in scientific communities. The intertwining and networking of scales becomes particularly visible when 'European significance' is narrated by describing transnational cooperation and territorial or other kinds of plurality included in the site's history. This is a way to make familiar cross-

border cooperation across different times to simultaneously pave the way for present EU integration.

As the 'European significance' of heritage is described in this way in the AHD of the EU, what kinds of representations of Europe are thereby produced in them? In the panel reports, Europe is about values, knowledge and science, and inventing and developing political systems and political principles. Europe is thus presented as an innovative place of influential ideas and positive trajectories. In addition, the panel reports present Europe as a battlefield; some sites are framed as places of peace but also war is commonly referenced. 'European significance' means unions between states at different moments in history, transnational cooperation or, more generally, something to do with the plurality of territorial or non-territorial elements. Among the twenty-nine EHL sites, only three are directly about European integration, but the 'roots' of EU integration are pointed out at many more. The reports' emphasis on transnational encounters builds the history of Europe and the EU as a unified continuum; it creates a teleological narrative of the history of Europe and of the EU as a natural outcome of it.

<A>**Politics of Scale in EU Heritage Policy Discourse**

<FL>The purpose of the EHL initiative is to produce and foster a heritage whose significance and meaning exceeds the national scale and emphasizes the European one. This emphasis indicates how politics of scale is being used in constructing a European identity through a cultural heritage. In scholarly discussion, the idea of Europe, a European identity and European integration have been theorized with various models (e.g. Delanty 2002; Eder 2009; Mayer and Palmowski 2004; Sassatelli 2015). Eder (2009) has modelled the idea of a European identity through three 'stories' that construct the idea in different ways. The post-national story merges

national stories into shared stories that rely on the idea of a shared European past and common cultural features; the supranational story stems from the emergence of a distinct story that is decoupled from national stories and instead emphasizes various European-level civic, economic and political mechanisms, such as European citizenship; and the transnational story focuses on the hybridity of Europe and the diversity of its people and cultures (Eder 2009; see also Sassatelli 2015).

The construction of a European cultural heritage in EU heritage policy discourse utilizes aspects of all three of these heuristic and to some extent overlapping models. In the discourse, the idea of a common European cultural heritage transcends the national scale and thus takes a post-national antithetic stand on the traditional national narration of heritage. The EU heritage policy and initiatives themselves represent supranational mechanisms that seek to regulate and govern national-, regional- and local-level heritage actors in the making of a European cultural heritage (Lähdesmäki 2014a, 2014b).

The transnational model of a European cultural heritage emphasizes diversity as its key characteristic. In practice, the construction of the idea of a common European cultural heritage occurs in the EU heritage policy by recognizing the hybridity and diversity of heritage in Europe but, however, by narrating diversity as a starting point for the perception of unity of the European cultural heritage. As a part of this transnational model, the EU is actively attempting to promote transnational cooperation that enhances contacts and activity between EU heritage actors.

The idea of diversity in EU heritage policy discourse is, however, often narrowly defined as national and regional diversity in Europe. Thus, the idea of diversity commonly has a territorial shape in the discourse. The EHL panel reports also bring out a somewhat varied

picture of diversity by referring, for example, to multi-ethnicity, multireligiousness and multilingualism. The transnational model of heritage is closely connected to the post-national model in EU heritage policy discourse; the discourse repeatedly brings out expressions related to these two aspects in the same sentence. For example, the decision on the EHL initiative quotes the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and explains how it 'confers on the Union the task, inter alia, of contributing 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' (EP 2011: 1). The ideas of diversity and unity are an inter-productive entity in EU heritage policy discourse. Fostering diversity is expected to make cultures more familiar to people; create dialogue between people and cultures; enable perception of common elements among different cultures; and finally produce a sense of communality and a feeling of belonging based on the perceived common cultural elements (Lähdesmäki 2012).

The three stories defined by Eder (2009) explain the idea of Europe by taking a different approach to nation and 'the national'. Nations, nation states and their territorial borders form a starting point in the construction of the idea of Europe and various communal phenomena defined as European, such as European cultural heritage. In this construction, national-scale processes, practices and policies are either objected or adapted to the European level. In fact, the whole practice of building a European communality, the feeling of belonging and identity by fostering a common heritage is borrowed from the nineteenth-century nation-building processes (see Lähdesmäki 2014a; Peckham 2003; Risse 2003).

The politics of scale in EU heritage policy discourse is closely related to the EU's identity politics. Since the EHL initiative's core aim is 'strengthening European citizens' sense of belonging to the Union' (EP 2011: 3), the ideas, values and topics brought forth in the policy

rhetoric can be perceived as core elements of the EU's collective identity building. They also function as building blocks that the EU offers its citizens to use in their private identification processes. The EHL applicants must present in their application a clear project of how to communicate their 'European significance' to audiences. In the initiative, the national, regional or local identity building potential of heritage is expected to be extended or even replaced by a European identity project. In the preparation phase of the EHL, national interpretations of heritage were considered a problem to be tackled through the EHL's emphasis on European reinterpretations of heritage meanings. As the EC's Impact Assessment (EC 2010b: 15) of the EHL argues:

> <EXT>This leads us to a second level of the problem which is that the reading or interpretation of cultural heritage in Europe, including of the most symbolic sites of our shared heritage, is still to a very large extent a national reading. The European dimension of our common heritage is insufficiently highlighted and its potential to stimulate intercultural dialogue is insufficiently exploited.

<A>**Conclusions: EU Heritage Policy as Tool for Promoting a European Identity**

<FL>The analysis brought out how the heritage-scale relationship is extremely complex and relational: different scalar layers merge and criss-cross in the meaning making of a European cultural heritage. This meaning-making process does not follow any simple spatial hierarchy of territories or a nested scalar system but brings forth politics of scale as a dynamic process.

The idea of a European cultural heritage is constructed in EU heritage policy discourse through various territorial and non-territorial elements whose significance in the construction

process is situational and thus variable. After the European, the most common scalar focus repeated in the policy discourse of the EHL is the national territory discussed in reference to a nation, nation state, state, EU member state or country. Their plurality, interaction and amalgamation produce the core of a European dimension of cultural heritage. When the discourse refers to diversity, regions and their specificities are also included in the construction process. A European cultural heritage is also signified in the discourse through a spatial micro-scale – specific sites are interpreted and explained to represent a European cultural heritage. Occasionally, the heritage is also explained as gaining its 'European significance' by transcending the borders of Europe; heritage proves its 'European significance' by having a global or universal importance or recognition.

In EU heritage policy discourse, a European cultural heritage is typically constructed from various non-territorial ideas, political principles, values and phenomena that are, however, commonly affixed to territorial entities, particularly to states and countries. These ideas and phenomena are explained to be European if several territorial entities are involved in them. However, some of these phenomena, such as European intellectual history, scholarly achievements and scientific views are introduced as European without stressing any particular territorial affiliations.

Besides spatial scales, EU heritage policy discourse is also formed in a relationship to time. The discourse introduces a European cultural heritage through various historical periods and events that are nevertheless commonly interpreted from the point of view of present day EU politics and political processes. Thus, the core temporal focus of the EHL policy documents is on the present day or even the future. The discourse repeatedly emphasizes the importance of engaging young people in fostering a European cultural heritage. This emphasis indicates one of

the main political goals of the EU's heritage policy: educating a new generation of Europeans who will share a common European cultural identity.

Tuuli Lähdesmäki (PhD, DSocSc) is an Academy Research Fellow and Adjunct Professor at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä (JYU), Finland. Lähdesmäki specializes in heritage, culture and identity politics, particularly in the European context. She currently leads the research projects 'European Cultural Heritage in the Making: Politics, Affects and Agency' (EUCHE), funded by the Academy of Finland, and 'Legitimation of European Cultural Heritage and the Dynamics of Identity Politics in the EU' (EUROHERIT), funded by the European Research Council. She is the Co-PI in JYU's research profiling area 'Crises Redefined: Historical Continuity and Societal Change' (CRISES).

Katja Mäkinen (DSocSc) is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Finland. Interested in the uses and meanings of concepts, she is currently investigating the EU's cultural heritage policy and citizens' participation in temporal-spatial meaning making of cultural heritage as a member of the

research project 'Legitimation of European Cultural Heritage and the Dynamics of Identity Politics in the EU' (EUROHERIT), funded by the European Research Council. She is an editor of *Shaping Citizenship*: *A Political Concept in Theory, Debate and Practice* (Routledge, 2018).

<A>**References**

Checkel, J.T. 2006. 'Constructivist Approaches to European Integration', in K.E. Jorgensen, M. Pollack and B.J. Rosamond (eds), *Handbook of European Union Politics*. London: Sage, pp. 57–66.

Christiansen, T., K.E. Jorgensen and A. Wiener (eds). 2001. *The Social Construction of Europe*. London: Sage.

Delanty, G. 2002. 'Models of European Identity: Reconciling Universalism and Particularism', *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 3(3): 345–59.

———. 2010. 'The European Heritage from a Critical Cosmopolitan Perspective', *LSE 'Europe in Question' Discussion Paper Series* 19: 1–20.

EC. 2010a. Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council Establishing a European Union Action for the European Heritage Label. COM(2010) 76 final, 2010/0044 (COD). Brussels: European Commission.

———. 2010b. Impact Assessment: Commission Staff Working Document SEC(2010) 197, March 9, 2010. Brussels: European Commission.

———. 2013. European Heritage Label. 2013 Panel report. Brussels: European Commission.

———. 2014. European Heritage Label. 2014 Panel report. Brussels: European Commission.

———. 2015. European Heritage Label. 2015 Panel report. Brussels: European Commission.

———. 2016. European Heritage Label. Frequently Asked Questions. Official Web Site of the

European Commission. Retrieved 4 May 2016 from

http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/faq/index_en.htm.

Eder, K. 2009. 'A Theory of Collective Identity: Making Sense of the Debate on a "European

Identity"', *European Journal of Social Theory* 12(4): 427–47.

EP. 2011. Decision no 1194/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16

November 2011 Establishing a European Union Action for the European Heritage Label.

Official Journal of the European Union L 303: 1–9.

Lähdesmäki, T. 2012. 'Rhetoric of Unity and Cultural Diversity in the Making of European

Cultural Identity', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18(1): 59–75.

———. 2014a. 'Transnational Heritage in the Making: Strategies for Narrating Cultural

Heritage as European in the Intergovernmental Initiative of the European Heritage

Label', *Ethnologica Europaea* 44(1): 75–93.

———. 2014b. 'The EU´s Explicit and Implicit Heritage Politics', *European Societies* 16(3):

401–21.

Littoz-Monnet, A. 2012. 'The EU Politics of Remembrance: Can Europeans Remember

Together?' *West European Politics* 35(5): 1182–202.

Mayer, F.C. and J. Palmowski. 2004. 'European Identities and the EU – The Ties That Bind the

People of Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42(3): 573–98.

Paasi, A. 2001. 'Europe as a Social Process and Discourse', *European Urban and Regional

Studies* 8(1): 7–28.

———. 2009. 'Regions and Regional Dynamics', in C. Rumford (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of

European Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 464–84.

Peckham, R.S. 2003. 'The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture', in R.S. Peckham (ed.),

    Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 1–13.

Risse, T. 2003. 'European Identity and the Heritage of National Culture', in R.S. Peckham (ed.),

    Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 74–89.

———. 2004. 'Social Constructivism and European Integration', in T. Diez and A. Wiener

    (eds), *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 159–76.

Sassatelli, M. 2015. 'Narratives of European Identity', in I. Bondebjerg, E. Novrup Redvall and

    A. Higson (eds), *European Cinema and Television: Cultural Policy and Everyday Life*.

    Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 25–42.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.

TEU. 1992. Treaty on European Union (92/C191/01). *Official Journal of the European*

    Communities NoC 191: 1–112.

Wiesner, C., A. Björk, H-M. Kivistö and K. Mäkinen. 2018. 'Introduction: Shaping Citizenship

    as a Political Concept', in C. Wiesner, A. Björk, H-M. Kivistö and K. Mäkinen (eds),

    Shaping Citizenship: A Political Concept in Theory, Debate and Practice. New York and

    London: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

Wiesner, C., T. Haapala and K. Palonen. 2017. *Debates, Rhetoric, and Political Action*.

    Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.