

Appropriate narratives
Archaeologists, publics and stories

Edited by

ELISABETH NIKLASSON and THOMAS MEIER



BUDAPEST 2013

Front Cover Illustration

Hidden narrative in the vicinity of the Berber village Imouzzer in Morocco
(Photo Elisabeth Niklasson)

Back Cover Illustration

Greek flag-design used during the Revolutionary War,
in a gun-slit of the *Kastro Favierou, Methana, Greece.*
(Photo Linos Papachristou)

ISBN 978-963-9911-47-5

HU-ISSN 1216-6847

© The Authors, Archaeolingua Foundation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, digitised, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

2013

ARCHAEOLOGUA ALAPÍTVÁNY

H-1250 Budapest, Úri u. 49

Cover design by Erzsébet Jerem and Gergely Hős

Copyediting by Anna Freya Schneider, Elisabeth Niklasson and Thomas Meier

Desktop editing and layout by Rita Kovács

Printed in Hungary by Prime Rate Kft.

Table of Contents

Preface	7
Programs of the Round Table in The Hague 2010 and the sessions in Oslo 2011 and Helsinki 2012	9
ELISABETH NIKLASSON – THOMAS MEIER	
Appropriate narratives – an introduction	15

The nature of narratives

GERHARD ERMISCHER	
A visit to the Motel of the Mysteries: Stories and storytelling in archaeology	29
ELISABETH NIKLASSON	
Archaeology as European Added Value	49
TUIJA KIRKINEN	
Archaeological nature writing in the making of past landscapes – an ecocritical approach to prehistoric wilderness in Finnish archaeology ...	87

The stakeholders of narratives

MICHAEL A. CREMO	
A report from a person who appropriates archaeologists’ narratives for the public	111
DIANE SCHERZLER	
“Selecting what is important for the reader”: About appropriations and transformations of archaeology in the mass media	133
THOMAS MEIER	
Archaeology and identity in a Bavarian village – academic and local histories	145
JUTTA LESKOVAR	
Neopaganism, archaeological content and the belief in “Celts”	185

Greece – for example ...

STELLA KATSAROU-TZEVELEKI

The Acropolis of Athens as imaginary neighbour
in the local ‘homeland’ 201

JOHN BINTLIFF

Public versus professional perceptions of an invisible heritage:
A Greek case study 237

HAMISH FORBES

It’s the fort that counts, Cultural marginalisation and
alternative monumentality in a Greek community 249

The dangers of narratives

ESZTER BÁNFFY

Disarmed post-socialist archaeologies?
Social attitudes to interpreting the past –
an interim report from Hungary 271

About the authors 295

Archaeology as European Added Value

ELISABETH NIKLASSON

Abstract:

Ever since the Council of Europe's campaign 'The Bronze Age – The first Golden Age of Europe' was carried out in the 1990s, archaeologists have from time to time expressed concern about periods or interpretations being used as tools for forging a collective identity tied to the geographical, political and ideational entity of 'Europe'. While narratives of a pan-European unity in prehistory have often been disregarded or deconstructed by the research community, discussions on increasing cross-border cooperation and harmonization of practices is still on-going. Both of these directions warrant continuous critical consideration, especially since it is suggested that a future 'Archaeology of Europe' rely in part on the opportunities for financial support offered by the European Commission. European Commission enabling structures, especially within the field of culture, still talks of a common European past. By focussing on 'European added value', the first award criteria for achieving funding under the European Commission Culture programmes, this paper discusses what meanings such a value evoke in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage. It also provides some examples of how such meanings can become visible in the narratives of co-funded archaeological projects.

Archaeological narratives (grand or petit), carefully moulded out of archaeologically produced facts, are not created in a vacuum. They are written in a specific time, under a specific set of circumstances with a specific set of objectives in mind, all of which assist in their formation. For the most part we recognize (at least principally) that embedded 'plots' – employed to provide our narratives with a sense of "continuity, coherency, and meaning" (WHITE 1987: 11) – do not arise spontaneously from the isolated mind of the enlightened researcher, but are contingent on discursive environments and inherent modes of storytelling. We also know that ordinarily, before we can even start to build an empirical base permitting us to tell a story which claims can be evaluated by peers, we need some sort of basic means or economic incentives. These prerequisites are intrinsically bound; archaeology cannot survive if no one is interested in funding it, and if our narratives do not correspond in some way to lived experiences or political strategies in the present, they risk generating little or no economic support. This is all very well, but I hardly need to call attention to the importance of funding among fellow archaeologists. Money, or rather the lack thereof, is a topic discussed on

a daily basis in most branches of the discipline. However, when it comes to the funding arrangements themselves, as crucial as they are to any archaeological undertaking (or to actions in any other field for that matter), they are rarely seen as anything more than an annoying circumstance or unfortunate necessity. And, at best, they are something signified by a logo or an acknowledgement at the end of a publication. Contrary to such views, I believe that the conditions underlining such arrangements is of great importance and a very good place to start if we are interested in increasing our knowledge about the ‘values’ or ‘political economy’ of archaeology, and to raise the state of critique.

For that reason, this paper is centred around the first criteria applicants must fulfil in the European Commission funding programmes Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013, the one of ‘European added value’. The criteria under which financial support is granted is one of the main points at which benefactor and beneficiary meet, interact, oppose and become part each other’s storylines. By using examples from archaeological projects which have benefited from co-funding from these programmes, I will look at whether and how this notion of ‘European added value’ can be perceived in relation to their plots and narratives. But first the criteria itself and the choice of circumstance, which raises questions about the aforementioned issues of discursive environments and inherent meta-structures, calls for a discussion on what the ‘European added value’ of archaeology might be to the European Commission. Turned around, it also raises questions about what the value of Europe might be to archaeology. In other words, to what extent do these funding bodies – by way of (geo)politically defined criteria like European added value and alongside well-known regulating mechanisms like peer-communities – interact in the creation of archaeological narratives and infrastructures? And, since archaeologists (while increasingly reflexive and by no means naïve) do not enter into discourses of Europe as blank slates, how might preset ideas be induced or wilfully offered when narratives are written? Drawing upon documents, texts and ethnographic material collected during my on-going PhD studies, I will engage with these questions from three angles: perceptions of funding in archaeology, archaeology and the EU/European added value, and lastly, European added value and archaeological projects.

On funding

All archaeology involves funding of some kind and all types of funding involve politics on different levels, both in a practical sense and as part of the infrastructures of power at work in all human interaction. It needs to do so if we accept that firstly, archaeologists should get paid for the wide range of tasks they perform. Secondly, that we are not practising archaeology only for ourselves but to contribute to society in some way. And thirdly, that regardless of our approval, archaeological narratives are still drawn upon in politics and when building collective identities, so we had better participate if we want to make our voices heard.

Despite being so central, the conditions under which funding is granted are seldom explored in a critical fashion. Do not get me wrong, the various financial ties between archaeologists and state authorities are often assumed or referred to implicitly when dealing with the range of themes related to archaeology and modernity (e.g. DIAZ-ANDREU 2007; KOHL – FAWCETT 1996; THOMAS 2004; TRIGGER 2006 [1989]), but the practicalities of these funding arrangements are rarely developed upon in any detail (for exceptions see HAMILAKIS 1999).

Meanwhile, studies looking specifically at financial aspects of archaeology, aiming to situate the profession in a larger socioeconomic context (see e.g. AITCHISON 2000; 2009; AITCHISON – SCHLANGER 2010; DEMOULE 2004; 2011; WILLEMS 2009), have mainly been concerned with describing national financial structures and assessing the consequences of certain types of funding (such as commercial- developer- or state funding), rather than reviewing aspects of political agendas or their ideological roots. Importantly, the gap between archaeology as Cultural Resource Management and academic archaeology has been addressed in this context, although the main concern seems to lie with the level of scientific thoroughness and the overall degree of knowledge production, and less about the potential cognitive impacts or how funding agencies might play a part the content and character of the questions posed.

One reason for the lack of interest in such aspects could be the prevailing view of archaeological research and practice as detached – at least intellectually – from the political aspects of the everyday work (i.e. legal permits, administrative procedures or funding engagements). As emphasised by Michael Shanks when talking about the political economy of the discipline of archaeology, politics is still seen as the context in which archaeology takes place, or how the results are used, rather than being an integral part of the practice (SHANKS 2004: 497).

In this view archaeology is often seen as a science based on a “stock of knowledge embodied in theories”, thereby expelling funding issues from the arena of rationality and criticism and reducing them to an outside interference, getting in the way of researchers autonomy (ADDELSON 2003 [1983]: 179). This makes inquiries into any proposed interaction between the two seem redundant at best. After all, what you write in an application is just prose, having no real bearing on what you actually do right? In line with Shanks I would argue that this relationship goes beyond cosmetics and that we need consider all parts of archaeological practice as bound to its epistemology. Even the most basic declaration, that funding creates better opportunities for researchers within the dominant traditions to exercise ‘cognitive authority’, and help others of their own persuasion to rise in the ranks – thereby gaining even more funding – shows how funding effects the contents and organization of knowledge production at any given historical moment (ADDELSON 2003 [1983]: 177f). Ultimately, it affects how we will come to understand the past and present (see ADDELSON 2003 [1983] for in depth discussion). Viewed in this way, funding engagements becomes something we cannot afford to dismiss, and a way to explicate current entanglements with discourses of power.¹

Of course, archaeologists are no distinct species and this discussion could apply to almost any field trying to increase their status as well as our knowledge of the world. Still, each field of thought presents its own characteristics and challenges. In a study on peer review panels in the United States, social scientist Michèle Lamont found that the notion of ‘excellence’ was defined very differently depending on the field of the evaluator, and that “disciplines shine under different lights [...] and are best located on different matrixes of evaluation, precisely because their object and concerns differ so dramatically” (LAMONT 2009: 9). Furthermore, the historical underpinnings of archaeology as a state authorized activity, legitimising heritage in the construction of national pasts, makes it worthwhile to consider in its own right. With this in mind, EU funding programmes in culture stand out as particularly thought-provoking when it comes to the fields of heritage and archaeology. This is partly because it represents a relatively new level for cooperation, with potential effects on disciplinary infrastructures, and partly because it can act as a source of inspiration for potential reincarnations of longstanding notions of “European-ness”.

¹ In this text I refer to discourse as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice; the way social and political domination are reproduced in text and talk (FAIRCLOUGH 1992: 4; 1995).

European added value – The concept

“The conversation (about European Added Value) is constant. In everything the commission does it is always about: is this something Europe should deal with? Is it something we do better here?” (EC-EAC03 2012, European Commission official, Culture, translation mine).

Before going any further, it might be helpful to know a bit more about this concept. Ever since my time working as a trainee for the European Commission, its vagueness has intrigued me. As part of the team of administrators managing the selection process for the programme Culture 2007–2013, one of my tasks was to assist experts and when needed, clarify how certain criteria should be addressed. This was not an easy task and with experts from a range of different countries and fields, with varied experience in evaluation procedures, the differences and nuances in how criteria were approached fascinated me. European added value (from now on EAV) is the first listed amongst the three highest valued award criteria, declaring that projects supported by Culture 2000 needed to “provide real European Cultural added value” (Call for proposals 2003), while projects supported by Culture 2007–2013 are judged based on “the extent to which the project can generate real European added value” (Programme Guide 2010).

Used as a condition for most EU programmes and actions, and embedded in a family of interrelated concepts,² the notion has become hugely popular during the last decades and anything having to do with the EU agenda now come equipped with the claim that the proposed actions should lead to an increase of such a value. As pointed out by political scientist Daniel TARSCHYS (2005: 37), the extensive use of the argument almost vanquishes its potential credibility. Of course, the meaning of the notion of ‘value’ itself is not easy to delimit, and adding European to it makes it even more complex. From a social theory point of view, anthropologist David Graeber argues that there are mainly three ways in which ‘value’ has been used; values in the sociological sense of what is good, proper, or desirable in human life, value in the economic sense as measured by how much others are willing to give up to get desired objects, and value in the linguistic

² As a consequence of what has been called ‘The value Turn in Governance and public policy’, many similar concepts like Surplus value, The value chain, Common values, Nordic value or “*Nordisk nytta*” have developed (TARSCHYS 2005).

sense as ‘meaningful difference’ (GRAEBER 2001: 1f.). All three understandings have bearing on the concept of EAV.

According to the EU Council resolution establishing Culture 2007–2013, “European added value is an essential and determining concept in the context of European cultural cooperation, and a general condition for Community measures in the field [...]” (2006: 1855/EC). Such declarations of importance are not necessarily followed by explanations of *how* it is important or *what* it stands for, although an attempt to nail down its content was made in 2003. Then it was stated that it should apply to: pan-European, multilateral, cooperative, visible, knowledge generating and awareness raising actions – primarily benefiting European citizens – so as to create a sustainable economic development and integration of cultures (2003: C13/03). In other words, a sound economic justification should be matched with positive contributions to a sense of European unity, making EAV about what is “good” and “right”, as well as the worth of cultural actions in an economic sense. It is also stated in the document, similarly to the UNESCO notion of ‘Universal Value’ (see CLEERE 2001), that EAV is meant to “be implemented in a flexible way”, leaving it defined by its vagueness, simultaneously empowered and undermined by it. In a linguistic sense it is perhaps the word European that is most significant. Notwithstanding that both the geographical delineation and adjective ‘European’ are epistemological entities (with ontological effects), the notion is laden with meanings (progress, Christianity, enlightenment, democracy, colonialism, totalitarianism etc.). Since the majority of these embedded meanings – persistently invoked in EU rhetoric’s –³ builds on notions of “us” and “them”, of inclusion and exclusion, it is hard to imagine how a flexible European added value (note that value is in singular, not plural) could do anything but reinforce division. While all types of identity build on division, which is not by default a negative feature, there is a risk that already existent western chauvinism settles comfortably in this mould. Among the effect these rhetoric’s have already had, the now habitual conflation of ‘Europe’ with the space of the European Union can be mentioned. Tanja Petrovic has called this “thinking Europe without thinking”, explaining that countries “[...] already within the EU can include or

³ As a recent example, European Commission President J. M. Barroso, said in a speech at the opening of the archaeological and historical exhibition ‘Europe meets the world’ at the National Museum of Denmark in January 2012, that “We are always speaking today, because of the crisis, about the financial markets, but Europe is about culture, Europe is about values, Europe is also about civilization [...] we should not be afraid of the word ‘civilization’” (BARROSO 2012, original language).

exclude, while those who are ‘on their way to Europe’, or those who do not have the option of membership at all, are excluded” (PETROVIC 2011: 1).

Discussing the works of Clyde Kluckhohn, Graeber explains his definition of value as “conceptions of the desirable”, in the sense that the “desirable refers not simply to what people actually want [...] Values are ideas about what they *ought* to want” (GRAEBER 2001: 3, original emphasis). This could be a good way to approach the concept of EAV, as being about what those working towards an “ever closer union among the peoples of Europe” (1957 Treaty of Rome) want EU citizens to want. To be fair, and temporarily disregarding the ‘democratic deficit’ which has plagued these institutions, it also comes down to what the voting publics want. Either way, it is not just a wish or mere abstraction. The concept of EAV affects the way people in the EU do things, as well as the evaluators and participants in funded projects who have chosen to relate to it.

As a final remark, EAV is certainly not the only vague criteria that experts and applicants have to interpret (others like ‘intercultural dialogue’ and ‘synergy effects’ can be even more difficult), but it is one of the core concepts in all actions of the European Commission and as such it becomes interesting in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage, both due to the symbolic and economic role heritage have been given in European cultural politics, and due to archaeology’s role in authorizing national pasts.

Archaeology as European/EU added value

Now let us consider this connection between the European Commission and activities in the field of archaeology and heritage, by looking into the premises for their respective investment in each other. Namely, wherein lays the European added value of archaeology and heritage for the European Commission (if anywhere)? And what might European added value be in relation to archaeology?

To begin with, in the context of European Commission actions, archaeological activities and sites are usually included into the wider category of cultural heritage and have only occasionally been discussed explicitly or on their own.⁴ Consequently, it is as one of the essential components of the set phrase ‘European

⁴ However, as discussed by SMITH (2006) the European or western ‘authorized heritage discourse’ – a discourse favoring monumentality, scientific/aesthetic judgment, nation building and institutionally sanctioned knowledge – does tend to privilege archaeological conceptualizations of heritage. This is reflected in most EC and EU conceptualisations of heritage.

Heritage' they have become activated and meaningful (see TZANIDAKI 2000 for an extended overview). In this shape, there have been mainly three types of added value assigned to them; intrinsic European value, value for contemporary European culture and identity and commercial value (i.e. tourism, employment, PR and branding).

Already in the Treaty of Rome (1957), establishing the European Economic Community (EEC), the protection of "national treasures of artistic, historical or archaeological value" was mentioned (Art. 36). But it was not until the 1970s and the 'Declaration on European Identity' (1973) – in which "reviewing the common heritage" was listed as the first measure – that heritage was put to work in relation to goals of cohesion. Up until then the EEC had relied on federal-functionalist theories of integration, in which the integration of individual economic sectors was expected to generate spill-over effects. These effects would then translate into cultural cohesion and an ever stronger role for to supranational institutions (see ROSAMOND 2000). In the 1970s the EEC realised that this idea of a European ethos or common identity, emerging by itself as a bi-product of financial commitment, was not likely occur without directed efforts. The new message, as it was passionately expressed by a French representative of the Council of the European Communities at the time, became: "There is no political power without economic power. There is no economic power without political and cultural purpose" (1981: 14/11/CEC, also in TZANIDAKI 2000). The preservation of heritage was included in this purpose, and the motivation for supporting it was articulated in the first Recommendation on the topic: "...the architectural and natural heritage which reflects Europe's cultural identity is seriously threatened with decay and disappearance and urgent measures are needed" (1974: 75/65/EEC). This emphasis on heritage in a state of crisis, was repeated in recommendations and resolutions throughout the 1970s, and focus was placed on saving and preserving the common tangible heritage, as well as contributing to an increased workforce of heritage experts and improved techniques, thereby increasing tourism and movement of cultural goods (1977: 6/77 EEC). The fear of loss and the destruction of sites and monuments was a real concern in the post-war period (and still is), and it was believed that the social and cultural values they represented would also wither in their wake (SMITH 2006: 100). As a result, their intrinsic European value and their potential value for a European identity, was dependent on the discourse of a heritage in crisis, passively waiting for someone to rescue it for the benefit of all Europeans.

Alongside its economic value this inherent value was emphasised throughout the 1980s, but with a twist towards a more positive notion, accentuating its dynamic cohesive properties. In relation to the European Parliament 'Report on the protection of the architectural and archaeological heritage' (1982), a report which led to financial support for projects on sites like Skyllition (IT), Acropolis and Mount Athos (GR), the motivation for Community involvement was expressed in the following way:

“No aspect of culture gives stronger and clearer expression to the link with the past than architectural monuments and archaeological sites. They are the silent but revealing testimony to our European cultural history, because monuments have a European character. They are not national, styles from ancient times to the present being European. They therefore kindle the awareness among Europeans that, despite the great variety, they have a common culture, and this, even more than a common economy, is what is really needed for a united Europe” (1982: 0206 EP).

Rhetoric's aside, it is important to note that what little financial support came from the EEC at this time was generally connected to cooperation with the international (non-EU) organisation Council of Europe and with UNESCO. It was not until 1992, when the Maastricht Treaty broke new grounds by establishing a legal base for cultural action (1992: Treaty of Maastricht) – and the European Communities became the European Union – that the European Commission could carve out their own space in the field of culture. While there were (and still are) strong subsidiary rules in place, stating that the European Commission could not in any way interfere with national interests in culture, the first funding programmes in this field were launched only a few years later. Among them were the Raphaël programme (1997–1999), which was entirely dedicated to heritage and engaged archaeologists and heritage professionals on many different levels (see NIKLASSON 2013). The first generation of programmes were followed by the interdisciplinary programme Culture 2000, and the current successor Culture 2007–2013, both supporting heritage activities as only one out several areas. While these programmes only offer co-funding for projects, and even though the scale of investments cannot be compared to ones in other fields and sciences, it is important to recognise that cultural actions have long served as food for

commissioners and politicians longing to anchor the myth of European Unity in a past a little bit more distant, a little less dark (see RIEKMANN 1997).

So, what happened to the European added value of heritage when these programmes came into being? With the famous Maastricht Article 128 – stating 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”

– cultural heritage slowly came to be seen as something more malleable and mobile, as an active agent in identity building. The presumption that it was something already in existence that could be brought to the fore, was now accompanied by the view that heritage activities with a ‘European dimension’, could increase the European added value of monuments and sights (1997: 2228/EC). As an expression of this non-static value, it was stated in the webpage of the Directorate for Culture and Education in 2004 that: “cultural heritage is widely recognised across Europe as a vehicle of cultural identity”.⁵

Today, although the notion of heritage is still heavily linked to the fields of archaeology, preservation and the museum sectors – intangible heritage, diversity and socioeconomic values, are more and more emphasised in cultural actions.⁶ In an interview with a European Commission official in Culture, upon the question of what kind of attitudes there were towards heritage in the commission, he concedes that:

“It’s a hard topic, or a very traditional topic [...] the fact that the [Culture] programme has a multidisciplinary approach is good in that respect cause it is not focusing on [...] too traditional aspects

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/portal/activities/heritage/cultural_heritage_vehic_en.htm [28.06.2013].

⁶ This change was highlighted in the rhetoric of EU enlargement, a long process which led to the re-definition of heritage towards intangible values like “democracy, pluralism and the rule of law” (TZANIDAKI 2000: 23). Another important influence has been the UNESCO Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, adopted on the 20th of October 2005 (2005: UNESCO). It aims to preserve cultural diversity worldwide and the Community became party to it in 2006.

of culture but it can be transversal so there are projects that are born as more traditional ones for example with activities focusing just on heritage and then they found their way and linked to other sectors” (EC-EAC01 2011, original language).

In this context ‘traditional’ was later exemplified as restoration or public heritage activities, the latter being something archaeologists would probably not consider in this way.

The need for intersectional cooperation is often stressed in relation to the economic value of heritage. Mirroring the general political and economic situation in the EU and elsewhere, the emphasis on economic value has increased drastically in recent years (especially in relations to the coming programme *Creative Europe*). When asking the same official what this might mean for the value of heritage I got the response:

“I participated in a few seminars and debates organised by actors in the field of heritage and [...] they asked also for some contributions on the classic value of heritage if you can call it that, or social value. I mean there are different factors and all of them are equally important of course, but probably nowadays the economic one is the most visible [...] [but] let’s not forget that heritage is quite a complex concept so it is not just economic and that is something we always try to stress” (EC-EAC01 2011, original language).

This ambivalence is widespread in EU discussions involving cultural heritage. While the economic value has always been acknowledged (especially in relation to tourism and the heritage industry), the ideas of an inherent European value residing inside monuments versus a dynamic value as building blocks for a European sense of belonging, have never successfully merged. This parallel existence, in the field of tension between *promoting* and *creating* a heritage for Europe, where well-seasoned meta-narratives can be used together with a freshly assigned European significance, can be compared to the writing of a book after the movie is already made. As anthropologist Cris SHORE (2000) has observed, European Commission discourses on Europe have their roots in nineteenth century liberal modernity, and the institutions have, at least until the beginning of the 21st century, used the same methods for identity building as the nation states (flag, hymn, currency, heritage, specific days). According to him this builds

on the flawed assumption that a European identity can be created by tapping into already existing patterns of ‘European culture’ and ‘core values’. That such an identity will emerge through stimulating the awareness of a shared cultural heritage, all while ignoring the fact that precisely those cultural elements have stood as dividing walls between Europeans (SHORE 2000: 225). Shore, along with other anthropologists and social scientists, agree that the initiatives undertaken so far have not been very successful (DELANTY 2010; SHORE 2000; 2006; THEILER 2006). The European Commission has managed to “Europeanise” some of the cultural infrastructures within its jurisdiction, by offering a spatial category outside the realm of national authorities and reconfiguring national elements into “European” products (TRETTER 2011: 945). Yet, top-down initiatives looking to generate a European added value, by prescribing what EU citizens *ought* to desire, does not seem to have had the anticipated impact on a societal level.

Roel DURING (2010) and Claske VOS (2011), two researchers who have separately looked into how EU discourses on heritage have been transferred and negotiated on local and regional levels, both insist that the gap between those active at a policy level and those implementing activities at ground level, has been too wide. This has led to a great deal getting intentionally or unintentionally lost in translation, and their results show clearly that what becomes ‘European’ in the set phrase European heritage (if anything), is not always what was originally hoped for. For example, the Regional Programme on Cultural and Natural Heritage in South East Europe, funded by the EU and the Council of Europe in an attempt to bring about Europeanisation in applicant states, ended up working contradictory to their goals of reconciliation in Serbia (VOS 2011). According to Vos, the programme created a division between the people who were for and against the initiative, and the sites selected for support became the ones the national institutions lay no claim to or had no interest in. That they did not succeed as economy boosting, goodwill-generating instruments does not mean they had no effect. While publics may never have understood that the annual heritage day in their country is an EU initiative,⁷ or cared much about the new European dimension of heritage sites in Serbia, archaeologists and other professionals in the field of heritage are more connected on an EU scale than ever and this is bound to have an effect on the development within our fields.

⁷ Similar to the examples discussed by Claske Vos (2011), European Commission officials have made some remarks in my interviews, that the event called the European Heritage Days tend to become ‘nationalised’ in countries where it is a successful initiative, while the event is still called ‘European’ in places where it is not.

As a final remark it might be wise to say a word or two about the future of heritage in the European Commission. Despite or perhaps because of the current European sovereign-debt crisis (starting in 2008), the role and significance of cultural heritage is being renegotiated. So is the support for humanities and cultural actions within framework programmes dealing with Research and Regional development (from which cultural heritage projects have benefited greatly). When the Green Paper on ‘Horizon 2020’, the future major EU funding instrument for research, was presented in February 2011 it immediately became clear that research into subject areas like archaeology and heritage – along with other topics in the social sciences and humanities – was not to be considered a priority or hardly even a concern. This led to strong objections from various disciplines and institutions. While debates continue, the European Commission’s directorate for education and culture has adopted – alongside already supported initiatives such as the ‘European Heritage Awards’ and the ‘European Heritage Days’ – its perhaps most emblematic heritage initiative as of yet, the ‘European Heritage Label’. This new label will focus especially on young audiences and on Europeanising the didactic contents on selected sites, rather than restoration, popularity, aesthetics or cultural historical values (2011: 1194/EU). On the whole it appears as if heritage is still (or perhaps to an even greater extent than before) seen as something that needs to be highlighted, preserved and communicated within EU cultural actions, rather than critically analysed and researched. This type of asymmetry has the potential to increase uncritical practices in regards to narratives woven around archaeological sites, actualizing the question of where in the span of tension between a future ‘Archaeology of Europe’ and a ‘Europe’ in archaeological interpretations, the notion of European added value has its place.

Europe/EU as added value for archaeology

Having talked at some length about the values of heritage within the European Commission, I would now like to narrow the scope and turn to the discipline of archaeology to discuss how this added value could manifest itself and what it could entail.

Aside from the most basic value which the programmes of the European Commission holds to archaeology, the one of economic opportunity, there are three interrelated ways in which this could be approached:

- One is the value of Europe as a frame for interpretation of the past, which in some cases have led to the search for a unique ‘European-ness’ corresponding to the landmass called Europe and the peoples residing there. This could be named the archaeology of a European past.
- The second is what could be called the “non”-value of Europe, as presented in scholarly efforts to deconstruct its meanings, in relation to the meta-narratives of modernity (including the accounts of a European past created in the former category). In a way, the sheer wealth of texts written on this topic during the last 30 years has in itself created a trope of Europe, an array of specific ways for deconstructing it and eventually recreating it in the process of tearing it apart.
- A third way to approach a European value is by looking at the influence of geopolitical institutions and infrastructures as enablers, thereby highlighting the potentials and the consequences of the EU as a level of governance affecting archaeological practice. It actualises the Europe of the EU as a “new” platform for cooperation. Let us call this a future archaeology of Europe.

Within Archaeological storytelling, long dominated by meta-narratives such as evolutionary theory or Marxism, Europe have figured as everything from an interpretative geographical frame – the backdrop or stage upon which the plot has played out – to starring as the main character or phenomenon to be explained, sometimes turning out to be the very explanation in itself. Late 19th and early 20th century narratives of Europe habitually followed a teleological path of progress reaching its crescendo in modernity, and whether it was due to uncorrupted barbarian origins or the resurrection of a civilized classical past, peoples in Europe were attributed with certain favoured characteristics, distinguishing them from various Others (i.e. CHILDE 1925; 1962; CLARK 1952; HAWKES 1940; RENFREW 1973). Archaeologist Herdis HØLLELAND (2008) has considered such narratives in some depth, paying particular attention to the Bronze Age and the works of Gordon V. CHILDE (1892–1957). She argues that, while archaeological grand narratives of Europe have in different ways been uncritically incorporated in the political identity discourses of the Council of Europe and the EU (especially when it comes to European personhood and citizenship), they have also had the reverse effect and contributed to an increased openness and critical awareness in Bronze Age archaeology (HØLLELAND 2008; 2010; 2011). The particular use of the Bronze Age has also been considered by archaeologist Anna GRÖHN

(2004). Although she creates a good overview of projects benefiting from support from the European Commission Culture programme (up until 2004), one main point of focus in her study – as in most texts on this topic – is the Council of Europe’s campaign ‘The Bronze Age – The First Golden Age of Europe’ (1994–1997) (COUNCIL OF EUROPE 1994). These campaigns, followed by exhibitions like ‘Europe in the Time of Ulysses – the European Bronze Age’ (1998–1999), demonstrated how archaeologists interacting with ideas of Europe in a political setting, had little trouble tying together a past, present and future Europe. A campaign pamphlet from 1993 suggests that

“The Bronze Age was an exciting period of Europe’s history when contacts between the various parts of greater Europe began to develop, mirroring the modern interaction between the member states of the Council of Europe” (COE 1993).

Similarly, in the theme number of ‘European Heritage’ (1994 No. 2), quotes by Gordon V. CHILDE (1930: 2) such as ‘...all the vital elements of modern material culture are immediately rooted in the Bronze Age’, were used to tie the period to the Europe of today. These campaigns and exhibitions later received attention from both critical archaeologists and enthusiastic European Commission officials, the latter intensifying their cooperation with Council of Europe in the area of culture and cultural heritage from the mid-1990s onwards (1996: 7575 CoE). Alexander Gramsch has argued in relation to the campaigns and what he saw as a growing Europeanism in archaeology – or the hunt to “present histories of the ‘Europeanness’ of prehistoric cultures in Europe” (GRAMSCH 2000: 7) – that we need a ‘Reflexive Theory’ rooted in sociological theory and epistemology, to guide future research on prehistories in Europe, taking into consideration the fundamental differences in the archaeologies of the continent (GRAMSCH 2000: 16). While there are signs that such a change is slowly taking place, there are still traces left of what Martin Bernal has called the “[...] continental chauvinism inherent in all our historiography, or philosophy of writing history” (BERNAL 1991: 32). Even though the approach suggested by Colin Renfrew in the 1970s, of “[...] seeing the events of European prehistory as the result of a purely local process, in essentially European terms” (RENFREW 1973: 121), probably finds little or no support today, attempts to question Europe as a frame for interpretation often end up arguing for the validity of such a statement in the first place. And on

that note, it might be time to enter the discussion about the so called “non”-value of Europe.

Grand narratives have received significant attention in the humanities ever since the late twentieth century’s ‘linguistic-’ and ‘cultural turn’.⁸ Having corresponded particularly well to the political movements of colonialism, imperialism and nationalism, archaeological narratives is no exception (PLUCIENNIK 1999: 656). Emerging in pace with the political project of building Europe, this shift towards questioning the assumptions beneath constructed pasts (and presents) has led many scholars to ask ‘when was Europe?’, ‘what is Europe?’ and ‘how is Europe done?’ (BUGGE 2003; BALZARETTI 1992; BURKE 1980; 2006; GODDARD *et al.* 1994; DELANTY 1995; 2010; MALMBORG – STRÄTH 2002; SHORE 2000; PAGDEN 2002; THEILER 2006 etc.).

In the meantime, in the wake of dissolution and epistemological upheaval – situated knowledge’s and imaginary communities – archaeology developed an obsession with identities. While they were now recognized as fluid both in the past and present, and no longer restricted to national borders, this also opened up for dialogues of European identities. As pointed out by Gramsch, the political reasons behind these ‘turns’ as they came to be adapted in archaeology, such as the crisis connected to the “dissolution of established nation-states”, is at the same time partly to blame for what he calls the ‘Europeanist turn’ (GRAMSCH 2000: 7). Thus, although critical in nature, EU discourses on Europe have also been assisted by academic questioning and the search for ‘European-ness’ that intensified after the Second World War (GODDARD *et al.* 1994). By now the study of European Commission cultural policy and the notion of ‘European identity’ have almost become a field of its own in social and political sciences. Despite the fact that archaeologists, as pointed out by Mark Pluciennik, “are generally better at examining the past, including the history of their own discipline, than at considering the present or the near future” (PLUCIENNIK 1998: 816), quite a number of studies have considered the topic from an archaeological point of view (e.g. GRAMSCH 2000; GRAVES-BROWN – JONES 1996; GRÖHN 2004; DURING 2010; ENGLISH 2008; KRISTIANSEN 2008; PLUCIENNIK 1998; TZANIDAKI 2000; VOS 2011).

Such critical approaches (wherein I include my own research) have a tendency to become, and perhaps needs to become, traditional in their critique of tradition

⁸ Deconstructed by theorists like Jean-François LYOTARD (1984) and Hayden WHITE (1987), undermined and contested by post-colonial theorists such as Edward W. SAÏD (1978) and Gayatri SPIVAK (1988).

(as in canonical). Discussing the hermeneutics of tradition, philosopher Marcia Sá Cavalcante SCHUBACK (2013) describes tradition as something inescapable that we can only approach or understand from within, as a *withsense* rather than an absence or a presence. Tradition has a critical potential in that it provides steady footing for reproach, but we cannot escape it and we keep recreating it in the act of deconstruction. In search for operational values the European Commission have both drawn on and fought traditional notions of Europe, and in midst of the economic crisis this search have also been interrupted by tradition in its various forms (like ultra-nationalism). In the critical narratives of archaeologists and other scholars, the frame of Europe may have been proven hollow and it may even have lost its image (if it was ever there). But this does not render the attempts to uphold it – the efforts to fill the frame with a new image – harmless, but all the more dubious, calling for continuous critical consideration.

This brings me to the third type of potential European added value, to the ideas of a future archaeology of Europe. While anachronistic evocations of a pan-European unity in prehistory have generally been dealt with by proponents in the former category, discussions on increasing cross-border cooperation and harmonization of archaeological practices within the EU and Europe, carry on. With the formation of the Council of Europe Conventions on archaeological heritage and the start of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) in 1994, and later also the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium* (EAC) in 1999,⁹ platforms for exchanging and integrating research and ideas, guidelines and languages became established. In 1999, seeing that concerted action was being developed and problems addressed, archaeologist Willem Willems expressed confidence in the future of European archaeology, reassuring us that “European archaeologists are working on that future, and that they are doing it together” (WILLEMS 1999: 16). A few years later, in view of new EU legislation which affected archaeological heritage, and the lack of EAA and EAC representation in Brussels, the tone was less optimistic (WILLEMS 2007: 68). Nevertheless, judging from the continued debates within the field and new platforms for cooperation – like the ‘Joint programming initiative for Cultural heritage’,¹⁰ the new ‘Reflection group on EU and Cultural Heritage’ composed of representatives of National

⁹ A network of heads of national services responsible under law for the management of the archaeological heritage in the Council of Europe member states (<http://www.european-archaeological-council.org> [20.02.2013]).

¹⁰ <http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/> [20.02.2013].

Heritage Institutions of EU member states, and long running EU supported projects like ‘Discovering the archaeologists of Europe’¹¹ – pan-European cooperation does not seem to be in bad shape at all.

Looking at it optimistically, this new level of collaboration may be a way to directly influence laws and regulations on national and EU level, and otherwise at least act as a channel for information about political decisions which may affect the “raw material” of the discipline or the conditions of employment. As a platform for research it can also work to mend the gaps between archaeology in different parts of Europe and make it easier to ask the big questions. However, there are several things to keep in mind here. With the creation of common guidelines, laws and codes of ethics, consolidation and the freezing of development on a restricted geopolitical level might also follow (see HAMILAKIS 2007). In the long term, chances of interpretations and practices becoming stuck on that level may also increase. As pointed out by archaeologist Matthew JOHNSON (2006), the basic ways in which archaeologists do things matter; the way we dig determines the way we interpret. Recent efforts to come to terms with – or at least understand – the differences between ways of doing archaeology in Europe, have provided a base for a deepened discussion (BIEHL *et al.* 2002; GRAMSCH – SOMMER 2011). But to actually harmonize practices and research frameworks on a European level, especially since it has been suggested that future archaeological frameworks should rely in part on financial support from the European Commission (HARDING 2009; KRISTIANSEN 2008; WILLEMS 1999; 2007), may prove a treacherous road to walk.

The question one might ask however, is if there not already such a thing as European archaeology. It was addressed in 2008 by Kristian Kristiansen and number of other scholars in a discussion article named: Do We Need the ‘archaeology of Europe’? (KRISTIANSEN 2008). By demonstrating the narrow geographical scope of archaeological journals and their content, he argued that due to the step away from grand narratives and big questions, local and national presentations and restricted citation networks are dominating archaeological research. Subsequently, if we increase our knowledge of different languages and expand our field of enquiry, archaeology would regain its status as a scientific field of expertise. While calling attention to the relationship between ideology, politics and archaeology in the formation of critical knowledge, he argues that the best way to reach the global questions is through first establishing a European platform

¹¹ <http://discovering-archaeologists.eu/> [12.05.2013].

(KRISTIANSEN 2008: 24). Yet, the distinction between a National, European and Global level is not very straightforward. We can talk of Europe in terms of east, west and central or expand it to ‘the western world’, but the opposition between nations within Europe and the differences in the self-image of nations as European, is not big enough to blur the contrast between Europe and its various Others. That line has been more actively maintained through the centuries. Using the words of Neal Ascherson in his response to the article, I am curious as to why Europe should somehow be the ultimate (or first) container (ASCHERSON 2008: 25). There seems to be far more reasons to avoid reinforcing anew the preset cognitive boundaries of our field. After all archaeology is one out of a number of western ways to tell stories about the human past, and while laws and practices differ there is in one sense already “no archaeology but European archaeology”, as it was aptly put by Thomas Meier in his response (MEIER 2008: 36).

Narratives in the making

So what kinds of plots are suggested when projects apply to the Culture programme? And how might narratives, created in projects already considered to contain or to be able to generate European added value, actually read?¹² Based on previous discussions about the value of Europe in archaeology and the value of archaeology for the European Commission, a handful of very different archaeological projects funded by the Culture programmes will serve as examples of wider tendencies observed in my on-going research. First however, in order to get a better idea about the programmes themselves, I will briefly present some of the basics.

Between the years 2000 and 2006, Culture 2000 co-financed 1 529 actions and projects, out of which 398 were in the field of cultural heritage and with a total budget of 236,5 million Euro (2008: C3345/ECOTECH).¹³ As you would expect, all of these projects did not involve archaeology or the care archaeological remains,

¹² In this part I use the definition of narrative as a story or a sequence within a larger story, presenting an idea or account of the past. Except for articles and books, this can refer to texts on a homepage, a project report (where the narrative of the project itself is told) or a folder/leaflet etc. Plot (not “emplotment”) refers to aims or objectives, often with a meta-narrative backdrop (like for example EU policy texts which also have a narrative structure, especially memorandums).

¹³ The number of projects is calculated based on the yearly lists of projects supported in the field of Cultural Heritage (<http://ec.europa.eu/culture/archive/> [25.01.2013]).

but approximately a third had archaeological links or topics. Culture 2007–2013, still in force, has 400 million Euros for co-financing roughly 300 cultural actions per year.¹⁴ Both programmes support cooperation activities among cultural operators from eligible countries and rest on the legal base first established in the Maastricht Treaty 1992.¹⁵ Culture 2000 was meant to “share and highlight, at a European level, the common cultural heritage of European significance”, and to promote “[...] mutual exchange between European and non-European cultures” (2000: 508/EC). Similarly, Culture 2007 is justified through phrases like:

“For citizens to give their full support to, and participate fully in European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common cultural values and roots as a key element of their identity and their membership of a society founded on freedom, equity, democracy, respect for human dignity and integrity, tolerance and solidarity [...]” (2006: 1855/EC).

The meaning of Europe is not addressed in these programmes, except when it comes to what is considered to be eligible ‘Third countries’ (geographically within Europe). There also remains a tension between an essentialist notion of unity, separating European and non-European cultures, and the respect for diversity (also reflected in the EU motto ‘unity in diversity’).

The programme is divided into three strands for different types of projects, but the one in focus here and the one providing the highest amounts of co-funding is strand number 1 (with subcategories 1.1 and 1.2.1), financing multiannual and shorter period cooperation projects.¹⁶ The selection is carried out in three phases. The first takes place in the Commission where administrative eligibility criteria are checked. The second consists of a two-step evaluation by external experts in

¹⁴ <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/> [24.01.2013].

¹⁵ Maastricht Treaty 1992, Article 128; Amsterdam Treaty 1997, Article 151; Lisbon Treaty 2009, Article 167.

¹⁶ In the current programme, multi-annual projects have to involve a minimum of six cultural operators from six eligible countries. Lasting from a minimum of 36 months to a maximum of 60 months, they are granted from EUR 200.000 to a maximum EUR 500.000 per year. Shorter period cooperation projects should be shared by at least three cultural operators from three eligible countries. Maximum duration is 24 months and the amount of funding ranges between EUR 50.000 and EUR 200.000 per year. In both cases, EU support is limited to 50% of the total eligible costs (<http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/> [24.01.2013]).

which each application is assessed by two persons, separately at first and then together in a so called ‘consensus meeting’ where the final scores (1–100) are decided. The criteria of EAV, alike the second (relevance to the objectives of the Programme) and third criteria (level of excellence), counts for 0–20 points, while the remaining four can get only 0–10 points. In the third phase, the commission puts together a list of graded projects and makes a final decision based on the established budget, whereafter the expert evaluation sheets are sent out to the applicants together with a letter of rejection or acceptance. During the implementation of the project a commission ‘project officer’ is assigned as the main contact for the coordinators, and usually this is also the person evaluating the mid-term and final reports of the project (although the financial part is evaluated separately). In the final report, and in order to attain the last payment, the project is obliged to demonstrate how they achieved their goals and consequently also those of the sponsor.

European pasts

If we look at the archaeologies of a European past, there exist a range of projects corresponding to this in some way. In the short summary provided by the projects for the programme web page and database,¹⁷ we find project descriptions such as:

“The objective is to show the roots and the common European dimensions of comparable architecture or archaeological elements of the walled towns” (Culture 2000, Walled Towns: From Division to Co-Division, 2002–2003).

¹⁷ While these elements, lifted from short descriptions, may provide an inadequate picture of the actual activities of these projects, it is the wider implications that are of concern here. Although it is clear that different types of project texts have different aims and therefore uses different types of language, this does not mean that texts directed towards the EU or the public are somehow less significant. Beside the structuring role of applications in organising projects, and the obligation to deliver something at least similar to what was promised, the mere fact that I am able to write this paper shows that these are lasting documents with an impact. Furthermore, it has been argued that the European institutions, due to their own ambivalence about what European culture and EAV actually means, have sought to conceptualise it using projects of an exemplary nature (BANUS 2002).

“To search for a deeper knowledge of the influence that ancient Rome exerted on its provinces in order to help EU member states to be fully aware of the historical roots of their common cultural and social traditions” (Culture 2000, *Living and Dying in the Roman Empire: New Perspectives of Funerary Archaeology*, 2004–2005).

“Archaeological experts will work on providing 3 cultural scenarios [for 3D reconstructions], based on Italian, German and Polish ancient societies, and on finding cultural interconnections, economic, cultural and artistic links between the scenarios” (Culture 2000, *Connecting European Culture through New Technology – NetConnect*, 2006–2009).

“Cultural heritage offers tangible expression to the shared cultural past of European countries: it forms part of the ‘source DNA’ of the spirit that became the phenomenon Europe. Ultimately it represents the evidence and justification of Europe as a geo-cultural entity. Consequently, in the process of forging greater European unity, heritage institutions can play a significant role” (Culture 2007–2013, *Cradles of European Culture*, 2010–2015).¹⁸

There are three noticeable characteristics in these types of articulations; the search for similarities, the presumption that Europe can be treated as a culturally specific entity, and the meshing together of past and present, pointing towards Europe of today as the endpoint of a predestined development in line with the grand narratives of modernity. The language used, like ‘European dimensions’, ‘roots’ and ‘common heritage/culture’ echo EU policy. But does this also shine through in other project narratives? Taking a closer look at the NetConnect project, which created three virtual prehistoric Iron Age landscapes based on archaeological interpretation and research (Magna Graecia IT, Glauberg DE, Biskupin PL), the pattern is repeated in several places. One type of narrative produced was the visualizations themselves. While some of the reconstructions appear to be very site specific, they are also bound together in trailers created for the project, videos in which the 3D scenarios are put together like movie promotions with intense

¹⁸ Collected from the lists of projects at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/archive/culture2000/cult_2000_en.html [24.01.2013]; http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm [24.01.2013].

music. Captions like ‘The wait is over’ and ‘Nothing will be like before’, binds the three sites together by displaying the most impressive features of the sites in sequence.¹⁹ While these do not provide any insight as to what these sites might have in common, a paper from 2007 puts forward the following view:

“At several times and in different regions, the impact of social, economic and environmental changes always caused new ways of living. The investigation of agriculture made people settle down and the emergence of new social systems sometimes caused the development of new settlement structures. Sharing the information about sites (connected with a common specification), spread all over Europe, links the past with the present and can give an idea of a future Europe without frontiers – frontiers in thinking and frontiers as borders and differentiation between countries” (BERTACCHINI *et al.* 2008: 6).

The meshing together of past and present is made extremely explicit in this paragraph, much more so than in other project publications (cf. BEUSING – POSLUSCHNY 2009). Not only is there an underlying presumption that sites all over prehistoric “Europe” can be easily connected, but also that highlighting these connections could assist in current integration of Europe as a geopolitical space. Even if there had been overwhelming empirical material to support a notion of a “pre-Europe”, the issue lies in the circular argument. If projects, as in the case of Cradles of European Culture, start from the idea that cultural heritage can be used as “evidence and justification of Europe as a geo-cultural entity”, the outcomes will have little or no chance of altering that statement. In the perspective of the European Commission, it can be argued that these types of plots and narratives fit their notion of a European identity and common heritage quite well, both in regards to the inherent and the cohesive values of cultural heritage. However, since Europe is no stable, sovereign, autonomous object but something that exists only in “historical relations and fields of power” (MALMBORG – STRÅTH 2002: 7), no two Europe’s have been alike. This does not mean that Europe does not exist. When talking about the Europe of the EU as a construction and imagined community, it is important to remember that it is not just symbolic, but something

¹⁹ [GT] NetConnect - Trailer 1. 2010. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DwYx5lj3wPk&feature=youtube_gdata_player [24.01.2013].

very real and important to those working within the European Commission; “they are ‘building’ Europe; they are ‘constructing’ a new world which they generally know to be right” (MCDONALD 1996: 47).

While I believe there can be ways for archaeologists to participate in such ventures, it requires some consideration as to what constructions “do”. As pointed out by Bruno Latour, the more interesting question is instead whether a construction is well made or not (LATOUR 1999: 16). Looking at these first examples from the point of view of critical awareness, they are found wanting. After examining a number of other projects using this type of wording it is also clear that these passages often relate specifically to modules or activities meant to be presented to publics, and one might ask why such activities should require less critical consideration (instead of more) than the ones aimed towards the research community.

Europe as a “non”-value

For the second ‘value’ I will exemplify using only one project, partly because there are far fewer projects corresponding to this category and partly because this project makes for a very clear example. *Archives of European Archaeology* (AREA) began in 1999 as one of the European Commission’s Cultural Heritage Laboratories and was funded in three intervals until 2008. As put forward in the European Commission summary in 2005, the project dealt with:

“Issues such as the discovery and presentation of the European archaeological heritage, and the role it has played in the construction and consolidation of identities at regional, national and transnational levels”.

In this context European archaeology is described as “a common cultural, scientific and socio-economic heritage of value and interest, as a source of knowledge and of leisure”. The main activities consisted of research on the history of archaeology, and promotion and protection of archaeological archives.²⁰

While the various descriptions on the webpage and the titles of narrative outputs contain words like ‘pan-European’, ‘European archaeology’, ‘European

²⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/archive/culture2000/pdf/projets2001/2001patrimoine_pluri.pdf [24.01.2013].

history' and 'European citizens',²¹ this project does situate the discipline and the practices of archaeology in historical discourses of power, thereby elucidating how (as a social practice) it has come to affect the interpretations of the past. European archaeology becomes a European added value in itself, and perhaps this is the only sustainable way to approach discourses on European identity and a common heritage. After all, archaeology has been most valuable politically as a resource in building the Europe of nation states, a Europe with a dark legacy. AREA dealt with this legacy under themes like 'archaeology abroad' and 'archaeology under dictatorship'. In the travelling exhibition (2008) photos of archaeological excavations carried out under Franco and Mussolini were included,²² and the project arranged meetings on topics like 'Networks, Contacts & Competition in the History of Archaeology' (2006). While it is hard to judge the ultimate impact of the project, it had the potential to act subversively while at the same time confirming Europe as a culturally situated space. The frame remains intact but the painting is altered dramatically.

When it comes to the added value for the EU, this project does perhaps not have a lot to offer in terms of identity building, but as with all larger cooperation projects funded by the culture programmes it involved archaeologists from many countries (11), and networks and platforms for cooperation were established as a result. In relation to such networks, in my interviews with project leaders and European Commission officials, the Europeanisation of archaeologists themselves has often come up. This brings us to what I have called a future archaeology of Europe. Perhaps these connections (and standardisation efforts) are the main result of all of these projects and if so, what might that mean for the future of the discipline?

A future archaeology of Europe?

Most projects co-funded by the Culture programmes have a strong network component. Mobility of professionals and the building of sustainable relations are some of their core features. Only the process of putting together an application creates such links, or as expressed by a European Commission official:

²¹ <http://www.area-archives.org/> [24.01.2013].

²² http://www.area-archives.org/files/Pictures_AREA_Traveling_exhibition.pdf [24.01.2013].

“[...] you work for I don’t know how many months building a cooperation [...] if they are selected fine of course but even if they are not selected there is an advantage because the network is still there and can find other solutions” (EC-EAC01 2011, original language)”.

But some projects are more focused on this aspect than others. One such project is ‘Archaeolandscapes Europe’ (ArcLand), running from 2010 to 2015. It is continuing the work of previous co-funded projects like ‘European Landscapes – Past, Present and Future’ (2004–2007) and ‘Conservation through Aerial Archaeology’ (2000–2001). The ultimate aim of the network is “the use throughout Europe of aerial survey and ‘remote sensing’ to promote understanding, conservation and public enjoyment of the shared landscape and archaeological heritage of the countries of the European Union”, and the long term legacy is expected to be:

“[...] better appreciation of the landscape and archaeological heritage of Europe, closer contact between heritage professionals and the general public, more effective conservation of the shared cultural heritage, the international sharing of skills and employment opportunities, better public and professional education, the wider use of archive resources and modern survey techniques, and higher professional standards in landscape exploration and conservation”.²³

While the word ‘shared’ is highlighted here (surely for political reasons), it appears to be referring to the countries of the EU in their current geopolitical form.²⁴ At the moment the project has 61 partners and associate partners from all EU member states, out of which 27 are co-organizers and tied to the EU contract.²⁵ With its focus on methodology development and networking, this project does

²³ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2009/selection/documents/strand_1_1/02_projects_description.pdf [24.01.2013].

²⁴ The synonym ‘common’ is more ambiguous in this sense, and more often refers to something we ‘have in common’. We can ‘share’ something even if it is not something we have in common.

²⁵ ArchaeoLandscapes Europe, 1st Interim Report – Reference Period: 15/09/2011 to 31/12/2011 <http://www.archaeolandscapes.eu/index.php/en/about/partners.html> [24.01.2013].

indeed have the potential to increase the use and knowledge of archaeological practices in regards to aerial archaeology, and to change the level (literally and figuratively) of archaeological interpretation. Working across national borders is more or less prerequisite in this sense, and the outcomes can create a better base to ask the larger questions as called for by KRISTIANSEN (2008). Nevertheless, it can also consolidate “the landscape and archaeological heritage of Europe” in its singular form, making it much easier to ask questions about – or find patterns within – prehistoric “Europe”, while turning “non-European” landscapes into blind spots (see also MEIER 2013 on the “Europeanness” of landscapes).

Lastly, a second project worth mentioning that belong to this category is ‘Archaeology in Contemporary Europe – ACE’ (2007–2012). It builds on a network of 13 partners and focuses on archaeology as a cultural, scientific and economic practice in the present. Similarly to the AREA project, it deals with archaeology as a European added value in itself, with themes like: the significance of the past in the present, current practices in archaeology, mapping of archaeological practitioners and increasing the relevance and public interest of archaeology.²⁶ The importance of questions on the nature of archaeology in today’s Europe cannot be understated, but it needs to be accompanied by critical questions like: What is Europe about in today’s archaeology? Alongside this contemporary focus and interest in building a base which could be used for streamlining measures, it is interesting to note that they are also filling the frame of Europe with archaeological interpretations. Through narrative compilations like ‘The very beginning of Europe?: cultural and social dimensions of Early-Medieval migration and colonisation’ (ANNAERT *et al.* 2012), and ‘L’Europe: Un continent redécouvert par l’archéologie’ (DEMOULE 2009), they engage with the question of a European past (critically in parts), but even so they end up confirming the specificity of the continent.

Conclusions

“No other world region holds such a rich inheritance, reflecting the way in which Europe has been the cradle of so much of the world’s development. But we are still not reaping the full benefits and spill-over effects of culture in Europe” (EU Commissioner in culture Androulla VASSILIOU, SPEECH/12/725, original language).

²⁶ <http://www.ace-archaeology.eu/> [24.01.2013].

Archaeology of Europe, European archaeology, or looking for a European ‘unity in diversity’ in the remains of the past – does it really matter which way we turn it? It certainly does, but it would be naïve to think that they are mutually exclusive. The adjective ‘European’ is still used extensively in archaeology. Talking about European archaeology seems closer at hand than talking about archaeology in Europe and reading for instance the session descriptions for *European Association of Archaeologists annual meeting in Pilsen 2013*, interpretations of periods in *European prehistory*, such as the *European Neolithic*, or certain pan-*European phenomenon*’s, are addressed from a *European perspective*.²⁷ In such forms it is generally meant to indicate the current geographical extent of the continent carrying the name, although being simultaneously a contemporary signifier and a construct (or several) – relating to historically, socially, and institutionally specific structures of beliefs and statements (FOUCAULT 1971) – calling something European comes with added baggage.

When archaeologist Colin Renfrew wrote about Europe and archaeology in the 1990s, he insisted that we need to re-define the critical questions and “[...] formulate them in relation to frameworks of thought that do not themselves offer or determine a readymade answer” (RENFREW 1994: 171). Despite this, the argument still rested on the presumption that “[...] every continent is unique” (RENFREW 1994: 157). While it is true that “[...] we can only change the structures that bind us once they have been thought” (HODDER 1990: 19), it cannot stop there. Once we accept Europe as something constructed, as both signifier and discourse of power, it is not enough to just recognize this. At that moment it can no longer serve as a valid base or a frame for asking questions about societies preceding its conception by millennia. As insisted by David Lowenthal “[...] any treatment of the past, however circumspect, invariably alters it” (LOWENTHAL 1985: 264), and I would like add that any change in the formations of disciplines, any new or revamped frames we set around our topics, has bearing on our interpretations. Buzzwords and catchphrases, adapted to a pre-set format in order to maximize chances of achieving funding, may seem like external circumstances having nothing to do with the actual activities carried out. But only by working in a larger geopolitical frame and being encouraged to think through concepts such as European added value we engage with them.

In this paper I have discussed a number of ways in which the first application criteria of the European Commission Culture programmes correlate to, or is

²⁷ <http://www.eaa2013.cz/programme/> [24.04.2013].

manifested in, European Commission discourse and in narratives of archaeology and heritage, pointing towards a number of potential effects. From this discussion it is clear that the notion of EAV has a critical and subversive potential, while it could also lead to the consolidation of ethics and platforms for cooperation on EU level. In some cases the recycling of longstanding notions of European-ness become visible. In the late 1990s, archaeologist Mark Pluciennik wrote in response to the increased prospects of European funding that, as collaborating archaeologists

“[...] we should consciously, as part of our task, work deliberately on the margins of any proposed ‘European’ boundaries”,

and that

“[...] projects which deliberately ignore physical and political boundaries by working across them may have more to offer in this respect than either collaborative projects within individual countries or pan-European projects aimed at producing common methodologies, standards and archaeological languages” (PLUCIENNIK 1998: 822).

Fourteen years later, I like to consider my research as a way to revisit this request. Not because increased cross-border cooperation, or the European Union for that matter, should somehow be seen as destructive forces or as having a negative effect on archaeologies in Europe and elsewhere. Not because there are no warranted empirically oriented pan-European research projects, or because grand narratives of Europe are somehow fictional accounts, but because projects taking EU integration goals a point of origin and Europe as a contrast frame for their research, should also critically reflect on the foundations of said work. There may be no Archaeology but European archaeology, but it surely has more values than European added value. In relation to Council of Europe’s European landscape convention, Thomas Meier has discussed the potential of viewing the European-ness of landscapes as the manner and values by which they are managed (freedom, democracy etc.) in order to work against traditional exclusive and top-down approaches (MEIER 2013). This might be one way to tackle the issue, even though it does not challenge the frame. These values are embedded in the dominant western meta-narratives and as such intimately related to “[...] the impulse to moralize reality, that is, to identify it with the social system that is the

source of any morality that we can imagine” (WHITE 1987: 14). Also, as we know from postcolonial discourses they can be exclusive, albeit in different ways.

Lastly, in light of current European Commission initiatives, it appears as if archaeological activities and heritage processes are less interesting as objects of study or areas of research, than they are as a selling point. And, that where there is an anxiety about the usefulness of heritage in relation to the idea of Europe, rather than being reconsidered, essentialist ideas of Europe are being reused. Archaeologist Cornelius Holtorf has argued that “archaeology matters most when its meta-stories matter” (HOLTORF 2010: 391), highlighting the point that we need to continue to tell stories but become better at it, by understanding and critically assessing the meta-stories we tell and the ones we evoke. Archaeologists may never be able to achieve genuine dialogue with their narrative subjects; but in reflecting upon their situated authorship they might be able to do so with the people upholding the structures enabling their narratives to be written.

References

- ADDELSON, KATHRYN PYNE (2003 [1983]), The man of professional wisdom. In: Sandra Harding – Merrill Hintikka (eds), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science*. Dordrecht. 165–186.
- AITCHISON, KENNETH (2000), The funding of professional archaeological practice in England. *Cultural Trends* 10/39, 1–32.
- AITCHISON, KENNETH (2009), After the ‘gold rush’: global archaeology in 2009. *World Archaeology* 41/4, 659–671.
- AITCHISON, KENNETH – NATHAN SCHLANGER (eds) (2010), *Archaeology and the global economic crisis: Multiple impacts, possible solutions*. Brussels.
- ANNAERT, RICA – TINNE JACOBS – INGRID IN’T VEN (eds) (2012), *The very beginning of Europe?: cultural and social dimensions of Early-Medieval migration and colonisation (5th–8th century)*. Conference proceedings: Archaeology in contemporary Europe, May 17–19 2011. Brussels.
- ASCHERSON, NEAL (2008), Europe and its “Kossinna province.” *Archaeological Dialogues* 15/Special Issue 01, 25–27.
- BALZARETTI, ROSSI (1992), The creation of Europe*. *History Workshop Journal* 33, 181–196.

- BANÚS, ENRIQUE (2002), Cultural policy in the EU and the European identity. In: Mary Farrell – Stefano Fella – Michael Newman (eds), *European integration in the 21st century: unity in diversity?* London. 158–184.
- BARROSO, JOSÉ MANUEL DURÃO (2012), *Opening of 'Europe Meets the World' Exhibition*. Copenhagen, 12 January 2012. SPEECH/12/7. (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-7_en.htm [24.07.2013]).
- BERNAL, MARTIN (1991), *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization. Vol.1, The fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785–1985*. London.
- BERTACCHINI, PIER AUGUSTO – GIUSEPPE CONTI – RUTH BEUSING – RAFFAELE DE AMICIS – ALEKSANDER BURSICHE – MARKUS ETZ – DANIEL HOLWEG – AXEL POSLUSCHNY – ASSUNTA TAVERNISE – MARIA T. LINAZA – DOUGLAS PRITCHARD – THOMAS W. MAVER – SUSANNE SIEVERS (2008), *NetConnect: Connecting European culture through new technology. Conference proceedings: EVA-London 2007*. London.
- BEUSING, RUTH – AXEL POSLUSCHNY (2009), *The NetConnect-Project – New access to ancient sites. Conference proceedings: Computer Applications to Archaeology 2009 Williamsburg, USA*. (<http://www.caa2009.org/PapersProceedings.cfm> [1]).
- BIEHL, PETER F. – ALEXANDER GRAMSCH – ARKADIUSZ MARCINIAK (eds) (2002), *Archaeologies of Europe. History, methods and theories/ Archäologien Europas. Geschichte, Methoden Und Theorien*. Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher 3. Münster – New York – München – Berlin.
- BUGGE, PETER (2003), *A European cultural heritage? Reflections on a concept and a programme*. In: Robert S. Peckham (ed.), *Rethinking heritage; cultures and politics in Europe*. London – New York. 1–13.
- BURKE, PETER (1980), *Did Europe exist before 1700? History of European Ideas* 1, 21–29.
- BURKE, PETER (2006), *How to write a history of Europe: Europe, Europes, Eurasia*. *European Review* 14/02, 233–239.
- CHILDE, VERE GORDON (1925), *The dawn of European civilization*. The history of civilization series. London.
- CHILDE, VERE GORDON (1930), *The Bronze Age*. Cambridge.
- CHILDE, VERE GORDON (1962), *The prehistory of Europe*. London.
- CLARK, GRAHAME (1952), *Prehistoric Europe: The economic basis*. London.

- CLEERE, HENRY (2001), *The uneasy bedfellows: Universality and cultural heritage*. In: Robert Layton – Peter G. Stone – Julian Thomas (eds), *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*. London. 22–29.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1994), *The Bronze Age – The first golden age of Europe*. European Heritage 2. Strasbourg.
- DELANTY, GERARD (1995), *Inventing Europe: idea, identity, reality*. New York.
- DELANTY, GERARD (2010), *The European heritage from a critical cosmopolitan perspective*. LSE “Europe in Question” Discussion Paper Series 19. London.
- DEMOULE, JEAN-PAUL (2004), *Archéologie préventive, recherché scientifique et concurrence commercial*. In: Pierre-Laurent Frier (ed.), *Le nouveau droit de l’archéologie préventive*. Paris. 199–242.
- DEMOULE, JEAN-PAUL (ed.) (2009), *L’Europe: un continent redécouvert par l’archéologie*. Paris.
- DEMOULE, JEAN-PAUL (2011), *We still have to excavate – but not at any price*. *Archaeological Dialogues* 18/01, 5–10.
- DÍAZ-ANDREU GARCÍA, MARGARITA (2007), *A world history of nineteenth-century archaeology: Nationalism, colonialism, and the past*. Oxford.
- DURING, ROEL (2010), *Cultural heritage discourses and Europeanisation: discursive embedding of cultural heritage in Europe of the regions*. Wageningen.
- ENGLISH, PENNY (2008), “The flowering of the cultures”: The European Union and regional identity. In: Francis P. McManamon – Andrew Stout – Jodi A. Barnes (eds), *Managing archaeological resources: Global context, national programs, local actions*. Walnut Creek. 58–67.
- FAIRCLOUGH, NORMAN (1992), *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge.
- FAIRCLOUGH, NORMAN (1995), *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Language in Social Life Series. London.
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1971), *L’ordre du discours: leçon inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970*. Paris.
- GODDARD, VICTORIA A. – JOSEP R. LLOBERA – CRIS SHORE (1994), *The anthropology of Europe: Identity and boundaries in conflict*. Explorations in Anthropology. Oxford.
- GRAEBER, DAVID (2001), *Toward an anthropological theory of value: the false coin of our own dreams*. New York.

- GRAMSCH, ALEXANDER (2000), “Reflexiveness” in archaeology, nationalism, and Europeanism. *Archaeological Dialogues* 7, 4–19.
- GRAMSCH, ALEXANDER – ULRIKE SOMMER (eds) (2011), *A history of central European archaeology: Theory, methods, and politics*. Budapest.
- GRAVES-BROWN, PAUL – SIAN JONES (eds) (1996), *Cultural identity and archaeology: The construction of European communities*. London.
- GRÖHN, ANNA (2004), *Positioning the Bronze Age in social theory and research context*. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia Series 8/47. Stockholm.
- HAMILAKIS, YANNIS (1999), La trahison des archeologues? Archaeological practice as intellectual activity in postmodernity. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 12, 60–79.
- HAMILAKIS, YANNIS (2007), From ethics to politics. Introduction to Yannis Hamilakis – Philip Duke (eds), *Archaeology and capitalism: From ethics to politics*. Walnut Creek. 15–40.
- HARDING, ANTHONY (2009), Towards a European archaeology. *World Archaeology* 41/4, 629–640.
- HAWKES, C. F. CHRISTOPHER (1940), *The prehistoric foundations of Europe to the Mycenaean Age*. London.
- HØLLELAND, HERDIS (2008), *The Bronze Age – the dawn of European civilisation?: A case study of usages of the past within the European identity discourse*. Master Thesis, University of Oslo. Oslo.
- HØLLELAND, HERDIS (2010), Spells of history: Childe’s contribution to the European identity discourse. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 20/1, 30–37.
- HØLLELAND, HERDIS (2011), Personhoods for Europe: The archaeological construction and deconstruction of European-ness. In: Christopher Prescott – Håkon Glørstad (eds), *Becoming European: The transformation of third millennium Northern and Western Europe*. Oxford. 12–18.
- HODDER, IAN (1990), *The domestication of Europe: Structure and contingency in Neolithic societies*. Oxford.
- HOLTORF, CORNELIUS (2010), Meta-stories of archaeology. *World Archaeology* 42/3, 381–393.
- JOHNSON, MATTHEW H (2006), On the nature of theoretical archaeology and archaeological theory. *Archaeological Dialogues* 13/02, 117–132.

- KOHL, PHILIP L. – CLARE FAWCETT (1996), *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge.
- KRISTIANSEN, KRISTIAN (2008), Do we need the ‘archaeology of Europe’? *Archaeological Dialogues* 15/Special Issue 01, 5–25.
- LAMONT, MICHÉLE (2009), *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge.
- LATOUR, BRUNO (1999), *Pandora’s hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge.
- LOWENTHAL, DAVID (1985), *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge.
- LYOTARD, JEAN-FRANÇOIS (1984), *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*. Theory and History of Literature. Manchester.
- MALMBORG, MIKAEL – BO STRÅTH (2002), *The meaning of Europe: variety and contention within and among nations*. Oxford.
- MCDONALD, MARYON (1996), ‘Unity in diversity’: Some tensions in the construction of Europe. *Social Anthropology* 4, 47–60.
- MEIER, THOMAS (2008), There is no archaeology but European archaeology ... *Archaeological Dialogues* 15/Special Issue 01, 34–36.
- MEIER, THOMAS (2013), What’s European in the landscape? In: Dirk Callebaut – Jan Mařík – Jana Maříková-Kubková (eds), *Heritage reinvents Europe*. Proceedings of the International Conference Ename, Belgium, 17–19 March 2011. Budapest. 55–63.
- NIKlasson, ELISABETH (2013), And we would like to thank: The role of funding in archaeology. In: Anna Källén (ed.), *Making cultural history: new perspectives on Western heritage*. Lund. 151–161.
- PAGDEN, ANTHONY (2002), *The idea of Europe: from antiquity to the European Union*. Washington.
- PETROVIC, TANJA (2011), Thinking Europe without thinking: Neo-colonial discourse on and in the western Balkans. *Eurozine* 2011-09-22. (<http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2013-02-27-petrovic-it.html> [24.01.2013]).
- PLUCIENNIK, MARK (1998), Archaeology, archaeologists and ‘Europe’. *Antiquity* 72/278, 816–824.
- PLUCIENNIK, MARK (1999), Archaeological narratives and other ways of telling. *Current Anthropology* 40/5, 653–678.

- RENFREW, COLIN (1973), *Before civilization, the radiocarbon revolution and prehistoric Europe*. London.
- RENFREW, COLIN (1994), The identity of Europe in prehistoric archaeology. *Journal of European Archaeology* 2/2, 153–174.
- RIEKMANN, MONICA (1997), The myth of European unity. In: Geoffrey Hosking – George Schöpflin (eds), *Myths and nationhood*. New York. 60–71.
- ROSAMOND, BEN (2000), *Theories of European integration*. The European Union series. Basingstoke.
- SAID, EDWARD W. (1978), *Orientalism*. London.
- SCHUBACK, MARCÍA S. C. (2013), *Traditionens hermeneutik* [The hermeneutics of tradition]. Lecture/Presentation 15 February 2013, Stockholm University, unpublished.
- SHANKS, MICHAEL (2004), Archaeology and politics. In: John L. Bintliff – Timothy K. Earle – Christopher S. Peebles (eds), *A companion to archaeology*. Malden. 490–508.
- SHORE, CRIS (2000), *Building Europe: The cultural politics of European integration*. London.
- SHORE, CRIS (2006), ‘In Uno Plures’(?) EU cultural policy and the governance of Europe. *Cultural Analysis* 5, 7–26.
- SMITH, LAURA-JANE (2006), *Uses of heritage*. Abingdon.
- SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY (1988), Can the subaltern speak? In: Cary Nelson – Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Illinois. 271–313.
- TARSCHYS, DANIEL (2005), *The enigma of European added value: setting priorities for the European Union*. SIEPS 4. Stockholm.
- THEILER, TOBIAS (2006), *Political symbolism and European integration*. Manchester.
- THOMAS, JULIAN (2004), *Archaeology and modernity*. London.
- TRETTER, ELIOT (2011), The ‘value’ of Europe: The political economy of culture in the European Community. *Geopolitics* 16/4, 926–948.
- TRIGGER, BRUCE G. (2006 [1989]), *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge.
- TZANIDAKI, JOHANNA D. (2000), Rome, Maastricht and Amsterdam. *Archaeological Dialogues* 7/01, 20–33.

- VASSILIOU, ANDROULLA (2012), *Celebrating Europe's extraordinary cultural heritage*. Published speech from the 5th European Heritage Days Forum in Cyprus Nicosia, 15 October 2012. SPEECH/12/725. (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-725_en.htm [24.01.2013]).
- VOS, CLASKE (2011), Negotiating Serbia's Europeanness: on the formation and appropriation of European heritage policy in Serbia. *History and Anthropology* 22/2, 221–242.
- WHITE, HAYDEN (1987), *The content of the form: narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore.
- WILLEMS, WILLEM J. H. (1999), *The future of European archaeology*. Oxbow Lectures 3. (https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/9860/1_953_003.pdf?sequence=1 [24.01.2013]).
- WILLEMS, WILLEM J. H. (2007), The work of making Malta: The Council of Europe's Archaeology and Planning Committee 1988–1996. *European Journal of Archaeology* 10/1, 57–71.
- WILLEMS, WILLEM J. H. (2009), Archaeological resource management and academic archaeology in Europe: Some observations. In: Silvia Alaura – Anna Lucia D'Agata (eds), *Quale futuro per l'archeologia*. Roma. 89–99.

EU and CoE Documents

- (1957) *Treaty establishing the European Economic Community*. Treaty of Rome.
- (1973) *Declaration on the European Identity*. The Copenhagen Summit, 14–15 December. Bulletin of the European Communities 12/73, 118–122.
- (1974) European Commission (EEC). *Commission Recommendation of 20 December 1974 to Member States concerning the protection of the architectural and natural heritage (75/65/EEC)*. OJ L 021 (28/01/1975), 22–23.
- (1977) European Commission (EEC). *Community action in the cultural sector Communication to the Council*, COM (77) 560 final, 2 December 1977. Bulletin of the European Communities supp. 6/77.
- (1981) Council of the European Communities (CEC). *Memorandum on Revitalization of the Community*, presented by the French Government. Bulletin of the European Communities 14/11/1981, point 3.5.1, I.

- (1982) European Parliament (EP). *Debate concerning 'EP 1982/0206 – Report on the protection of the architectural and archaeological heritage'*. Debates of the European Parliament. Annex to OJ, 1-288 (13/09/82), 7–18.
- (1992) *Treaty on European Union*. OJ C 191/01 (27/9/1992). Treaty of Maastricht.
- (1993) Council of Europe (CoE), *The Bronze Age: the first golden age of Europe* (Pamphlet). Cultural Heritage Division, Strasbourg.
- (1996) Council of Europe (CoE). *European cultural co-operation: activities of the European Union and relations with the Council of Europe*. Parliamentary Assembly 7th of June 1996. Doc. 7575.
- (1997) European Parliament and the Council. *Decision No. 2228/97/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1997 establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (Raphael)*, OJ L 305 (8/11/1997).
- (2000) European Parliament and the Council. *Decision No. 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 programme*. OJ L 63/1 ((10/3/2000).
- (2000–2006) European Commission. Culture 2000. Lists of *Projects supported in the field of Cultural Heritage*, divided per year. (http://ec.europa.eu/culture/archive/culture2000/project_annuel/projects1_en.html [24.01.2013]).
- (2003) Council of the European Union. *Council Resolution of 19 December 2002 implementing the work plan on European cooperation in the field of culture: European added value and mobility of persons and circulation of works in the cultural sector*. OJ C 013 (18/01/2003).
- (2003) European Commission. Call for Proposals: *A cultural celebration of the enlargement of the European Union*. Brussels, 12 September 2003. (http://www.eurodesk.no/element_db/4/4_Cultural_Celebration_of_EU_Enlargement.pdf [24.01.2013]).
- (2005) UNESCO. *Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions*. Paris 20 October 2005. (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001429/142919e.pdf> [24.01.2013]).
- (2006) European Parliament and the Council. *Decision No 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013)*. OJ L 372/1 (27/12/2006).

- (2007–2013) European Commission. Lists of *Projects supported in the field of Cultural Heritage*. (http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm [24.01.2013]).
- (2008) European Commission. *Final External Evaluation of the Culture 2000 programme (2000–2006)*. C3345. Framework Contract on Evaluation, Impact Assessment and Related Services. ECOTEC. United Kingdom.
- (2010) European Commission. *Programme Guide, Culture 2007–2013*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. (http://ec.europa.eu/culture/calls-for-proposals/culture-programme-guide_en.htm [24.01.2013]).
- (2011) European Parliament and the Council. *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*. OJ L 303/1 (22.11.2011).

Interviews

- EC-EAC01/2011, European Commission official – Culture Programme Management, Brussels November 2011.
- EC-EAC03/2012, European Commission official – Commissioners Cabinet Culture, Brussels November 2012.