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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHD</td>
<td>Authorised Heritage Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Cultural Contact Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>Cradles of European Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>Council of Europe (non-EU organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoR</td>
<td>Committee of the Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG EAC</td>
<td>European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG X</td>
<td>Directorate-General X, Information, Communication and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>European Association of Archaeologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Europae Archaeologiae Consilium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACEA</td>
<td>Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (just called the Agency in the thesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAV</td>
<td>European added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>European Cultural Paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>European Currency Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>European Heritage Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHMF</td>
<td>European Historical Monuments and Sites Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>European Landscape Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>European Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>European Regional Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Euro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUrope</td>
<td>Used in this thesis to refer to the symbolic and physical space of the European Community and later the EU. Not to Europe as a continent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Member of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL</td>
<td>Pathways to Cultural Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.A.</td>
<td>Unit of Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preface

In the early 2000s when I started studying archaeology in Gothenburg, the academic environment was heavily influenced by the revolt against grand narratives and methodological nationalism. Misuses of the past and the politics of heritage were central items in the curricula. I was therefore surprised when I came across an archaeological project application addressed to the European Union funding programme Culture 2000 that aimed to promote a sense of shared belonging among Europeans by confirming the existence of a ‘European identity’ in the past. Looking at other project descriptions I saw that the term was used quite often, sometimes accompanied by ‘European roots.’ From what I had read about the consequences of archaeology’s previous involvement in Western identity building projects, these phrases seemed like schoolbook examples the kind of exclusive and Eurocentric notions that archaeologists had attempted to rid themselves of.

The EU’s intention to foster ideas of a common heritage and identity was easily spotted in a quick overview of political documents, and I came to think of the institution as “the bad guy,” while archaeologists seemed to be biased or just unaware. This view was based on the presumption that the relationship between benefactor and beneficiary was fairly passive and straightforward. My initial irritation soon turned into curiosity, which eventually led me to Brussels. There I worked for five months at the administrative agency in charge of the EU Culture programmes, months during which I re-evaluated my assumptions many times over. In a multinational work environment where a shortage of time and money joined with the challenges of a heavily procedural workflow, I soon realised that the European Commission was far from a coherent body driven by clear intentions. Decision-making did not always happen via the authorised channels and interns like myself were assigned important tasks that the regular staff had no time for.

Later on, through speaking with archaeologists engaged in EU projects, I understood that their interaction with EU funding schemes often extended beyond the start and end of a particular project. In most cases they were also well aware of the political agenda of the funding programmes and reflexive in regard to their own participation. Therefore, I wish to emphasise that my research is not seeking to pass judgement on “bad” behaviour or to evaluate the success of either projects or EU policies. It is about understanding the practices and actors that create the past in the present.
One rainy November day in Brussels, I had a difficult conversation with a heritage professional involved in EU legislation. When trying to explain my topic, our talk suddenly turned into an interview about me and the premises of my research. The informant explained that the EU had never been interested in heritage, so there was nothing for me to study. I was simply barking up the wrong tree. My attempt to clarify that I was interested in the conditions of EU cultural actions and how archaeological projects interacted in that setting, was met with words of warning. If that was the case, the person said, I had to be aware of two things: firstly, at least three member states have to participate to achieve funding from these programmes, so by design they have a harmonising effect. Secondly, the single page in the application that states the project goals may have nothing to do with its real aims. ‘It is like money magic’ I was told, a performance to convince Brussels bureaucrats that the project is good for EU politics. At this point I was rather frustrated, answering that yes, the harmonisation and adaptation are the very reasons for my interest in the matter! The conversation then continued in a less accusatory tone. If we take a step away from heritage and look only at politics, my informant conceded, it is interesting to note how these programmes force applicants to relate to EU goals, that the application language has a political function.¹

Having regarded this conversation as a failure for over two years, I recently returned to it, realising that it is probably one of the most clarifying moments in the body of work that supports this thesis. The informant’s argument was based on two common perceptions. Firstly, that politics is something external to archaeology and heritage, an outside influence or annoying circumstance, not one of its components. Secondly, that some texts are less important than others and that certain phrasings are just for show. That such perceptions are alive and well in archaeology is a reassurance that the socio-political aspects of the domain are in great need of analytical attention.

Contrary to such views, this thesis starts from the premise that archaeologists and heritage professionals are co-creators of the frameworks they participate in. Not in terms of inherent biases, but because they exist and operate within the political. This means that if archaeologists achieve co-funding from the European Commission Culture programmes, a funding source aiming to promote European integration and bring a common cultural heritage to the fore, they are not only doing archaeology but they are also ‘doing’

¹ Fieldnotes, November 14, 2012; Interview 15 OT–04 2012.
Europe. The interesting questions become why and how (rather than if) this doing takes place and what it consists of.

To show how Europe is ‘done’ at the intersection between EU cultural politics and the domain of archaeology, I explore the sociopolitical and discursive bonds formed through EU policy aims and funding criteria. The research is based on an ethnographic approach involving the voices of EU civil servants, expert reviewers, consultants and archaeologists participating in co-funded projects, as well as their practices and productions. Therefore, this research is structured by the following overarching questions:

— How, and for what reasons, has the EU interacted with the domain of archaeology as a component of cultural heritage?
— How, and with what outcomes, have archaeological projects co-funded by the EU funding programmes in culture interacted with constructions of Europeanness?
— What processes of translation characterise this interaction, and where does the power to define Europeanness lie?

In my engagement with people and papers throughout the research process, these questions have guided the study towards certain themes. One concerns the ambiguities and anxieties connected to the notion Europe, as visible both in the both EU and in archaeological thought. Another has to do with the translation of political wills that occur from the time someone fills out a funding application to the moment it obtains support. A third deals with the archaeological narratives produced by the co-funded projects: the descriptions and representations created in the tangled space between archaeological legacies and the economy of belonging bred within the EU. The final theme looks at archaeological infrastructures and the value of EU-funding as a brand.

The research aims to contribute to critical debates in archaeology and heritage studies that call for a conscious engagement with heritage bureaucracies and other institutions participating in shaping the past in the present. By combining insights from within the EU and the archaeological domain, the study offers an intimate perspective of archaeology’s entanglement with an increasingly influential funding source. As a case study focussed on a domain that is historically situated in important ways, it also seeks to inform research dealing with EU culture policy and European identity. Ultimately, by expanding the notion of archaeological practice to include aspects like writing applications, I hope to increase interest among archaeologists and heritage professionals regarding the sociopolitical conditions of their work: to show that funding matters.
The EU and archaeology

Is there a European culture? … [T]here are cultural elements that we could broadly recognise as European, but it is very difficult to define what they might have in common. Rather like an elephant in a way: it is easier to recognise one than to define it.²

This statement, put forth by former European Commissioner for Culture Ján Figel, is rather telling when it comes to the European Union’s engagement with archaeology and heritage. The ‘elephant’ of European culture has always been assumed to be lurking just around the corner, in need of some stimulus to step out in the open. It has been a topic of European Community documents, debates and political speeches since the 1970s. Although the concrete motivations behind EU interest in the culture sector have varied from economic benefits and juridical impulses to European integration and identity building, there has been a tendency to (re)produce essentialism when appealing to a pan-European sense of belonging.³

Cris Shore has argued that the EU institutions’ reliance upon discourses rooted in nineteenth century liberal modernity builds on the flawed assumption that European identity can be created by tapping into already existing patterns of European culture and core values, ignoring the fact that it is such elements which have caused controversy in the past.⁴ Along with invented symbolic paraphernalia such as the EU flag and anthem, attempts to assert political legitimacy have been made with reference to the past and a historic inevitability.⁵ The permeable set in the Treaty of Rome, to establish ‘an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe,’⁶ rejected both the idea of pan-European nation building, and that of Europe as a cultural melting pot.⁷ This has not discouraged EU civil servants and parliamentarians from applying a nationalist rhetoric, using heritage as a symbolic resource, said to ‘perfectly illustrate the regional, national and European roots of Europe’s citizens.’⁸

Based on such, financial incentives have emerged to nurture and preserve the ‘elephant’ of European culture. As found in this study, more than 161 projects with archaeological themes have shared over 50 million EUR in co-funding from the programmes Raphael (1997–1999), Culture 2000 (2000–2006) and Culture 2007–2013.⁹ Along with specialists from a range of fields

---
³ Delanty 1995; Shore 2000.
⁶ The treaty which established the European Economic Community, signed in Rome 1957.
⁹ See list of projects in Appendix 3.
connected to culture, archaeologists and heritage professionals have benefitted from EU funding initiatives since the 1980s. Restoration projects on archaeological sites of ‘European significance’ and training schools for heritage professionals were the first types of initiatives to be funded, and from the late 1990s this was expanded to include heritage laboratories and multinational cooperation projects.

These initiatives have not always been deemed successful, not have they always involved large amounts of money. At least, not compared to funding actions in other policy areas. In fact, the amount allocated to culture has never gone above one percent of the total EU budget. EU cultural policy has also been dismissed as superficial and ineffective by scholars interested in law, political science and economy. Yet, even if the financial impact of EU cultural actions is minor, the discourses of Europeanness promoted through their efforts have had a powerful cognitive effect, leading researches to document, describe and scrutinise the ‘elephant’ of European culture.

It is in this context that the participation of archaeologists and heritage professionals becomes especially interesting. As argued by John Borneman and Nick Fowler, Europe is not ‘a stable, sovereign, autonomous object,’ but something which exists in ‘historical relations and fields of power.’ Archaeology has long been part of these relations. The question ‘when was Europe?’ – rooted in 19th century discourses on the uniqueness of European civilisation – has been considered natural and relevant to prehistorians long before the development of the European Community. Archaeological time periods or prehistoric peoples have been viewed through the raster of European modernity and capitalism, tracing the origins of contemporary Europe back to the Neolithic, the Bronze Age or Antiquity.

Embedded in this exceptionalism are ideas about mental and racial characteristics, a legacy still discernible in concepts like archaeological cultures. These connections are rarely made nowadays (at least not explicitly), but the connotations linger. Recently, the concept of Europe has been linked to questions of prehistoric bodies in studies using ancient DNA, looking for genetic continuity and diversity among ‘Europeans.’ When brought into public forums, especially at a time when right-wing populism and ultranationalism is flourishing, these results have become trapped in discussions.

---

13 See chapter two under ‘The origins of Europe in archaeological narratives.’
14 Wailes and Zoll 1995.
15 For racism and Europe see Jenkins 2000.
16 See Brotherton et al. 2013; Haak et. al. 2015; Seguin-Orlando et al. 2014.
of Europe as an acceptable extension of ‘national purity,’ clearly illustrating the concepts entanglement with racism.  

Ideological baggage aside, Europe has also been a frame for organising professional infrastructures. Over the last 30 years, cross-border cooperation and discussions on harmonising archaeological practice in Europe has intensified. Council of Europe’s (CoE) Valetta Convention,18 the start of the European Journal of Archaeology and European Association of Archaeologists (EAA),19 as well as Europae Archaeologiae Consilium (EAC),20 are examples of such efforts. In the context of this increased cooperation, it has been suggested that a future archaeology of Europe should rely increasingly on the opportunities for financial support offered by the European Commission.21 Since then, multiple cooperation initiatives tied to the EU, such as the European Heritage Heads Legal Forum,22 and the Joint Programming Initiative for Cultural Heritage,23 have emerged, accompanied by efforts to align archaeological archives or map the archaeological profession in Europe.24 

Such collaboration can be a way to directly influence or remain informed about laws and regulations on EU level, 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 ‘big’ questions.25 Yet, with the creation of common guidelines, practices and codes, archaeological collaborations may also become more restricted to the geopolitical level of the EU.26 As stressed by Matthew Johnson, the basic ways in which archaeologists do things matter, and so far classifications used in everyday archaeological work have not changed significantly as a result of theoretical debates.27 Neither has the scale at which we work, why increased European

17 For right-wing populism and Europe see Liang 2007. Examples of white supremacist groups using ‘European’ as a racial and cultural marker are Europe for Europeans (EFE) and Native Europeans: for the recognition of Native Europeans’ rights and for their preservation.
19 Planning started in 1990 and it was launched three years later (Kristiansen 1993).
20 A network of representatives from national heritage authorities in the Council of Europe member states, founded 1999 (www.european-archaeological-council.org [accessed 20.2.15]).
22 A forum of experts appointed by the national heritage authorities. Established in 2008 as a sub-committee to European Heritage Heads Forum which was founded in 2006.
23 JHEP is a transnational coordination action that started in 2010, with financial support from the EU’s 7th Framework Programme (www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu [accessed 20.2.15]).
26 See Hamilakis 2007 for a discussion on the ‘ethics’ of creating common codes of ethics.
cooperation still calls for a critical engagement with Europe as a conditioned space.

Ultimately, even if researchers and professionals within the archaeological domain are far from naïve and well aware of the points highlighted here, they do not enter into discourses on Europeanness as blank slates. Questions about how pre-conceived ideas may be induced or postulated in relation to funding programmes using concepts like ‘European roots’ are still important. Can archaeology assist in building a European identity for the EU, while at the same time avoiding reproducing and reinforcing inherited ethnic or teleological notions of a European past? Furthermore, could an increased reliance on EU-funding combined with condensing archaeological infrastructures on the continent, lead to homogenised practices? It is in the co-dependent relationship where benefactor and beneficiary meet and become part of each other’s storylines that these question are brought to a head.

Previous research

This study ties into and becomes relevant for a number of research fields. From an archaeological point of view it contributes to a long running debate about Europe and archaeology, as well as recent research directions using ethnographic approaches to study heritage bureaucracies and archaeologists doing archaeology. In the wider field of studies on EU cultural policy and European identity – positioned at the intersection between anthropology, social and political science, and the multidisciplinary field of EU-studies – it provides an interesting case study showing, among other things, how the specificity of a particular domain matters to the way it is considered and comes to interact in EU settings.

Archaeology and the EU

Several texts have discussed the notion of Europe in archaeology, and about a dozen explicitly make the link to EU culture policy. Many critical accounts were born out of the debates on archaeological ethics, accountability and the (mis)uses of the past than took place in the 1990s. These were rooted in both academic and societal motions. In the wake of epistemological upheaval and the ‘end’ of the grand narrative in 1970-80s, many archaeologists began to turn from studying systems and structures towards fluid identities, situated knowledge and imagined communities. The political reasons behind these shifts and their reception in archaeology – such as the crisis connected to the perceived dissolution of nation-states – paved the way for what Alexander Gramsch has called the ‘Europeanist turn.’ The critique of the

---

nation-state frame essentially brought the European frame back on the table. This rejuvenated interest in Europe was also a direct consequence of societal events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reinvention of the European Community as the European Union in 1992 (with its plans to establish a common European currency). Some began to promote Europe as a better solution, while others criticised it fiercely.

Among the optimist voices we find some archaeologists who argued that it is up to would-be Europeans to fill a European identity with content and that archaeology could be of assistance in this process.30 Most enthusiasts however, saw in this a new opportunity to mend a discipline long divided by war and political borders. Focus was placed on creating networks and platforms for dealing with heritage as a common European asset and responsibility. On the critical side, spurred by the harmful appropriations of the past during the Bosnian War (1992–1995) and the provocative CoE campaign *The Bronze Age: the first golden age of Europe* (1994-1997),31 archaeologists began to express concern about archaeological periods or interpretations being used as tools for forging a ‘new’ collective identity tied to political construction of Europe.

This discussion took place in the context of critical research on archaeology’s relationship to nationalism, imperialism and colonialism.32 By introducing EU policies into the discussion of archaeology and politics it formulated a clear critique towards the idea of ‘European communities’ in the past, resulting in a general critique and some attempts to deconstruct archaeological narratives.33 The debate successfully pinpointed why the creation of European identities came with the same problems as the 19th century creation of national identities, and proponents like Gramsch argued that archaeologists needed a ‘reflexive theory’ rooted in sociological theory and epistemology to guide future research.34

The debate peaked in the late 1990s, but made an interesting reappearance in 2008. In the discussion article ‘Do we need the ‘archaeology of Europe?’,’ Kristian Kristiansen argued that due to archaeologists withdrawal from grand narratives and big questions during postprocessualism, archaeological research was still stuck at the national and regional level. The best way to reach the global questions, he suggested, was by using ‘EUrope’ as a step-

---

30 For instance Renfrew 1994.
31 This reaction was also directed towards the CoE exhibition *Europe in the Time of Ulysses: the European Bronze Age* (1998–1999) and the campaign *Europe, a Common Heritage* (2000).
34 Gramsch 2000: 7, 16.
ping stone. Interesting responses were offered by several archaeologists (especially Neal Ascherson and Thomas Meier). As a collection of reflections about Europe in archaeology, the discussion has been instructive to my research. However, just as with previous debates – carried out mainly in articles and conference sessions – it remained on the level of using potent examples.

Few in-depth studies came out of either camp, however four later studies deserve to be mentioned in more detail. Anna Gröhn and Herdis Hølleland have both examined the particular use of the Bronze Age in connection to EU and CoE initiatives. To this end, Gröhn devotes a chapter of her dissertation to creating an overview of EU identity politics in relation to heritage, discussing projects supported by Culture 2000 up until 2004. Hølleland instead considers the connection between European identity discourse and archaeological Bronze Age narratives, paying particular attention to the works of V. Gordon Childe. She argues that, while archaeological narratives of Europe have in different ways been uncritically incorporated into political discourses of Europeanness, they have also had the reverse effect and contributed to an increased awareness in Bronze Age archaeology. These contributions have been useful to my study with regard to both content and approach. However, they stay, just as was the case with the texts emerging from the previous debate, at the level of EU policy and published narratives.

Placing a history of EU identity discourse next to one of archaeological notions on Europe can sometimes create a false sense of connection between two different developments. To tie them together I have instead focused on actual transactions of funds and criteria, as well as ethnographic fieldwork. In this study I will seek a deeper understanding of the interactions behind the official initiatives by studying the processes inside the European Commission, as well as by talking to the creators of the narratives.

The other two studies I want to mention are by Roel During and Claske Vos. They have approached the links between archaeology, tangible heritage, and Europeanisation processes from the perspective of European integration and cultural heritage studies. Their respective dissertations focus on how EU aims and strategies have been transferred and negotiated on local and regional levels in EU programmes tied to enlargement and regional policy. Through their case studies, they are able to show a gap between policy goals and the implementation of activities at ground level, leading to a great deal of confusion and things lost in translation. Their results show that what

---

35 When writing EUrope instead of Europe, I refer to the geopolitical space connected to the European Community and later the EU, rather than Europe as a continent.
36 For a recent addition, see Callebaut et al. (eds.) 2013.
38 Hølleland 2008.
39 During 2010; Vos 2011a, 2011b.
40 For a discussion on heritage and EU regions in a legal perspective see English 2008.
becomes 'European' in the set phrase European heritage (if anything), is not always what was originally hoped for. Their experiences have resonated with my own. Furthermore, just as with my work, both studies involve interviews and different kinds of fieldwork. Overall however, the focus remains on the results of EU political ventures in connection to receptions and effects on local communities. Their studies are more angled towards saying something about the EU rather than about the domain of heritage or the spaces ‘in-between.’ During even includes a type of evaluation of the effectiveness of EU policies, providing a list of suggested changes. As a result of this focus, paradoxically, actual criteria and review processes linking the political initiatives and the projects are passed over.

Archaeology and funding arrangements

In 1999, Yannis Hamilakis published an article addressing the ethical responsibilities of archaeologists in relation to sponsorship. Using the Çatalhöyük research project and its ties to the companies Shell and Visa as provocative examples, he pointed to the investigation of financial bonds as a big gap in research on sociopolitical aspects of archaeology, as something that has fallen between the chairs of historiographical accounts, interpretative issues and the politics of identity. In many ways, this observation is still valid. Despite being so central to any archaeological undertaking, the conditions and processes under which funding is granted have seldom been explored in a critical fashion. Studies looking at financial aspects of the domain, aiming to situate the profession in a larger socioeconomic context, have mainly described national structures and assessed the consequences of certain types of funding (such as commercial-developer- or state funding). Here, the main concern seems to lie with sustainable management and the level of scientific thoroughness, not with how funding agencies might play a part the content and character of projects.

That being said, financial aspects have recently begun to be taken into account within the approach called ‘archaeological ethnographies.’ This direction involves archaeologists studying the ways of archaeologists, in order to facilitate a deeper critical engagement with the conditions of the domain and the various groups with stakes in the material past. Studies taking this approach have usually concentrated on particular archaeological sites, projects or exhibitions as places where academically sanctioned practices, political assertions and local voices meet (or in the case of the latter, are kept outside of political representation). Discussions have centred on

41 Hamilakis 1999: 62.
materiality, temporality and sociopolitical bargaining, including everything from sensuous encounters with things to the impact of national authorities.44 While taking archaeological sites and fieldwork as starting points has proven effective in demonstrating political dynamics and social consequences, the focus on field archaeology or Western archaeology “abroad” tends to replicate popular notions of this being principally what archaeologists do. Time-consuming but essential parts such as permits, reports and funding arrangements are often underemphasised. Thought-provoking exceptions are Lynn Meskell’s The nature of heritage: the new South Africa (2012a), and a dissertation by Sjoerd van der Linde called Digging holes abroad: an ethnography of Dutch archaeological research projects abroad (2012).45 Both study specific sites or archaeological projects, but place importance on the political wills that underline transactions of funds and their consequences. It is in relation to these lines of inquiry, I would argue, that archaeological ethnography will have most to offer in terms of future research on the political economy of archaeology.

Finally, perhaps the most promising area to which my study contributes is current research on heritage bureaucracies and cultural diplomacy.46 In recent years, archaeologists have started to look into political decision-making ‘in situ,’ especially within UNESCO and American based institutions. The motivations behind these efforts resonate with my own. As stated by Meskell: ‘archaeologists need to educate themselves more fully about the practices and politics at work in the operationalizing of World Heritage and one avenue would be through an ethnography of heritage-making and policy.’47 In relation to these studies my emphasis on heritage-making in the EU could extend the geographical scope of the discussions and the understanding of differences in institutional logic.

EU cultural policy and cultural heritage

This work differs from the field of research on EU cultural policy relating to law, political economy and integration,48 in that it takes a vertical rather than a horizontal approach, starting from the discipline of archaeology. A common denominator in texts dealing with Europeanisation is that they often start from EC/EU discourses on European culture, identity or citizenship,
and use this as a framework to approach different components. Heritage is included as one piece in a big puzzle, and specific topics such as archaeology are hardly ever mentioned. Commonly, researchers also establish different phases in the EU work on culture, making the development of cultural initiatives seem as one of clear intent and direction. By focussing on a narrow topic within the EU cultural jungle, I have found it easier to understand the contradictions and processes of socialisation contained by these institutions.

Within this broad category, the work carried out by anthropologists and sociologists based on participant observation at EU institutions has been especially useful. From the anthropological side, interest was sparked by Marc Abélès and Cris Shore in the early 1990s. Upon finishing his research in the European Parliament in 1992, Abélès was invited into the European Commission to study the formation of identities among civil servants. The study, conducted together with Irène Bellier and Maryon McDonald, lasted several years. Shore began to examine identity building among EU officials at the same time. His studies, based on interviews and policy analysis, are angled toward the discourses and symbolism of EU cultural integration. Shore argues that EU civil servants have created a type of elitist European identity of their own while Abélès, Bellier and McDonald have pointed towards the ambivalence and remaining tensions of national identities in institutional Europe-making. Their research has provided the basis for my understanding of the inner logics of the Commission.

One especially interesting study starting from EU policy is Oriane Calligaro’s Negotiating Europe: the EU promotion of Europeanness since the 1950s (2013). This book examines the changing ideas and manifestations of Europeanness in the EU based on published and unpublished documents as well as interviews with EU officials. Out of three main chapters, which deal with academic initiatives, cultural heritage, and the Euro banknotes and coins, the dealing with heritage has been of particular interest. Her work, originally a PhD thesis, was conceived within and aimed toward the field of European Studies, starting from the logics and mechanisms of EU integration and identity discourse, moving outwards. Published at a time when I had myself already examined many of the same documents with a similar objective, Calligaro’s research has worked both as a source of additional information and as a grounds for comparing my own results. The differences lie in the scope and method. Calligaro uses EU initiatives, such as the mobilisa-

49 Europeanisation is a broad term referring to the level and dynamics of European integration since World War II, in regards to EU citizens, organisations, regions and nation-states. See especially Borneman and Fowler 1997.
tion of funding for Holocaust memorials, as effective examples of European heritage-making, but pays less attention to the details of participation and the specific history of domains like heritage. Furthermore, although the case studies are well developed, the vastness of the topic does affect the depth and room to contextualise the actions described.

Monica Sassatelli is another scholar whose work deserves mention. Starting from a sociological perspective, she has written extensively on the topic of European integration in relation to EU cultural initiatives. Her texts revolve around the mobilisation of a European cultural space and questions of how European identities are constructed and negotiated in relation to existing identities. Her main case-studies are the European Capitals of Culture (EU), the European Landscape Convention (CoE), and to some extent the Culture 2000 programme (EU). Like many researchers studying European identity, she starts from EU policy and chooses cases based on what might tell her the most about its formation. Similar to the work of During and Vos, she connects the policy level to local actors, resulting in a fieldwork resembling my own. A study carried out in cooperation with Jasper Chalcraft in the early 2000s examined the reception and negotiation of international policies in the Italian region Emilia-Romagna. Alongside UNESCO World Heritage nominations, they studied the influence of the Culture 2000 programme and included some voices from co-funded archaeological projects. This material has been useful as a source of comparison.

Research design

Overall this study can be described as exploratory and inductive in nature. It takes an ethnographic and discursive approach, using participant observation, semi-structured interviews and a variety of texts to study the cognitive and practical bonds between EU funding instruments and actors in the domain of archaeology that have benefitted from them. This focus has led me to empirically ‘study up’ and ‘laterally,’ concentrating on authorised actors within the EU bureaucracy and archaeology rather than the reception of produced narratives in local communities. While those angles are important, there is, as argued earlier, a need for research that examines political meaning-making ‘in situ.’

Since entities like the ‘domain of archaeology’ and ‘the EU institutions’ consist of the texts and individuals upholding them, I study the attitudes, intentions and doings of all involved parties: the importance given to archaeology in policy documents and among EU civil servants, the criteria and review process, as well as the experiences and outputs of the selected projects. In other words, I am studying human actions and interactions under a

specific set of circumstances. This is based on the assumption that an interaction must take place for anyone to achieve funding from the EU. By interaction I refer to anything from the promotion of an archaeological project in the European parliament or attempts to influence EU actions via stakeholder meetings, to intertextual ways of relating to EU policy in project proposals. I also assume that archaeologists and heritage professionals enter into such settings carrying certain ideas about Europe. However, the degree, forms and effects of these interactions or ideas are not taken for granted.

Due to the transnational nature of the institutions and projects under study, I have also chosen to treat texts, individuals and the settings in which they meet as multi-local. Although they are all situated in regional, national and international frameworks – tied together by personal, political and academic allegiances – ascribing significance to any one of these frames in advance would have restricted the study. This approach has required a creative and flexible type of fieldwork, using a wide range of sources and jumping from place to place, both geographically and in terms of insider and outsider perspectives. It resonates with the ethnographic approach taken by heritage scholars studying the inner workings of UNESCO, and the respective dissertations of Jan Turtinen (2006) and Herdis Hølleland (2013), have worked as sources of inspiration. Analysing the inner dynamics of the World Heritage selection processes, they have both used observations, interviews and fieldwork on multiple sites to learn about the sociopolitical processes of heritage-making.

**Choices**

In this thesis archaeology is defined broadly. As a mode of engagement with material remains, it is taken to include the people, thoughts and things marked as its domain. Archaeology is simultaneously seen as an academic discipline, a field of research and education in universities and museums, cultural resource management and as a matter of concern within heritage bureaucracies. Rather than being set beforehand, this definition is a result of my theoretical perspective (see below), and a consequence of the array of archaeological aspects represented by the projects studied.

The setting of EU culture policy as a base for exploring the intersection between archaeology, politics and notions of Europe was established already at the outset of the research project. Aside from a long engagement with heritage as a core theme, the field’s symbolic and material investment in European identity – whether linked to values, identities or roots – turns it into a condensed laboratory of European heritage-making. Within this context the Culture programmes Raphael (1997-1999), Culture 2000 (2000-2006) and Culture 2007–2013 represent policy in action, a distilled version
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56 Hølleland 2013; Meskell 2012b, 2015; Turtinen 2006.
of political aims that demand an articulation of the value of archaeology and heritage.

The projects co-funded by these actions are thus relevant to the questions posed in this thesis precisely because they are informed by an explicit rhetoric of bringing a common European heritage to the fore. Although the study has involved actors and texts from other EU policy fields such as Research and Innovation and EU Regional policy, which actually spend more on heritage than cultural actions do, these fields become less relevant due to their wide focus and inclusion of heritage by default rather than design.

The focus on the domain of archaeology as a component of the wider category of cultural heritage has worked to delimit the scope of a project which could otherwise have drifted into an unmanageable mess. This focus has sometimes proven hard to adhere to, both due the fluid lines of archaeology/heritage and because documents and people have been eager to talk not just about these topics but about EU cultural policy and politics in general. Ultimately my narrow focus, at least compared to other studies analysing Europe-making, has worked to my advantage in terms of analytical potential as well as keeping my research ‘en route.’

The temporal and geographical scope of the thesis is wide, extending from 1970s to 2013 and from Iceland to Turkey. Stopping at 2013 was a practical choice since 2014 marks end of my fieldwork and material collection period. It was also an empirically appropriate choice due to the completion of Culture 2007–2013. Extending beyond that would have resulted in a more fragmentary study. The geographical focus, in terms of specific regions, EU member states or East versus West Europe was not decided beforehand. It has depended on the individuals and projects studied, which in turn were selected based on their EU experiences and the thematic focus.

Theories
This research is influenced by the seemingly contradictory directions of social constructionism and critical realism. In line with the former I believe that science does not provide us with a mirror to nature, and that descriptions of reality are always subject to social practices. This implies that changing the way people think and interact about a certain phenomenon also has the power to change its social constitution. It does not mean, and this is where critical realism comes in, that constructions are not real. As advocated by Roy Bhaskar, critical realism holds that any construct or action that creates

57 Hacking 1999.
58 When talking about Europe as a construction and imagined community, as Maryon McDonald has stressed, we are not only talking about a purely symbolic construction but using language that is very important to those working in the European Commission, they ‘are “building” Europe; they are “constructing” a new world which they generally know to be right (1996: 47).
an effect on something else, that affects ‘the real world,’ should be seen as ontologically real.\textsuperscript{59} Yet we can, just as argued in social constructionism, only know of them through certain types of descriptions. The difference has been said to lie in the realist standpoint that, although descriptions are never ‘value free,’ some come closer to the ontological level than others. As argued by social theorist Dave Elder-Vass, the idea that this position contradicts the stance of most social constructionists is the result of polemic debates between scholarly camps, one conjuring the straw-man of hyper-relativism and the other rejecting realism wholesale.\textsuperscript{60} Instead, he puts forth a ‘realist social constructionism,’ a moderate position that merely states that not everything depends on the way we think about it and that explanation and causal mechanisms are essential to scientific enquiry.\textsuperscript{61}

Adopting this stance means that I regard entities like Europe and European heritage as ‘real constructions.’ Such constructions are shaped and upheld by discourses, and with a considerable impact on the world. It also has bearing on the way I approach economic relations and the nature of archaeology. Directing attention to the role of archaeology in the political economy of the past in the EU means placing focus on the social, cultural, and symbolic dimensions of the practical bonds uniting them.\textsuperscript{62} In doing so I take issue with the distinction between practice and context often made in discussions concerning the conditions for doing archaeology.\textsuperscript{63} By claiming that that politics is about the environment in which archaeology takes place or how the results are used, rather than being integral to the practice, the question of where the money comes from is often made irrelevant.\textsuperscript{64}

In line with the statements of Michael Shanks on the political economy of the discipline,\textsuperscript{65} I view archaeology as a mode of cultural or scientific production rather than scientific discovery: ‘a hybrid process of heterogeneous engineering’ in which the remains of the past are translated through the cultural and political interests of the present, thereby making the politics of archaeology into an ‘ecology of mobilizing resources, managing, organising, persuading.’\textsuperscript{66} In this political ecology, all parts of archaeological practice are significant for its constitution and value, from tourist experiences and illicit trade, to land development and international agendas. Funding sources

\textsuperscript{59} Bhaskar 1975: 250. See also Archer et al. (eds.) 1998. For archaeology see Wallace 2011.
\textsuperscript{60} Elder-Vass 2012: 6–7.
\textsuperscript{61} Elder-Vass 2012: 8.
\textsuperscript{62} In this sense, even if the study is not founded on a materialist perspective, it is inspired by Marxist understandings of economic links as configuring social hierarchies and legitimising power. See Matthews et. al 2002 and Patterson 1999 on the political economy of archaeology.
\textsuperscript{63} In line with Samuels 2008 and Shanks 2004.
\textsuperscript{64} The following paragraphs are based on a section in Niklasson 2013b.
\textsuperscript{66} Shanks 2004: 503.
become a dynamic element, shifting the focus from the holy grail of untainted empirical enquiry to a more entangled view of archaeological practice.

The feminist philosopher Kathryn Pyne Addelson has discussed the role of funding in relation to cognitive authority, a concept that can be connected to Shanks’ ‘ecology.’ According to Addelson, the cognitive authority of specialists in science, and indeed academia as a whole, lies in their social arrangements and positions of power, allowing them to spread their metaphysical commitments by telling other researchers what their problems should be. Thus, she argues, ‘if we think of science as a stock of knowledge embodied in theories, then the problem of funding does not seem to be a problem having to do with rationality and criticism in science. Instead it may appear to be a question of political or other outside interference with the autonomy of the researchers.’ Given that funding creates better opportunities for researchers within the dominant traditions to exercise cognitive authority, thereby gaining even more funding, it becomes clear how money affects the organisation and contents of the sciences at any given moment. How it influences ‘the way we all will come to understand the world.’

Both Shanks’ and Addelson’s concepts have been useful. By acknowledging cognitive authority, we can visualise prestige hierarchies and the way they operate with the help of funding mechanisms, but most likely at the expense of the agency of the funding source itself. On the other hand, in Shanks’ political ecology, where all parts involved in the research process are taken under consideration, we risk ending up without any clear nodal points where different positions are articulated. Together they have grounded my understanding of the relationship between archaeology and funding, providing a sense of focus while at the same time recognising power imbalances between different elements.

In order to analyse this relationship I have relied on discourse analysis and tools from network theory. The latter will be explained in chapter four, but a note on discourse belongs here. When using the concept I refer to the way social and political domination is reproduced through text and talk. This understanding draws on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), an approach born in reaction to a perceived lack of depth in linguistic applications of discourse. Norman Fairclough, one of its chief proponents has called CDA ‘a social theory of discourse,’ and views discourses as creating relationships, not just representing them. To him, a ‘discursive event’ is simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice and an instance of social

\[67\] Addelson 2003[1983]: 177. See also Samuels on the notion of ‘biases’ in archaeology (2008: 88).
\[69\] Laclau and Mouffe 2001.
\[70\] Mills 2004: Chapter 6.
\[71\] Fairclough N. 1992: 92.
While I do not subscribe to the explicit goal of changing the structures under study, the combination of Foucault’s emphasis on power and Fairclough’s focus on the actual constituents of discourse within text, has guided my analysis of EU documents and interview transcriptions. Fairclough’s ideas on intertextuality, of how texts are constructed by reference to other texts, has been especially useful when searching for ‘buzzwords’ and recurring phrases that are applied to create certain effects in funding applications. In this sense, failed attempts to assert power have been just as interesting as successful ones. This understanding has also led me to focus on ambivalence; situations in which interpretations differ among participants within a discourse, showing how interactions are more diverse and fragmented than they appear, especially in consensus seeking processes.

Ethnography

The materials collected during my ethnographic fieldwork consist of official and unofficial documents, photographs, audio recordings, fieldnotes and ‘headnotes.’ A key part of the material originates from my five month internship with the European Commission (October 2010 to February 2011). I worked in a ‘unit’ at the agency in charge of selecting and administering projects funded under Culture 2007–2013, which consisted of about 30 employees from different countries. I performed tasks that ranged from checking applications for eligibility, preparing material and instructions for expert reviewers, attending the evaluation panels in a moderating function and analysing final project reports (all under my co-workers supervision). During my last three months I also conducted a type of impact study based on the outreach of co-funded projects, which would function as reference material for the subsequent programme Creative Europe.

I applied for this position as an independent researcher, before my PhD studies began. The fact that this work was carried out without the protection of a university research profile lead to some methodological challenges. I was not just observing, but working there. My experiences were thus affected by the search to ‘find my place’ within a new working environment, trying to demonstrate my competence by learning the new tasks I was assigned as quickly as possible. Due to my temporary position and limited grasp of
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74 Roger Sanjek writes: ‘we come back from the field with fieldnotes and headnotes. The fieldnotes stay the same but the headnotes continue to evolve and change … the headnotes are more important’ (1990: 93). Based on memories of personal experiences, headnotes fills in the gaps in the fieldnotes and changes in relation to new experiences over time. As Ottenberg explains, ‘headnotes and written notes are in constant dialogue, and in this sense the field experience does not stop’ (1990: 146). Suddenly something you couldn’t make sense of in the field becomes clear to you years after (1990: 94). As such headnotes can also be distorted and stereotypes may develop in our minds (Ottenberg 1990: 144; also in Hølleland 2013).
the main working language,\textsuperscript{75} fitting in proved quite difficult. Most of the time I felt like an observer, albeit one with access to working documents and the general gossip. While this meant that I missed out on some intricate details, the relative distance also worked in my favour. The quasi-status as an ‘Other within’ allowed me to observe internal dynamics while not becoming involved with colleagues on a personal level. My position also remained interchangeable, never tied to any fixed perspectives within the workplace, and I made a point of talking to the experts and other types of ‘Others within.’ Overall, my observations have proved very useful in terms of painting a general image of the attitudes and tensions within the Agency, while being less useful as sources of information on administrative details, events or larger political developments.

During my later fieldwork in Brussels – consisting of four periods lasting from two to four weeks each – I was no longer a participant, but an observer. I jumped around between different buildings and policy areas, carrying out formal interviews and having informal conversations. My previous participation had left me with a substantial knowledge about the everyday procedures and people that made the Commission run. I was therefore still able to sit in on Commission events in Brussels and interact with expert reviewers, former interns and EU officials I had met during my internship. Among the events I attended were the annual stakeholder meeting \textit{Culture in motion} and the forum \textit{Cultural info days}. Both were arranged by the EU Directorate-General in charge of culture. The first was an opportunity for the EU to interact with archaeologists, heritage professionals and other cultural operators, while the second was an information forum and networking event for aspiring applicants to \textit{Culture 2007–2013}.

When choosing interviewees, I have primarily approached EU civil servants in positions to make decisions about, give advice on, or administer actions involving or supporting archaeology and cultural heritage. As the focus of my research was set to culture policy, I first contacted persons working within that field, but during the research process I have also interviewed persons in other policy fields as a way of situating the topic within the EU institutions. Here, research carried out by Chris Shore provided insight into details such as the best time to schedule meetings with Commission officials (mid- to end of the week in the afternoon).\textsuperscript{76}

My fieldwork was not limited to the Commission. In combination with my visits to Brussels, I travelled to other parts of Belgium, Germany, Great Britain and Austria to meet with expert reviewers and project participants in co-funded projects. In reaching out to archaeologists I made use of the annual conference of the European Association of Archaeologist where many

\textsuperscript{75} The working language turned out to be French, not English or German. What language is used often depends on the native tongues of the majority of employees in a Commission unit.

\textsuperscript{76} Shore 2000: 9.
project constellations gather. There I was able to go to project sessions and meet with participants to discuss their projects. My target group was professionals active within the field of archaeology and heritage management who had either been involved in EU settings in a representational capacity, or whose projects had benefitted from EU co-funding through the Culture programmes. Aside from these target groups, I have also talked to persons positioned in-between archaeology and the EU, such as the experts hired to peer-review projects, independent EU consultants working with applicants, and national information points for the Culture programmes.

The interviews were carried out in a semi-structured way, primarily through face to face meetings at the informants’ workplaces or other places chosen by them. Most informants responded to my request right away, but EU officials proved more difficult to get in contact with. With them I often had to reschedule interviews multiple times. Because of distance, three interviews had to be carried out via Skype and telephone, and seven via email. Although email interviews always lead to a loss of nuance, I found their responses to be forthcoming and outspoken. This was probably due to my familiarity with the context of their work and the fact that I had previously met everyone in person.

For all interviews I used open ended questions based on a number of themes that were sent out to the interviewee beforehand. With consent of the interviewee, the conversations were recorded and transcribed. Upon meeting informants I clearly stated the purpose of my research, informed that the material would remain in my care, and offered to share my transcriptions afterwards. Those who wished to read the selected quotes and know about their respective contexts received this information before the thesis was submitted. Almost everyone I talked to came from a different country, but spoke English fluently. Quotes are therefore always presented in original – according to the transcription – and intact with grammatical errors. The only exception is interviews carried out in the Nordic languages, for which I have translated the selected passages into English.

The goal in all cases was to achieve a relaxed conversation. Generally, I think this worked well. Being an archaeologist and having worked as an EU intern meant that people on all sides felt it safe to assume that I knew the basics and I was considered a colleague or an acceptable kind of stranger. This awareness also led to some difficulties. Because I sometimes knew too much it was hard not to ask overly leading questions or to express my own frustration regarding some of the matters discussed. My in-house experience also made it necessary to assure some informants who needed to uphold a positive image in the eyes of the Commission that I was not some sort of “spy” or internal investigation officer.

---
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Para-ethnography

My ethnographic approach differed from many others in the sense that I aimed to investigate the spaces in-between several communities based on certain aspects singled out beforehand. It was primarily their perceptions and attitudes towards ‘Europeanness’ I was interested in, not a community or a person’s entire story. That being said, as an ethnographer I have always paid attention to the meta-level of conversations (how things are said). I also recognise myself as a co-creator in the role of participant-observer and interviewer.\(^{78}\) This co-creation does not occur on equal and balanced terms since the combination of the transcription and my subjective experience of the event becomes the authorised interpretation. My understanding includes many perspectives but it is still partial. I consider ethnography to be a means of scratching the surface, that an ethnographer can never really see things from a ‘native’s’ point of view. Therefore, as famously stated by Clifford Geertz:

The trick is not to achieve some inner correspondence of spirit with your informants … The trick is to figure out what the devil they think they are up to.\(^{79}\)

With this goal in mind and with the focus placed on the anecdotal, the taken for granted, on everyday contradictions, compromise and personal agency, this research effort can be called ‘para-ethnographic.’ This is a term specifically developed in relation to the problem of experts studying experts, since it flips the perspectives in terms of how ethnography is usually performed.\(^{80}\) Pursuing ethnographic enquiry in situations where the informants are engaged in an intellectual labour resembling your own can be tricky. A para-ethnographic approach suggests that researchers experiment and try to work collaboratively under such circumstances. An example from my own research is when one of my informants, a former leader of an EU-funded project, sometime after our conversation about subjects like European identity and accountability, published an academic article reflecting precisely on these matters in relation to his EU experiences.\(^{81}\) This could be seen as the subject ‘stealing the show’ (at first this is how it felt). Inspired by the para-ethnographic viewpoint however, I decided to consider this article as any other piece of empirical material, and something to be further discussed with the person in question. Such collaboration does not work all the way through the research process however, as the final interpretation must always be the responsibility of the researcher.

\(^{78}\) See Briggs 1986.
\(^{79}\) Geertz 1974: 29.
\(^{80}\) Holmes and Marcus 2005, 2008: 40.
\(^{81}\) 03 PJ–01 2011.
On ethics and the difficulties of studying colleagues

There are other problems involved in studying ‘up’ and ‘laterally.’ At the Commission I had made my research interests clear when I applied for an internship and informed my colleagues of them, but I was never asked to sign any specific confidentiality agreement relating to the work at the Agency (as was the case with fellow interns working with sensitive EU policy areas such as the tobacco or oil industry). On the other hand, I was there under a Commission contract and bound to more general rules of confidentiality (not to use or publish, for personal benefit, any information or facts not already public). The question relates to the wider issue of what to do with unofficial information which may, if spread, have unintended consequences.

Anthropologist Marc Verlot suggests that this is a larger problem when working with powerful people than with marginal or powerless groups. While sensitive information can work to empower the latter, the same exposure might have harmful consequences for the professionals and institutions represented by the former. I find this argument somewhat inverted. Of course, to study ‘up’ does not make your informants less human. Even if their actions shed light on practices and structures that extend beyond their person, they do not automatically embody an entire system or institution. Nevertheless, to discuss sensitive information about such groups seems more justifiable from a democratic point of view than studying ‘subaltern’ groups.

Verlot does acknowledge that researchers must remain critical whatever their entity of study, and suggests that the best way out of this dilemma is to achieve what Michael Herzfeld calls ‘the necessary level of intimacy.’ In so doing, he states: ‘our own practices become a subversion of elite exceptionalism, opening it up to the realisation of its human – indeed, its common properties.’ I agree, and it is precisely the reason why my experience working at the Agency was so humbling. The people around me and above me in the Brussels hierarchies became something very different than a grey mass of ‘elites’ and ‘experts.’ They became individuals struggling with everyday decisions and deadlines under sometimes very unforgiving circumstances. Keeping this in mind, I employ my unofficial knowledge with restraint. Aside from their position and relevance for my research I do not reveal any personal or third party information. Furthermore, no unofficial files used during my internship will be quoted or otherwise referenced in this work.

I have also chosen to anonymise my informants. Their position, field of expertise and relevance for the study is included, but their names and the archaeological projects they belong to are hidden. In the text they are referred to by way of codes that indicate their role in relation to the thesis, and the year of the interview (EX for experts, EU for officials and staff, and PJ

82 Verlot 2001: 352.
83 Herzfeld 2000: 236.
84 Herzfeld 2000: 236.
for project leaders and participants). Aside from ethical reasons, I have withheld personal information for the reason that it does not add anything to the analysis. The study is concerned with structures and practices. Though I take great interest in individual statements and strategies, I consider them greater than the sum of their parts. Naming actors may detract from this focus.

Added to this are ethical considerations that come with interviewing persons in their professional capacity. Studies building on such material have sometimes been regarded as threatening and damaging to professional identities. David Mosse was confronted and officially accused of having caused such damage after publishing an anthropological study about an international development project.\(^{85}\) Instead of backing away, Mosse took the critique as a research opportunity in itself and went on to discuss the issue in several academic texts.\(^{86}\) According to him, the core of the problem lies in the different approaches to the construction of authoritative knowledge. From the informants’ point of view ethnography can seem like a form of bad evaluation as it does not involve any negotiation or search for consensus. Thus, he argues, what is encountered when examining communities of managers, consultants and policymakers, is ‘a professional habitus that automatically transfers the actuality of events into the pre-given categories of acceptable and legitimate fictions.’\(^{87}\) This is evident in my own research. For instance, many informants did not understand why I was interested in their opinions rather than ‘facts’ (published objectives, figures and information folders), feeling uneasy about this fact. They would much rather provide me with official, and in their eyes, powerless information.

Structure of the thesis

The remainder of this thesis is divided into independent yet interrelated chapters. Chapter two examines the conditions that make questions about European origins possible to ask. Following the cultural historical career of Europe as concept, from its use by Greek geographers to the beginnings of the EU, it argues that Europe has never been ‘obedient to our minds.’ A process of filling the notion with content has conspired to make it real and as a construction it has exerted influence on things, peoples or places classified as non-European. The second part turns toward Europe in archaeological thought, arguing that there has long existed a ‘continentalism’ in the domain. By discussing examples from influential narratives on European prehistory, it addresses ideas of Europe as barbarian space and cradle of civilisation.

The third chapter deals with the EU and their involvement in the archaeological domain. It investigates how and why officials and parliamentarians

\(^{85}\) Mosse and Lewis 2005.
\(^{86}\) Mosse 2006, 2011; Mosse and Lewis 2006.
\(^{87}\) Mosse 2011: 54.
have concerned themselves with this sector. Here I argue that archaeology, as part of a ‘European heritage,’ has carried specific meanings in the political economy of culture in the EU. After tracing the money invested in heritage and the motivations behind, I show how archaeology has become both a promise and a problem in EU settings.

Chapter four explores the link between archaeology and the funding programme Culture 2007–2013 from inside the corridors of Brussels. It looks at different actors and processes which have bearing on the way cultural heritage is understood in relation to Europeanness. Starting with the administrative unit in charge of the funding programme, I move on to the perspectives of expert reviewers, the external project consultants, and finally to the beneficiaries’ points of view. Two theoretical keys, the black box and translations, are used to structure the analysis. The Commission’s own notion of European added value (EAV) – a criterion used to score the applications – is used to as a thread throughout the chapter.

Chapter five moves on to the narratives produced by co-funded projects with archaeological themes or actors. Based on a database of 161 projects, it discusses common time periods and objects of study. A number of projects are analysed further, taking into account their self-presentations, publications and outreach material. Focus is placed on how research themes and scopes are motivated in relation to the conceptual frames of the funding source.

Chapter six reverses the perspective by examining the role of the EU as a brand in archaeology. The focus is set on the role and importance assigned to the EU as a funding source in respect to: the money itself, its political nature and the level of prestige it generates for project participants. The chapter also includes a discussion on the potential impact of EU-funding on archaeological networks and infrastructures.

Chapter seven synthesises the previous chapters by following the life of a hypothetical project application, tracing the Commission context it would enter into all the way up to its implementation. The journey is divided into three stages: the ‘pre-application phase,’ ‘the application phase’ and the ‘post-application phase.’ Each phase addresses the central conditions and motivations that influence the role of archaeology in EU cultural actions. It also explains the translations and strategies taking place, aiming, ultimately, to showcase the role of archaeology and its potential implications in the construction of Europeanness.

Although chapter three to six are presented as separate studies, readers should keep in mind that they cross-cut and overlap both temporally and in terms of social networks. A voice in one chapter may provide a different take on an argument set forth in another. Along the way, new questions are raised and alternative paths become visible. Those not explored in this thesis will hopefully be picked up by future researchers. For now, taking cue from Commissioner Figel’, it is time to take a closer look at the so called ‘elephant’ of European culture.
Chapter 2. Positioning Europe

Since the inception of the European Economic Community … nations [in Europe] are bound together not only geographically but also economically, politically and to an extent, socially. As a result, many of the people living in Europe have grown to think of themselves as “Europeans”… But if we go far enough back in time, would we find common roots that united the people living here? A common culture that we can call “European” or that we can point to when explaining the mentality of people today?¹

This question, raised in the introduction to a book I read during my time as a student, has been asked in various forms since the early days of the discipline. Similar to several influential archaeological narratives, it takes contemporary Europe as its starting point in an attempt to investigate links between prehistoric places, peoples and processes connected to the landmass so named. At its base rests a presumed notion of a European culture or mentality in need of explanation. Although the answers may vary, the question itself persists.² Therefore, the first part of this chapter is dedicated to illustrating the conditions that make such questions possible to ask in the first place. Drawing on previous research, it provides a brief account of the cultural historical career of Europe as a signifier, looking at how this combination of letters has been used as a pointing finger, and at what this finger has pointed. In the second part of this chapter, I turn towards Europe as it has been represented in archaeological thought, using examples from influential archaeological narratives to show its plural meanings.

On horses, planets and gloves
In the introduction to this thesis I argued that Europe and Europeans were ‘real constructions.’ Declaring this is easy. The real challenge lays in finding out what fuels these constructions, and their resulting effects. One particularly useful tool when considering such constructions is Ian Hacking’s concept of ‘dynamic nominalism.’ In ‘Making up people’ (2002) he explains this approach (in the spirit of Foucault) as relating to how ‘our classifications and

¹ Gillis, Olausson and Vandkilde 2004: 1.
² In the case above no particular Europeaness was actually found. Based on the development of agriculture, metallurgy and domestication of animals in Northern, Southern and Central Europe during prehistory: ‘no particular dawn of culture that could be designated “European” could be identified’ (Gillis, Olausson and Vandkilde 2004: 152).
our classes conspire to emerge hand in hand.’ ³ Specifically, he examines ideas about how certain kinds of human beings appear in unison with their categorisations, such as ‘the multiple personality’ of the 1980s. Using a number of example classes – like horses, planets, and gloves – he argues that, although categories may be changeable and human-made, some labels fit too well not to be ‘given by nature.’⁴ Horses are beings with similarities that stretch beyond our grouping of them into a certain class. They are ‘obedient to our minds’ and have so much in common that, if named differently, we would still recognise them as a kind of animal.⁵ Planets are more dependent on our classification. As has recently been the case with Pluto, they can cease to be planets. Furthermore, most of the time we can only work with representations of them. The case can also be made that the heavens actually appeared and therefore were different before and after the Earth was placed in line with the other planets, excluding the sun and moon.⁶ Still, these formations would be there without our classification and they do carry ontological similarities and differences. Gloves however, are something entirely different. They are created by us in order to fit a certain part of our body. The idea, category and item developed in symbiosis. If we accept these premises: Is Europe a horse, a planet or a glove?

In light of the political geography of the present, Europe is often thought of as a horse. Everyone immediately recognises it on a map and the term European, whether used as an adjective or a noun, rarely calls for any clarification. However, stripping Europe of its historic classifications as a continent, a Christian space, a top civilisation and a racial unit, what remains? Is it still, like horses, a recognisable entity? And could the peoples living on the landmass be neatly categorised as particular kinds of human beings? Surely the answer must be no.

Looking at its physical delineation, the boundary drawn arbitrarily along the Ural Mountains, through the Caucasus region, the Dardanelles, the Bosphorus and the Mediterranean, there is nothing ‘given’ about Europe. It is an entity that demands extensive human intervention to make sense. A case could perhaps be made if extending the scope to Eurasia and the physiographic continent. Understood as discrete chunks of land separated (preferably) by water or tectonic plates, Eurasia, Africa, North America, South America, Antarctica and Australia are relatively distinct formations with ontological similarities and differences. However, since continent is a historically unstable class that still lacks consensus with regard to established criteria, continents are really more akin, in this analogy, to planets. Greenland, a large distinct landmass that matches the description of a continent is la-

⁶ Kuhn 2000: 220.
belled ‘the largest island’ while Australia has become ‘the smallest continent.’ North and South America are almost completely detached from each other and located on different tectonic plates, while Europe and Asia form a continuous landmass, sharing the same plate. Yet the Americas are often considered one continent with two subcontinents while Europe and Asia, today and historically, have been separated.

As a standalone object then, Europe really appears more like a glove. Or at least something in between a planet and a glove. It is not physically created by humans, yet the borders of the landmass has changed over the ages, rarely matching the array of lands and peoples considered European. In fact, Europe provides an excellent example of how a process of naming things begins once a class has been produced, conspiring to make it real.

Once upon a time there was Europe

The first known use of the word ‘Europe’ is in the Homeric hymn to Apollo from the 7th century BC. In this context it did not represent the continent but Central Greece. Europe was also used simultaneously to denote a part of Thrace, numerous cities, and a river. In The myth of continents: a critique of metageography (1997), Martin Lewis and Karen Wigen provide a critical account of the construction of Europe as a continent. According to their historical survey, it was only in the 6th and 5th centuries BC that Greek mariners and geographers began to divide the world into zones, with Asia to the east, Libya to the south and Europe to the north and west of the Mediterranean (figure 1). Together this made up the oikouménē, meaning the ‘inhabited world.’ Consequently, it rarely took the full spatial extent of the continents into account.

Written accounts on oikouménē sometimes involved ethnographic descriptions regarding Celts, Scythians, Thracians and Ethiopians, but as argued by Denise McCoskey, the aim was not to define peoples as born of their continents. When discussed, specific cultural traits were associated with climate and distance. The further away, the stranger the inhabitants. Non-Greek speaking ‘barbarians’ in the colder northern regions were thought to exhibit a harshness, related to (but not necessarily causing) a kind of freedom, creativity and savagery, while peoples in the more temperate southern regions were more complex in thought, spirit and rule. Too much sun however, like in Asia, would lead to irrational behaviour or a slow mind,
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7 Hom. H. Apollo 251, 291. In Erdmann 2015[2006]: Section A.
8 Erdmann 2015[2006]: Section A.
a distinction that allowed Greek scholars to frame eastern enemies (like the Persians) as naturally opposite to western peoples.¹¹

Until Roman times, the west was therefore perceived as under-civilised and the east as hyper-civilised, while Greece occupied a comfortable middle position. The continental scheme highlighted this, placing the Aegean Sea at the heart of the world.¹² The division was criticised early on by Herodotus, who called for a more complex portrayal, questioning why three distinct ‘women’s names’ had been given to what was really a single landmass.¹³ Yet, a seed had been planted and the partition would be reused, developed and filled with meaning over centuries to come.

Propelled by military expansion and overseas trade, the Roman Era saw the physical outlines of the world grow increasingly detailed. Through late antiquity, scholarly representations of the world began to resemble the maps of today. Ptolemy’s Geographia, a second century compilation of geographical knowledge (the first to introduce a global coordinate system),¹⁴ resulted in a

¹¹ This paragraph draws on chapter 1 in McCoskey 2012, especially the discussion on the Hippocratic essays Airs, waters, places.

¹² Lewis and Wigen 1997: 22.

¹³ Lewis and Wigen 1997: 22. Herodotus also pointed out the relative nature of barbarianism (McCoskey 2012: 60).

¹⁴ Originally written in Greek at Alexandria around AD 150, Ptolemy’s topography of Europe, Africa, and Asia remained the most detailed and extensive account for centuries to come. It was translated into Arabic in the 9th century and Latin in 1406, and became highly influential in late medieval and Renaissance Europe (Fritscher 2015[2006]; Berggren and Jones 2000).
much smaller Europe, positioned at the left hand corner of the world, while Africa and Asia grew larger. The border to the east, previously drawn by Herodotus at the Phasis River in the Caucasus (modern Rioni), was moved to the Tanais (modern Don River). The terms Europe and Asia were sometimes used to mark political subdivisions within Roman territory, but as a continent or meaningful division of the world, Europe was not yet a category that bore much weight. Although the Celts and Gauls were created as Others – perfectly matching the climatically conditioned traits of northern ‘barbarians’ – there existed hitherto no ‘Europeans,’ either as Other or self.

The proportionally more balanced portrayal of the continents was largely forgotten during the early Middle Ages, when conceptual depictions of the world became dominant. The three part division remained however, and as maps turned increasingly Jerusalem-centred – designed according to the Christian cosmological order in the shape of a circle divided by a T – the populations on the continents were declared descendants of the three sons of Noah. Notably, as all important biblical locations were to be found in Asia, the lands of Sem, the European continent was not considered the homeland of Christianity.

This infused the landmasses with some religious and cultural significance, but Europe remained an unstable territorial notion. Although famously named ‘Pater Europae’ (in a single text by an anonymous poet in 799), the use of Europe as a reference point during the realm of Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire should be understood within this context. Europe was a term sometimes used in court circles when referring to the old Western Roman Empire, but there was no unified ‘medieval Europe’ or a European consciousness at this time. While the tighter economic, political, religious and linguistic currents of this time have led historians to search for the birth of Europe in this period, it has often been at the expense of diversity and the variety of responses to Carolingian culture. The key reference point for self-identification at this time was Christendom, a notion stretching far beyond the western territories.
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15 Lewis and Wigen 1997: 23.
19 Since the start of European Community building after World War II, Charlemagne’s role as the ‘father of Europe’ has been hoisted out of proportion by historians, receiving undue attention due to its contemporary appeal (Balzaretti 1992; Oschema: in print).
20 Nevertheless, Klaus Oschema (in print) points to some instances in which Charlemagne was named as the leader of Europae regna (the realm of Europe) by later medieval authors situated on the margins of the landmass, especially Ireland.
22 Riekmann 1997: 68.
Along with the early Renaissance revival of the classical legacy – facilitated by the work of Arabic scholars and Byzantine monks – the continental scheme from late antiquity made a comeback. Aside from a renewed scholarly interest, the European continent seemed an increasingly good political match. Christian territory needed to be reaffirmed, both in light of northward expansion to the Baltic and in face of looming collapse in the East. As a result, by the 15th century Europe had become a replacement label for Christendom, especially among the growing number of Renaissance humanists. When the Ottoman conquests finally separated Christian traditions, a trope of Europe as the last bastion of Christendom developed in the sphere of Latin Catholicism, standing strong but alone in a fallen world. For instance, after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Pope Pius II referred to Europe as a cultural unity and fatherland. This transition meant that as a concept, Europe inherited the opposition to Islam which had intensified since the 11th century, paving the way for its reinvention as a civilisation in its own right.

It was from the late 15th century onwards, when this legacy of religious opposition merged with the political interests to differentiate Europe against a whole range of new Others, that it transformed fully from planet into glove. It slowly became what Borneman and Fowler has termed ‘a strategy of self-representation and a device of power’ (figure 2). The voyages of exploration and the “discovery” of the New World turned the long standing continental scheme upside-down. Reality had to be redrawn both mentally and physically into four world quarters, a process that took nearly a century. In this process, Europe was increasingly depicted as a standalone space, occupying the first page in world atlases.

Soon, the continental border also began to stabilise, largely due the Swedish army officer and German scholar Philip Johan von Strahlenberg (1676–1747), who argued successfully for the abandonment of the Don River as Europe’s eastern boundary. Instead he drew it along the Ural Mountains, the Caspian Sea, the Caucasus and the Black Sea. He thereby boosted the Russian Europeanisation programme – culturally excluding Siberia while conveniently including the Ottoman possessions in the Crimea within its sphere of influence. Although the continental scheme has since been extended, Strahlenberg’s European border has persisted.

26 Erdmann 2015[2006]: Section C.
29 Strahlenberg 1730: 106.
Figure 2. Europa Regina, 16th century cartographical personification of Europe as a regal woman. Originally reproduced from engraving by Johannes Putsch at the Hapsburg court. Comenius Museum in Naarden, Netherlands. Wikimedia Commons. Contributor: Aida 2006, URL: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Europe_as_a_queen_map.JPG (accessed 15.11.15).
In tune with cartographic Eurocentrism, monographs on the history of Europe started to appear. More importantly, by the 18th century the genre of travel literature had become popular. Full of curiosities and exoticising descriptions of places and peoples far away, it created a meaningful difference between that which was considered European and that which was considered non-European. Although distant peoples were often considered bizarre and uncultured, the genre also popularised the trope of the ‘noble savage’ or the ‘good savage.’ The savage was an outsider who had escaped the corrupting influences and constant wars of European societies, symbolising a kind of purity and innate goodness.

Europeans were also classified biologically, most famously in Linnaeus’ (1707–1778) work *Systema naturae* (1735). Drawing on classical writings regarding human temperaments and contemporary categorisations of peoples, he defined the continents by geography and human ‘types.’ Starting from humans as a single species, Linnaeus named four subspecies. One of these were *Europaeus*, which, in line with current European notions about their own superiority, was described as white, strong, inventive and governed by law. *Asiaticus* was defined as yellow, stiff, melancholic and governed by opinion, and *Afer* – the African subspecies – as black, sluggish and ruled by impulse. *Americanus*, considered red, ill-tempered and ruled by custom, was placed beneath *Europaeus* in the first edition, but as the trope of the noble savage grew in popularity it was moved to the top, shifting emphasis to *Americanus* contentment and freedom from the shackles of civilisation. Despite this division, Linnaeus’ schemes were more horizontal than vertical in nature. To rank the human types was not a goal in itself.

During the development of 18th century Enlightenment, the maps and historical accounts of the continent merged with biological, geographic and anthropological classifications, into the idea of a unique European civilisation. Instead of representing a last bastion of Christendom, Europe became a unit of choice for scholars seeking to explain the world through more secular perspectives. The model allowed for multiple civilisations placed on a step-ladder of development, where man progressed towards a morally just society through knowledge, skills (arts) and virtue. In contrast to others, Europeans owned the complete set, while at the same time remaining capable of self-criticism.
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1 Burke 2006: 237.
2 Schmale 2010: 171.
3 Marks 2001: 50.
4 Zack 2002.
5 The word ‘civilisation’ is a neologism from 18th century French, used as an opposite to ‘barbarity’ and to mark the passage to a civilised era (Braudel 1987: 33).
6 This ‘potential for progress’ would later fuel the French and American revolutions, and be incorporated into the UN declaration on human rights after World War II (Bugge 2003: 67).
7 See for instance Adam Ferguson’s *An essay on the history of civil society* (1767).
During the Enlightenment, a strong Orientalism emerged in the late 18th century. According to rationalists like Voltaire, it was the Orient which stood as the cradle of everything of value that the West possessed. This was considered plain to see from both historical accounts of the Near East as well as objects and ancient monuments, things which had recently become the task of national institutions to collect, study and protect. Yet, Orientalism simultaneously worked to support ideas of European superiority. It was the Europeans’ consciousness of their own barbarism, their unique intellectual and physical abilities – their rational minds, morals, strength and light complexion – that settled the verdict. Eastern civilisations and peoples, although once great, were considered static due to ages of despotic rule. After the demise of the Roman Empire, the Olympic torch of development had been passed on from East to West.

During the 19th century, facilitated by the monarchs’ loss of divinity, the separation of cosmology and history, and the domestication of national languages through print-capitalism, the nation-state fraternities cemented a new sense of unescapable belonging. Now, a vertical biological taxonomy of physical and behavioural traits married models of cultural evolution and ethnic conceptions of ownership and identity. Just as you could not choose your family, you could not choose your race or nation. Genealogy, race and the ancient homeland became neutralised constants. In an extended framework, this also applied to continents. As argued by the influential 19th century human geographer Carl Ritter: ‘Each continent is like itself alone; its characteristics are not shared by any other. Each one was so planned and so formed as to have its own special function in the progress of human culture.’ Ritter used this idea of continents as living organisms as a base for racist interpretations of the world.

Enlightenment models of civilisation were built on the premise that, at least in theory, everyone could become civilised. Along with the emergence of European imperialism, this potential for movement was dampened. European states were considered sanctioned in their colonisation of what science and popular assumptions deemed flawed or stagnant peoples, a project in which the emerging disciplines of anthropology and archaeology was of particular assistance. Darwin’s *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or, the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life* (1859) inspired theories of social evolution based on racial difference, which in turn inspired early prehistorians like John Lubbock (1834-1913). In his

---

8 Said 1978. See also Marchand 2012 on Orientalism in Germany.
10 For antiquarianism and collections see Díaz-Andreu 2007.
14 Ritter 1881: 183.
thesis *Prehistoric times: as illustrated by ancient remains, and the manners and customs of modern savages* (1865) – a work that became especially influential in the context of European colonisation – Lubbock argued that not only had natural selection rendered Europeans culturally different, it had also made them biologically more able to use culture. Due to their deficiencies, non-Europeans in non-industrialised societies were considered hopelessly stuck in various states of barbarism. From exhibiting potential for progress, they became regarded as lesser human breeds. Through them the ancient past could still be observed, while Europeans had moved on and had acquired ‘History.’ As a consequence, expressed aptly in the 1899 poem *The white man’s burden* by Rudyard Kipling, colonised peoples came to be seen both an encumbrance and a duty, and “caring” for them an act of benevolence.

Of course, the process of defining the nation-states built heavily on differentiating oneself from ones neighbour. Arguably more so than the comparison with faraway peoples. Scholars began to establish national histories and mythical golden ages that worked to justify social change, idealised points in time when politics and religion converged and ethnic consensus defined the homeland. Towards the late 19th century, an increasing number of prehistorians directed their gaze inwards, finding merit in a nationalist barbarian past, while Classical scholars moved towards Hellenism. Ian Morris has called Hellenism a ‘continentalist’ approach to the past. It upheld Greek Antiquity as the cradle of European civilisation, a nexus of belonging for the wider racial and cultural club called the West.

![Figure 3. Bench from the Apartheid period in South Africa. 'District 6' Community Museum, Cape Town. Photo courtesy: Yael Marom.](image-url)
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16 Smith 1997: 37.

Evolutionary models of explanation had helped uphold these ties, making it possible to detach ancient civilisations like Hellas, Egypt and Babylon from their present populations. Their relics were considered safer and more spiritually at home under Western and Central European stewardship. Thus, from the perspective of cultural appropriation, the nationalist obsession with ethnic origins actually stimulated a broader transnational awareness than in previous centuries. Importantly, the ages of imperialism and colonialism also meant that Europe was increasingly defined from the outside, by overseas Empires, emigrants and peoples under colonial rule. With the rise of the United States of America, Europeanness fused with the idea of the West on the one hand, while for Americans it became a bygone homeland.

By the dawn of the 21st century, the term Europe had long since inhabited scholarly and political realms and its various classifications. This lead to serious consequences for many classified as non-European (figure 3). Yet, I would argue that Europe had never been a political entity or governmental concern in any real sense. Napoleon and the First French Empire, just as Charlemagne, used the concept of Europe, but their key source of inspiration was ancient Rome. Neither did the European Concert, the agreement between European rulers that resulted in the Hundred Years’ Peace (1814-1914), indicate the start of Europe as a self-regarding political community. And while the Third Reich – also inspired by the Roman Empire – fostered grand visions of a unified Empire on the continent, they did not draw on ideas of Europeanness or a European civilisation as much as a self-styled, racially conditioned utopia.

It was only in the wake of World War II that the notion of Europe met with actual political interest for the first time. From a state of diplomatic and economic urgency, Europe was created as a self-aware and future-oriented international project based common values of freedom, democracy and human rights. However, as envisaged by the logic of modernity, it could only be considered legitimate if it had a history and peoples which identified with it. Rather than adopting a new idea of what it means to be European, the Community leaned on established notions of a ‘common inheritance,’ seeing the unification as the ‘recreation’ of the European family. Although they predate the founding of the Community, Churchill’s famous post-war speeches on a ‘United States of Europe’ offer a window into contemporary discourses. In 1945 he regretted the previous lack of substance given to the
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18 For the consequences of this detachment in Greece, see Hamilakis 2003.
19 Huet (1999) argues that this was not Napoleon Bonaparte’s own making, but a joint creation by him and his artistic advisers. For ancient Rome and Napoleon I–III, see also Trigger 2006[1989]: 213.
20 According to Elrod (1976), the concert was more of a diplomatic instrument that depended upon individual leaders. It did in no way challenge the doctrine of national sovereignty.
21 Loosemann 1999.
22 See Gusejnova 2012 for extended analysis.
idea of Europe, stressing that unification would bring together the continent ‘in a manner [unknown] since the fall of the Roman Empire.’ This bond would not be new in spirit, but founded on the heritage of Western civilisation:

This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the western world. It is the fountain of Christian faith and Christian ethics. It is the origin of most of the culture, arts, philosophy and science both of ancient and modern times. If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, to the prosperity and glory which its three or four hundred million people would enjoy.

Although Churchill was on the extreme end when it came to promoting a future European Community, his use of Enlightenment discourses on European superiority reflects the climate in which the first steps toward an economic and political bond was forged. By actively collecting and meshing together previous ideas on Europenness into a new institutional discourse, the story of Europe started to be told to a degree it had never been before. As argued by Sonja Riekmann, Europe was raised as a kind of magical formula and moral concept already in the *Schuman Declaration* (1950), the first proposal for a European Coal and Steel Community. Only by concealing Europe as a geographical concept, and using it as a synonym for the new cooperation, could it become a driving force for integration later on. Ironically, the political conflicts surrounding the Iron Curtain did not seem to threaten this vision. Rather, the splitting of Europe into East and West confirmed its natural state as a whole.

Since then, even if it was specified in the Treaty of Rome that only European states can be members of the EU, the Community’s definition of Europenness has remained indistinct. As late as 1992, the following was written in relation to the enlargement process:

The term European has not been officially defined. It combines geographical, historical and cultural elements which all contribute to the European identity … The Commission believes that it is neither possible nor opportune to establish now the frontiers of the European Union, whose contours will be shaped over many years to come.
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26 Riekmann 1997: 64.
This passive approach has led to serious problems in the Community’s politics of belonging. Religion has become a factor in discussions on Turkish membership and the cultural heritage of democracy has become a rhetoric to keep Greece in the union despite economic collapse in the 2010s. On the other hand, a floating idea of Europe has also proven effective. The EU has by and large become synonymous with Europe and despite the constant state of crisis and democratic deficit, they have managed to create Europeans. If not as a specific ‘type of person,’ at least as bodies registered and classified through European passports. Political terms like ‘third countries’ and ‘non-EU nationals’ have developed, sharpening the border toward ‘non-Europeans.’

This exclusionary rhetoric became palpable when Morocco applied for membership in 1986. According to Iver Neumann, their application was dealt with ‘in no uncertain terms; Rabat was simply told that the organization was open only to Europeans, and that was that. There was no room for ambiguity here, only unequivocal exclusion and marking of Morocco as clearly “non-European”.’

The origins of Europe in archaeology

Within archaeological storytelling, long dominated by meta-narratives such as Marxism or evolutionary theory, Europe has 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 it has turned out be the very explanation in itself. When it comes to research on pan-European prehistory, it is safe to say that no one has ever started from a series of local archaeological assemblages and simply found Europe. Although studies have always built on observations about technology, environment, subsistence patterns and sociopolitical structures across the landmass, fitting these into a single frame has required an Other. Europe has been born as a culturally conditioned space out of competition and contrast, most often in relation to the Orient.

Enclosed by the long standing trope of barbarism versus civilisation, these contrasts have sometimes rendered Europe a backwater to more advanced societies, or depending on perspective, an individual force going its own way. The former take has emphasised external cultural transfers, especially from Mesopotamia or Egypt to Classical Greece and ancient Rome. In this model, European civilisation is placed on standby after the fall of Rome to ‘barbarian hordes,’ only to be activated again in the Renaissance. The second approach has sought the cradle in barbarianism itself, as an uncor-

30 Shore 1993: 786.
rupted and creative force standing against Oriental despotism.\textsuperscript{33} The element of competition here lies in which civilisation or system would come out on top: bound to rule the world. Of course, this competition was always rigged, seeing as capitalism, science and Western democracy were deemed the crowning achievements.

Aside from these fundamentals, something more is often needed to make Europe seem like a relevant frame in which to order our facts. Such relevance has usually been established in relation to recent historical developments, through queries like: ‘Since capitalism, and more specifically industrialism, developed in western Europe, it has posed the natural question: why Europe?’\textsuperscript{34} Or ‘[When] did Europe acquire the distinctive character that it was later to impose on much of the rest of the world?’\textsuperscript{35} Here, the question ‘why?’ draws upon the historical idea of Europe, while the ‘when?’ alludes to origins.

Narratives structured around such historical ideas hold explanatory power.\textsuperscript{36} Combined with the search for origins, a figure since long recognised for its ability to (re-)order reality, these questions tend to guide narratives on a given course, relating and juxtaposing prehistoric societies in a European patchwork with a predetermined end point. They also frequently entail a value judgement or imply an ancestral bond between the scholar and the object of study. Bernard Wailes and Amy Zoll has referred to this as \textit{ethnic partisanship},\textsuperscript{37} while Neil Asher Silberman has spoken of the \textit{archaeologist-as-hero} narrative, namely: ‘when the discoverer proclaims his or her connection to a modern population that claims decent from the group under study.’\textsuperscript{38}

This being said, it is important to note that among the archaeologies of European nation-states, the study of Europe as an entity with its own prehistory has never been a major concern.\textsuperscript{39} Owing much of its success to its usefulness in nationalist discourses – as one out of many technologies for exclusion and identity building in the 19th century – most archaeologists have followed suit and specialised in specific fields tied to their own countries, conducting research on interregional and local scales.\textsuperscript{40} As a result, many of those who have written grand narratives of European prehistory have be-
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come well-known, making both their texts and their persons into popular objects of study.

In the following, I will use examples from their narratives to point toward techniques of Europe-making in archaeology. The aim is not to evaluate the credibility of specific interpretations or to undermine archaeological understandings of prehistoric life on the continent, but to look at what such narratives set forth as Europeanness and to what kind of Europe they refer. Almost all selected narratives stem from the Anglo-Saxon tradition in archaeology. This is not only a result of my own linguistic limitations. Although there are archaeologists who have written narratives on a European scale outside this tradition, most do stem from Great Britain and Scandinavia. The dominance of the English language in academic circles have of course assisted in the spread of these accounts, but another reason may be their position on the edge of the physical landmass of Europe, making the continental perspective seem somehow more accessible.

**Europe between barbarism and capitalism**

One of the key tropes which has defined Western society’s self-image since the late Renaissance is that of ancient Greece as the birthplace of a European spirit. The Hellenism which developed during the nationalist disputes and imperialist aggression of the late 18th and 19th centuries was not overly concerned with archaeology. However, after the break between Greece and the Ottoman Empire, it became important to distinguish Greece from the occupying power and ‘re-identify’ a truly European Greece. In this quest many European powers were ready to assist. Traditionally, tropes on classical antiquity such as ‘the cradle of Europe’ had stressed early influences from the Near East, while barbarians were considered destructive elements. Through Heinrich Schliemann’s excavations at Troy (1870s), Tiryns (1880s) and Mycenae (1870s), and Arthur Evans’ work at Knossos (1900–1931), a prehistoric antiquity for the Classical World was established. This construct brought nationalist archaeologies concerned with barbarian Europe and classical archaeologists closer together. The site of Knossos, upon its unearthing, was immediately characterised as European, both by Evans and other researchers. According to critical accounts, Evans’ creation of Minoan archaeology as a cradle of Western civilisation was deliberate and highly polit-
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41 Sarunas Milisauskas has remarked upon the disproportional amount of attention given to pan-European scholars, while the majority of national archaeologists have been forgotten (2011: 7).

42 Oschema (in print), argues that this was why medieval scholars in Ireland were some of the first to take a continental perspective during their own time, since the territories on the continent appeared as a unity if seen from the margins.


Thus, even if scholars in the classic tradition produced few grand narratives of continental Europe, their works preconditioned the creation of Europe as a unique entity in prehistory.

Oscar Montelius (1843-1921) was the first to carry out a comprehensive artefact classification on a continental scale, a work made possible by the rapid construction of railway networks in the mid-19th century. His syntheses on European prehistory did not present Europe as a superior civilisation, rather the opposite. In his works on the relationship between Europe and the Orient, Montelius advocated a diffusionist model in which civilisation entered Europe in bits and pieces from the outside. Although it was a lack of refined technology that defined European societies, the juxtaposition nevertheless created Europe as an entity. An interesting example of how this was done can be found in the text ‘Typologien eller utvecklingsläran tillämpad på det mänskliga arbetet’ (1900). Produced in relation to a natural science conference, he starts by explaining pedagogically that the ‘type’ is for the prehistorian what the species is for the natural scientist. After going through series of Bronze Age axes from Scandinavia and Italy, he sorts them into cultural periods in a relative chronology, concluding that:

A comparison between Europe and the Orient in typological terms shows a far greater liveliness within our continent than in the lands of the East. In Europe we encounter a richness in shapes, a vigour, a readiness for change … and consequently a speedy development, which makes a strange contrast to the Oriental predilection for keeping the old forms unchanged … This opposition between the West and the East, which appear early on, and which has continued since, is closely connected to the peculiar differences in folk-character in mentioned parts of the world, that has been of such great importance for these peoples’ whole development and therefore so decisive for their history and their current relationship to each other.

---

46 McEnroe 2002. Se also Hamilakis and Momigliano (eds.) 2006, especially the chapters by Morris, Hamilakis and Sherratt.
47 Montelius 1899, 1903. See also Baudou 2012; Trigger 2006[1989]: 222–232.
48 Montelius 1900: 237.
49 The Swedish word ‘folkkaraktär’ is an ambiguous concept, referring to the traits of a people based on ethnicity or culture. However, Montelius did not adhere to racial models of interpretation (Trigger 2006[1989]: 230).
Here, despite Montelius’ belief that early Oriental impulses had developed civilisation, he drew upon current evolutionary frameworks to explain the diversity seen in the material. Contemporaneous understandings of what set Europeans and Eastern peoples apart were used to rationalise as well as naturalise a distinction between Europe and the Orient over time. In this process, although Montelius’ work focused on nation-states to a much higher degree than continents, he underpins Europe as a natural overhead category.

The 20th century archaeologist V. Gordon Childe (1892–1957) is probably the one to have written the most influential grand narratives of a European prehistory. He entered into archaeology through Classical studies, and like many others he was interested in the origins of the Indo-European languages. After travelling extensively around Europe by train in the early 1920s, Childe published one of his first and most influential works, *Dawn of European civilisation* (1925). By combining all the bits and pieces available to him in a modified cultural historical approach based on diffusion, Childe pronounced the late Neolithic and the Bronze Age as the start of an indigenous European civilisation, a period when man became ‘master of his own food supply’ through technological skill, organized co-operative labour, and commerce.

The plot assigns the Egyptian and Sumerian centres – in conjunction with the Minoans and Mycenaeans – the role of muses, radiating civilising influence onto the peninsula. In Central Europe the Danubian peasants were considered the pioneers of progress, while westward diffusion to the civilisation of Los Millares in Spain and successive Arabic societies resulted in a process of slow degradation. According to Childe, they may have been ‘too oriental to survive on European soil.’

The struggle towards an independent civilisation also contained an ‘Other within:’ the tragic Megalith cultures of western Europe. From their ‘gloomy’ rituals and sacerdotal conservatism

---

51 According to Trigger, Montelius took advantage of the popularity of Darwinian thought to increase the importance of archaeology (2006[1989]: 227).
52 See especially Childe 1927[1925]; 1930; 1958.
53 Childe was inspired by the German prehistorian Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931), the founder of the culture-historical model in which Montelius’ artefact series was turned into distinct ethnic groups sharing a language and culture. Kossinna had entered into prehistoric studies through linguistics, obsessed with finding the homeland of the Indo-Europeans. His research was a reaction to the central role of Classical archaeology in Germany and the preoccupation with Greek Antiquity as the cradle of European civilisation (Baudou 2002: 178). Instead, he put forth the Finno-Ugrian barbarians of the Stone Age in northern Germany and Scandinavia as the true engineers, creating a nationalist and racist account of prehistory that served the political interests of the nascent German nation and the Nazi movement. Childe embraced the basis of the culture-historical approach and the idea that archaeological cultures represented peoples, but dismissed Kossinna’s racialist interpretations (Trigger 2006[1989]: 135–241).
54 Childe 1927[1925]: 1.
55 Childe 1927[1925]: 301.
originated nothing, Childe states.\textsuperscript{56} During the course of the Bronze Age, however, the invading Celts finally imposed civilisation upon them.\textsuperscript{57} In contrast to Montelius, Childe’s motive was to defeat the idea of the absolute supremacy of Oriental civilisations and to demonstrate the relevance of Europe’s barbarian past. Childe argues for a middle position, in which the Orient was seen as a key influence but that ‘the peoples of the West were not slavish imitators.’\textsuperscript{58} The true originality of our ancestors was displayed not in inventing what early climatic conditions had reserved for others, but in the manner in which they adapted and improved the inventions of the Orient … and thus before the second millennium they had outstripped their masters and created an individual civilization of their own.\textsuperscript{59}

Not only did Eastern societies owe their initial success to favourable climate, as is suggested here, they were also deemed static, totalitarian and far too preoccupied with ‘ghostly things.’\textsuperscript{60} Europeans on the other hand possessed ‘energy, independence and inventiveness,’\textsuperscript{61} something which Herdis Hølleland, who has analysed Childe’s texts in relation to discourses on European identity, discusses in terms of ‘European personhood.’\textsuperscript{62} When linking assemblages in the archaeological record to prehistoric societies, much of the explanatory power in Childe’s argument came to rest in the perceived immaterial qualities of Europeans versus other peoples.\textsuperscript{63} Childe also establishes ethnic partisanship by calling Europe ‘our continent’ and naming the prehistoric Europeans ‘our predecessors,’ ‘our nameless forerunners’ and ‘our ancestors.’ That Childe was Australian in nationality did not appear to have been an obstacle when making such connections, as his intended audience was most likely the British.\textsuperscript{64}

Childe’s take on culture and his materialist view of history drew on 19th century frameworks of evolutionary progress and remnants of Enlightenment discourses on European uniqueness.\textsuperscript{65} Even if he attempted to stay clear of ethnic and nationalist interpretations and was nuanced compared to many of his contemporaries, paying attention to local variations and uneven speeds of progression, a continental chauvinism is manifested in his narratives. This

\textsuperscript{56} Childe 1927[1925]: 284f.
\textsuperscript{57} Childe 1927[1925]: 285.
\textsuperscript{58} Childe 1927[1925]: xiii.
\textsuperscript{59} Childe 1927[1925]: 23–24.
\textsuperscript{60} See Hølleland 2012: 13 or 2008: 40 for a scheme of attributes given to the pair.
\textsuperscript{61} Childe 1927[1925]: xiv.
\textsuperscript{62} Hølleland 2010; 2012.
\textsuperscript{63} These Others did not just include Near Eastern peoples, but also Egypt India and China (Childe 1927[1925]: xiv).
\textsuperscript{64} Childe spent most of his life in Britian (Trigger 1980: 9–10).
\textsuperscript{65} Hølleland 2012: 13; Shennan 1987: 367.
chauvinism was already implicit in the description of his subject as ‘the foundation of European Civilization as a peculiar and individual manifestation of the human spirit.’\(^\text{66}\) That a Europe mirroring that of his own time was the outcome – defined by individualism, innovation and commerce – was not surprising. In his later works, stressing the importance of the Bronze Age smith, Childe continued to build upon this narrative of the Bronze Age as the cradle of modern capitalism.\(^\text{67}\)

Childe’s approach to European prehistory was not the only one put forward in the first half of the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century. For Christopher Hawkes (1905–1992) and Grahame Clark (1907–1995), the first a supporter Childes theories while the other took a critical stance, the environment became a more important factor. Hawkes argued that the process of Europeanisation was mainly driven from within, but that it was the peripheral position and physical character of the continent that gave rise to the vitality of its peoples. The conclusion remained similar to Childe’s, although he saw the fall of Knossos in the Middle Bronze Age as the key turning point, marking the break-up between Europe and the Orient, after which a ‘coherent unity of European civilisation’ came into being.\(^\text{68}\) Grahame Clark’s approach stripped Europe of some of this Europeanness. In his most famous work, *Prehistoric Europe: the economic basis* (1952), Europe became an environmental laboratory in which ecology, economic practices and subsistence patterns could be observed within their active ‘social units.’ Although he had argued in *Archaeology and society* (1939) for the need to interpret data in terms of social history, his narratives on Europe were more clinical in nature. This was probably a result of his approach as well as his interest in the Mesolithic, a time period that has proven difficult to turn into a usable past.\(^\text{69}\) In the end however, even if Clark’s Europe was more geographical than cultural, he demonstrated a way of thinking about continents as natural entities.\(^\text{70}\)

If the version of Europe discussed up until now has been a highly masculine creation, occupied by patriarchal Indo-European warrior cultures, male engineers and elites, archaeologist Marija Gimbutas’ (1921–1994) Europe was of a different character.\(^\text{71}\) Focusing on the same time period as previous scholars – the Neolithic and the Bronze Age – Gimbutas argued for the existence of an Eastern European civilisation which she named ‘Old Europe.’\(^\text{72}\)
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\(^{66}\) Childe 1927/1925: xiii.

\(^{67}\) See Rowlands 1987, and Rowlands et al. 1987 for a critique of ‘primitive capitalism.’

\(^{68}\) Hawkes 1940: 381, also in Holleland 2008: 39.

\(^{69}\) As commented by Bradley in relation to Mesolithic studies, who wants to think of hunter-gatherers, whose goal in life was to ‘have ecological relationships with hazelnuts,’ as our ancestors? (Bradley 1984: 11, in Zvelebil 1996: 160).

\(^{70}\) This especially manifest in popular works like *World prehistory: a new outline* (1969).

\(^{71}\) Gimbutas 1956, 1970.

\(^{72}\) This was also her home turf. Lynn Meskell (1995) has argued that her theories were inspired by Stalin’s invasion of the Baltic countries at the time of World War II.
It was a proto Indo-European society that worshipped female deities and had a more balanced relationship between genders. It was later overrun by the warlike Indo-European ‘Kurgan culture’ from the steppes, but left some lasting influences. In this form, Europe acquired an even more original version of itself, an earlier starting point in prehistory when an even freer people inhabited the continent. Although this theory never gained wide acceptance among archaeologists in the West, the choice of connecting Europe with ‘Urheimat’ clearly shows its power as a construction, as something that can be partially detached from geographic Europe.

From the late 1950s onwards, narratives about Europe changed direction. In the aftermath of World War II, objections arose with regard to the ethnic assumption resting in the idea of archaeological cultures, and the vague nature of cultural boundaries was increasingly explored. The search for Indo European origins, especially Aryans, came to be seen as distasteful. The culture-historical framework was also criticised for being unscientific, relying too much on guesswork.

As a reaction, processual approaches based on logical positivism developed in the 1960s. Initially called ‘New Archaeology,’ cultural evolution was perceived as a scientifically predictable process that could be studied in relation to environmental factors. Adaptation and change were to be studied based on quantitative data, an approach which was fuelled by new technical tools and testing equipment such as radiocarbon dating. In this climate, processual archaeologists like Colin Renfrew continued to write grand narratives of Europe, challenging the ideas of Childe on the one hand while reinforcing notions of an autonomous European development on the other.

In *Before civilization: the radio carbon revolution and prehistoric Europe* (1973), Renfrew compares diffusionist approaches to a ‘chess game of migrations’ that rarely led to any sensible conclusions. Instead, he argues that archaeologists need to see ‘the events of European prehistory as the result of a purely local process, in essentially European terms.’ Using radiocarbon dates corrected against bristle cone tree ring chronology, he places the origins of Europe in the early Neolithic. With dates pushing back the presence of metallurgy in the Balkans and structures like Neolithic passage graves the North-West of Europe by millennia, the influence from the Near East was marginal. Renfrew argues (even in the Mycenaean and Minoan cultures). He also concludes that ‘while farming in Europe depended largely on Near Eastern plants and animals, the manner of its adaptation and the way of life were themselves characteristically European.’

---

75 Renfrew 1973: 121.
The ‘European terms’ and characteristics referred to throughout the text remain inexplicit.\(^{77}\) Interestingly, they are often accompanied by the view that each prehistoric society should be analysed in its own right. The early civilisations in the Aegean are seen as the ‘result of a European development,’ which should be explained largely in ‘Aegean terms.’\(^{78}\) Just as in the culture-historical interpretations, Europeanness appears to be an inherent quality in the places and peoples on the landmass.\(^{79}\) It becomes a glove, knitted around a wide range of prehistoric societies that sometimes only share the label itself. A continental chauvinism is especially noticeable in the celebratory attitude toward the lack of influences from the East, seemingly a positive outcome of re-interpretation. Putting himself in the position as hero, Renfrew announces that ‘at last Barbarian Europe emerges as a society, or as a group of societies, where striking developments and changes were taking place all the time.’\(^{80}\)

At this time, the European Community was (as we shall see in the next chapter), working hard to gain popular support, and its very existence meant that the topic of the history of Europe gained new interest. Scholars from a variety of scholarly fields began to re-interpret events from a continentalist viewpoint.\(^{81}\) This political reality is something that should be taken into account in regard both to Renfrew’s and to later grand narratives of Europe.\(^{82}\) In debates on archaeology and European identity during the 1990s, Renfrew critically addresses questions of ideological bias, ethnicity and Eurocentrism in archaeology. In ‘The identity of Europe in prehistoric archaeology’ (1994), he reflects on archaeological responsibilities in the face of political misuses of the past, arguing that we need to move away from the idea of a single origin by re-defining the critical questions, formulating them ‘in relation to frameworks of thought that do not themselves offer or determine a ready-made answer.’\(^{83}\) At the same time, he starts from the conviction that ‘each continent on the earth is unique,’\(^{84}\) a statement echoing that of Carl Ritter described in the first section of this chapter, that ‘each continent is like itself alone’ and therefore destined to play a different part in the progress of the world.\(^{85}\)

As pointed out before, continents are themselves cultural constructs and in this sense Europe is just as problematic as the frame of the nation-state. Its


\(^{78}\) Renfrew 1973: 211, 234. For an extended account on early Aegean civilisation as the result of internal developments, see Renfrew 1972.
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\(^{80}\) Renfrew 1973: 132.

\(^{81}\) Goddard et al. 1994.

\(^{82}\) See Larsen 1989: 121. Also in Kristiansen 1996: 142.

\(^{83}\) Renfrew 1994: 171.


\(^{85}\) Ritter 1881: 183.
constructed nature is addressed by Renfrew in another text, where his incentives are more clearly articulated. Recognising that the past does not offer any ‘ready-made formula’ for extracting anything like a ‘European identity,’ he suggests that it is the task of contemporary Europeans to construct such identities and that if they should wish to do so, there are an abundance of ingredients available: ‘linguistic, genetic, cultural, religious and in terms of shared history from which a common myth may be created.’\(^{86}\) This would suggest that creating a European identity is indeed something which archaeology can assist with.

As a reaction to the positivism and lack of human agency in processualist research, the highly varied approaches crowded under the umbrella of post-processualism emerged from England (and later Scandinavia) during the 1980s. Postprocessualist themes were largely concerned with post-modern subjects such as symbolism, ideology, gender and critical theory, and included efforts to recognise the situated role of the scholar in interpretation. Due to these foci, and the academic criticism of grand narratives that marked this period, few syntheses on European prehistory emerged from the movement.

Ian Hodder’s *The domestication of Europe: structure and contingency in Neolithic societies* (1990) is an interesting exception. Using a contextual approach, he argues that domestication should be viewed as a cultural phenomenon, something that can be observed through symbolic evidence from homes, settlements, and burials in Europe and the Near East. In his narrative, the spread of agrarian society starts in the Levant ca. 7500 BC, spreading across Anatolia, the Balkans and Central Europe to Scandinavia and the British Isles over a period of 4,000 years. As a basis for interpretation, he tracks changes in the symbolic structures of what he calls the ‘domus,’ the nurturing and female home and the ‘agrios,’ the wild and male outside.\(^ {87}\) Having defined the role of the domus-agrios in South East Europe, the structural concept ‘foris’ – representing boundaries – is introduced in order to explain the differences throughout Europe, incorporating them into the theoretically posed dichotomy. Southern Scandinavia turns out to fit this pattern rather poorly, while northern France and lowland Britain work better. Under the title ‘Europeans and Indo-Europeans’ Hodder admits that his interpretation may need more comparative material from other parts of the world. Still, it is suggested that the roots of this symbolism may be observed already in the European Palaeolithic, that the presented model of long term internal structural change can accommodate Palaeolithic cave paintings in France, the tripartite Indo-European system and the stranger-king concept in a ‘possible perspective on Indo-European unity.’\(^ {88}\)

\[^{86}\text{Renfrew 1996: 134.}\]
\[^{87}\text{Hodder 1990: 302–305.}\]
\[^{88}\text{Hodder 1990: 307.}\]
On the whole, compared to the narratives previously discussed, Hodder’s account is more concerned with prehistory in Europe than a specifically European prehistory. Yet, the reasons for using Europe as a framework are not made entirely clear. Hodder writes that the very idea for the book came from a conversation with an anthropologist who had suggested that the Palaeolithic cave art of south-west France – one of the places in which Hodder’s narrative ends up – could not have been made anywhere else but in Europe, leaving Hodder with an ‘unthinkable thought.’ Thus, in some ways it was the very same question about European uniqueness as before, which prompted the study. Hodder also explains how it was at sites located in the Nuba mountains of present-day Sudan, that he first saw the symbolic patterns of domus-agrios, making it possible to recognise them at Çatalhöyük. To start the investigation from a regional perspective, cutting across continents therefore comes across as a more sensible choice, especially since large parts of Europe did not seem to match this model.

Perhaps the answer is embedded in his statement about how ‘we can only change the structures that bind us once they have been thought.’ Europe is definitely such a structure, but was it changed through this narrative? Taken together, despite the fact that Hodder engages with questions of bias throughout the book, admitting that his model might apply to Europe as well as the Near East or the whole world, and that prehistory often works to create an ‘illusion of understanding the present,’ the continental mould still creates Europe as a unity in diversity during the Neolithic. The ‘unthinkable thought’ appears not to have been so unthinkable after all.

As stated previously, the 1990s saw a flare-up of critical articles and compilation volumes dealing with archaeology and Europeanness. This was sparked by a number of things. Major events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989), the cultural agenda set out in the EU Maastricht Treaty (1992) and the urgent need of cooperation showcased by the invocation of an ethnic past in the Bosnian War (1992–1995), motivated the work on the Valetta Convention (CoE 1992), and the start of the Journal of European Archaeology (1993) and the EAA (1994). This ‘EUphoria’ was especially visible in the CoE campaigns and exhibitions: The Bronze Age: the first golden age of Europe (1994–1997), and Europe in the Time of Ulysses: the European Bronze Age (1998–1999).

One of the front figures promoting the pan-European perspective was Kristian Kristiansen. His narratives on European prehistory build upon
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world-systems approaches to social change,\textsuperscript{94} looking at the ways in which Europe have been interconnected on a macro-scale in the past, as reflected in cultural, social, and economic patterns.\textsuperscript{95} In \textit{Europe before history}, he introduces his topic as ‘the prehistoric foundations of the historic Europe that emerged with the Roman Empire,’ establishing a foundation for the study by declaring that the Bronze Age represents ‘the first industrialisation in the history of Europe,’ the time when Europe entered the world system.\textsuperscript{96} His narrative is one of interaction and extensive trade networks between the Near East, the Mediterranean, and Central Europe, putting forth Mycenaeans as clever entrepreneurs and middle hands between Eastern and Central European societies. Going from small-scale luxury trade in the early periods, to large-scale trade in commodities later on, Europe gradually enters the world stage, a development particularly driven by the emergence of European warrior elites and the rise of metallurgical centres from 1900 BC.\textsuperscript{97} It is both the regional differences in Europe and the similarities, Kristiansen argues, that later determined the success of Roman expansion and thus European history.

Overall, Kristiansen’s argument is centred on the uniqueness of the Bronze Age rather than the uniqueness of Europe. The centre-periphery division in this approach echoes the diffusionist models of previous scholars and the entities of the Near East and Europe are still in play, but their relationship is more equal and intertwined than oppositional.\textsuperscript{98} Nevertheless, Europe is still treated as an entity, sometimes referred to as an interconnected region, sometimes as a geographical area and sometimes as a culturally conditioned space. It is the historical idea of Europe as the cradle of capitalism, the question of when and why it developed in Europe, which structures the narrative. This is a question which Kristiansen refers to as ‘natural.’\textsuperscript{99} Even though he critically addresses topics like ideology, European origins and uniqueness – opposing Renfrew’s perspective on Europe as an isolated subcontinent – he still proposes that European prehistory has to be ‘understood in terms of Europe’s position for several thousand years,’\textsuperscript{100} affirming it as an entity already at the outset. These ingredients, a continental thinking mixed with the search for the roots of a phenomenon tied to modern Europe, is the very recipe of a narrative of – as Rowlands has put it – a present that ‘rediscover
its ideologically in the past,’ and doing so ‘precisely because such schemes are available as the conditions within which people think and act.’

From this point on, narratives of Europe have continued to be written in archaeology. Newer texts usually relate to and take the scholarly critique of European frameworks since the 1990s into account (as did Kristiansen), but this does not mean that the questions have changed. An example of this can be drawn from the introduction of the compilation *Becoming European: the transformation of third millennium northern and western Europe* (2012):

Are recent and contemporary agendas and ideological dreams all that construct the concept of Europe? Or are there authentic material and social institutions, ideology and experiences – a common heritage with roots in the third millennium BC – that render concepts of Europe still viable in archaeology?

Here, the same old question about specificity is asked, only with the critique baked into the formula, an approach often justified based on the argument that the empirical evidence does support the idea of a specific European development after all, a fact that cannot be ignored. A more active way of relating to the critique has been to argue for the necessity of creating grand narratives and myths about Europe that are relevant to current society, otherwise others will write them for us. Aside from these reactions, there are certainly many fractions in archaeology that continue to use Europe as a natural category, uninterested in its political relevance and history.

**Conclusions**

There seems no end to the potential of a pre-existing cultural rhetoric to categorise and exclude people. But it clearly is one notion of origins … that has had a powerful influence in organising what is taken to be, at any particular time ‘contemporary thought.’

Europe has a long history, and unlike ‘horses’ – in keeping with Hacking’s metaphor – it has never been ‘obedient to our minds.’ Yet, ever since its first mention by Greek geographers, a process of filling the notion with content has conspired to make it real. As a geographical entity it has been an artificially cropped frontier, altered based on perspective and political wills.

---
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As a cultural unit, it inherited the meaning of Christendom and opposition to Islam, a separation which transformed into a division of civilisations during the Enlightenment. Crowning Europeans as the rightful owners of the world paved the way for the concept’s unceasing entanglement with racism. More than being defined from within, however, Europe as a class has been dependent on the classification of things, peoples or places as non-European, often exerting violence on that which has fallen outside of set criteria. As a self-regarding political and economic entity founded on a selection of secular values, it is a recent creation, but even if no two ‘Europes’ have been identical, each has inherited something from older representations. This is certainly true of Europe.

What I have attempted to show in this chapter then, is the basic but essential fact that just as there has long existed a naturalised way of thinking in nation-states, there has also existed a habitual way of thinking in continents. While the national frame has been re-politicised in archaeology through critique of methodological nationalism, Europe – while not undisputed – has endured as a more unbiased frame. This way of thinking is intimately connected to what Martin Bernal has called a ‘continental chauvinism inherent in all our historiography, or philosophy of writing history.’

By this I do not mean to suggest that archaeologists should call the landmass something else, or that there are no empirically warranted pan-European studies. Though I have argued that the ontological status of Europe is that of a ‘glove,’ a signifier which was formed along with a function, it would not be wrong to call present Europe a ‘horse.’ If some otherworldly creature were to describe the world today, the continents would probably be identified without much effort. Still, knowing the history of Europe as a representation, it should be considered to the same degree as when using the nation-state as a spatial delineator, whether it is a relevant container in which to organise our knowledge of the past, or if it is in fact a question that should never have been asked.

106 Bernal 1991: 32
107 See Macdonalds 2013 for an in-depth study on the present ‘content’ of Europeanness in different parts of Europe and the notion of a ‘European memory complex.’
Chapter 3. Archaeology in the EU: Narratives of Anxiety

During my fieldwork in Brussels, I often discussed my research topic with persons active in other areas of EU policy than that of culture. More often than not, the reaction was one of mild surprise:

*I had no idea the EU ever supported heritage or archaeology! But culture is a pretty insignificant field in the EU, is it not?*

Even officials directly engaged in heritage issues sometimes felt compelled to explain to me that:

*There is not really any EU policy dealing with heritage. We have no competences in that field, and what counts as culture policy are really just recommendations and actions limited by the rules on subsidiarity.*

For those who share the view of the first commenter, this chapter may serve as an introduction to the contexts in which EU officials and parliamentarians have concerned themselves with heritage and why. As for the latter reaction, I readily admit that there is no such thing as an EU heritage policy, but in this chapter I will argue that there is and has been a political economy for heritage in the European political project and that in this economy, archaeology has occupied distinctive locations. On its own, or as a part of ‘cultural heritage,’ archaeology has been activated in disparate policy fields such as culture, regional development, neighbourhood policy and research.

Within these directions, archaeological sites, buildings and monuments have been seen variously as a means to further European integration (as embodiments of a shared European past), as a way to promote European ‘excellence’ in research, as a professional sector where the enhancement of skills could increase employment and create a competitive advantage in a global perspective (in conservation methods for example), and as an economic opportunity for the tourism market. It has also been used as an asset in external relations, either by boasting of European heritage as the richest in the world.

---
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or to strengthen ties to countries aspiring to membership through funding the restoration of archaeological heritage sites.²

From these locations, archaeology has operated as a tool or resource to draw on in political deliberations. Importantly, however, archaeology has not been passive. It has influenced the political environments, the debates and the documents in which it has been activated. I will argue that archaeology, as a specific discursive figure is brought into the EUropean political context carrying certain properties. In the setting of EU cultural actions, archaeology becomes both a promise and a problem. Starting from the ‘hands-on’ connection of funding, I will trace where archaeology has appeared in EU budgets and supporting documents, on whose initiative, in relation to what issues and carrying what meanings. In so doing I hope to build a broad (albeit not all-inclusive) understanding of archaeology’s role in EU cultural initiatives.

On heritage and the figure of archaeology

Sitting at the breakfast table one early morning in March I found, among the headlines of the day, a Swedish article on the conflict between Israel and Palestine. It read: ‘The Palestinians claim this is their land, but they have no proof.’³ The article presented the perspectives of a Jewish settler on the West Bank. He told the reporter that they could prove, by way of archaeological evidence, that grapes for wine had been grown in the area 2000 years ago, confirming the presence of Jewish people in the region over the past two millennia. The example illustrates well the Janus faced nature of the domain of archaeology. Archaeological finds were expected to prove ownership in the present, a request linked to positive feelings of belonging on the one hand and negative practices of war and exclusion on the other. Such expectations and desires align in what I shall call the figure of archaeology. It is a rhetorical figure rooted in popular imagination, the legacies of archaeology as a discipline and in modernity’s need of History, it does not take the current diversity of the domain into account, only what archaeology is thought to ‘bring to the table.’

Since the late 19th century, archaeology has, in the minds of government representatives and institutions, been considered “good for” something: for the individual, the region, the nation, the European Union or the world. The figure is positively charged. Archaeology is expected to further the knowledge of humankind by unveiling the lost and forgotten, to educate us about where we come from and produce records for future generations. Ar-

² For a brief overview and description of heritage in these different policy areas see the Commission report: Mapping of cultural heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities [hereinafter: Commission mapping of cultural heritage (2014)].
URL: http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/kolumnister/wolfganghansson/article20472551.ab (accessed 17.3.15).
archaeological sites are expected to create a positive image of a village or region, in order to increase tourism. It can satisfy desires to alter self-perceptions and appearances, turning persons or political entities into more ‘cultured’ or ancient versions of themselves. Either by consuming authenticity in museums and antique shops, or by promoting an archaeological destination as the cradle of a nation. Archaeology could be expected to legitimise claims to power and territory, or to become a therapeutic agent in mending old wounds, like in the case of the restoration of the Mostar Bridge after the Serbo-Croatian wars. Importantly, archaeology is expected to delight, letting individuals partake in a journey of discovery, touching objects that no one has touched in millennia. As argued by Cornelius Holtorf, such expectations are what makes archaeology a popular ‘brand,’ and if engaged with, they can contribute to entertainment, openness, and reflection.

These expectations and desires rely on the notion that the remains of the past carry intrinsic values or potentials, both by default and because of the accumulated feelings and meanings invested in them over the ages. On the flipside, they are what makes archaeological monuments and sites useful in warfare (as in Afghanistan 2001 or by IS in 2015), ethnic conflict, and in political agendas of exclusion. It is why ultranationalist groups find archaeology appealing, and what gives segregating origin myths like that of Alexander the Great as the forefather of Macedonian citizens, their power. They also turn archaeology into a rather expensive problem for institutions and governments who by law are assigned to care for them. The Janus faced nature of archaeology means it can change sides at any moment, and that archaeologist can never choose just one side. Political (mis)uses of archaeology do not occur independently through outside interferences or infiltrators, but are things made possible by the figure of archaeology.

I believe that we are all suffering from a consuming fever of history, and ought at least to recognise that we are suffering from it.

The figure of archaeology is not unfounded. Over the last centuries archaeologists have made claims about the past which others have listened to. Developed as a child of modernity in the context of 19th century Western nation building, the discipline has (as discussed in chapter two), assisted in the search for early civilisations and human origins. Often based on ethnic crite-

---

4 Nikolić 2012.
5 Holtorf 2007.
7 Gori 2014.
8 Nietzsche 1983[1874]: 60.
ria. By offering scientific evidence of continuity, it has legitimised claims to territory and ownership, helping to create collective identities through mechanisms of exclusion. Furthermore, it has contributed to ‘the creation of a linear cumulative temporality, and the establishment of a homological link between space and time,’ separating places and monuments from everyday life, declaring them in need of protection. As part of an archaeological record, they were regarded as a source of objective information to be uncovered and interpreted by specialists.

In the role of specialists, archaeologists have had a long historical engagement with the legitimisation of heritage, both as a concept and a unit of management. As a result of this engagement, Laura-Jane Smith argues that a ‘hegemonic, self-referential discourse favouring monumentality, scientific objectivity, aesthetic judgment and nation building’ has emerged. This discourse, named the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD), ‘tends to privilege archaeological conceptualizations of heritage,’ placing emphasis on the intrinsic value of physical remains and their non-renewable character. Smith argues that archaeologists and heritage professionals have used this discourse to maintain their own positions and roles as experts. Hence, it correlated closely to my proposed figure of archaeology.

I do not see archaeology as hopelessly self-servicing and elitist, or as something heritage needs to do away with, but what articulating the AHD effectively demonstrates, is that if modernity has represented ‘the condition of the possibility of archaeology,’ then archaeology has represented a condition for the possibility of heritage. As highlighted by Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels, archaeology and heritage management operates within the same value regimes. By looking at how ‘significance’ is established, she argues,

---

9 ‘Archaeology was not the handmaiden of history’ Silberman once wrote, ‘It was the delivery boy of myth’ (1989: 32). Here he referred to Schliemann’s removal of “unsuitable” archaeological layers in his obsessive search for Homer’s Troy.
10 See Sassen 2006 for discussion on how claims to territory and ownership defined the nation-states spatio-temporal order by establishing a founding myth in the past.
13 On archaeologists and the expert role see Meskell and Pels 2005. For an interesting study on how archaeological authorising practices work see Pruitt 2011.
14 As stated by David Lowenthal: ‘Archaeological legacies become pawns of personal feuds and nationalist goals, ruins and refuse sites fashioned into metaphors of identity. What gets excavated and how reflects heritage needs more than scholarly aims’ (1998: 235).
15 Smith 2006: 3.
16 An adapted version of AHD, called Authorised Archaeology Discourse (AAD), has been suggested by Linde in relation to the production of values and mechanisms of exclusion in archaeological research projects. Like AHD, it prioritises archaeological and scientific values, but it is focused on collaboration, research and site management (2012: 83f).
17 Smith 2006: 11.
18 Thomas 2004: 2, my emphasis.
19 Samuels 2008.
we can see clearly how heritage practices frame the past as an object, and how archaeology, shaped as a study of the past, empowers heritage.

Thus, by articulating this figure of archaeology – a tool to be employed in the following discussions – I want to stress that not only are society’s expectations on archaeology why it is considered worthwhile to invest in, but it also configures the values of heritage at large. Depending on the setting, it can render the archaeological domain a problem and a promise. Popular images may be contested or ignored within the discipline, but archaeologists rarely hesitate to draw upon them when trying to achieve funding. Due to the Janus faced nature of the domain, this figure should neither be disregarded nor used only when convenient, but always critically engaged with. In light of this, the task of examining the figure of archaeology as part of the meaning given to cultural heritage in the EU, becomes an important one.

Material and method
Aside from taking advantage of existing research on the topic of culture in European integration, and the few but immensely helpful contributions discussing heritage in the EU that have been written by archaeologists and heritage scholars, this chapter will mainly rely on EU documents obtained through archival research. They include a wide range of texts, as summarised below.

Types of documents:

— **Treaties.** Agreements under international law. Binding document.
— **Decision.** A legislative tool binding those to whom it is addressed. A decision is generally taken in direct relation to a Treaty.
— **Resolution.** Written proposals, motioning an assembly to take certain action. Can be adopted as binding or non-binding.
— **Recommendation.** A legal device that, without obligation, suggests the member states or EU citizens act in a certain way.
— **Communication.** A policy document with no mandatory authority or legal effect, published on the initiative of an institution when it wishes to put forward its own thoughts on a subject matter.
— **Reports.** Technical or diagnostic guidance documents, produced prior to or following an action to assist in decision-making and evaluation.
— **Memorandums.** Explanatory briefing notes accompanying texts.
— **Call for proposals.** Contains the essential rules and conditions to apply for funding under specific programmes and actions.
— **Guides/Instructions.** Regularly updated documents explaining the details of the application and evaluation procedure.

These various texts originate from the following institutional bodies:

— **The European Council.** Brings together national and EU-level leaders about four times per year, setting the broad priorities of the EU but without power to pass laws.
— **The Council of the European Union** (the Council) [not to be confused with Council of Europe (CoE)]. In the Council representatives of national governments defend their country’s national interests. They pass laws, coordinate broad economic policies, sign international agreements, approve the EU budget, develop foreign and defence policies, and coordinate cooperation between courts and police. The Presidency is rotated and shared between member states.

— **The European Parliament** (EP). The EP consists of elected MEPs assigned on a five-year basis to represent European citizens. The EP has three main roles: debating and passing laws (with the Council), inspecting the work of the Commission, debating and adopting the EU’s budget (with the Council).

— **The European Commission** (Commission). The Commission represents the EU as a whole. In principle, although the system is far less coherent in reality, the Commission proposes new laws and the Parliament and Council adopt them. The Commission and the member states then implement them and manage the EU budget. The Commission is organised in departments known as Directorates-General (DGs). The president and the 28 Commissioners are appointed on a five-year basis by the Council, but it is the president who assigns each Commissioner its policy area. The lion part of the staff consists of administrators, lawyers, economists, translators, interpreters.

— **The Committee of the Regions** (CoR) is an advisory body representing local and regional authorities in the European Union. Issues ‘opinions’ on Commission proposals. The Commission, the Council and the Parliament must consult the CoR before EU decisions are taken on matters concerning local and regional government.
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**Figure 4. Confusion at the Commission historical archives. Brussels 2012.**

*Photo by author.*
Several factors have made the archival research difficult. To begin with, the EU archives are divided by institution, the Parliament, Council and Commission all having their own archives. Some are located in Brussels, others in Florence and Strasbourg. At the Commission historical archives in Brussels, I quickly realised that my limited knowledge of French and vague idea of what I was looking for made the task of finding relevant documents almost impossible. Not only was access limited to documents 30 years or older, but you also had to know the type, year and context of the documents. Upon asking the archive staff for help, I was presented with a cardboard box containing thousands of mixed (and often duplicate) files, whose topics revolved around cultural issues, stretching from the 1960s to the late 1980s (figure 4). Going over the files I found many useful bits, but ultimately the experience worked more as a way to familiarise myself with the nature and range of sources rather than something that could be systematically catalogued. Having collected and studied a large number of documents, it was through previous research by political scientists and anthropologists into EU policy on culture that I could piece everything together.

Figure 5. Analytical approach used in chapter three.
Two methods have worked to delimit the material. The most basic of these can be called “following the money.” It means taking the allocation of funds seriously. When actual money is involved, especially within such a complicated decision making structure as the EU, it signals that some agreement about the importance of a matter has been reached. A discourse has taken shape and become stable enough to allow it to be translated into action. I therefore started by creating a database of all the budget lines and descriptions relating to cultural heritage in EU historical budgets from the 1970s until the 2010s. Naturally, I first had to know what type of transactions to look for. Since the EU budgets rarely listed supported topics or projects in detail, this initial search was directed by my survey in the archives.

Upon finding relevant lines I took a genealogical approach, tracing the family tree of the political decisions and other documents motivating the transaction.20 This analysis guided me towards what I call breaking points, times when a sudden increase in funds occurred or when archaeology enters (or leaves) the description attached to a budget line. I have chosen the points 1976, 1983, 1996 and 2007. From these years I have moved backwards in time to find the reasoning behind the funding decision, outwards to understand the wider context, and inwards to view the figure of archaeology (figure 5). The points have been explored as ‘discursive events,’ instances in which power is constituted simultaneously through texts, discursive practice and social practice.21 This means compelling numbers, parliament sessions, official documents and other sociopolitical circumstances to enter into a conversation about the role of archaeology in European heritage-making.

---

20 As argued by Samuels, genealogies are useful because they direct attention towards ‘the creation of objects through institutional practice, as well as towards the political interests involved in writing history’ (2008: 73).

1976. Archaeology enters the scene: a token — 20,700 U.A.\textsuperscript{22} in 1976.\textsuperscript{23}

The first time archaeology can be connected to a line in the EU budget is in 1976, when a modest sum was dispensed as a ‘token entry’ for ‘Expenditure on cultural projects.’ Although no details about the target of the entry were given, it was stated in a Commission communication issued the year after, that scholarships had been granted for ‘craftsmen’ to attend expert centres in Rome, Bruges and Venice.\textsuperscript{24} These centres specialised in different types of techniques for the conservation and restoration of cultural heritage. The sponsorship, which also included a ‘large-scale Community information campaign’ by the Nuclear Research Centre in Grenoble, was said to be anchored in a 1974 resolution dealing with, among other things, architectural heritage.\textsuperscript{25}

Tracing the steps back leads us to May 1974, when the resolution on measures to protect the European cultural heritage was adopted in the EP.\textsuperscript{26} As the first Community resolution dealing directly with heritage, it was to provide stable footing for Community documents on the topic for decades to come. Drawing attention to ‘the impoverishment of the European cultural heritage’ and the need for preservation and increased public awareness of ‘historic and artistic relics of the past,’ the resolution suggests that an ‘inventory of the European cultural heritage’ should be created and educational measures should be taken in order to disseminate this information. Presenting the preparatory report, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on cultural affairs and youth,\textsuperscript{27} the rapporteur MEP Elles (UK) justifies the initiative as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} The Unit of Account (U.A.) was created in 1962 due to a need for common market organisation to sell products at a guaranteed price. It was a fictive currency or measuring standard whose value corresponded to the gold parity of the US Dollar registered with the International Monetary Fund (IMF). After the creation of the European Monetary System in 1979, the u.a. was replaced by the ECU.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} All four centres were to receive support for several years to come (Community action in the cultural sector (1977): 19–21).
\end{itemize}
To sum up, we realize that a long-term programme is needed, covering both financial measures and measures to secure the awareness of states in order to attain our stated objectives. We possess thirty centuries of irreplaceable wealth – the visible products of man’s creative and imaginative genius and the one unifying thread through all our member states. In view of the intention expressed by the Heads of State or Government in the Declaration of Copenhagen in December 1973 to create a European identity, there can be no firmer foundation than the wealth that transcends all political parties, all national frontiers and all centuries, a cultural heritage which brings a deeper value and meaning to our daily lives beyond the economic, financial and material considerations which so beset us.28

Breaking this statement into parts, two things stand out as especially relevant. The first is that cultural heritage – represented by three thousand years of tangible remains – simultaneously appears to confirm and offer building material for a ‘European identity.’ Secondly, the need for such an identity – rooted in a longing for something that transcends everyday struggles – is activated and deemed necessary in the face of crisis, something that can fill the emptiness and lack of spirit felt at the time.29 Remembering these two things, we might first want to look at where – if anywhere – archaeology is located.

Looking at the texts surrounding this resolution, it is clear that archaeology – although often hidden under the wide umbrella term ‘architectural heritage’ – was securely fastened within the definition of European cultural heritage.30 It was part of a heritage in need of protection both from and by the peoples of Europe. Because, as expressed by MEP Broeksz (NL) when speaking in favour of the resolution: ‘if the pyramid of Cheops still stands, this is only because man has not been able to destroy it.’31 As the discussions went, the best way to remedy this situation was by educating the young to become stewards of this heritage and to share ‘treasures’ between member states (harmonizing taxes and laws), although the most urgent task was to create a list of sites and incentives for increased conservation. It was recognised that it would be difficult to establish criteria for sites to be included on the list, but that a mix of universal and culture-specific features would have to do.32

---

29 This crisis was also referred to as the ‘vacuum’ left behind when Europeans had abandoned ‘traditional and spiritual values.’ *EP Debates* (1974): 7, also in Calligaro 2013: 84.
30 Doubly so in fact. Aside from adopting the main definition of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention – including buildings, sites and monuments – the resolution incorporated the more conflict-ridden part of the convention dealing with illicit trade and ownership of cultural property, such as artefacts from archaeological excavations. *EP Debates* (1974): 8.
Overall, in the resolution text itself and in the parliament proceedings, ‘archaeological treasures’ and sites are mainly highlighted as a problem. It is considered a particularly threatened aspect of European heritage, victim to neglect and decay in the ‘veritable race against time,’ and connected to theft and illegal trafficking of cultural property: ‘the new phenomena of our time which demand international cooperation.’ Interestingly, the focus on educating the young, on democratising ownership of heritage assets and doing away with ‘foolish nationalism’ in favour of exchange, directs the spotlight toward a central aspect of the figure of archaeology, namely that it is marked as different from other ‘artistic treasures.’ In the discussion that followed the presentation of the report, Italian MEP Premioli pushed both for increased ‘academic’ training to enable Italians to ‘enjoy and appreciate their cultural heritage,’ and for a new open-mindedness toward other member states who also appreciated it and wanted to purchase or borrow parts of it, exclaiming that ‘we must not deny other peoples the opportunity to enjoy our works of art.’

In response, his fellow countryman MEP Cifarelli stated, that although educating and sharing were both honourable pursuits, they should keep in mind that:

There are many people, especially among the young, whose view of archaeology is rather like Schliemann's: they all imagine that they are going to discover the seven walls of ancient Troy. This involves a very serious danger because this is how the Etruscan vases will quickly finish up in the museums of Washington or other cities and we are faced with the destruction of much cultural property … What archaeology needs is that public authority, the State, or the commune, or the province, or the “Land,” should be allocated property rights in areas of archaeological importance, where no factories shall be built and no roads dug.

This makes it clear that even at this early stage archaeology turns into an exception of sorts, something in need of help but at the same time too precious to meddle with. Going back further, this is precisely the way archaeology was highlighted the very first time it was mentioned in Community documents, in the Treaty of Rome, establishing the European Economic Community. The protection of ‘national treasures of artistic, historical or archaeological value’ was listed as an exception to the rules on free movement of goods. Due to its deep connection to territory and identity – highlighted in the figure of archaeology – archaeology was both a barrier and an attractive piece to include when laying out the puzzle of a European heritage.

---

35 The Treaty of Rome 1957: Art. 36. Its forerunner, The Treaty of Paris (1951) established the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Both Treaties were signed between Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany.
In many ways this is true for the realm of ‘cultural heritage’ as a whole – having always been jealously guarded by the nation-states within Community discourse – but conservative components like archaeology were one of the reasons why heritage did not make its entrance before the late 1970s. In addition, there was certainly a lack of both interest and money. Archaeology was considered a chiefly non-commercial field and the collaboration was of a more strictly economic nature at this time. So why did the topic appear at this time? Two explanations can be identified. One relates to the bigger picture, to the unstable political environment and to the work of other actors like CoE and UNESCO. Another is connected to personal politics and the promotion of national agendas within the institutions.

The bigger and smaller picture

Returning to Elles reference to the ‘considerations which so beset us,’ we are reminded that the late 1960s and early 1970s were times marked by recession and slow economic growth. The member states were heavily affected by external issues like the failure of the Bretton Woods system and the 1973 oil crisis, as well as internal conflicts about the need for integration measures and how to use the limited budget. On top of this, popular support for the Community was decreasing rapidly. Unlike in the functionalist visions that had guided them thus far, in which the integrated management of economic sectors was thought to create a European sense of belonging as a natural bi-product, the cooperation and its legitimacy capital appeared to stagnate. The political project seemed to stand on very shaky grounds, and was in need of a makeover.

---

36 Staiger 2013: 23.
37 The Bretton Woods system of monetary management established the rules for commercial and financial relations among the world’s major industrial states in the mid-20th century. The system dissolved between 1968 and 1973 followed by the 1973 dollar crisis, a key factor in opening the way for creating global financial markets (Fabbriini 2009: 6).
38 The 1973 oil crisis started when the members of the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) proclaimed an oil embargo. The shock-rise in prices had both short and long-term effects on world politics and economy.
39 According to Staiger, a dualism between intergovernmental policymaking and supranational law-making were characteristics which caused problems during this period in the Community (2013: 23).
41 In a famous letter to the European Council (1975), Belgian Prime minister Leo Tindeman’s described the situation as so severe they had to ‘save what has already been achieved’ and ‘take drastic measures to make a significant leap forward.’ This leap toward a more ‘humane society,’ was to be built on mutual respect for cultural characteristics but focussed on ‘the factors uniting us’ rather than on those ‘dividing us.’ To achieve such a society, European citizens needed to be educated in the languages and cultures that ‘constitute the common heritage, which the European Union aims specifically to protect’ (1975 Tindemans report on the European Union, Bull. In: EC Bull. Supplement 1/76: 28).
The document referenced in the resolution, the Declaration on European Identity,\textsuperscript{42} can be seen as a response to this identity crisis. The text, signed in 1973 by the Heads of state and Government in Copenhagen (figure 6), was an attempt to identify some core beliefs and attributes distinguishing the constellation of the nine member states from other countries and alliances.\textsuperscript{43}

In the endeavour of defining a European identity, the first necessary step was ‘Reviewing the common heritage.’\textsuperscript{44} The act is framed by the next section,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{42}1973 Declaration on the European Identity, Copenhagen Summit. In: EC Bull. 12/73 [hereinafter: Identity declaration (1973)]. The groundwork for the declaration was laid at the summit in Hague (1969) where Europe was declared an ‘exceptional seat of development, culture and progress’ which was ‘indispensable to preserve’ (EC Bull. 1/70), and Paris (1972) where it was stated that ‘Economic expansion is not an end in itself … It should result in an improvement in the quality of life as well as in standards of living. As befits the genius of Europe, particular attention will be given to intangible values and to protecting the environment’ (EC Bull. 10/72: 14–26).
  \item \textsuperscript{43}The member states at this time were: Belgium, Britain, Denmark, France, Italy, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany. In 1973, Britain, Denmark and Ireland had just been included, which also provided new impetus for cooperation. Britain had applied before, but the request was vetoed both times by President Charles de Gaulle due to their trade preferences and military bonds with the United States. De Gaulle’s retirement in 1969 opened the door for accession (Bache and George 2006: 540–542).
  \item \textsuperscript{44}Identity declaration (1973): point 2502.
\end{itemize}
stating that ‘unity is a basic European necessity to ensure the survival of the civilisation which they have in common.’

Framed by this common civilisation, the ‘originality’ and ‘own dynamism’ of European identity would then emerge out of the ‘diversity of cultures within.’ In other words, there was a wish to define an identity which (as made clear by the attempt itself), was simultaneously taken for granted and non-existent. This was perceived as a basic homogeneity framed by a shared ‘European civilisation,’ as well as something that would come about through the cooperation.

This tension between confirming and building a European identity, also present in the quote by Elles, relates to much broader aspects of modernity’s relationship with the remains of the past, to the interplay between the intrinsic and cohesive values of heritage. In fact, opening the door to this discussion of the intangible values of heritage was what allowed Community involvement in the first place, seeing as they had no legal competence in the field and no territory under its jurisdiction. The impetus to view heritage in this way did not come from within the Community however, but from CoE, in essence, the muse of early Community discourse on the subject. The European Cultural Convention (1954), aimed at setting up goals to ‘achieve a greater unity between its members,’ stated that citizens of the states signing the convention should be encouraged to learn about each other and the ‘civilisation which is common to them all.’ Conceived of as shared ideals and principles, this commonness was extended to ‘objects of European cultural value’ as ‘integral parts of the common cultural heritage of Europe.’ As such they were in need of protection, requiring the contractors to ‘safeguard and to encourage the development of its national contribution to the common cultural heritage of Europe.’

46 Identity declaration (1973): para. 3.
47 See also Stråth 2010: 403, Hølleland 2008: 47.
48 This is further exemplified in the final paragraph, where it is stated that ‘The European identity will evolve as a function of the dynamic of the construction of Europe,’ but that the Nine should be more progressive in defining their identity when it comes to external relations with other countries or groups of countries (Identity declaration (1973): para. 22).
49 The Council of Europe (CoE) is an international organisation promoting cooperation in the areas of legal standards, human rights, democratic development, the rule of law and cultural cooperation. It was founded in 1949 and has 47 member states (as of 2015).
52 European Cultural Convention: Art. 1.
This is echoed in a Commission communication based on the 1974 resolution, that the heritage ‘which reflects Europe's cultural identity is seriously threatened with decay and disappearance and urgent measures are needed.’ Therefore, while already in place, this commonness also had to be realised through joint action. Here we see the same kind of tension. Heritage is valued for its intrinsic properties, representing an already existing common civilisation manifested in objects of European cultural value, and is, at the same time promoted for its potential in building a European culture. Importantly, joint action also meant joint responsibility, and the declaration of a common system of values transformed it – by design – into a common asset and issue. Interestingly, Oriane Calligaro has also pointed to this function, how the blend of European ideals and objects into common European heritage made the convention fruitful soil for the European Parliament’s first resolutions in the area.

However, the inspiration behind using heritage for its cohesive capacity did not only come from other European initiatives. The discourse on European heritage under threat – of archaeological sites and historical buildings being in acute need of attention – was fully in motion at the time, stimulated by the ongoing professionalisation of the heritage field. CoE and UNESCO appear consistently in the documents, especially the European Architectural Heritage Year (1975), the Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (1969), and the newly established World Heritage Convention (1972). In fact, heritage had become something of a hot theme and the Commission wanted a piece of the action. This is evident from upset voices of actors warning that Community activities might come to overlap with those of the CoE, that the Community should not take credit for something that was not their idea nor their domain in the first place. Ironically, the Commission, in search for something tangible on which to rest the idea of a European identity, had to compete with both the nation-states and other actors with stakes in European heritage.

This brings us to the second level, concerning the institutional actors in the Commission and the European parliament. One of the main reasons cultural heritage came up on the agenda at this time was the will of one person, Robert Grégoire, member of the Commission DG for Education, Research and Science at the Commission. As shown by Calligaro, who has delved deep into parliament records from this time, he was the ‘ghost writer’ of

---

54 Calligaro 2013: 82f.
55 See Ashworth 1999 for a discussion of these events in relation to a European sense of place.
56 Sassatelli argues that this overlapping was why culture was dismissed in the early days of European integration (2006: 25).
Elles report as well as the subsequent 1974 resolution. In charge of the newly established division dealing with cultural issues, he worked relentlessly to find ways of putting culture on the Community agenda despite the fact that it was a sensitive topic and one that did not fall under their jurisdiction. In reality, Calligaro argues, cultural heritage was but a ‘Trojan horse,’ a means for specific actors to promote action in the cultural sector.

Aside from the presence of a strong character like Grégoire and the key role played by Italian MEPs, Eliot Tretter has pointed out that the growing economic sector of culture was something the Community simply could not avoid getting involved with at this time. Taken together with the strong French protectionist stance towards American and Japanese cultural industries at the time, Tretter further argues that the ‘development of the Community’s cultural policy was like any other industrial policy designed to ensure the Community’s economic competitiveness.’ Was this really the case?

In the document cited at the beginning of this chapter, the 1977 Commission communication, we can see that it is indeed clearly angled towards a cultural sector. Concerned with the conditions of cultural workers and harmonising copyright and tax laws, the document highlights the economic values of cultural heritage, presenting conservation specialists as ‘active agents in developing regions and promoting tourism.’ Yet, the actual treatment or exchange of physical artefacts and sites was still dealt with as an exception and something particularly connected to national identities. Conservation measures were discussed under ‘Other actions’ as contributions made ‘over and above the application of the treaty to the cultural sector.’ However, when it comes to the part focussed on raising awareness, ‘articles of archaeological or historical interest’ were included in a pilot scheme.

---

57 Calligaro 2013: 84.
58 The ‘Cultural problems division,’ DG Education, Research and Science (DG XII) was the result of a Council memorandum from 1972, reacting to the Paris summit’s (1972) call for ‘non-material values and wealth and to protection of the environment’ in the name of a ‘European spirit.’ 1972 Mémorandum de la Commission au Conseil des Ministres des Communautés européennes pour une action communautaire dans le domaine de la culture. Reference: working documents 1973–1975 (BAC 144/1987 65).
59 Calligaro 2013: 79; see also Psychogiopoulou 2008: 9.
60 Tretter 2011.
61 Tretter 2011: 944.
63 The Commission defines the cultural sector as ‘the socioeconomic whole formed by persons and undertakings dedicated to the production and distribution of cultural goods and services.’ Community action in the cultural sector (1977): 5.
64 Community action in the cultural sector (1977): 17.
planned for 1978, which would create ‘European rooms’ in museums. ‘The peoples of the Community do not yet know each other well enough’ the motivation goes. The member states should therefore be encouraged to show the diversity and the ‘cultural similarities, links and affinities between all the countries and regions,’ so that ‘the peoples of the Community will be able to reflect on this phenomenon’ and better see the benefits of economic and political cooperation.66

The figure of archaeology

We can now see a myriad of circumstances leading up to the first actions supporting tangible heritage in the budget of 1976. The legitimacy crisis in Community institutions led to a ‘normative’ shift in Community discourse,67 rationalising efforts to outline a European identity based on a common European civilisation. This created opportunities in which national and personal agendas overlapped with market oriented ambitions for the field of culture. Due to the professionalisation of the heritage field and the recent conventions concerning its protection, focussing on the topic was a strategic move.

Rather than demonstrating its irrelevance, the fact that heritage could be used as a ‘Trojan horse’ goes to show how powerful it was. In the wake of the destruction caused by WWII, the idea of creating a European culture or identity might not have seemed so appealing, but who would oppose measures to restore and protect cultural heritage? Besides, it was a tool that had worked to build a sense of togetherness and neutralise the political order of nation-states, so why not Europe? However, as a relatively new supranational actor, the burden of proof lay with the Community and a list of European heritage was needed, something which would effectively rebrand sites as European in the process. This list was not something that Community representatives could establish by themselves however. At this point the ‘relics of the past’ could only be seen as reflecting broad immaterial qualities such as the ‘genius’ of Europe. Aside from reinforcing a type of methodological continentalism, it was a hesitant discourse, careful not to sanction hierarchies of difference between Europe and other continents, merely stating that there were differences. The lack of jurisdiction therefore necessitated the participation of national representatives and experts.

On the question of what the figure of archaeology could do for the Community at this point, the answer is: to provide rhetorical fuel for the discourse of crisis needed in order to mobilise actions in the cultural sector. It attached a particularly fragile and threatened feature to the notion of a common heritage. It could also tie ideas of European unity to prehistoric times, making it possible to summon ‘thirty centuries of irreplaceable wealth’ as ‘the one unifying thread through all our member states.’ Of course, to fear

67 Staiger 2013: 24.
the loss of the past, of culture and of identity, are central conditions of modernity at large. Heritage has always needed some crisis or another in order to flourish, and archaeologists have depended on such fears for their employment. By including archaeology in the concept of a European cultural heritage, it became clear that it was a component closely connected to the very things the Community tried to steer clear of at this time, such as claims relating to territory, genealogy or blood. It was marked as an exception from the rules of trading in cultural goods and something in need foremost of protection by the member states. Unlike other cultural fields, its objects could not be treated as commodities. Altogether, it is evident that archaeology, although included in the cultural heritage ‘package solution’ to the perceived identity crisis, was featured more as a problem than a promise in the pursuit of an integrated Europe, exposing the main difficulties of this undertaking.

1983. Archaeology on its own two feet: EHMF

— 100,000 U.A. in 1977.  
— 1.3 million ECU in 1983.

The next budget line worth stopping at is 1983. After the first budget post in 1976, the amount reserved for cultural actions grew steadily. During this period, limited funds had been directed towards conservation actions under the heading of ‘Contribution towards financing the conservation of the architectural heritage.’ Aside from the expert centres, which received funding several years after 1976, I have only identified one supported project with an archaeological theme from this period, the contribution of 100,000 ECU towards the Museum and site of Milos in Greece in 1982. There are however several written questions from MEPs requesting information or support. A person by the name of Ewing asked whether protection of archaeological

---

69 European Currency Unit (ECU) was a European account and currency unit that consisted of a basket of all currencies of the member states. The international designation was XEU. It was the precursor of the euro, but did not exist in terms of coins or bills. It was replaced by the euro (EUR) on the 1st of January 1999 with the value 1:1.
72 Ca. 50 Community scholarships a year had been financed in order to ‘to enable young people to train in a variety of conservation skills, including craft activities.’ Commission answer to written question No. 342/83 1983. In: O.J. C 257: 14.
discoveries would be within the Commissions’ sphere of responsibility, and a Kavanagh asked for assistance in the preservation of archaeological remains on the medieval wood quay in Dublin. Both got ambiguous replies, stating that although cultural heritage issues generally fell outside Community jurisdiction, their requests would be taken up for discussion. Early financial support in this area seems to have been distributed almost at random, something also noted by other scholars.

In 1983, however, something happens: the amount of funding for culture and heritage is suddenly doubled. About half of the money was directed to two new provisions in the budget, the European Historical Monuments and Sites Fund (EHMF) (220,000 ECU) and ‘Support for the restoration and conservation work on the Parthenon on the Athenian Acropolis’ (500,000 ECU). The older entry on conservation remained (100,000 ECU), as did other posts on cultural cooperation, but an archaeological heritage site and a new programme had appeared.

Below the budget lines, we find a new supporting document listed, an EP resolution on architectural and archaeological heritage (1982). The text revolves around very similar themes to those presented in 1974 and 1977, stressing the ‘importance of the architectural and archaeological heritage for our European culture and history and awareness of our European identity’ and the ‘moral obligation to ensure that future generations inherit a humane world.’ Harmonisation of laws, support for conservation, and awareness-raising in different forms were highlighted, the main addition being the importance of tourism. It also dealt explicitly with individual sites in need of care due to decay, development, and looting.

The idea of creating a dedicated monuments and sites fund was not new, but this was the first move towards its realisation. As a pilot scheme, it would support a selected site from a different member state every year. This was considered the best way to secure funding for monuments of ‘European significance’ which were in need of special attention. Among the support actions in the resolution, we find: Archaeological excavations at Skyletton, the prevention of further destruction of ancient archaeological sites in Eleu-

74 Written question No. 50/76 1976 (PE 44.188/Fr. Commission archives).
76 Reference was made to 1977 Community action programme on the environment (in: O.J. C 139), and the 1976 European Parliament resolution on Community action in the cultural sector (in: O.J. C 79) [hereinafter: EP resolution on Community action (1976)].
77 Psychogiopoulou 2008: 14.
sis, the protection of ‘valuable Bronze Age sites’ in the Netherlands, and
preservation activities at the Acropolis of Athens (figure 7).80

The justifications accompanying these proposals were included in the 26-
page preparatory report.81 In most cases, the relevance for the Community
was vaguely formulated, such as protecting ‘archaeological sites as an out-
standing record of our civilisation.’82 The Acropolis however, enjoying its
very own budget post, acquired an almost spiritual aura. The site was said to
represent ‘the embodiment of Europe’s entire history,’ which was now ‘suc-
cumbing to the onslaught of technical progress.’83 Admitting that the site was
but one part of the worldwide ‘record of the human adventure,’ MEP Beyer
de Ryke (BE) insisted that:

… it goes without saying that the European Parliament is a remote descendent
of the parliament of Athens, and the birthplace of European democracy cer-
tainly merits the attention of the elected members of the European Assem-
bly.84

Figure 7. Parthenon, Athens. Press photo from the signing of the Accession Treaty

80 IT, Doc. 1–876/80; GR, Doc. 1–363/81; NL, Doc. 1–680/81; GR, Doc. 1–557/81. Included
in: 1982 European Parliament report on the protection of the architectural and archaeologi-
Here, we clearly see the figure of archaeology at work. The Acropolis is referred to as a record, a mirror of Europe’s past. It is presented as an origin myth for the Community, a usable past and golden age. Overall, there was a new emphasis on archaeology in the resolution. It is noted twice that heritage to be protected ‘includes not only urban, rural and industrial architectural works but also archaeological monuments and sites.’ This would suggest that archaeology was something that was not previously included in the process. In the preparatory report however, the author MEP Wilhelm Hahn (DE) suggests that frequently ‘the notion of an architectural or archaeological asset conjures in people’s minds the idea of an ancient monument which leads on to the subject of promoting archaeological excavations.’ He argued that this heading should be viewed in much wider terms. This would suggest that conventional archaeology had been seen almost as the equivalent of heritage. Another interesting ambivalence concerns the reasoning regarding what makes archaeological and architectural assets European:

… cultural assets reflect the universal values of art which cannot be reduced to purely nationalist terms. But this does not prevent us from using the general expression of European cultural identity or European culture since we are dealing in this case with our entire continent. This is why we insist that awareness of European culture is essential if we are to define and give substance to European identity. It is in no way inconsistent with the foregoing to reaffirm that the architectural and archaeological heritage is a universal asset.

This lopsided somersault pinpoints the contradictions inherent in the construct of European heritage, balancing between universal and European values, its importance simultaneously taken for granted and neglected. When it comes to the EP debate on the report however, things are presented in a more seamless manner:

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, just as there is today a powerful environmental protection movement, which has realized that we shall not survive if we destroy nature around us, man has also become aware of his history … Only the continuity of the past, present and future can ensure that mankind will overcome the problems of the future and survive. But 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

---

85 In the report, Hahn replaces the word ‘monuments’ with the word ‘assets,’ because it conveys the legal connotation of ownership that is passed down through the generations (EP report (1982): 11). The change in terminology can be linked to the increased socioeconomic value placed on heritage as the workforce of professionals and the tourism industry expanded.
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.\textsuperscript{87} According to this statement, archaeological sites are not only European in spirit, as in the more hesitant rhetoric of the 1970s, but also in physical form. Through their European styles they link a European past to a EUropean present. As before, a tension can be found between the awareness of a European identity already in existence and one yet to be realised. It is a sharper rhetoric in which a common culture and cultural identity lies dormant in the monuments, ready to be awoken and taken to heart, offering a ‘tangible experience of a common destiny.’\textsuperscript{88} The discourse of crisis is still strong and saving archaeological sites is still a problem, especially in the face of things like ‘the unending cancer of suburban growth,’ that was destroying the ‘social fabric’ of society.\textsuperscript{89} Now, however, ‘man has also become aware of his own history.’ The tone is more hopeful and archaeology gets to play a more positive part.

In the debate that followed, just as in 1974, worries were expressed about where the money should come from and whether not the Community actions would overlap with those of UNESCO and CoE.\textsuperscript{90} Simmonds (UK), made it clear that the idea of financial support coming out of the Community pockets worried him deeply, while Italian and Greek MEPs promoted the resolution strongly. They emphasised their extra need for support in view of their abundance of treasures, and name-dropped numerous archaeological sites not included in the resolution. Greek MEPs even seized the moment to call for the return of the Elgin marbles, showing the wild card potential of archaeology as a figure in political conflicts of ownership and territory. In the closing speech, reinforcing the positive tone set by Hahn, Commissioner Natali (IT) declares that the Commission:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
\ldots is firmly convinced that a discussion of European culture, of the essence of our past, is one which should not be neglected; rather it should be emphasized, for through the knowledge of these common traditions and origins we can re-discover the primary components of the European identity.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\textit{The bigger and smaller picture}

The time between the first resolution in 1974 and the one in 1982 was one of slow but sure institutionalisation of cultural heritage in the Community, in which archaeological sites went from being handy symbols and rhetorical

fuel to something also deserving financial attention. It was still a passive
discourse and heritage remained a minor point on the agenda, but the 1977
communication on action in the cultural sector had showcased its market-
oriented values. This is neatly summarised in the follow-up communication
on *Stronger Community action in the cultural sector* (1982):

There is no need to dwell upon the cultural justification for conserving the ar-
chitectural heritage, given the splendour of that heritage in the Community
and the value that Europeans attach to it. The point to stress is rather that the
legal basis for the Community's contribution to preserving this heritage lies in
the fact that it is a contribution to a rich resource that generates economic ac-
tivity (tourism, scientific research, art, publishing, etc.) and that conservation
is itself an economically and socially viable activity for the firms and workers
connected with it.  

This should be seen against the backdrop of the slow economic recovery that
marked the early 1980s, after a decade of recession and high unemployment
in the West. Times of crisis led to a restructuring of land development,
marked by massive abandonment and replacement of industries and infra-
structure. At the same time, economic sectors focusing on services gained
new impetus. In the parliamentary debates, it was pointed out that the mem-
ber states needed common rules in relation to the distribution of costs be-
tween developers and states at 'sites of archaeological discovery.'  
Thus, while changes in the pace of land development provided a necessary sense of
acuteness, viewing heritage as a service sector allowed the Community to
get involved with matters for which they had no legal basis. This becomes
particularly clear in relation to cultural heritage tourism, an area which now
began to receive steady support from the European Regional Development
Fund (ERDF).

Aside from their growing importance as international bodies at the time,
the lack of legal basis is why UNESCO and CoE are referred to constantly in
the documents as partners in these issues, included in everything from for-
mulation of actions to processes of selection of sites.  
Although the forces pushing for the establishment of a specific Community culture policy was
not to succeed in their mission for another 20 years, they had now managed
to legitimise the extension of Community influence in the area. As was pas-

---

92 1982 Commission Communication. *Stronger Community action in the cultural sector*. In:
94 Between 1980 and 1982 the ERDF assisted ca 40 cultural tourism and infrastructure pro-
ducts with 7.5 million ECU. Most funds went to Italy and the UK. Examples mentioned were:
The conversion of a coal mine in Wales into a museum, restoration of the medieval castle of
Teggiano, preservation of the buildings and monuments near Herculaneum. *Commission
95 See Vos 2011b for relations between CoE and the Commission.
sionately expressed by a French representative of the Council of the European Communities at the time:

There is no political power without economic power. There is no economic power without political and cultural purpose.⁹⁶

A single major factor in the relative success of the 1982 resolution was the inclusion of Greece as a member state in 1981. As clear from the records of the early 1980s, and supported by the observations by Tretter, Italian MEPs were now joined by Greek politicians in the quest to place tangible heritage firmly on the Community agenda. In other words, representatives of the nations that, based on the relative size of their heritage industry, had the most to gain from such funding.⁹⁷ Through their membership, they pushed a topic that generated both prestige and funding. Discursively, it was a match made in heaven.

The figure of archaeology

If cultural heritage was the ‘Trojan horse’ used to put culture on the agenda, the Acropolis can be said to have put the final nail in the woodwork. By tweaking the discourse into being about the actual material remains of the past and its financial support, the political wills within the Community hoped to give new urgency to the idea of establishing a cultural agenda. Through the new support programme, sites like the Acropolis could work even better as an origin myth for the Community. The political power of a single archaeological site in legitimising Community involvement in culture can be directly connected to the figure of archaeology. Although the symbolism of this particular site was established long before the archaeological discipline took root, it has since become an archaeological entity. As such it has been preserved, controlled and protected from citizens by way of fences and studied as part of a scientific record. Though the site was already used to neutralise the political order in Greece at this time, activating the figure of archaeology in this new political setting allowed both Greece – the new recruit – and the Community, to boost their symbolic capital. It lent itself well to a type of methodological continentalism, imitating the discourses of belonging developed within Western nation-states.

At this point, this is how archaeological sites were discussed in the Community, as plain evidence of a diverse yet common identity and culture in Europe, waiting to once again be recognized in this capacity. The discourse of crisis was still prominent at this time, and the fruitful paradox maintained in the Community – of heritage being useful due to its market-oriented val-

---

ues while in need of immediate protection from the destruction caused by need of the market (for ex. modern development) – had afforded it a more stable place on the agenda. Furthermore, with the general improvement of the political and economic situation in the member states, archaeology had become slightly more of a promise and less of a problem. What archaeology was expected to “do” for the Community was still mainly to provide symbolic capital, but what the Community could do for archaeology was marginal.

Although the early initiatives did provide some financial support, it was for the most part a one-way street. Archaeology entered the agenda, but few archaeological projects benefitted from this until the mid-1980s. However, this was about to change. As we move on to the next breaking point it is important to remember that, although archaeology stood in the shadow of architectural heritage during most of the 1970s and 1980s, many supported projects did involve representatives from the field. This was partly because conservation experts often have some archaeological expertise, but mostly because the EU definition of conservation activities has always been very wide, including ‘identification, recording, presentation, display, conservation, restoration, documentation and management.’

1996. Archaeology from diversity to unity: Raphael

— 1.7 million ECU in 1984.
— 26 million ECU in 1996.

During the consolidation phase in the early 1980s, it had been confirmed that archaeology, as part of the cultural and architectural heritage of Europe, had a part to play within the Community if it was connected to the wider economic ‘cultural sector’ anchored in the Treaty of Rome. As the activities in the culture sector increased, we see a subsequent rise in budget provisions for culture. The sum directed towards the broad domain of tangible heritage amounted to about half of the total up until 1995, and a bit below half from then on. The chosen breaking point of 1996, has less to do with a change in funding amounts, than it does a structural change in how tangible heritage

102 The Treaty of Rome (1957) is used as a reference in the budgets from 1987 onwards. Articles used to justify cultural action were: 117 promoting ‘improved working conditions and an improved standard of living for workers,’ 118 ‘promoting close co-operation between Member States in the social field’ and 128, promoting a ‘common vocational training policy.’
projects were funded. After having been supported under many separate posts with various headings, sometimes by themselves and sometimes grouped together with other types of actions, heritage initiatives were now combined in the new Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage – Raphael. It was the first Commission funding programme entirely dedicated to cultural heritage, engaging archaeologists and heritage professionals both as beneficiaries and in its design. As such, it marks a break with a previously more passive and unstructured engagement with tangible heritage.

Another important development visible in the budget at this time is the inclusion of cultural heritage in other policy areas. The topic had been featured within the field of environment and regional development from 1974, but only since 1989 had it been specifically listed in the budget. In 1990, it also made a first appearance in a budget line within research, included in the programmes STEP (science and technology for environmental protection) and Epoch (climatology and natural hazards). This brought archaeology into a different context.

First, however, looking back at the previous decade, what had been achieved since funds started to be distributed? From 1983 to 1996, financial support for the flagship sites of Parthenon and the Acropolis had amounted to 5.5 million ECU. Additionally, projects in Lisbon (PT), Coimbra (PT) and on Mount Athos (GR) had been awarded grants (ca. 4.7 million ECU).

After 1983, the name and content of the budget posts involving cultural heritage changed. Three separate posts dealt with heritage in 1983–1986 and just one post in 1987, called ‘Support measures for the architectural heritage.’ In 1991 four posts concerned heritage, including the new ‘Cultural cooperation with third countries’ and ‘Operations to heighten European consciousness through culture.’ In 1993, the name of the major post on heritage changed from protection and ‘promotion’ of the European cultural heritage to protection and ‘development.’ Raphael was joined by two other programmes: Kaleidoscope 2000 (supporting artistic and cultural activities with a European dimension); Ariane (supporting the field of books and culture) and an extra post of ‘other cultural measures’ and cooperation with third countries.

As early as 1974, the European Commission issued a recommendation within the field of environment, stressing the need for preservation of the rural landscapes which are ‘characteristic of Europe.’ Commission recommendation (1974): 22–23.


Figures from 1983 to 1991 are based on are based on information provided in New prospects for cultural action (1992), Annex A: 5. Figures from 1992 to 1996 are estimated based on budget descriptions and indicated yearly allocations (see ‘EU Budgets’).
Under the EHMF annual heritage scheme, 42.7 million ECU had been distributed to restoration actions with a European dimension. Although the programme officially began in 1984 and ended in 1995, the pilot sites funded in 1983 have also been included in this sum. The amount had been shared between 459 projects (out of a total of over 7,739 applications). Examples of projects are: ‘Help in raising the East Indiaman Amsterdam from the Channel’ (NL, 1983), restoring Roman walls in Tongeren (BE, 1984) (figure 8), preservation of Trajan’s Column in Rome (IT, 1984) and the Temple of Epicurean Apollo (1984, GR). Overall, sites in southern Europe had received extra attention by the Community. Heritage in this region was seen as a ‘special possibility’ and in need of serious conservation efforts.


The wreck was never raised from the channel but excavations were carried out through the 1980s and the grant might have been used for this purpose instead.

The wreck was never raised from the channel but excavations were carried out through the 1980s and the grant might have been used for this purpose instead.


At the outset, calls for applications were kept very short and directed toward national and regional ‘monuments and sites of European renown,’ financed due to their ‘artistic value’ or ‘historical interest.’ From 1988 the Commission became more ambitious, introducing more rules and yearly themes. The reason for financing the projects was now the ‘effect that investment in Europe’s past can have upon its future cultural, social and economic development,’ an articulation that reflects a contemporary movement toward viewing tangible heritage as political tools rather than just symbolic assets (active rather than passive agents).

The inclusion of more details also had to do with Commission officials’ growing frustration with the large amounts of low quality proposals they kept receiving. In the late 1980s, they had had enough and decided to publish a paper on the selection criteria and guidelines for presentation. Given the vaguely formulated half-page description offered in the call during the first years, the high number of unqualified applications is not surprising. More surprising, or telling even, is that Commission officials only decided to provide clearer rules and descriptions halfway into the scheme (a recurring feature in the decades to come).

Despite this clarification, there still seem to have been issues concerning transparency. The stated criteria, talking mainly about the overall quality and the public impact of the projects, did not only fail to give a clue about what phrases like ‘Europe’s past’ or ‘European dimension’ included, but there were also questions concerning the selection process itself. In 1996, MEP Guido Podesta asked the Commission why the comments of the jury were never recorded and why there were no lists accounting for the order of preference applied. On behalf of the Commission, Mr. Oreja replied that lists were created based on ‘the jury’s appreciation, which reflected the votes received by each Member State.’ The criteria were said to be twofold, their ‘historic, cultural and architectural importance as well as the quality of the technical intervention proposed.’ This answer certainly leaves room for interpretation. The overall lack of coherence of this scheme – visible already in the budget lines – was commented on by the EP when it came to an end, explaining that the ‘lack of a legal basis and the limited resources’ had led to

this situation, going so far as to deem the actions ‘inadequate’ and with ‘no real impact on society.’

In 1996, Raphael was supposed to pick up where the prior scheme, just described, left off. However, due to political difficulties in launching the programme there was an in-between period during which preparation actions were supported. That year, an interesting call for cooperation proposals involving archaeology was published. It was aimed at ‘movable archaeological sites, monuments and objects belonging to a chronological or unitary stylistic context, conserved in situ.’ The ‘movable’ part appears rather contradictory. The jest of it seems to be that sites and monuments should be moved into, or preserved in such a way that ‘the aesthetic and historical balance between the sites/monuments and their context’ could be re-established. Authenticity and significance in terms of civilisations and ‘bygone ways of life’ was emphasised, but it was now the project rather than, as before, the site that had to present a ‘real European dimension.’ It would be the result of the cooperation of at least three partners from different countries, one or several sites and specialists from multiple fields (including archaeology, architecture and conservation, economics, tourism, and communication). Priority would be given to ‘projects associating several movable sites/monuments/objects.’ This shows the shift to a more active Commission approach to heritage, wherein both professionals and objects of study would be tied together in a holistic ‘European dimension.’

Aside from the schemes mentioned here, many other types of grants not directly implicating objects or sites had been open to archaeologists, such as networking events, professional training, enlargement-related actions in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as public outreach campaigns. For instance, archaeological lectures and exhibitions were funded under the public awareness award scheme called Platform Europe launched in 1990, aiming to en-

---

121 According to the Commission, 392 projects were financed under the preparatory pilot period for Raphael (1994–1997). It is unclear whether these projects overlapped or were the same as those funded under the regular pilot scheme (1998 Proposal for a European Parliament and Council decision establishing a single financing and programming instrument for cultural cooperation: Culture 2000 programme. COM/98/0266. In: O.J. C 211: 7 [hereinafter: Proposal for Culture 2000 (1998)].
123 In fact, it is clear from the documentation of a consultation meeting with professionals in the domain of cultural heritage held on March 13th 1992 that the emphasis on movable heritage originated from the stakeholders (New prospects for cultural action (1992), Annex B: 6).
125 Cooperation was defined as activities favouring ‘the scientific knowledge, study and handling of cultural, technical and economic problems related to protecting cultural heritage’ (Call for proposals 1996. In: O.J. C 67: 13).
courage a sense of citizenship through events emphasising the diversity and ‘common roots’ of Europeans.\textsuperscript{127} It was turned into the Kaleidoscope programme in 1991, set to foster creativity and ‘knowledge of the European cultural heritage’ in order to enhance a ‘sense of belonging’ among European citizens.\textsuperscript{128} As part of this widening of activities, the EU started to work more actively with CoE, contributing 70,000 ECU yearly toward the European Heritage Days from 1994 up to the establishment of a joint partnership in 1999.\textsuperscript{129} Taken together, it is clear that a substantial amount of the budget for cultural actions had been directed towards heritage.

If we look at other areas such as research, environment and regional development, the amounts offered in culture are less impressive.\textsuperscript{130} Under the environmental programmes in FP1–FP4 (the EU framework programmes for research 1986–1998), 59 projects dealing with the ‘protection and conservation of the European cultural heritage’ were funded, and in only one programme (STEP 1989–1992) eight projects got to share approximately 6 million ECU (compared to the 70–150,000 ECU per project offered in the annual scheme under Culture).\textsuperscript{131} The majority of projects were explicitly concerned with scientific techniques, for example, one project focused on conservation techniques for megalithic monuments made of granite and another on methods to preserve archaeological iron.\textsuperscript{132} In other frameworks such as ‘The Financial Instrument for the Environment’ (LIFE, 1993–1995) we find less technical projects connected to archaeology. This includes projects such as Development and enhancement of the Carnac megalithic sites (1994–1998, 254,614 ECU), which aimed to restore an archaeological site and its natural environment and better adapt it for seasonal tourism according to a new, transferable model.\textsuperscript{133} In other areas that promote researchers directly, archaeologists benefitted in terms of mobilising networks, courses and conferences, in programmes such as ‘Training and mobility of researchers’ (1994–1998).\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{127} Conditions for participating in Platform Europe. In: O.J. C 167: 2 (Call for proposals).
\textsuperscript{128} Conditions for participating in Kaleidoscope programme. In: O.J. C 205: 19 (Call for proposals).
\textsuperscript{130} For a brief overview see Chapuis 2005.
\textsuperscript{131} The programme had 75 million ECU, out of which 8% was directed towards heritage projects (Council decision of 20 November 1989 on two specific research and development programmes in the field of the environment – STEP and Epoch (1989 to 1992), 89/625/EEC. In: O.J. L 359: 9).
\textsuperscript{132} For list of funded projects see Chapuis (ed.) Vol I (2009) and Vol II (2011), Preserving our heritage, improving our environment (Commission publication).
\textsuperscript{134} First report on cultural aspects (1996): 67.
Lastly, hundreds of projects tied to the archaeological domain were supported through the ERDF and The European Investment Bank during this period. These projects were selected and administered on national or regional bases under headings connected to tourism infrastructure or sustainable development and land use. The use of the structural funds for cultural heritage projects varied greatly from one member state to another. For example, in light of its regional economic potential, 2.9 million ECU went towards the restoration and protection of archaeological sites at Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabias in 1984.135

Supporting archaeology with no ‘ulterior motive’

Now we know more about what was funded, but why was it funded and with what motivation? Looking at the supporting documents for culture, amassing from three in 1983 to no less than 35 in 1996, we can see they are to a large extent concerned with topics like books and reading, music, theatre and flagship events like the European Cultural Month and European Cities of Culture.136 The nine documents listed for cultural heritage stretch back to 1986, dealing as before with conservation and protection but also with cooperation with partners in Central and Eastern Europe. Tracing these records back in time opens up an ocean of supporting documents. I have therefore chosen to focus only those of specific relevance for the figure of archaeology, an EP resolution from 1988 and a group of documents relating to Raphael.

The 1988 resolution on the conservation of Europe's architectural and archaeological heritage,137 the successor to the 1982 resolution, was drawn up based on 37 motions for resolutions submitted by MEPs over a four year period.138 It basically meant the reinforcement and widening of previous actions, confirming that the historical, cultural, economic and social arguments for supporting architectural and archaeological heritage were ‘still completely relevant’ and that action undertaken should be ‘stepped up.’139 The more emblematic side of the justification, previously shaped in the irreconcilable tension between confirming a European identity and the moral obligation to save the cultural property of the member states, was now taken a step further:
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136 For European Capitals/Cities of Culture see Sassatelli 2008 and Staiger 2013.
138 The motions for resolutions concerned aid for conservation work related to the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, grants to safeguard and restore historic city centres, voluntary work camps for young people, training in conservation of art and artefacts, training in cultural heritage management, the taxation of privately owned architectural monuments, preventing art theft, and recovering stolen art (EP resolution on archaeological heritage (1988): 424).
Whereas the Community's archaeological, artistic and architectural heritage affords a vision of the European nations in which their identity is no longer constituted by epic feats at the expense of their neighbours, but rather by a gradual transition from one form to another in which the differences and the continuity, the overlapping and mutual influences, reveal both the identity and diversity of European culture, a civilization which cannot be misrepresented in the service of any form of political ulterior motive and whose national cultural identity must not be allowed to be distorted either by the Member States or, indeed, by the states associated with the Community.¹⁴⁰

Rather than just stating the need to raise public awareness through showcasing the common ‘European character’ of monuments and sites,¹⁴¹ the Janus faced nature of the domain was recognised. The age old tendency of civilisations and nation-states to destroy each other’s heritage was commented upon in the documents. Because of past conflict, creating a European sense of belonging would require a ‘gradual transition’ over in which national identities and differences were protected. Importantly, it was the other nation-states that presented the great threat while a European culture/civilisation was put forth as an all-inclusive frame that could accommodate these differences, the Community offering to become steward of national heritages for their own good. As put forth in the EP report backing up the resolution, the ‘original traits’ of each country or region ‘fit harmoniously into the common structures that underlie the styles.’¹⁴² Clearly, national cultural differences were conceived of as a bittersweet predicament that needed, if not to be overcome, at least to be domesticated by the Community. Naturally, the Community would not be doing it ‘in the service of any form of political ulterior motive.’

The focus areas of the resolution responded to this idea of a gradual transition through highlighting education, information and tourism. Conservation work that would result in increased tourism to archaeological monuments would be prioritised, scholarships would go to training of guides and site managers. Based on the campaign on A People’s Europe (1985),¹⁴³ voluntary heritage work camps for young people would also be organised. The expectations on what archaeological monuments like the Parthenon could “do” for the Community was thus to offer ready at hand and positively charged points of identification, bridging the gap between Brussels and the people. The sites could be used as ‘trademarks,’ offering learning experiences.¹⁴⁴ However, just as in 1974, it appears as if these goals were not considered to be fully compatible with archaeology. After a passage on the need to document the

¹⁴⁴ See also Calligaro 2013: 96.
cost-effectiveness of conservation actions, it was suggested that principles should be established so as to facilitate:

… the resolution of conflicts between more archaeologically or anthropologically-inclined approaches, that is between approaches which set more store by the aesthetic value of a building and its ‘aura’ and those which stress its educational and social value.145

Here, archaeologically inclined approaches are juxtaposed with those emphasising the very values that the EP and the Commission were trying to promote, turning archaeology into a conservative force. Looking back at Smith’s notion of the AHD, of how archaeological perspectives have steered selection processes in heritage,146 this passage illustrates how such value criteria could become a problem in a new political setting. The figure of archaeology, in this case projecting the domains alleged unwillingness to move beyond valuing objects for their own sake (i.e. age, wholeness, greatest specimen), created frictions with Community wishes to use them in identity building. A strained relationship between national legacies and supranational aspirations. This did not mean that archaeology became less included in Community discourses on cultural heritage however, at least not yet.

Moving forward to the documents leading up to the Raphael programme, we find – for the first time since the 1974 resolution – an attempt to actually define the potential contents of a European culture and European heritage. In the proposal put forth by the Commission in 1995 it was stated that ‘cultural heritage is the expression of national and regional identities and the links between peoples.’147 In the Annex to the proposal this was developed further by stating that ‘cultural heritage is the interface between our differences and our similarities, finding expression in movable and non-movable forms.’148 These forms were defined as ‘heritage, archaeology, museums and collections, archives and underwater heritage.’149 The ambiguous term ‘interface’ is here best explained in relation to the general objectives stating that ‘cultural action is intended to highlight the common heritage of the peoples of Europe and illustrate our dual cultural identity as being both national and European.’150

At this point, archaeology is discussed in a setting clearly connected to the expectations of the figure of archaeology. As a strong component of her-

146 Smith 2006.
itage, it is assumed to be able to show the ‘interplay of diversity and constancy’ which ‘perfectly illustrates the regional, national and European roots of Europe’s citizens.’\textsuperscript{151} In using the word ‘roots,’ a discourse on origins and indigenousness is activated, clearly tying into questions of territory. The symbolic interface that tangible heritage is thought to represent becomes not just the connective surface between different peoples within the landmass called Europe, but the surface between the peoples of Europe, with different European cultural identities rooted in land and blood. To make people recognise this dual identity, the following objectives were included:

--- pooling of knowledge;
--- improving expertise and preservation practices;
--- increasing public access and information to ‘contribute to the affirmation of a European citizenship;’
--- promoting best practices to ‘realize Europe’s potential;’
--- foster cooperation with non-member countries and the Council of Europe.\textsuperscript{152}

To the Commission, this idea of cultural heritage sounded completely feasible and was perfectly in line with the previous EP resolutions. However, because of the poignant phrasing and the issues with the financial framework it took no less than three years for the programme to get the official go-ahead. According to an EP report, there were at times ‘intense confrontations’ between the EP and Commission, leading to ‘several informal meetings, in the guise of technical meetings or trialouges.’\textsuperscript{153} An extra committee was created after the proposal failed to go through a second reading in the Parliament (usually the final step) and at the committee meeting, the report states, ‘the dispute was brought into the open but no agreement was possible.’\textsuperscript{154} In the end, the programme was passed with 40 changes (out of 72 suggested).

The most content-related objection came from the advisory body Committee of the Regions (CoR), who were concerned about the definitions of culture and heritage.\textsuperscript{155} Asking for a broader definition that takes into account the shifting nature of the concept, they state that it should ‘be borne in mind’ that the material cultural heritage ‘always has its immaterial side,’ objects

\textsuperscript{154} Report conciliation committee 1997: 5–6.
having their ‘own spirit.’ Although CoR also referred to the roots of European peoples, they expressed worry that the narrow definition could undermine ‘cultural originality and cultural identity.’ They criticised the Commission’s notion of culture as being stuck in a ‘right-wrong’ or ‘highbrow-lowlbrow’ dimension, hoping that, based on the relative meaning of ‘European significance,’ the Commission would make sure to avoid favouring high profile heritage. Instead, CoR argued, different heritages should be regarded ‘with reverence.’ Furthermore, as stated in another passage they believed that the ‘downsides of European history’ should not be denied, but should be ‘employed as a vehicle of ethical growth among Europe's citizens.’

That such objections should emerge from the CoR was not surprising. Part of their mission is to balance or decentralise power from Brussels. Their objection, that the vagueness of the concept of European culture would (again) result in elitist or essentialist definitions, is a critique the Commission has faced continuously. To remain within the comfort zone of cultural heritage, viewing it as a natural carrier of European values was, however, a strategic move. It was and is still a crucial part of the ‘soft’ power approach so distinctive of the EU institutions, developing recommendations, communications and non-binding agreements. This approach is especially central to the area of culture where power has always been limited.

So what changed due to the protests? In the amended proposal of 1996, not much was altered except for that archaeology became ‘archaeological heritage, including archaeological sites,’ and in the sub-action supporting cooperation projects between research centres, ‘archaeological and/or scientific institutes’ were specifically spelled out as a target groups. In the final decision of 1997 however, only the ‘archaeological heritage’ part was kept, while other aspects, including libraries, architectural heritage and cultural landscapes were added. The proposal had also been combed free of the concept of European identity and what remained of the idea of heritage as an ‘interface’ was the reference to tangible heritage as ‘links between peoples.’ Thus, rather than providing more concrete explanations or develop-

---

ing the reasoning behind the action, the proposal had been stripped of uncomfortable rhetoric. The concept of heritage was broadened but still restricted to tangible aspects and no mention was made of the negative sides of a European past.

This is mainly true for cultural actions. In ERDF the idea of heritage was already quite broad. Although ‘dark’ heritage was not part of their agenda, the regional support programmes had, since 1983 used the term ‘social heritage’ and were focused on how rural and industrial sites could contribute to social inclusion, cohesion and economic stability in deprived areas.\footnote{Calligaro 2013: 99. See also During 2010.}

The bigger and smaller picture
A lot had happened in the Community since the early 1980s, and by the end of the decade it enjoyed its strongest legitimacy as of yet. In 1986 Spain and Portugal entered the Community, and in 1987 the \textit{Single European Act} came into force, aligning the member states to the objective of establishing a single market by 31 December 1992. It was the first major treaty reform in the Community, afterwards considered a turning point in the history of EU. The member states’ newfound determination to hasten economic integration, also offered Commission president Jacques Delors an ideal opportunity to forward agendas of social cohesion. Together France and Germany drove European integration, their leaders believing that a monetary union would strengthen the Community enough to withstand the effects of the imminent collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe.\footnote{Dinan 2014: 7.}

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and reunification of Germany did cause major political upheaval as well as new hopes for the future. The period to come was marked by the attempts to consolidate EU integration by sticking to the plans set up during the previous years, while simultaneously approaching the ex-communist states as potential members. Meanwhile, in 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden joined the Community, bringing the total number of member states to 15. During the same year, EU’s external borders were sharpened through the introduction of the \textit{Schengen Agreement}, activating notions such as ‘Third countries’ and ‘non-European cooperation.’ All of this required a re-definition of European culture, one that distanced itself from tangible aspects like heritage sites, oriented more toward European values as constituting heritage (such as democracy, pluralism and humanism). European culture in singular rapidly turned into ‘cultures’ in the 1990s.

When it comes to EU cultural politics, two things had specifically worked to make the \textit{Raphael programme} possible. The first was \textit{A People’s Europe} campaign, which started in 1985. Inspired by the \textit{Solemn Declaration on the
European Union (1983) and gaining momentum due to the involvement of the Ministers of culture in the European Council, the large scale campaign had made institutional actors view cultural heritage more positively than ever before. They wanted to make ‘Europe come alive to the Europeans,’ a goal that materialised in the creation of the EU flag, a broadcasting channel, the official anthem and more advanced ideas on a common currency. Based on a nation-state model, it was assumed that ‘Europe’ had one ‘culture.’ As a result of this movement, the Commission realised that their actions in heritage had been too incoherent. Funding had to be better organised to guarantee that projects really achieved a European dimension, and to make sure that the Commission label or ‘stamp of approval’ was marketed (figure 9). A more active stance was developed during this period, which Johanna Tzanidaki has called ‘the popular face of heritage’ in the EU.


166 The prime objective for culture in this declaration was ‘to promote, to the extent that these activities cannot be carried out within the framework of the Treaties: closer cooperation on cultural matters, in order to affirm the awareness of a common cultural heritage as an element in the European identity’ (1983 Solemn declaration on European Union. Signed 19 June 1983 in Stuttgart. In: EC Bull. 6/83).
169 McDonald 2012: 546.
The second thing was the reinvention of the European Community as the European Union through the Maastricht Treaty, which came into effect in 1993.\textsuperscript{171} The importance of the Treaty cannot be denied, as it turned an organisation previously intergovernmental in nature, into a supranational union with a single voice in international negotiations. The political body, now the EU, finally had a legal incentive to act in the field of culture. While there were still strong subsidiary rules in place, stating that the Commission could not in any way interfere with national interests in culture, it could set the goals a bit higher.\textsuperscript{172}

All of these events affected the world of heritage and archaeology. Networking activity soared after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the signing of the Maastricht Treaty, inspiring the creation of new organisations and associations.\textsuperscript{173} Importantly, many archaeologists and heritage professionals participated in the creation of Raphael. Already in 1992, potential actions were discussed with ‘professionals in the field of movable and built heritage,’ and by 1996, ten meetings with national representatives and independent heritage experts had been held.\textsuperscript{174} In archaeology, this increased movement was particularly connected to the CoE’s then recently issued \textit{European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage} (1992), followed by the \textit{Bronze Age Campaign} (1994–1997), both morally supported by the EU.

This campaign, which later received critique for being near to political propaganda, emphasized the Bronze Age as a prosperous time; when Europe became truly connected for the first time.\textsuperscript{175} In fact, some projects which later achieved funding under Raphael were initiated and developed as a result of this campaign. In the midst of this activity, the EAA was established as a new platform for archaeologists in Europe (1994). These were not isolated events. Representatives within the various movements came to interact with the EU concerning the definition of heritage and the selected areas for action within Raphael. EU officials could work towards their policy goals sanctioned by the support of professionals, who in their turn succeeded in safeguarding already-established hierarchies of power on a supranational level.

\textit{The figure of archaeology}

It seems, indeed, that no serious thought was given at the time of the drafting of the EC Treaty to what ‘a common cultural heritage’ signified.\textsuperscript{176}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{171} Signed by the members of the European Community on February 7\textsuperscript{th} 1992.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Sassatelli 2006: 27.
\item \textsuperscript{173} See introduction, p. 19.
\item \textsuperscript{174} \textit{First report on cultural aspects} (1996).
\item \textsuperscript{175} See for instance Bolin and Hauptman-Wahlgren 1996.
\item \textsuperscript{176} Psychogiopoulou 2008: 29.
\end{itemize}
Until the mid-1990s, archaeology had held a far less prominent position in discourses on cultural heritage than it had in the pre-1983 discussions. The documents leading up to the creation of *Raphael* represented a peak in the discourse on sites and monuments as being able to give substance to a common European culture. Heritage was an asset thought to possess rhetorical strength. In the words of Calligaro, whose results support my own, they saw heritage as ‘a vast and complex web of cultural transfers that are understood as the very essence of European identity.’¹⁷⁷ Officials and MEPs increased emphasis on heritage as the ideal pedagogic instrument, turning the discourse from seeing heritage as a reflection (something able to convey their European character through citizens simply looking at them) to a more malleable resource for identity building. The difficulty of the task had also been recognised and a more active approach had been adopted (the monuments needed a ‘little help from their friends’). The lack of societal impact of previous schemes had been addressed in *Raphael* through changing focus from the monuments themselves possessing a European dimension to viewing the whole domain of professionals dealing with the tangible past as the producers of the same, making the people into the building blocks.

The lack of impact on society can thus be interpreted as a lack of the kind of impact that the EU was looking for. For long, the lack of any clear definition of heritage had been a strategic move in the Community. As Hahn had stated in 1982:

> Nor is it the task of your rapporteur to define the criteria by which a specific cultural asset or ‘monument’ comes to form part of the architectural and archaeological heritage … We shall leave it to the experts to decide …¹⁷⁸

This is what made the critique by CoR so unsettling. The EP and Commission had relied on the power of vagueness and of taking things for granted, as the link between old things in Europe and a European identity. By forcing a definition, the intentions were laid bare and up for scrutiny.

The links previously taken for granted resonated, by design, with archaeology as a component of heritage. This meant two things. First, in the figure of archaeology, archaeological (and other) objects are expected to be able to create and confirm a new layer of collective identity, neutralising the political order of the present by collecting disparate elements under an umbrella of Europeanness. This fit well with EU rhetoric but the model required an Other, a non-articulated presence of something or someone left out in the rain. Soon, the EU enlargement would lead to a ‘meaningful difference’ being developed between the words ‘European’ and ‘non-European.’ Archaeology and heritage would be considered a useful tool to bridge this di-

---

¹⁷⁷ Calligaro 2013: 96.
vide. Up until now the discourse had effectively been concerned with an Ethnic European identity. Second, the frame of EUrope had not been contested, rather it had been filled with suitable content. The reliance on recruited experts and the influence of national rhetoric about monuments and sites meant that its meanings were kept in line with national and disciplinary customs for what to place value on. Until 1996, having been co-created with the expert community and especially with the CoE, it meant that when the EU became more ambitious and endeavoured to have a say in what a European heritage and dimension was, this created friction.

2007. The fall of a rising star: the Culture programmes

- 27.9 million ECU in 1997.\textsuperscript{179}
- 36.5 million EUR in 2001.\textsuperscript{180}
- 47 million EUR in 2007.\textsuperscript{181}

The formation of Raphael and its siblings marked a general turn within the EU toward more holistic strategies for financial support. Through this programme, including its preparatory actions in 1996, archaeology became a specific target in the EU budget for culture. Until 1999, it was allocated 10 million ECU per year in the budget, but already in the year 2000 we see a new programme taking over. In the Framework programme in support of culture (Culture 2000), Raphael and some of its siblings were merged into a single action.\textsuperscript{182} The total amount was raised to 31 million EUR per year, out of which 34% went towards cultural heritage (in other words approximately the same amount as before).\textsuperscript{183}

The work to establish ‘a single instrument for programming and financing aimed at the implementation of Article 128’ had started in 1997.\textsuperscript{184} The change was fuelled by the perceived failure of previous programmes, particularly Raphael. The structures and networks created through the projects were considered short lived and the low amounts offered had impacted the visibility for the EU and overall quality of the output negatively.\textsuperscript{185} The division of cultural actions into different programmes was said to be the main problem, something Culture 2000 would solve. Cultural heritage now became part of a family of cultural topics and the hierarchy set in the Maas-

\textsuperscript{183} Chapuis (ed.) 2009: 8.
tricht Treaty – with archaeology as a part of heritage as a part of culture – was implemented in practice.

The point where we stop, at the budget year of 2007, the successor programme *Culture 2007–2013* had just taken over. From 2007 to 2013 it received 43–55 million EUR per year. The programme firmly placed heritage as one among many cultural themes. Heritage no longer received any dedicated sums within the program, but competed on equal terms with the Arts under the dictum: may the best proposal win. Although resting on the same legal basis as *Culture 2000*, including the goal to heighten ‘the awareness of the common European cultural heritage,’ the topic gradually became more hidden beneath the heading of cultural cooperation. Instead, there was an emphasis on intangible heritage (European values and traditions), diversity and European memory. Culture had also become more articulated as a policy area, with yearly themes such as ‘intercultural dialogue,’ and formalised evaluation procedures, from this point on run by the sub-organisation called the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA).

The motivation behind this breaking point is not so much the presence of archaeology, as its gradual disappearance, now slowly losing what standing it had gained under *Raphael*. Another reason is its inclusion in other policy areas. Aside from the continuous support under research policy, archaeology appears in digital heritage initiatives (information and media policy), as a product for the tourism market (Competition policy), as a tool for social innovation and development under regional policy, and as sites of ‘diplomacy’ under External relations.

*Raphael 1997–1999*: 30 million ECU distributed to 222 projects (out of 1,769 proposals). Applicant success rate of 12.5%. Depending on the year, the EU covered up to 50% of the total costs.

Despite decreasing visibility in culture, many projects in archaeology were still funded through the programmes. Based on an analysis of the inconsistent and somewhat brief descriptions offered in the Commissions lists of selected projects, at least 45 out of these had archaeological partners.

---


191 The other 50% was usually split between the partners based on financial capability, but was not restricted to actual currency. It could also consist of working hours.

192 *Raphael*, selected projects 1997, 1998, 1999 (see ‘Culture programme materials’).
and/or included archaeology in their objectives. The leading organisations in the projects, called coordinators, were mainly academic institutions and regional or state heritage departments from Greece, France, Italy, Germany and Spain. Among the other partners, called co-organisers and usually consisting of 3–5 organisations from different member states (sometimes up to 20), Italy was most heavily represented, followed by Spain, France and the United Kingdom. This pattern is consistent with the overall distribution in *Raphael*. Interestingly, Greek organisations were more visible in archaeological projects than in other topics.

On top of this, the programme supported 18 *European heritage laboratories*, which received a maximum of 400,000 EUR per year during the programme period. These were special actions at sites of ‘European significance,’ qualified ‘by virtue of the interest or exemplary value of their content.’ It was in this context the support for sites like the Acropolis of Athens could continue, along with new sites and projects supported in 1998–1999. The reasoning behind echoes that of the 1984 scheme, with little emphasis on what it was that was European about the sites. Since the laboratories in *Raphael* were still co-selected with national authorities, it may have worked as a compromise, fulfilling promises made to the member states.

*Culture 2000*: 236.5 million EUR distributed to 1,529 projects (out of over 4,700 applications). Applicant success rate of 32%. The EU covered up to 50% of the total costs.

In 1999, the new framework programme for culture started through a call for ‘Experimental measures’ in which three archaeological projects received funding (out of 55 selected). A year later the programme *Culture 2000* started. At least 86 projects with archaeological partners and/or archaeology in their objectives were supported, sharing a total of around 21.3 million EUR. Again we see Italian partners in a dominating position. *Culture 2000* also continued to support *European heritage laboratories*. Out of 19 funded, seven involved archaeological themes.

---

193 Other recurring coordinators came from DK, UK, BE, NL, AT, FI, LUX and SE.
196 Among these were: *Archives of European Archaeology* – AREA (FR), *Proactive earthwork management on Hadrian’s Wall UNESCO world heritage site* – PEMHW (GB), *Boyne Valley archaeological park* (IE), and *RockCare* (SE). Commission answer to written question No. 181/99 1999. In: O.J. C 341: 61.
198 These were: *Archaeology and Europe* (AREA), THUCYDIDE working with European coastal military heritage (including archaeological sites), and *Pan-European Corridors*, aiming to define the cultural corridors of ‘ancient pan-European trade areas.’ *Selected projects, Experimental measures 1999*, see ‘Culture programme materials.’
199 Based on calculations in database of co-funded projects.
Figure 10. Graph of the distribution of coordinating organisations between member states in 154 projects co-funded by Raphael, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013. For seven projects, no country was found.
The figures for Culture 2007–2013 are harder to estimate. At the time of writing no final report has been presented, and the documents listing the figures for each programme section and year remain incoherent. The programme had a total budget of 400 million EUR to be distributed to about 2000 action and projects. According to the interim evaluation, applicant success rate was sometimes as high as 45 percent.\textsuperscript{200} I have found 30 archaeological projects supported during this period, sharing 21.2 million EUR.\textsuperscript{201} German and Italian organisations were most frequent. Looking at the graph including all three programmes (figure 10), it is clear that these two member states had the most partners in leading positions across the board. The influence and engagement of Italian representatives and MEPs that started already in the 1970s was still reflected in the distribution of funds 40 years later.

During this period, cultural heritage had also entered budget lines in the policy area of Competitiveness. For instance a pilot project called European Destinations of Excellence was launched, intended to promote economic growth by drawing attention to ‘the value, diversity and shared characteristics of European tourist destinations,’ meanwhile helping European citizens to ‘become better acquainted with one another.’\textsuperscript{202}

ERDF had increased their funding of heritage projects since the 1980s, especially through the Interreg programmes from 1989 onwards (European territorial cooperation – ETC).\textsuperscript{203} Between 2007 and 2013 it is estimated that ERDF allocated 3.2 billion EUR for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{204} Lastly, in relation to the objectives of the common agricultural policy (CAP) – an area of legislation that has had direct impacts on the protection of archaeological sites and the conditions of contract archaeology – heritage in rural areas was listed as an important resource for social and economic sustainability.\textsuperscript{205}

\textit{Culture goes intangible while heritage gets stuck in the past}

Eight supportive documents are listed under the budget line ‘Developing cultural cooperation in Europe’ in 2007, the core part consisting of the decisions securing the old, current and new programmes. Gone were the long lists of EP resolutions of previous decades, now replaced by the treaty base common to Raphael, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013, stating that the Community shall:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{200} Evaluation ECORYS 2010: 55. Again, the EU covered up to 50\% of the total costs.
\item \textsuperscript{201} Based on calculations in database of co-funded projects.
\item \textsuperscript{202} Enlargement programme for SMEs. Pilot project on European destinations of excellence. Art. 02 02 08 of the financial year 2007. O.J. L 77.
\item \textsuperscript{203} See During 2010 for an analysis of heritage in the Interreg programmes, and English 2008 for a legal perspective on heritage in EU regional actions.
\item \textsuperscript{204} Commission mapping of cultural heritage (2014).
\item \textsuperscript{205} Agriculture and rural development. Title 5 of the financial year 2007. In: O.J. L 77.
\end{itemize}
… contribute to 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.\textsuperscript{206}

This phrasing left a lot of room for interpretation, and since there were many chefs involved in the work of translating it into action, the programmes and actions varied in both structure and thematic focus. These variations had consequences for the way cultural heritage was defined, and by extension for the position of archaeology. In \textit{Culture 2000}, just as in \textit{Raphael}, archaeology was explicitly referred to as a part of the definition of cultural heritage,\textsuperscript{207} but in the decision establishing \textit{Culture 2007–2013} it was no longer listed at all (although neither were any other sub-fields). Looking at the summaries above, we know for sure that many archaeological projects received funding under the programmes but the closer we get to 2007, the less archaeology and tangible heritage appears to be discussed explicitly. At the same time new concepts like European cultural memory take the stage. Why is this?

The opening sentence of \textit{Culture 2000} states that ‘Culture has an important intrinsic value to all people in Europe’ and ‘is an essential element of European integration.’\textsuperscript{208} It goes on to explain culture as a socioeconomic factor, good for business and for Europe’s image in the world, as well as for promoting European citizenship. Although these aspects had always been considered essential, the intrinsic value of cultural expressions was now listed as the source of all other qualities. It was what justified the programme as a solution to ‘the challenges facing the Community at the dawn of the 21st century.’\textsuperscript{209} This location of value was later transferred to \textit{Culture 2007–2013}, where diversity became the central buzzword.

The new focus on a European cultural memory is significant. It was introduced in the cultural budget during \textit{Culture 2000}. Suddenly, the ‘preservation of Nazi concentration camps sites as historical memorials’ appeared next to posts such as ‘subsidy for cultural organizations advancing the idea

\textsuperscript{206} The Maastricht Treaty Art. 128 (Signed February 7, 1992) aimed to prepare for the European Monetary Union and introduce new political elements (citizenship, common foreign and internal affairs policies). The Treaty of Amsterdam (Signed October 2, 1997), reformed EU institutions ahead of enlargement. Culture became Art. 151 and it was added that cultural aspects should be taken into account in other policy fields. The Treaty of Lisbon (Signed December 13, 2007) aimed to make the EU more democratic, efficient and able to address global problems. Here, culture was listed in Art. III–280.

\textsuperscript{207} The definition reads: ‘intellectual, non-intellectual, movable and non-movable heritage (museums and collections, libraries, archives, including photographic archives, audiovisual archives covering cultural works), archaeological and sub-aquatic heritage, architectural heritage, all of the cultural sites and landscapes (cultural and natural goods).’ \textit{Decision No 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of February 14th 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 programme} O.J. L 63: 8 [hereinafter: \textit{Decision establishing Culture 2000 (2000)}].

\textsuperscript{208} \textit{Decision establishing Culture 2000 (2000)}: 1.

\textsuperscript{209} Mainly globalisation, the information society, social cohesion and employment.
of Europe.’ 210 The former was included as a result of an EP initiative in 2003, while the latter had been long standing and pertained to ‘organisations actively working for European integration’ and ‘raising awareness of the European ideal.’ 211 The juxtaposition of negative heritage and the positively charged European ideals is striking and one is tempted to ask: could they be combined? The answer must be no, since in 2007 this budget post had already been redirected to another area of EU policy, the citizenship programme. This is very telling. I have noticed before that when Commission representatives talk about aspects like Nazi concentration camps, it is often within the trope of the EU as a peace project. The Nazi heritage is put forward as something that stands against everything that is European, in conflict with the real values and heritage that define the political project. By being moved to the citizenship programme it is also placed firmly in the present or recent past, detached from positively charged features, such as Greek democracy. It cannot, it seems, become part of European culture or a common heritage. It can only become a memory. 212

Overall, the increased focus on European memories, values, and respecting diversity did not mean that the more homogenising strategies disappeared; rather they continued to exist side by side, just as with the concentration camps and the European ideals. The divide has many causes. One appears to be the sometimes conflicting views of the EP and the Commission. During this period, the EP pushed problematic heritage onto the agenda and the CoR lobbied for local and regional identities, while the focus of Commission still leaned towards commonness and positive symbolism. As we have seen, personal agendas are always at play, but to a great extent, these differences has to do with the fact that Commission act and speak as an institutional body, in charge of interpreting the treaty clauses on a common heritage, while the parliament is more interchangeable and ‘in the now,’ full of individuals speaking from their political platforms. Different institutions have different agendas and models, and according to Clive Barnett, this is not merely a conflict over definitions, but indicates different models of the administration of cultural policies at the European level. 213

In the premise for Culture 2000, the direction of the programme is described as working towards ‘the development of a cultural area common to the European people, which is open, varied and founded on the principle of subsidiarity.’ 214 This area is thus mostly located in the future. The only definition of a ‘cultural area’ I could find was in a report from 1996, calling it ‘a

211 Among these was the heritage organisation Europa Nostra (EUR 80 000 yearly).
212 For memory and Europe see: Remembering National Memories Together: The Formation of a Transnational Identity in Europe Klaus Eder
space within which the association of certain cultural features is dominant.\textsuperscript{215} Whether intentional or not, putting the concept of culture as dominant features, next to European \textit{people} in singular form summons the image of an established commonness and a shared inventory to draw upon. Any aspiration of reproducing such associations would therefore risk transmitting the highbrow-lowbrow division criticised in previous actions.\textsuperscript{216}

Indeed, looking at the original proposal put forth in 1998, there was a pronounced intent to reveal a common cultural heritage by endorsing ‘mutual knowledge of the culture and history of the European people.’\textsuperscript{217} However, instead of viewing cultural heritage as the ‘links between peoples’ (as in \textit{Raphael}), \textit{values} became the link, making any specific focus on heritage redundant. It creates a loop back to the place where we began the chapter, to the notion of cultural heritage put forward in 1974, as representing the ‘spirit’ of Europe. The difference is that back then cultural heritage was seen as the embodiment of culture – i.e. it \textit{was} culture – while it was now placed next to a European culture and defined by values and memories.

This separation becomes visible when looking closer at the decision text, where the word ‘diversity’ is generally paired with the word ‘cultures’ in plural (national, regional etc.) or with societal issues (inclusion of socially disadvantaged people or the young), but never directly with the set phrase ‘cultural heritage.’\textsuperscript{218} The opposite is true for the word ‘common.’ It appears as if diversity is foremost a characteristic of the present, while commonness is rooted in the past (as roots or cultural heritage) or in the future as European values, both in need of affirmation. These temporal directions seem to work in parallel, the past becoming a constant, an object. As a sign of this we find urgings to respect diversity by protecting minority cultures and languages, combined with sections stating that in order to integrate European citizens ‘greater emphasis should be placed on their common cultural values and roots as a key element of their identity.’\textsuperscript{219} What citizens have in common, or should have in common, are both values and roots, future and past.

For the applicants this meant reconciling EU goals to promote ‘intercultural dialogue’ and ‘new forms of expression,’ while endorsing ‘mutual awareness of the history, roots, common cultural values of the European

\textsuperscript{215} This was attributed loosely to Fernand Braudel and examples were the fine Arts, literature, knowledge and features ‘which characterise a society and make it possible to understand the world.’ This definition was likened to UNESCO’s declaration on culture (Mexico 1982), as consisting ‘of all distinctive, spiritual and material, intellectual and emotional features which characterise a society or social group’ (\textit{First report on cultural aspects} (1996), Point 3: 3).

\textsuperscript{216} CoR 1996. See Shore 2000, for a discussion on elitist interpretations of culture in the Commission.


\textsuperscript{218} This applies to the decision text.

peoples and their common cultural heritage." The idea of a cultural specificity connected to the peoples and landmass of Europe becomes most apparent when contrasted to ‘other’ cultures. The part of the programme that supported cooperation with ‘third countries,’ co-funded projects based on their contribution to ‘the fostering of intercultural dialogue and mutual exchange between European and non-European cultures.’ A meaningful difference is established between the two, marking the boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them.’

The parallelism visible in the decision text was, not surprisingly, manifest in the EP debates on the original Commission proposal. Throughout the responses to the programme proposal and EP report, certain types of connections were made more often than others. These included links between heritage and origins, diversity and socioeconomic or educational aspects and artistic expression and creativity. The Commission representative Mr. Oreja opened the debate by referring to the culture sector as ‘sensitive,’ but important as a means to involve citizens in ‘building the new Europe.’ He went on to say that the preservation and dissemination of the common cultural heritage should be backed in addition to the goal of creating a ‘common cultural area as a means of fostering creativity.’

The author of the EP report MEP Mouskouri (GR), pointed to ‘Europe’s cultural future’ in cultural industries, especially pushing for the inclusion of young people, while MEP Baldi (IT) regretted the demotion of cultural heritage, concluding that the programme ‘must aim to encourage the conservation of movable and fixed heritage by identifying the common European origins from which the diversity of national cultures has sprung.’ One parliamentarian, Ferét (FR), equalled Culture 2000 to the Euro and EU enlargement in importance, and made reference to Greece as the cradle of Europe by stating that:

Thanks to Mrs. Mouskouri, we, the children of Athena, are no longer orphans. I will therefore be voting unreservedly and enthusiastically for her report.

From these and other responses, it is clear that heritage was still understood as tending to and informing about objects and sites. It was stuck in the past and therefore separated from the notion of creativity. The merging of the programmes into a single action in Culture 2000 did not necessarily change the concept of culture or the idea of what archaeological sites could do for the Union. As a subgroup of heritage they were still connected to origins

rather than European cultural memories, and to positive values rather than negative.

The bigger and smaller picture
This period marked a progressive and contemplative phase in the EU, when the discourse surrounding heritage slowly changed, supported not so much on a state of crisis as on political ambition. The EU saw some of its biggest changes yet, with the introduction of the single currency in 1999 and the enlargement process to the east starting in May 2004, eventually leading to a 27-country Union in 2007. As a sign of the will to move forwards, the Treaty establishing a European Constitution (2004) was put forth in order to streamline democratic decision-making and management in the EU and formalise European Foreign affairs. It also demonstrated the renewed interest in European values. When citizens in both France and the Netherlands voted ‘No’ to the Constitution in referendums in 2005, EU leaders declared a ‘period of reflection.’

Faced with this failure on the one hand and the integration of the new eastern member states on the other, cultural action had to change tactics and express European citizenship differently. The discourse slowly returned to the intangible. This had already been manifested in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000), endorsing the idea of common values as a European heritage in itself. It was also marked in the Treaty of Lisbon (2007), working toward a more democratic and transparent union, able to tackle global challenges such as climate change, security and sustainable development. Outside the EU, currents moved in the same direction, as demonstrated for instance by CoE’s Faro Convention on the ‘value of cultural heritage for society’ was signed in 2005.

In relation to the expansion eastwards, there was talk of a reunited ‘European family,’ of how the cultural heritage of eastern European countries had always been ‘European in spirit.’ Funds were dispatched for socioeconomic actions such as The Iron Curtain Trail, a touristic heritage trail presented as an ‘example of soft mobility’ and ‘a symbol for the reunification of Europe.’ The discursive enveloping of Central and Eastern European nations was two-sided however. As argued by Claske Vos in relation to heritage

227 Proclaimed on 7 December 2000 by the EP, the Council and the Commission. Its legal status was uncertain until the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon on 1 December 2009.
229 Improving the business environment for SMEs, tourism projects. Art. 02 02 03 of the financial year 2006 (in: O.J. L 78) and Art. 02 02 03 of the financial year 2007 (in: O.J. L 77).
actions in EU’s strategy for the Balkans, the membership was promoted as a way for the region to move away from ethnic nationalism and violence, to ‘leave its past behind,’ while at the same time keeping them at arm’s length distance in terms of real integration. Tanja Petrovic has highlighted how such strategies have led to a state of ‘thinking Europe without thinking.’ A habitual conflation of Europe with the space of the European Union, leading to a type of bullying by those countries already inside the EU or ‘on their way to Europe’ against those who do not have the option of membership.

In a larger perspective the increase of terrorist acts directed towards cultural symbols and UNESCO world heritage sites, like the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan 2002, and the looting of antiquities during the Iraq War (2003–2011), reactivated the discourse of crisis, the loss of ourselves through the loss of the past. In many ways this period marked a return to the discourses of the 1970s. Faced with destruction, world leaders were reminded of the need to protect heritage for its symbolic meaning and not just aesthetics, as favoured in the figure of archaeology.

The figure of archaeology

Heritage wore two different sets of clothes during this period. On the one hand, it lost its touch with the physical world, wearing a new gown of values and languages in a diverse European mosaic. On the other, it trotted around in the same old garments as before, representing origins, roots and common European characteristics. This could be seen as archaeology simply being taken for granted or as archaeology being actively marginalised due to changing EU visions about culture. There is something to say for both.

Archaeology and tangible heritage certainly continued to achieve funding during this period, so on a practical level it can be argued that it was such an ingrained part of culture that it needed no mentioning. This would be supported by the observation that tangible heritage has often been more pronounced in EU political history during times of crisis, when preservation has often been elevated as a key concern. On a discursive level, tangible heritage has been connected to origins and sameness, while culture has been about visions. This shows how the figure of archaeology persists even in the face of rendering the subject matter uninteresting or incompatible with EU goals (figure 11). When a deeper link to Europe as a kind of homogenous and inherited variety of people and things was no longer valid as a line of argument, tangible heritage became a mere responsibility, an area in which previous investments had generated few lasting benefits. Part of the problem was still that many member states had no interest in sharing their heritage, as it was intimately tied to already formed identities. When Europeanising her-

230 Vos 2011b: 224.
231 Petrovic 2011.
itage failed, rather than revamping it as a creative or dynamic field, the Commission just talked less about archaeology. There was an unwillingness to shake out the old clothes.

In its new outfit however, especially in other policy areas and actions such as regional policy, heritage became a promise. The EU had, as part of their agenda, set out to preserve local differences, a goal more compatible with national expectations on heritage. Another feature, seemingly offering the EU a “way out” in regard to both the difficulty of dealing with dark heritage and the sensitivity involved in the reclassification of national or regional monuments as ‘European heritage,’ was the new focus on a European memory. However, this approach was not considered to belong in the Culture programmes.

Conclusions and further reflections

In this chapter I have argued that archaeology, as a specific discursive figure and domain, is brought into the European political context with some already pre-established properties that have affected the way it has been used in the political economy of culture in the EU. By following the money invested in archaeology and cultural heritage and tracing the motivations behind its inclusion, I have sought to understand how archaeology as a figure has been translated into a different environment as part of a ‘European cultural heritage.’ From this, it is clear that the Janus faced nature of the domain of archaeology, rooted in modernity, has turned it into both a promise and a problem. A promise because:

— It was useful as rhetorical fuel in reinforcing a discourse of crisis. As a child of modernity, the threat of losing one’s culture is a central condition of archaeology. By invoking this fear, archaeology and tangible heritage could be used as a ‘Trojan horse,’ putting other topics like culture on the agenda.

— It was a well-tested method of identity building, conjuring ideas about roots and origins. This gave it metaphoric strength. Mimicking the nation-states, the EU put forth archaeological sites as evidence of a diverse yet common identity, a European culture which was greater than the sum of its parts. As such, European heritage did not need to be defined further. It worked best if the member states and citizens themselves decided the content.

Figure 12. Archaeology in EU cultural actions. Vertical axis displays relative financial and discursive importance of the topic. Horizontal axis shows period.
As a result of the expectations placed upon archaeology as a part of cultural heritage, of what it could “do” for the Community, sites were considered useful as pedagogic instruments, a way for citizens to learn about their common European background.

Archaeology became a problem due to much the same things:

— Because of the protective stance toward archaeology and heritage from within the member states, any suggestion of sharing a European inheritance in any other sense than the rhetorical and symbolic, was not well received. Already at the outset, archaeology had to be marked as an exception from the rules of trade and exchange. The domain was considered a restricted area, its objects foremost in need of protection.

— Archaeology brings with it established ideas of what constitutes heritage and how it should be valued. This meant that stakeholders within the domain were happy to see investments in their field but not interested in changing its premises. When the EU became more ambitious and endeavoured to have a say in what European heritage should be and how it should be “done,” this created friction. In Raphael, archaeology and heritage had been less constrained by the EU goals of integration and more adapted to the needs of the domain, while Culture 2000 was modelled after the needs of the EU. As the EU increasingly turned towards the present, tangible aspects of heritage became something not just stuck in the past, but also something stuck in the EU political past. Ultimately, the persistence of the figure of archaeology contributed to the EU losing interest in the subject.

Taken together, up until the 1990s, the tagline can be said to have been: ask not what archaeology can do for the Community – ask what the Community can do for archaeology. The figure of archaeology made the domain useful, partly because it resonated with the EU, which, just as archaeology, is a project of modernity. On the one hand, tangible heritage functioned as a kind of anchor, mooring the notion of a common European cultural heritage to something solid. On the other, because of its strong commitment to nationhood, what archaeology claimed for its own often undermined, by design, the very idea of a common European inheritance. Overall, it was more of a promise than a problem, but when the EU cultural ambitions grew, the tables turned. The new tagline became: ask not what the Community can do for archaeology – ask what archaeology can do for the Community. In this context, the persistence of the figure of archaeology made the domain unfit to sustain the notion of a fluid European culture based on contemporary.

This conclusion holds true for the period considered in this thesis, up until the final years of Culture 2007–2013. Since then, much has changed. Although the new Culture programme Creative Europe (2014–2020) takes even
less of an interest in archaeology than *Culture 2007–2013*, I have noted how tangible heritage, nevertheless, has made a strong comeback in EU cultural actions. Its return is marked by two parallel approaches. One is consistent with the trend from 2006 onwards, to move away from homogenising aspects such as fostering a European identity and concepts like European roots. Here, the Council’s conclusions *on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe* (2014) is significant. It presents an agenda which goes beyond highlighting the symbolic and economic value of heritage, focusing to an equal degree on participation and plurality. The conclusions and the Commission’s response to them represent the closest thing to a real EU cultural heritage policy as of yet, and they are the first texts that clearly describe heritage as something which is ‘constantly evolving.’

The second approach signifies a return to the rhetoric that surrounded *Culture 2000*. However, instead of the EU losing interest in tangible heritage on account of a strong focus on European contemporary values, the connection is reforged. In 2011, the Commission adopted its perhaps most emblematic heritage initiative as of yet, the European Heritage Label (EHL). The label is awarded to sites with a symbolic or historic value for European history *and* integration, concentrating primarily on Europeanising the didactic contents or “story” told about the sites. Its chief aim is to ‘strengthen the sense of belonging to the Union’ among young people.234 The dual focus on history and integration creates ample space for archaeological sites to apply, and among the first to be awarded the label in 2013 was the Roman site Carnuntum in Austria. Once again heritage is celebrated for its wished-for Europeanness, and regarded as something that citizens need to *learn* about.

Furthermore, just as when the Community first took an interest in heritage in the 1970s, the element of crisis is present. Both in terms of destruction and illegal trafficking, and by the Euro crisis, which has effected heritage budgets in many member states. The new EU Commissioner of Culture, Tibor Navracsics, recently connected these aspects by arguing that European citizens’ lack of self-esteem was to blame for the Euro crisis. That is to say, their inability to find strength in a common European identity despite their ‘rich cultural heritage’ and ‘common roots.’235 An age old Community mantra is repeated. In light of these developments it is clear that tangible heritage and archaeology will have a part to play in the area of EU culture policy in the future. Time will tell if it will be as a problem or a promise.


Chapter 4. Inside the Black Box: Translations in the Culture Programme

I was once told by an EU consultant specialising in giving courses for future applicants that applying for EU funding is like playing cricket; it may seem like just another bat-and-ball sport, but no matter how much you watch it and try to learn the statistics, field positions and jargon, you never quite figure out how to score. In line with this statement, when discussing the topic of EU funding schemes with archaeologists in workshops and on conferences, the most common emotive response has been that of frustration. Whether based on experience or hearsay, EU funding schemes (by many addressed as a whole) were perceived as administratively strenuous at best, completely inaccessible at worst, with rules and selection procedures shrouded in mystery. An archaeologist who had applied several times without success told me that you need to have at least one person in your project who ‘knows their way around Brussels.’

This view corresponded to the way external consultants explained the value of their services, and the certain smugness sometimes expressed by successful applicants over having solved the puzzle. While the European Commission prides itself on its openness as an institution, with rules on transparency and user-friendly guides for expert reviewers and applicants, the results of the external evaluations of the Culture programmes and the responses received in my interviews did not mirror this self-image. The metaphor of the black box comes to mind; a system that uses certain information to produce results, but that works in a way that is secret or difficult to understand.

How does this system operate? A ‘call for proposals’ emerges from the box called Culture 2007–2013. In hope of achieving co-financing, multinational constellations of individuals set to work, investing time and effort in putting together hundreds of applications that enter the box (figure 13). A couple of months later an expert evaluation report and a Commission deci-

---

1 28 PJ–09 2013.
2 In the external evaluation of Culture 2000 it was stated that a quarter of the applicants thought the selection process and assessment of criteria were unclear (ECOTEC 2008b: 74–76). In the 1st and 2nd interim evaluation of the Agency, transparency was also listed as an issue. The culture unit was singled out as problematic (COWI A/S 2009).
sion of funding materialises in the hands of the applicants. In the end about 
300 successful projects emerge out of the box every year, having pledged to 
generate European added value, intercultural dialogue and sustainable net-
works through their various objectives. But what happens inside?

To find out, the chapter begins by examining the programme *Culture 2007–2013* from within a European Commission agency. I then turn towards 
the expert reviewers assessing the project proposals. The role of private con-
sultants and EU Cultural Contact Points are discussed next, whereafter the 
views of archaeologists partaking in co-funded projects are addressed. Two 
analytical keys, the black box and translations, are employed to guide the 
analysis and articulate the findings. The first part of each subchapter is fo-
cused on the black box, its functions and the viewpoints of different actors. 
The second part considers the translation of the assessment criterion *Euro-
pean added value* (hereinafter EAV). The goal is to achieve a deeper under-
standing of the ‘hybrid process of heterogeneous engineering’ that goes into 
creating and assessing EU project proposals in heritage and archaeology.

*Figure 13. Boxes of project proposals awaiting transport to the evaluation panels in 
the next building. Brussels 2010. Sketch based on photo by author.*

---

4 The only exception is subchapter three which is divided based on the type of actor. This is 
because it includes two different types of actors.

5 Shanks 2004: 503. See also ‘Theories’ in the introduction.
Configuring the metaphors

The metaphor of the black box has been widely used both within and outside of academia. Borrowed from the field of Cybernetics, it was used by David Clarke in 1968 when discussing the way archaeologists and anthropologists approach fragmentary assemblages of excavated material as clues to past realities, or what Clarke, in the spirit of the New Archaeology, refers to as ‘culture systems.’ Following Ross Ashby, Clarke talks about the ‘black box’ (a concealed system which can only be studied based on its input and output), the ‘very large box’ (how increasing the size of the box leads to unpredictable outputs) and the ‘incompletely observable box’ (some parts remain inaccessible as researchers studying the same box often look at different circuits).

Bruno Latour’s appropriation of the black box, as a type of actant that can condense and conceal the complexities of large networks consisting of people and things, is probably the most famous one. In Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society (1987), he suggests that it should be used in cases where ‘many elements are made to act as one,’ contrasting older manual cameras, which had to be dis- and reassembled for every photograph taken, to the Kodak automatic, which acted as one piece, not meant to be taken apart. Michael Shanks has likened the ‘archaeological artefact’ to a black box in a similar manner, describing how they are often seen as closed and mysterious entities separated from people, when in reality no such distinction is possible. Ilana Gershon describes how a mathematical problem can be discussed for years, circulating through multiple nodes in a network, each node changing it ever so slightly before it is finally solved and published. Afterwards it turns into an accepted truth under a specific name, a black-boxed shorthand concealing all the complexity that contributed to its creation. In both cases, in building facts and in building objects/machines it comes down to ‘how to ally oneself to resist controversies.’

Can the Culture programme be understood as such a machine? It is not really taken for granted or used as shorthand in the same sense as in the abovementioned examples. When, for example, an applicant opposes the results of the evaluation, or when an external audit is called for, the complex
alliances maintained within might falter and become visible to all.\textsuperscript{13} Studying a would-be black box usually means that you treat it as such, that you look at the input and the output and try to figure out how it works based on that. But since I, and other actors, already know what it looks like on the inside, does the metaphor still work? It depends on the depth and the perspective from which you are looking at it. As Ashby puts it:

We do in fact work, in our daily lives, much more with black boxes than we are apt to think. At first we are apt to think, for instance, that a bicycle is not a black box, for we can see every connecting link. We delude ourselves, however. The ultimate links between pedal and wheel are those interatomic forces that hold the particles of metal together; of these we see nothing, and the child who learns to ride can become competent merely with the knowledge that pressure on the pedals makes the wheels go round.\textsuperscript{14}

Similarly, one could read the massive amounts of documents released by the European Commission every year and follow the proposed guidelines without grasping the full extent of how those documents are created and negotiated. Knowing how to ride a bike – or how to write successful applications and approved project reports – is no guarantee that you understand why or how one works. From the applicant’s point of view the process may appear as a black box, while for an EU employee it is just a mass of everyday procedures linked to wider institutional contexts. Accepting this conditional nature, the black box nevertheless offers a fruitful starting point.

In order to discover from what angles this programme appears as a black box and what power positions and professional cultures that define it, I will use the ANT-inspired concept of \textit{translation}.\textsuperscript{15} As applied in this chapter, translation means the act of converting interests, how certain expressions of will or values arise in one end of a network (like award criteria), and proceed to be translated through a number of recruited actors (like expert reviewers). These actors transmit the will of the enabler, in this case the Commission, while changing it in the process: consciously or unconsciously, obediently or subversively. The list of translations involved in the Culture programme is long:

— One translation occurs when policy officials at the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) are assigned the task of interpreting the policy goals expressed in the Treaties, transforming them into funding programmes and assessment criteria.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13} In these cases Latour speaks of how black boxes, when viewed as \textit{intermediaries} – actants which transports meaning without transforming it in the process – can suddenly transform into \textit{mediators}, actants which ‘translate, distort, and modify the meaning or the elements they are supposed to carry’ (2005: 39).

\textsuperscript{14} Ashby 1956: 110.

\textsuperscript{15} Latour 2005.}
Another is in the hands of the culture unit at the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), translating the programme decision, i.e. the ‘blueprints,’ into guides and instructions for applicants.

A third translation happens when applicants are recruited to interpret the wills of the Commission. Based on the call for proposals and the programme guidelines, they design the project to fit the programme.

In this process, national Cultural Contact Points (CCPs) or independent EU consultants are sometimes recruited by the applicants to assist with these translations.

One of the final translations takes place when the expert reviewers, recruited based on their capacity to evaluate matters within a certain domain, are engaged to translate the translations of both the applicants and the previous recruits. Their judgements are turned into points, arranged on a list that provides the basis for a final decision.

The results of these translations are called transformations. They are the outputs emerging from the box, such as guidelines, lists of selected projects or narratives written by archaeologists achieving co-funding. Some of these transformations are dealt with in this chapter, but a core part, that of the project narratives, will be the theme of chapter five.

Material and method

The empirical base in this chapter consists of ethnographic fieldnotes and observations, as well as formal and informal conversations with persons connected to Culture 2007–2013. Observations are recorded in two notebooks, a digital field diary and photographs taken during fieldwork. They mainly consist of descriptions of events, meetings and my interactions with different persons, but they also contain more intimate reflections regarding colleagues, the functioning of the funding programmes and some stressful situations (this material remains with the author and can be accessed by other researchers upon request).

Due to their relative closeness to the application process and the programme, 30 interviews have been considered particularly useful for this chapter. These include:

- Four interviews with Commission employees working with the Culture programme in different capacities. Three men and one woman working in policy development and programme coordination (Commission), and programme administration (Agency). All interviews were carried out in Brussels.
- 11 interviews with expert reviewers with a cultural heritage profile. They had participated in review panels for the Culture programmes Strand 1.1 (multiannual cooperation projects) and 1.2.1 (cooperation projects up to three years). Seven men and four women from ten countries. Four in-depth interviews were carried out in Brussels, Austria and Sweden and seven via email. They were asked open ended questions about the programme and 16 See full list of interviews in Appendix 1.

17 Nationalities: AT, DE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HU, IT, NL, SE. Participation in panels: 1–7 times each, avg. 3.7 times per person.
award criteria, the socio-dynamics of participation, and the main challenges presented. Their collected experiences amounted to 41 panels and over 700 evaluated projects. Outlooks varied based on national, cultural and professional backgrounds, as well as experiences working for the EU in other capacities. Answers were not always restricted to the topic of heritage, yet they had bearing on the outcome of evaluations of cultural heritage projects.

— Two interviews with national contact points for the Culture 2007–2013. They were both civil servants, one man and one woman. One worked in the sphere of cultural heritage while the other was engaged in the cultural sector at large. I met both in person and the main focus was placed on their roles, their view of the programme, the criteria, the expert-reviewers, the consultants and applicants, placing emphasis on cultural heritage.

— Two interviews with one consultant who had a specific competence within cultural heritage and the Culture programmes. I tried to get the story of the firm, the consultant’s role in the projects and the relationship to the Commission.

— 11 interviews with archaeologists involved in projects co-funded by the Culture programmes. Ten interviews were carried out in person (in Sweden, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Austria, Germany and Czech Republic), and one via Skype. I mainly spoke with the project leader or the person in charge of writing the application. With the exception of one case, all project leaders were male (this is a pattern). They were asked questions about their roles and experiences, their view of the programme, the criteria and the experts.

Qualitative coding techniques have been applied to identify meaningful junctures in recorded observations and transcriptions. Grounded in important aspects identified during fieldwork, I have marked keywords and passages with labels so that data could be searched, combined in themes, and retrieved later for further comparison and analysis. These include: criteria, key challenges, specificity of heritage, application poetry, not just about the money, Commission-applicant relationship, and scoring techniques. Using codes can have the effect of inadvertently directing the study towards a pre-set conclusion, creating a circular argument. With this in mind, I have allowed codes to evolve continuously, and through their combination new ones have emerged.

For this chapter I also use Commission working drafts, guidelines for evaluators, and official programme documents. Since these texts represent assemblages of oral statements transferred into specific types of authorless texts, I treat them as discursive events, created at ‘the intersection of text and talk.’ This allows me to address documents in combination with, rather than separately from the ethnographic sources.

Aside from ethnographic material and interviews, I will draw on research carried out within the fields of sociology, anthropology and political science. A note of caution however; while much has been written on evaluation panels in relation to science funding, their results are not fully applicable to the

---

18 See interview themes and questions in Appendix 2.
19 Calculated based on times participated and an avg. of 17 applications per expert/panel.
case at hand. Culture 2007–2013 was not primarily a tool for financing research projects. It had an interdisciplinary focus with a clear emphasis on mobility, circulation of cultural goods and community outreach. That being said, a majority of the projects had a research component, and most of the experts assessing the proposals had a background in research within their respective fields.

The agency of the Agency: a circuit in the machine

In early October 2010, I took my first trembling steps into the corridors of Brussels. It was the start of what was to become five humbling and instructive months at the European Commission, working as an intern for the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (hereinafter the Agency). During the application process – in which I was accompanied by 11,756 other applicants with completed master's degrees (mainly in law, European studies or economics) – I noticed that things in Brussels worked a bit differently from what I was used to. After passing the first step, called ‘pre-selection’ (now down to 2,500 applicants), I stumbled upon several online discussion forums claiming that in order to pass the final step and become one of the chosen 500, it was necessary to actively lobby the particular unit you wanted to work for.

Many fellow applicants stated that they had emailed or called Commission employees early on in the process. Others said it was unnecessary and something to be avoided since it was not an accepted practice. Not entirely sure what ‘lobbying’ meant in this situation (I had already been shortlisted after all and it was not clear who made the final decision), I sent a couple of emails to ‘Heads of units,’ presenting myself as an archaeologist with a research interest in EU culture policy and programmes. I soon received a response informing me in no uncertain terms that ‘lobbying is not allowed!’ Nevertheless, the place from which I received this response ended up selecting me. Later someone working there told me that they had liked my email.

These types of ambiivalent codes of conduct and mixed messages, alongside the vibrancy and tension caused by a multi-lingual and multi-national work environment, made my internship at the Commission both difficult and thought-provoking. The Agency I ended up at was portrayed officially as an administrative machinery that merely reported to, and practically implemented the programmes on behalf of the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC).

---

22 Email: European Commission Stage Coordinator June 15, 2010.
23 To a lesser extent the Agency also operates under Communication (DG COMM) and EuropeAid Development and Cooperation (DG DEVCO).
In reality however, it was a place full of agency.24 It was a place where the brainchildren of EU policymakers and the goals of the EU treaties were turned into physical currency in the hands of project leaders, and where the outcomes of their projects were evaluated. I therefore dedicate this subchapter to the agency of this particular Agency, arguing that if the Culture 2007–2013 is understood as a sociopolitical action appearing as a black box, the Agency can be seen as one of its key nodes.

The black box: the politics of the non-political

The Agency is best described as a quasi-autonomous institution.25 It is guided by policy and supervised by Commission officials at the ‘Parent DG,’ but with some managerial independency.26 Compared to other types of intermediary agencies working with project funding, such as science-based or strategic funding agencies, it is clear that it belongs in a third category: political funding agencies directly answering to a ‘ministry.’27 One of the reasons behind this logic of power delegation, which has grown in popularity since the early 2000s, is its alleged ability to enhance the credibility of EU actions.28 In light of the massive fraud charges and ‘cover up’ that the Commission faced in the late 1990s – leading to the resignation of the whole Santer Commission and to huge internal reforms – it is not surprising that the EU found this strategy of delegation appealing.29 Ironically, this divide has in itself given rise to practical issues and questions of accountability.30 As Martin Shapiro has put it: ‘if indeed it is the low legitimacy of the Commission that fuels the move to agencies, why should we expect that the same appeal to technocratic legitimacy which failed the Commission will succeed for the agencies?’31

---

24 Throughout this subchapter, when using of the word agency in italics, it refers to a ‘doing’ which can be passive or active but which does not presuppose intentionality. In this context it is specifically used to point to the ambivalence between the expected or allowed agency of actants in a network, and the less visible or unofficial doings.


26 The Agency employs around 430 persons and has a mandate running from January 2005 to December 2015. The Culture 2007–2013 programme is one out of 15 actions they deal with. It is managed by the culture unit, which carries out tasks such as formulating and adapting the programme guide and application documents, drawing up calls for proposals, selecting experts, monitoring evaluation panels and signing project agreements. It also monitors project development and financial exchanges (intermediate reports, financial reports etc.). The staff sometimes visits projects, but mainly provide information and regulate changes in the project.


28 Majone 2001: 109–110. See also Busuioc et al. (eds) 2012.


30 For instance, an evaluation of the European Research Council Executive Agency concluded that responsibilities overlapped and that there was ‘a fundamental incompatibility between the current governance philosophy, administrative rules and practices and the stated goals’ (Vike-Freiberga et al. 2009: 40). See also Braun 1993.

From the outside, based on my conversations with project leaders and other archaeologists who had experiences from the Culture programmes, the Agency and the culture unit in which I worked was considered as just another gear in the Commission machinery. This is perhaps not odd considering that all of their communication with the Commission went through their assigned project officers. Some said they were just administrators with no real interest or knowledge in the project topics, while others saw them as key players and their best chance at influencing the selection procedure. Therefore, applicants sometimes booked meetings with Agency employees to discuss their projects before the expert reviewers got involved.

So, stepping inside the machinery, who really did have the power? Despite these close ties to the Commission, legal and didactic texts concerning the Agency often take specific care to mention its non-political character:

The programme strands managed by the Agency are all centralised and support technical projects, which do not imply making political decisions.\(^{32}\)

The Commission may entrust an executive agency with any tasks required to implement a Community programme, with the exception of tasks requiring discretionary powers in translating political choices into action.\(^{33}\)

This means they could not make decisions according to their own judgment when it comes to changing the programme or the use of the budget. And ‘political decisions,’ in this context, would refer to changing the assessment criteria or skipping the whole evaluation segment. Despite this rather loose definition of the Agency as non-political, I found that the detachment from politics was part of the self-image of the culture unit, especially maintained in relation to its Commission counterpart at DG EAC. A segment from my fieldnotes may work to illustrate how I experienced this separation:

As X had explained to me regarding the task, ‘it is all very good and analytical what you have done in the template for the program evaluation, but the Commission don’t want us to think!’ So they cut everything I added into the new objectives out completely... The work of the Agency is so administrative and detached in one way, whilst in another it is the one part in this whole bureaucratic machinery that is closest to the actual projects and the actions it funds. It creates a very split vision and I can see why they do not always see the big picture in any of the levels of the hierarchy.\(^{34}\)


\(^{33}\) 2003 Council regulation laying down the statute for Executive Agencies to be entrusted with certain tasks in the management of Community programmes. In: O.J. L 11/1: para. 13

\(^{34}\) Fieldnotes, January 12, 2011. I later brought up this particular memory in an interview with a culture unit employee who agreed with the statement (18 EU–07 2012).
This statement should not be taken literally, but rather as an expression of frustration at the fact that the Agency did not have a voice in the same sense that the Commission did. Naturally, the Commission wanted the Agency staff to be smart and effective, but without being heard; their texts remaining authorless, their presence subtle and anonymous (figure 14). This was reflected in my fieldwork efforts in the sense that, while Commission officials generally agreed to be interviewed, Agency employees declined. Upon asking colleagues to discuss their work in relation to my research interests, one just laughed and said no, finding the idea absurd. Another recommended people outside the Agency, and a third simply stated that she had no time. The few I did talk to later on were keen to steer the topic away from personal opinions, uncomfortable with my interest in such aspects.

The incorporation of this non-political profile into their institutional self-image had several effects. It could act as a kind of shield against claims of wrongdoing. That is to say: ‘it is not our fault, we don’t make the rules!’ As argued by Michael Herzfeld, such methods of trying to escape blame by blaming ‘the system,’ is a built-in function of Western bureaucracies: a way of internalising the publics’ stereotypical expectations of bureaucratic injustice to offset their own sense of failure. The profile also became a way to form alliances in order to resist controversies with the Commission, the privileged node in the network. For instance, during my time there, a problem in the form of a conflict of interest presented itself during the evaluation panels. It had been revealed that one of the experts were part of a project he was assigned to evaluate, something experts pledge to inform the Agency about beforehand and a reason for expulsion. The person was fired, but it was decided that the matter should be sorted out internally before notifying the Commission representatives, otherwise hell would break loose.

The internalisation of this political/non-political break depends on several factors. One is the hasty set-up of the Agency in 2005–2006. Creating the Agency in the middle of a running programme period had necessitated a transfer of personnel from the Commission, meaning that some persons in the culture unit had worked there since the very beginning. I was told the whole thing had been a ‘learning by doing’ experience. Similar to the establishment of the European Research Council (ERC) and its executive agency, the overarching principles were set out beforehand but the rules, tasks and procedures was based on trial and error, as well as borrowing from practices of peer review elsewhere.

Another factor is what Maryon McDonald has described as type of ‘rolling uncertainty’ within the Commission. Due to movements of personnel, influx of new employees, and in particular, the low status of positions in the
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36 18 EU–07 2012.
37 Gornitzka and Metz 2013: 10–11.
culture policy area, people were always on their way to a better job, and those who lingered felt unsafe.\footnote{McDonald 2012.} Despite the long commitment by some of the staff, the Agency was set up on a temporary basis and a certain Othering of the Commission was fuelled by the fact that their jobs existed at their mercy. During my internship, employees would worry about things like the immanent replacement of the Head of Unit, a decision they had little say in, and about the extension of the mandate; if they would be needed in the new programme \textit{Creative Europe} (2014). As a basis for such decisions, the Agency was continuously evaluated, something which did not help to decrease feelings of insecurity.\footnote{External consultants examined the ‘added value’ of the EACEA in 2009 and 2013.}

In relation to the black box, the distinction between political/non-political becomes meaningful as a way to uphold the structure and to hide an ‘arena of interest struggles.’\footnote{Braun 1998: 811.} The tension between the Commission as parent and the Agency as a ‘child’ was not something visible from the outside, but it had certain effects. By neutralising their own political-ness, the Agency employees extended their leeway in certain situations, developing unofficial practices.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image14.jpg}
\caption{An EU civil servant avoids the camera. Brussels 2010. Sketch based photo by author.}
\end{figure}
One such instance where the Agency staff had a lot of power was in the selection and attribution of expert reviewers. Experts were hired based on personal expressions of interest following regular ‘Call to tenders’ and their information was collected in a database. Selected experts were then attributed to specific projects by the Agency.⁴¹ This sounds like just another part in a bureaucratic machinery, but selecting about 35 persons within a relatively short time-frame, preferably with high standing in their respective fields, was not always an easy task. Unsurprisingly, one strategy to make this run smoothly was to select experts that the culture unit staff had worked with before and knew to be effective and not prone to conflict.⁴² Some of the Brussels-based experts, who worked almost full time as evaluators for different EU programmes, were talked about as you would a close colleague. Likewise, unsuitable experts from previous years had become the stuff of legend, some spoken of in good humour, others as cautionary tales. One colleague told me about a match made in hell between two stubborn experts. Neither one would budge an inch during the consensus meeting. In the end the colleague had to work late and basically write the evaluation report in their place. Due to the rules stating that experts must be rotated (about every three years), their speediness and ability to cooperate could not always be considered, but it was definitely an unofficial criterion of some importance.

This practise enabled another type of intervention. In the process of attributing the applications to specific experts, language, experience and the field of knowledge mattered most. Though in some cases, when “troublesome projects” appeared in the stacks of applications, involving a partner that the culture unit had had serious issues with in the past or which had simply replicated an old application to the same programme, the staff would take into account during the attribution whether an expert was nice (tended to give high scores) or hard (tended to give lower scores). Similarly, if a project ‘ought to’ pass selections despite balancing on the line of approval – being pushed by MEPs, for example –⁴³ the project might have to be re-evaluated by ‘nicer’ experts. These can be seen as two out of many strategies to avoid potential threats to the status quo and to uphold the appearance of the Culture programme as a black box.

A third intervention is connected to the bricolage of people with different backgrounds and identities working at the Agency culture unit. Just as in other EU institutions, the staff consisted of persons with different nationali-
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⁴¹ In the ‘Guidance notes for experts’ it is stated that for each evaluation panel ‘the most suitable experts are appointed by the Agency’ based on criteria such as level and field of expertise, experience in project management or assessment, language skills and geographical origins. Participation was denied in case of conflicts of interest (2012: 4).

⁴² As an example of the opposite, Braun writes about how the National Cancer Institute, a US funding agency, deliberately chooses non-mainstream, opinionated and individualistic researchers as referees to counter existing patterns of cognitive authority (1998: 816–817).

⁴³ In some cases they had a say in the selection of multiannual projects.
ties, such as Czech, Slovak, German, Italian, Spanish, Greek, French and Belgian. The working language was French in speech, English in writing and whatever suited best at the coffee breaks (mostly French). For every week that went by, I found myself using more and more ‘Frenglish’ expressions, such as ‘le Out!’ which was used when an application did not make it through eligibility in the first rounds.

The certain acclimatisation that occur when persons from EU member states are reterritorialised and start working together in Brussels has attracted the interest of anthropologists since the early 1990s. The process has come to be called engrenage, a term adopted from the civil servants in Brussels themselves (French for ‘gearing’ or ‘enmeshing’). In his research, Cris Shore found that that the civil servants in the Commission had melded traditions and created a type of European identity and culture of their own. While Shore has described this process quite harshly as ‘an increasingly unaccountable Brussels-based transnational elite that is transforming itself from a class in itself to a class for itself,’ Marc Abélès has addressed the idea of engrenage by pointing to the anxiousness of EU civil servants. They are constantly being torn in different directions and forced to maintain a relativistic outlook, resulting in a culture of bargaining that neutralises political debate. He also found that the intercultural climate might actually reinforce national barriers rather than generate a common identity, similar to what Maryon McDonald has called ‘decoding differences in national terms.’

I would certainly not call the Agency staff a self-proclaimed elite – rather a self-proclaimed underdog – but the part about decoding differences based on nationality ring true. The most straightforward consequence of this was related to the division of successful projects among the Agency project officers, the personal contact persons assigned to them. This was often based on language and nationality. Professional experiences and personal preferences also mattered, but matching nationalities facilitated the communication. There were also other ways in which this decoding occurred. An interesting example was when an Italian colleague, after cataloguing a somewhat untidy project application with a Spanish lead partner, told me that she loathed Spanish projects and tried to handle as few of them as possible. This was due to an age old vendetta between nations, but also the firm conviction that all Spanish projects were messy. For similar reasons, another officer preferred Belgian projects. Although the constant changes of project officers,
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50 McDonald 2012: 549. See also and Zabusky 2000 and Suvarierol 2009.
relating back to the rotation of employees, reduced the effects of this inter-
vention, it shows how people allied themselves to keep the machine running.

Before moving on to the translation of award criteria, I would like to add
that many functions of the black box – such as neutralising political aspects
and upholding unofficial strategies – should be seen against the backdrop of
the logics of Western bureaucracies. In The social production of indif-
ference: exploring the symbolic roots of Western bureaucracy (1992), Herzfeld
likens bureaucracies to religious systems, the deity in this case being rational
efficiency. Both are founded on, and have as their tasks, to calibrate a collective
identity for a territory, state or the EU.51 Behind a mask of unity it works
silently, through its rituals, symbols and regulations, towards an ideal. Ap-
pearing as a black box is, thus, a prerequisite for such systems.

Translating European added value: escaping definition

The conversation [about EAV] is constant. In everything the Commission
does it is always about: is this something Europe should deal with? Is it some-
thing we do better here?52

In assessment procedures for grant applications, ‘the level of excellence of
proposed activities’ is an evaluation criterion that most reviewers are famili-
ary with. In the Commission Culture programmes, this only comes in at third
place. Instead, the first and most important criterion is EAV. Projects sup-
ported by Culture 2000 needed to ‘provide real European cultural added
value,’ while Culture 2007–2013 judged ‘the extent to which the project can
generate real European added value.’53 Its importance was even highlighted
in the resolution establishing Culture 2007–2013, declaring that ‘European
added value is an essential and determining concept in the context of Euro-
pean cultural cooperation, and a general condition for Community measures
in the field.’54

Ever since my time at the Agency, the vagueness of the criterion has in-
trigued me. That it was important was plain to see, but detailed explanations
of how it was important or what it stood for were scarce, making it hard for
both experts and civil servants to work with. Although it is a condition ap-
pied in most EU programmes, it seemed to acquire added layers of meaning
within cultural actions.55 Ordinarily EAV refers to economic benefits or se-

51 Herzfeld 1992: 2–10. Quoting Max Weber, Herzfeld articulates the similarity of this ‘trans-
cendent identity’ to Moses’ success in finding a compromise solution to class conflict by
organising the Israelite confederate under a common deity.
52 Interview 14 EU–05 2012, Official in Culture. Translation mine.
55 As a consequence of what has been called ‘The value Turn in Governance and public poli-
cy,’ many similar concepts such as: Surplus value, The value chain, Common values, Nordic
value or Nordisk nytta have developed (Tarschys 2005).
curing competitive advantages, simultaneously setting the limits of EU intervention in any given area. If a project has EAV it means it can legitimately be supported by the EU. It also has ideological connotations. The Council has stated that the concept should ‘not be based on entirely objective criteria,’ and in relation to the EU budget the EP has argued that EAV should contain a ‘visionary aspect.’

For the Culture programmes, this visionary aspect has been described by the Commission as ‘its contribution to a greater awareness of the existence of a common European heritage.’ This statement is intertextually interesting: a phrase copy-pasted from vaguely formulated policy aims into a setting where it becomes something to be measured. Yet it hardly counts as an explanation. A serious attempt to nail down its content was made in a Council resolution from 2003. In summary, it was specified that EAV 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. In other words, a sound financial justification should be matched with positive contributions to a sense of European unity. This turns EAV into a hub of moral concerns, signifying what is ‘good’ and ‘right’ as well as the worth of cultural actions in an economic sense. It also stated, similar to the UNESCO notion of ‘outstanding universal value,’ that EAV should ‘be implemented in a flexible way,’ an ambiguity leaving it at once empowered and destabilised. Trying to find out more about how it was translated on a day to day basis in the Commission, I asked two officials in DG EAC what they made of the criterion. I got the following replies:

Well you know it is my understanding, the common understanding, that this is very difficult. Added value is difficult to define but probably easier to understand, that you should support what cannot be supported on the national level … a sort of inverse definition but still we cannot provide a clearer definition of a value as such.
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60 From a social theory perspective, anthropologist David Graeber has argued that as a concept, value may refer to the sociological sense of what is good, proper, or desirable in human life, in an economic sense to how much others are willing to give up to get desired objects, and value in the linguistic sense as ‘meaningful difference’ (2001: 1). All three relate to EAV.
62 02 EU–01 2011.
For me this criterion is very difficult to understand and to explain … when we speak about the EAV we have to think not only about the union but all the European countries … this European value is a geopolitical issue, the symbol of democracy and contemporary development. 63

While the first person drew on a wide but pragmatic idea of EAV, as the geographic and legal level upon which the activities were carried out, the second directly linked it to the intangible values of the EU. Hence, if the architects of the programmes themselves were unsure about the concept, how was it translated by the Agency staff who was given the job to write instructions on how to evaluate and fulfil such a criterion?

The ‘Programme Guide,’ the manual of the programme, was a dynamic text updated almost every year, mainly by the Agency culture unit. Reaching the notable length of 94 pages (and still not considered exhaustive) it exerted a certain influence of its own, both shaping and being shaped by continual decision making. It was the first text I had to learn when I started, and the go-to document for solving problems. When it comes to EAV, the descriptions followed a steady pattern. In the Guides from 2008, 2009 and 2010, it was defined as:

— The way the objectives, methodology and nature of the cooperation among cultural operators demonstrate an outlook that goes beyond local, regional or even national interests to develop synergies at Europe-wide level;
— The way proposed activities may have a greater effect and how their objectives can be better achieved at European level than at national level;
— The way cooperation and partnership are based on mutual exchange of experiences and would lead to a final result that differs qualitatively from the sum of the several activities undertaken at national level, thus producing real multilateral interaction which promotes the achievement of shared objectives;
— Particular attention will be paid to projects allowing cooperation involving organisations that have not previously received any EU funding or co-operations that have been specifically designed to carry out the project in question.

The interpretation made here was much stricter than that offered by the Council resolution from 2003. The aim of integrating cultures is translated to ‘developing synergies’ and sharing experiences. It is a more defensive take on EAV, closely connected to the subsidiary rules. 64 Still, it is not very clear, talking at the same time about content (objectives and methodology), and the

63 07 EU–04 2011

64 The EU may supplement national activities in culture through independent actions in the areas of: knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples; conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance; non-commercial cultural exchanges; artistic and literary creation, including in the audiovisual sector (Para. 2, Art. 128 in The Maastricht Treaty, Art. 151 in The Treaty of Amsterdam and Art. 167 in The Treaty of Lisbon).
nature of the cooperation, allowing for political, geographical and ideational understandings.\textsuperscript{65}

Not in all cases the understanding [of EAV] has been the same, so again we have worked with the experts … for them to have the same understanding of all criteria. But selections are quite a challenge.\textsuperscript{66}

Thus, in order to explain it further the culture unit employed more unofficial strategies. An initiative was taken during my time there to create an example of two fictional evaluation sheets based on a collection of real applications, one with a ‘good’ and one with ‘bad’ formulation of the criteria. They were distributed as part of the information package received by experts, which included a list of appropriate phrases to use in the assessment sheets.\textsuperscript{67} The model evaluations were much appreciated by the experts, and one of them, being there for the first time, told me he had used them extensively. Although there is nothing strange or unusual about this way of helping experts to understand criteria, it is indeed both political and influential.

That the staff at the culture unit knew what ‘good’ and ‘bad’ represented in an evaluation text or project application was not in question. In their capacities as project officers for roughly 30 projects each at any given time, and having seen hundreds of assessment sheets, they had developed a shared understanding about this; a norm. Since their interactions with the funded projects were not limited to applications and review panels, the norms were also predicated by previous encounters with applicants and the know-how gained from following projects from start to end. This knowledge was applied in the face to face interactions with experts, such as in briefings held before the start of the evaluation panels.

In the case of EAV I found that the Agency’s translation resulted in a more practical interpretation of the concept, moving away from visionary aspects such as democracy, European culture and identity and towards experiences, geographical distribution and the physical need for cross-border cooperation. The constructed ‘good’ and ‘bad’ applications each explained EAV in this way, as European links: the more member states involved, the more EAV. A culture unit employee explained that, the part of the budget you get from the EU (50\%) is there to cover the EAV: the costs incurred due to the crossing of borders.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{65} For experts there existed another guide with complimentary instructions regarding the assessment procedure, but the explanation of the EAV essentially followed the one in the Programme Guide. EACEA: \textit{Guidance notes for experts} 2012, Strand 1.1 and 1.2.1.

\textsuperscript{66} 06 EU–02 2011.

\textsuperscript{67} Sending experts a really poor application in order to see what they thought of it was also suggested, but never realised.

\textsuperscript{68} 18 EU–06 2012.
Ultimately, even if the Agency employees’ translations of EAV had an impact, it rarely involved a value judgement in terms of the topics or specific contents of projects. The main motivation was to make things run as smoothly as possible without losing too much quality on the way. This can be exemplified by one of the ways in which the meaning of EAV was established by the Agency: through valorisation. Every year the culture unit project officers selected a number of projects showing exemplary EAV as ‘ambassadors’ for the programme. Their results were highlighted in media and their participants were invited to speak at Commission events. In this selection, Agency staff often put forth their favourites; projects they found interesting and well-structured, and with which they had developed a good connection.

The valorised projects became the ‘face’ of the programme, the success stories used in Commissioners’ speeches. They were presented as embodiments of EAV, but were not the result of active translations. They filled the category more by default than by design. When I asked a culture unit project officer about who then, if not them or the Commission, had the most power to define EAV, he told me it was the business of the experts. The assessments depended very much on what they felt was an added value. He shared this view with most of his colleagues, placing the role of making the assessment criteria operational – the act of translating application texts into points – fully into the hands of the expert reviewers. Therefore, the next part will be devoted to them.

From paper boxes to points: the expert reviewers

When it came to the selection panels, it seemed that everyone had some unanswered questions or suspicions. A Cultural Contact Point, assigned the task to promote and inform about the programme at national level, commented on their limited insight into the intricate workings of the panels: ‘It is right there [in the expert groups] that practices are really designed, but that is precisely what they keep so quiet about.’ A month earlier, an external consultant with long experience in assisting Culture programme projects had remarked: ‘I don’t know if the projects belonging to a certain field are assessed by people from the same field … sometimes I have the impression that certain projects that are quite specific or quite technical are not understood by the assessor.’ From the project corner, a person in charge of a successful project application explained that, naturally your application has to be good content wise but you also have ‘to speak the language of the ju-
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69 For full description see the interim evaluation of EACEA (COWI A/S 2009: 38).
70 See Banús 2002.
71 18 EU–07 2012.
72 24 OT–05 2012. Translation mine.
73 12 OT–02 2012.
ries,'\textsuperscript{74} while another person involved in an unsuccessful application stated that he did not trust EU experts at all and the comments he got showed that they had not even read the application properly.\textsuperscript{75}

These fragments of conversations work to illustrate two things evident in the material. Firstly, that from several angles the expert panel is the part of the black box that appears most hidden.\textsuperscript{76} Secondly, the questions raised in this research project are not only my own, but shared by many. What goes into the judgement of a project proposal? To what extent do the frames of the programme matter and what is this language of the juries? To address these aspects, I will start by looking at the dynamics of the expert panels, including the normative and social function of interdisciplinary peer review. The goal is to understand how the black box appears from the point of view of the experts, while critically discussing the practices they partake in and the potential consequences for the outcome of selections. After that, focus will shift to the question of how the notion of EAV is co-created by experts in relation to the topic of cultural heritage.

**The black box: socialisation and controversy in the expert panels**

When studying this node in the machinery, three aspects stood out as particularly interesting, aspects that made the wheels turn but which also caused controversies.

— The first was the dynamics created by the interdisciplinary character of the panels.
— A second thing was the social and professional bonds created between experts, which had effect on the outside.
— The third was the strategies and bargaining that occurred during the ‘consensus meeting,’ where experts had to agree on a final score.

Starting with the first aspect, one of the opening questions I posed to experts was simply: Is this a good programme? It elicited very similar answers. Everyone agreed that the programme was worthwhile but there were doubts about whether it really fulfilled its goals. The ‘Europeaness’ of the project proposals was questioned and the contours of the programme were considered vague. ‘The thematic diversity of the entries is sometimes extremely

\textsuperscript{74} 05 PJ–03 2011.
\textsuperscript{75} 31 PJ–10 2013.
\textsuperscript{76} The external evaluations of the programmes and the Agency support this view. Up to 40\% of applicants found the selection process non-transparent (PLS Ramboll 2003: 87; ECOTEC 2008b: 75). According to one evaluation, unsuccessful applicants were more likely to criticise experts or state the unfairness of the selection process, than to criticise the content of the feedback. It also states that ‘stakeholders have commented that the broad and multi-disciplinary nature of the fields concerned makes it more difficult to define experts’ levels of understanding and experience’ (ECORYS 2013: 44–46).
wide,’ complained one expert.77 The interdisciplinary character of the programme, divided into six altogether different subjects (cultural heritage; visual arts; performing arts; literature, books and reading; architecture; design, applied arts; and mixed projects) had consequences for how the panels operated and how topics were viewed.

Upon asking experts with a listed competence in cultural heritage about how the topic fared in this setting, the majority agreed that it fit in quite well.78 However, they also stressed that it was not given enough attention,79 that it lacked clear definition,80 and that it was ‘more complex and expensive’ than other topics.81 In part, this had to do with the vagueness built into the formulation of the programme, which in turn was based on vaguely formulated policy goals. This gave, as one expert noted, ‘a large freedom to people to submit all what they want … there are everything and nothing among the nominations.’82 The lack of definition meant that cultural heritage projects funded under Culture 2007–2013 dealt with everything from ‘the heritage of fishing’ or ‘European puppetry theatre,’ to interdisciplinary research on ‘Roman textiles.’ While this result was partly wished for, the question becomes: What expert is suitable to assess fishing traditions, puppet theatre and textile archaeology?

As discussed in relation to the Agency, the process of attributing the applications to specific experts was based primarily on the field of expertise and language, and efforts were made to hire people with competences in all the programme areas. However, due to lack of time, experts sometimes had to be recruited before the final quota of applications in each topic was fully known. At times this led to an imbalance in the attribution of proposals. Some of the experts interviewed mentioned how they had been asked to evaluate projects completely outside their area of expertise:
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77 38 EX–11 2014. Some remarks were made in comparison to their experiences from other EU funding schemes, such as ERDF and the research programme FP7, which were thought to attract higher quality proposals.
78 It was for example stated that: ‘to me it fits very well in, it is another sector, but eventually the effects are the same as in culture’ (35 EX–09 2013).
79 ‘Cultural heritage could have a stronger position. Contemporary stage productions are very prominent. Cultural heritage, in itself very broad, is well fit to embody the common European cultural roots’ (33 EX–07 2013).
80 ‘As I have been evaluator on a big number of entries concerning cultural heritage, I would say that this topic is sufficiently present among the other issues of the programme. Another question would be the definition or content of cultural heritage. In this aspect I would give more concrete definitions’ (38 EX–11 2014 OL).
81 32 EX–06 2013.
82 25 EX–03 2012.
I had to evaluate last year a project in music which I was not feeling comfortable at all with … in the last briefing we said so and they listened … but that has been an element that in previous years has influenced the decision.\footnote{01 EX–01 2011.}

Complaints made by unsuccessful applicants as to the level of understanding of the assessors may thus not be entirely unfounded. Rather than the experts being unqualified however, the “creaking” originates from a broken hinge in the black box, a structural problem. Knowing this, one of the questions I posed to experts was whether they found it important that the assessor was knowledgeable in the field of the application. There were experts who answered that it was indeed important, since you cannot evaluate theatre productions – ‘how much time it takes to stage something’ – if you have no experience in that area.\footnote{32 EX–06 2013.} There were also experts who argued that if you have a type of ‘cultural understanding’ or ‘familiarity with cultural projects and activities at large,’ specialised knowledge was not necessary.\footnote{25 EX–03 2012; 30 EX–05 2013.}

As demonstrated by Michele Lamont, who has written several studies on the function and dynamics of peer review panels in science funding in the US, experts participating in interdisciplinary review panels in research funding tend to develop a mutual understanding of the evaluation process, while insisting that award criteria should be assessed differently depending on the discipline.\footnote{Lamont 2009. See also Braun 1998 and Wessely 1998.} In her research, the meaning of ‘excellence’ – sometimes called the holy grail of academic life – was found to differ greatly among fields of expertise.\footnote{Lamont 2009.} This idea of a ‘cultural understanding’ therefore provides an interesting contrast. I found it to be rather in line with the vague programme goal of developing a ‘common cultural area.’

It also resonated with my experiences as administrator and participating observer of the panels. The completed ‘evaluation grids,’ documents used to score the project applications, all tended to repeat the same phrases no matter what the topic was. Thus, aside from a mutual understanding of the evaluation process, there was also a common language adopted by experts. No matter how much negotiation went into the assessments, they came out looking very similar. A norm about what constituted a good ‘cultural project’ appeared to grow out of the shared work experience and a general idea of what an EU project should look like rather than topic specificity.

Thus, the overlapping and mixing of competences in the panels created a type of fluency, merging topics into the frame of ‘European culture.’ This approach was also a consequence of the sometimes extensive workload. Everyone I communicated with mentioned the lack of time to properly read the applications, saying that ‘it was exhausting, confusing and impossible to
give time enough to study thoroughly all the aspects of the proposals,’\textsuperscript{88} or ‘I had to switch to a mode to make decisions when you do not have all the information.’\textsuperscript{89} For cultural heritage, the result of the interdisciplinary panels and the structural inconsistencies meant that it was located nowhere and everywhere. It was considered separate yet at home in the floating web of European cultural activities, judged on the same premises as other fields.

The diversity of proposals in need of assessment and the certain unbalance led to the development of another unofficial strategy to avoid controversy within the box: the appointment of experts having competences that were as broad as possible. They often had experience in two or more fields covered by the programme, as well as in project management on national and EU levels. Among the cultural heritage experts I met during panels, one was the manager of an art museum, one was in charge of heritage tourism in a region, one worked as an expert for UNESCO and one was an archaeologist specialised in Middle Eastern prehistory. Since any previous EU experiences were considered valuable, many had also participated in EU-funded projects themselves. The whole thing becomes a ‘loop.’ The programme mirrors the vagueness of the treaties, the variety in applications mirror the vagueness of the programme and the experts are hired to match the diversity of applications. This is not a failure, but a sign that the box works and produces meaning, establishing overarching frames but letting the actors recruited to translate their wills fill notions like EAV with content.

\textit{European experts or expert Europeans?}

The second aspect listed earlier derives from my repeated encounters with the experts I met during panels at other events in Brussels, such as at stakeholder meetings for EU cultural actions and the yearly information days for the Culture programme. They often attended in pairs or groups, visiting the events together as colleagues or friends. It made me think of the statement by Shore, that the only real Europeans are the ones working close to or inside the EU institutions.\textsuperscript{90} Was not one of the main outcomes of the programme, at least in terms of European integration, the interaction between experts facilitated through the panels?

By doing this type of work, professionals acquire a type of European profile. This profile can be expressed simply by listing their experiences as expert evaluators for the EU prominently in their CVs and on websites. It can also be asserted by using the knowledge gained from the panels in networking. The experts contacted in this project described the panel experience as overwhelmingly positive, rating things like networking, reading interesting research proposals and an overall camaraderie highly, adding things like ‘I

\textsuperscript{88} 33 EX–07 2013.
\textsuperscript{89} 30 EX–05 2013.
\textsuperscript{90} Shore 2000: 127.
think the way we cooperate is a very European way.\textsuperscript{91} In fact, half had long since been engaged in evaluation panels for other EU programmes, or had become so since I first met them during the panels. I also came across three expert reviewers by chance via their business websites, where they offered consultancy services to applicants seeking EU funding. Moreover, two had since started their own EU projects.

One reason for this pattern is likely the fact that experts are selected from a list based on self-application. From the responses to the question of how they first got involved in the Culture programmes, the most common were: through people working with the EU at state level, via other European institutions like CoE, or through pure interest in the topic and task. After recruitment, participation seemed to produce a craving for more.\textsuperscript{92} The system of keeping a list of experts seemed to attract people who were already committed to the political cause, or engaged in the world of EU funding.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{91} 30 EX–05 2013.
\textsuperscript{92} Not least due to the reasonable compensation. In-house work in Brussels on the Strand 1.1 and 1.2.1 panels amounted to, on average, 500–600 euro per day plus travel expenses. Evaluations lasted between 3–9 working days. EACEA 2006, \textit{Terms and conditions for experts in the framework of the next Culture Programme 2007–2013}.
\textsuperscript{93} While this was not a question specifically asked, some experts readily identified themselves as idealist, promoting EU values and the importance of the EU political project.

\textbf{Figure 15.} Exhibition at the Commission historical archives. Brussels 2013. \textit{Photo by author.}
Based on this, I expected that the culture panel experience would contribute to building expert communities. Yet, when asked about networking and additional benefits of participating in these evaluations, I received very mixed answers. One person stated that ‘it does not really build expert communities unless you work in the same field,’\textsuperscript{94} while another said that ‘certainly the exercise helps to build a community … the network built in evaluations can and has been useful in other contexts outside the evaluation.’\textsuperscript{95} Of course people might not, for different reasons, like to reveal in an interview if their participation afforded them certain privileges, but my impression was that on its own, \textit{Culture 2007–2013} had not contributed to any lasting collaborations.

The more cohesive element seemed to be Brussels itself. There, hundreds of experts on temporary contracts move between review panels in a sort of ‘expert economy,’ spawned by the EU institutions’ demand for speciality knowledges. The persons I had met at events and the ones who had participated most frequently in panels were also Brussels based, while the one- or two-time participants and the long distance travellers experienced less networking effects as a result of participation. This Brussels economy has an indirect effect on the constitution of the panels in the sense that experienced experts may gradually become ‘experts at being experts,’ much like EU civil servants become ‘experts at procedure.’\textsuperscript{96}

This circular movement, whereby experts becomes socialised into the normative frames of EU funding mechanisms, acquiring new bodies as ‘EUropean experts,’ can be considered a type of feedback loop; a function required to keep the black box intact which also worked to change the people and things passing through, ultimately affecting the whole system (figure 15). Seen from this angle, the act of bringing together experts from a wide range of fields in peer evaluation panels under an EU flag – with award criteria that are more concerned with creating a cohesive effect among Europeans than research or artistic outcomes – is one of the most Europeanising functions of the programme.

\textit{On consensus}

During my internship I participated as a moderator in the evaluation panels for Strand 1.1 dealing with multiannual cooperation projects, and 1.2.1 cofunding one or two-year cooperation projects. Out of the available ‘strands’ in \textit{Culture 2007–2013} – i.e. sections for specific types of projects – these

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{94} 32 EX–06 2013.
\textsuperscript{95} 35 EX–09 2013.
\textsuperscript{96} As an employee of the Secretariat for the EP Culture Committee told me, she should not even have been talking to me since she was an ‘expert on procedure,’ not someone who should have an opinion on the files she dealt with (11 EP–01 2012).
\end{footnotesize}
two were the largest.\textsuperscript{97} The panels generally lasted from one to two weeks. The first days consisted of individual assessments of three to five applications per expert and day.\textsuperscript{98} The boxes often contained over 200 pages of information, including the application form, budget sheets, CVs and activity reports. In total each expert assessed around 15–25 applications during the first week. The second week consisted of ‘consensus meetings,’ during which two experts wrote a joint ‘evaluation summary report’ for each project and tried to merge their points (figure 16). If they could not agree, a third expert was called in to make a final judgement. What really mattered in the end was the total amount of points, the hard currency of the programme.

Aside from the guidelines and unofficial strategies discussed in relation to the Agency, I found this meeting to be one of the most interesting aspects of the box. I approached the topic by asking experts about independence, willpower and manners, as well as whether they had experienced any difficult negotiations. Everyone agreed that they had felt wholly independent during the panels, but when it came to willpower and hard negotiations, almost everyone had a story to offer. Very hard negotiations were said to be quite rare and I was assured that everything was done in a general spirit of fairness,\textsuperscript{99} but their accounts also told of preferential treatment based on personal agendas (linked to fields of expertise or favouring their own nations), and how persons with dominant personalities could influence the decision. The following reasoning by one expert echoes the voices of many:

There are differences in the aspects from knowledge and skills to personal qualities and so on. In some cases I had to face with other experts that seem to reserve the exclusive right to decide about the matter and no argumentation and compromise could be reached about the issue. This procedures strain on the people and then they have to continue their work in a depressed mood … I had very few occasions when the written arguments on the quality of the investigated project differentiated in great extent to the other evaluator. This would suggest that there exists a general sense of a good project among experts. On the other hand, there were often big differences in the scoring related to the other opponent. This means that there are very different scoring habits from tolerant to punishing attitudes … The most embarrassing situation is when the conflict escalates and one of the experts has to give up because of other reasons, like lack of time.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{97} The strands are cooperation projects (Strands 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3.1), literary translations (Strand 1.2.2) and organisations active at European level (Strand 2). It also deals with management aspects (CCPs, Strand 3.1) and information initiatives on EU-funded cultural activities (Strand 3.3). The panels for Strand 1.1 and 1.2.1 occurred once a year. There were four other panels: book translation, ambassadors, festivals and cooperation with third countries.

\textsuperscript{98} The last two years of the programme the individual evaluations were prepared remotely.

\textsuperscript{99} According to their estimations, one in ten negotiations were hard and one in fifty would fail completely.

\textsuperscript{100} 38 EX–11 2014.
Several issues are identified here regarding the processes of translation. First of all, things like personality and preference matter and affect the outcome of selections. This may come as no surprise. Although review panels have a normative function, in which socialisation processes lead to certain common ways of interpreting the criteria set by the enabling body, ‘experts’ are no grey mob. They represent a mosaic of personalities with their own wills and agendas. Power struggles are inevitable and necessary components of such environments. Furthermore, and although they are reasonably well compensated for their work, the persons recruited are not doing it ‘just for fun’ or taking the responsibility lightly, but struggle with the fear of making the wrong decision.

The second issue concerns the tolerant and punishing approaches to scoring, which was mentioned as part of the strategies in the attribution of projects by the Agency staff. Even when two experts were of the same opinion or had the same understanding of a concept such as EAV, they could still give it entirely different scores. Therefore, specific strategies were said to be used in order to bargain about points during consensus. If two experts were in agreement over a project being of good overall quality, they would remove or add a point here or there on a specific criterion while making sure
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102 As stated by one expert: ‘We always know that every individual applicant put a lot of work into the application, so we really sometimes also feel bad that we have to destroy hopes you know’ (30 EX–05 2013).
the end result remained the same. This is a good example of how practices that are crucial for the functioning of the machine can remain completely hidden to the outside viewer.

All selected examples discussed here – the dynamics of interdisciplinary peer-review systems, adapting to structural problems through the recruitment of pre-listed experts, the nourishing of a Brussels based expert economy, and the strategies used by experts in the consensus meeting – can be placed under the category of ‘business as usual.’ This is precisely what makes them interesting. As pointed out by Donald Brenneis in relation to his extensive research on peer review panels, it is the ‘moments of accommodation, complicity, and seduction,’ the ‘processes of ongoing socialization,’ that makes all the difference: ‘it is not just kid stuff.’103

Translating European added value: detective work

Lamont has argued that studies dealing with evaluation mechanisms have a habit of neglecting the meaning given to criteria of evaluation.104 To avoid this tendency, as well as the trap of coming to see experts as ‘bodies characterised by unity and common function,’105 I will now take a step back and discuss in more detail what goes into this bargaining about points. What do experts bargain about and how are criteria like EAV understood in relation to notions like a ‘common heritage’?

First of all, while most experts stated that the criteria were useful, many pointed out that they were quite vague. The most difficult one was not EAV but the second criterion: ‘relevance of the activities to the specific objectives of the programme.’ This was mainly because it contained the ambiguous concept of *intercultural dialogue*. EAV came in at second place, considered hard to assess but easier to agree upon than the former. One expert reasoned:

There might be different interpretations of this criterion … I had one project that was about Charles V … an important European for sure, but the project was taking place to 98 or 100% in Aachen … Charles V might be a very important aspect of a European identity … [but] this, for me is not EAV.106

The translation of EAV in terms of space was the most common among experts. It also correlated well with the ‘by default’ translations at the Agency. One expert, recognising this pattern, stated that ‘it is common to look at this geographically, but to me this is not the most important factor.’107 By this expert and several others, more aspects were taken into account. Upon asking experts how they think EAV should be defined in relation to cultural
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104 Lamont 2009: 14.
105 Verlot 2001: 351.
106 30 EX–05 2013.
107 35 EX–09 2013.
heritage – geographically, geopolitically, economically, culturally and symbolically or something else – many stated that projects done in the bordering regions of all listed characteristics were the best. It may be difficult at first, one expert reasoned, but ‘the groups quickly establish a dominant meaning for heritage.’

Nevertheless, I soon found a tension between cultural or symbolic meanings of EAV and more pragmatic or technical interpretations. Two ‘extremes’ emerged. For this programme, one expert reasoned:

It would seem natural that the field concerned be the EU space. But the EU has decided to open it to countries under discussion for adhesion and, among them Turkey (and Georgia?) why certainly has a great culture but not belonging to the European one. At the same time, the programme is not open to Norway, Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, which certainly belong to European culture.

Here, the idea of a common European culture was a defining ingredient in the assessment of projects in archaeology and heritage. In connection to this, Christianity, Indo-European languages and Greek and Roman influences were brought up as a basis for Europeanness. Two other experts argued that, especially when it came to projects in history and cultural heritage, the ‘cultural terms’ were most important, and that preferably projects should maintain a European perspective when looking to the past. These responses are not without nuance but they clearly put forth cultural heritage as something to be evaluated in terms of cultural/symbolic properties, relating to pre-set ideas of Europeanness. Even if I had invited such reflection by offering the above stated keywords in regards to how EAV could be interpreted, their answers surprised me. Especially as no religious or symbolic aspects were mentioned in the guidelines.

At the other end of the spectrum, where the geographic/technical interpretations prevailed, there was a negative reaction to some of the characteristics I had suggested. One person said that geographic spread, economic and cultural considerations play into EAV for heritage but that she did not think a ‘European culture’ existed. On the same note, another expert stated:

For me this is not about looking upon it as strengthening some European identity or that kind of bullshit … the very questioning of such identities could add European value, and that would more likely catch my eye.
This knee-jerk reaction again points toward the difference between the two directions, where persons in the latter not only questioned but also undercut the assumptions made by the former. As most experts were very well aware of the integrational goals behind the programme, this could almost be seen as a subversive stance. The vagueness of the criterion clearly leaves enough room for both sides. Some stressed the need for clarity, but many thought the vagueness offered freedom: ‘you can take it to mean what you want … that is good if more radical and rethinking experts come in … but there are conservative powers working in the other direction as well.’

Within this space of ambivalence, experts can be seen as forging associations to advance certain interests, both as a group and individually, each one taking criteria to mean something slightly different. We can assume that those experts taking the symbolic and sometimes essentialist views of Europe and European culture into account, will argue differently and promote projects correlating to those characteristics, and vice versa. During my work at the Agency I read evaluation texts written by experts, stating that projects were ‘European in themselves’ since they involved particular prehistoric periods or traditions. Thus, even if the consensus meeting had a neutralising function and the common uses of phrases streamlined the texts, the various understandings discussed here had bearing on the outcome of selections.

On Eurospeak

Despite some experts considering the notion of European culture or identity pointless, many applicants used these phrases. Earlier in the chapter I asked: to what extent do the frames of the programme matter and what is this language of the jury? Previously, I touched upon the mixed languages that result from the unique work environment of the EU institutions. In negative terms, this is also called ‘Europeak,’ an overly bureaucratic and ambiguous semantic with unwarranted use of complicated words. Just like any other language, it creates and transports meaning. Learning it is described as a skill, something hard for both experts and applicants to master. Policy texts speaking of ‘heritage of European significance’ and ‘unity in diversity’ are written within this discourse, and award criteria like EAV can be seen as expressions of will formulated in the same context.

We have already discussed how the experts translate these expressions, but what is their take on the way the applicants do so? When it comes to the
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113 29 EX–04 2013. Translation mine (SE).
115 The term, also called eurojargon was coined by English native speakers to express their dislike of EU intervention. An EU homepage says the following about the topic: ‘People in the EU institutions … are in the bad habit of using words and expressions that they alone understand. We call these words and expressions “eurojargon”’ (URL: http://collection.europarchive.org/dnb/20070702132253/europa.eu/abc/eurojargon/index_sv.htm [accessed 3.1.2014]. Translation mine (SE).
extent to which proposers adapt their goals to the EU goals, the programme aims and the award criteria, experts were in full agreement that this was done to a large degree. This was partly because this is just the ‘way of the world,’ that it is about competition, and partly because the goals in themselves were sensible. The real question is, as a handful of experts commented, whether this adaptation resulted in balanced and consistent project proposals. In relation to this, one problem expressed was that some project consortiums were ‘trimmed to be EU projects.’ By this it was meant that the participating institutions had individual plans that they fitted into an EU cast, but only in the sense that they were ‘designing an umbrella’ to make it look like an EU project.\textsuperscript{116} It was estimated by two experts that up to half of the projects were created in this way, just to fit the call for applications. If true, why did so many projects use this language? Going back to the vagueness and ambiguity concerning EU goals, one expert stated:

> What has not been good is how the criteria direct the content and formation of the projects, making them sometimes arbitrary (…) it is apparent that they need to follow the goals and the criteria very closely in order to secure funding … I would like to see e.g. one really brilliant proposal ignoring or omitting the other criteria, but currently a really good proposal in a single area would not be selected since it is not relevant to the WHOLE programme.\textsuperscript{117}

This also points to a more general consequence of funding programmes directly connected to political policies. It is not exactly ‘applied science,’ but the criteria are strict enough that you have to adapt to them while being vague enough to demand active interpretation. During longer interviews carried out in person, I asked more explicitly about the use of a specific language in relation to these adaptations, and whether they thought applicants really meant what they said when using buzzwords such as ‘common heritage’ and ‘European identity.’ Providing some examples of this from my own experience, I received both laughter and explanations of tactics used during assessment. ‘Sometimes it is just nonsense, but they think that it would give them more points,’ one stated.\textsuperscript{118} ‘I don’t even think they themselves believe what they are writing,’ said another.\textsuperscript{119}

> I mean the applicants, the more clever of them … they know exactly the phrases that we look at and they write a text fitting to these questions that we have to the project. But in the majority of cases I just saw that these are individual local projects that get the spin by clever agencies … a textual spin so that it could be accepted as a European project.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{116} 30 EX–05 2013.
\textsuperscript{117} 35 EX–09 2013. Emphasis original.
\textsuperscript{118} 01 EX–01 2011.
\textsuperscript{119} 29 EX–04 2013. Translation mine (SE).
\textsuperscript{120} 30 EX–05 2013.
Interestingly, as I will discuss later on, this ‘textual spin’ was central to applicants, and both sides can be said to have made accurate observations. There was a way of approaching the evaluation, which entailed experts with various qualifications – under serious time pressure – looking for the ‘right’ information based on the criteria. These were held to be problematic by some experts and quite well functioning by others. Naturally, they had to make sure the application corresponded to the programme, and perhaps some potent phrases were added for good measure. Then, in turn, experts developed strategies to see through these phrases – described to me as ‘detective work’ – searching for weak aspects. Thus, if projects were rejected based on using fabricated umbrellas to make up for an unbalanced cooperation, this means they would probably never find out that this was the issue. Instead they might think they need to get better learn the ‘language of the jury.’ Not all experts found these notions awkward. Some frequently used terms like European identity themselves when discussing the benefits of the programme and EAV.

Overall, it is clear that processes of socialisation and configurations of norms took place inside the panels, while leaving room for personal agency. The assessment of cultural heritage projects had to do with a lot more than the actual features and articulations of the applications, or the EU goals on integration for that matter. Variables such as time pressure and uneven distribution of applications added a dimension to an overall impression of organised chaos. When it comes to EAV, it seems that all experts knew more or less how it should be translated in relation to cultural heritage, yet, due to the vagueness of criteria, interpretations differed and a tension was found between symbolic and more technical understandings. Still, these tensions never disturbed the functioning of the black box. Due to neutralisation processes, cultural heritage became one out of several topics in a mesh of European culture, enveloped in a certain language and assessed by experts with a ‘cultural understanding.’ Combined with the vagueness of criteria, this node functioned similarly to the way the Agency did, in a depoliticising manner.

The go-betweens: Cultural Contact Points and consultants

If applying for EU funding is ‘like playing cricket,’ then you need someone who knows how to play the game. This section explores two types of actors which are more acquainted with the Culture programmes than most, as they work on a daily basis with aspiring applicants. One is unauthorised in the eyes of the Commission, while the other is recruited and sanctioned by the same. They both operate outside or at the margins of the box, depending upon it in different ways. By helping to create successful project proposals they assist in the translation of the wills of the EU (figure 17). Connecting to the previous texts dealing with the Agency and the experts, this section will examine the black box and the interpretation of EAV from this middle space.
The first type of actor is the Cultural Contact Point (CCP). They function as national information points for the programme, responsible for promotional activities, facilitating participation, exchanging information with national cultural institutions, and act as links between different EU programmes. These positions, of acting as ‘gateways to the Culture programme,’ are held by civil servants working for national ministries or by private legal bodies assigned by national governments. It is paid for in part by the Commission. CCPs keep in contact with the Agency culture unit on a regular basis, and attend information days or training events in Brussels.

The second type of actor is the independent consultant. They are hired by applicants in order to construct a successful project. While the use of consultants is common, the Culture 2007–2013, being quite small compared to other EU funding programmes, only has a limited number of consultancies working explicitly toward its applicants. Out of these I have, in the course of my fieldwork, singled out one especially interesting actor. The name of this firm came up in many contexts during my months at the Agency culture unit and they have been used extensively by archaeologists applying to the programme. Few people not paid by the Commission have such a long experience in both the administrative and policy-related aspects, while at the same time participating in multiple projects.

Figure 17. EU superman. Cover illustration by Anna Wiedner in Swedish handbook for EU coordinators. In: Bäckman 1999.

122 On the Commission website it is stated that the CCPs are established in 36 countries, acting as gateways to the EU Culture Programme. They ‘can help you develop your project, prepare your funding application and build international partnerships,’ by providing information and guidance, networking support, info days, workshops, and seminars. Cultural Contact Points, URL: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/tools/ccp_en.php (accessed 9.3.14).
123 According to the external evaluation of CCPs (Culture 2000), it was stated that ‘the overall financial sizes of CCPs range between more than €300.000 in the case of largest CCPs to less than €30,000 in the case of the smallest CCPs’ (ECOTEC 2008a: 4). CCPs receive a global support of approximately 1.600.000 EUR per year (ECORYS 2010).
Points of (dis)connection at the edge of the black box

In an external evaluation of the CCPs published in 2008, it is stated that the tasks given to them were far too broad and not clearly explained by the Commission. According to the report, the performance and effort put into the task of acting CCP varied a lot between offices. For the most part, their work had resulted in pure promotional campaigns. It was also noted that the CCPs’ ‘contractual obligations limit their role to assisting potential Culture project applicants during application times and they lack sufficient and timely information from the Commission and the EACEA on key issues related to the exploitation of projects’ results.’

Therefore, the report stressed diplomatically, there was room for improvement when it came to the communication between the Agency and DG EAC. To nuance this rather dry information I will now involve the voices of the two CCPs that I contacted during my fieldwork, attempting to see what the view of the box is like from the ‘gate-way’ of the Culture programme.

The first point of interest for me was the communication with the Agency culture unit. Based on our conversations it became clear that the Agency was well regarded by the CCPs, but that the actual information sent to them was not considered sufficient. This issue of lacking insight resurfaced in relation to other topics as well. Upon asking about the status of cultural heritage in the programme, I got the answer that such things are hard to see from their point of view, since the more intricate workings of the evaluation process remain hidden to them. There is no openness within the EU system whatsoever, one CCP added. A specific point raised by both CCPs was that they never got to see any of the negative results. Without information about the failed applications, how were they to know about any potential priorities made? If they got the same information that was available to the public, how could they offer specialised advice? While blame was not directed towards the Culture programme management per se, experienced differences in management philosophies made their work more complicated as they could not access neither applications nor ‘evaluation summary reports.’ The detailed functioning of, and discourses developed within the box remained as hidden to them as to anyone else.

Turning to the relationship between CCPs and applicants, some general concerns were noted. One of the CCP Offices I came in contact with stated that they normally offer two meetings with each project that contacts them, one about the programme goals seen in relation to their ideas, and one concerning the application text. Here it was pointed out that they could absolutely not do the job for the applicants. While there were a few projects which kept in contact after a successful application, their work was focussed on the
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124 ECOTEC 2008a: 8.
125 In the interim evaluation of Culture 2007–2013 it was noted that, although not perfect, communication had improved under the programme (ECORYS 2010: 44).
initial stages. The economic framework was said to be the most complicated aspect of the application, and when it came to issues like hiring external firms to do some of the tasks, it was unclear from the Commission side what actually applied. I was told that there was a deep mental image among applicants of complicated EU administrative procedures. It was suggested that, in part, this image depended on personal sentiments toward the EU in general. As a result, the job sometimes involved explaining that it was not their elected government representatives that decided to fund the Culture 2007–2013 in the first place. This is interesting as it means that CCPs, aside from being sources of information, were pushed into the role of representing or defending the EU.

Since the CCPs were recruited to convey or translate the wills of the programme in the context of the member states in order to attract and help applicants, it was important for me to understand their preferred translation of criteria like EAV. When asked about it, one CCP stated that the criteria were explained in the guidelines, although: ‘I usually say… it is just about asking oneself the question: Why are we doing this at a European level?’ EAV was about the benefits that could be gained from looking at things from a larger perspective. Another CCP bypassed the question by referring to the expert-reviewers, frustrated that their practices and backgrounds remained hidden.

When it comes to the applicants adapting the language to fit the application, one CCP answered that there are always certain favourable ways to express one’s ideas in applications, but that in the case of the Culture programme the preferences of the experts remained unknown. The use of jargon was not considered a positive thing in itself, but one CCP expressed curiosity in regards to how experts from different cultures might read texts differently. In regards to buzzwords like European identity, it was stated that:

It depends on what you mean by all of that. I mean, European identity, maybe we create that by meeting each other to discuss, forming some kind of European room, or mental room, which could be a part of identity. I mean, these are really hard questions … but the programme supports the common heritage as well as diversity, it is this duality that always remain.126

The interpretation echo that of a CCP quoted by Monica Sassatelli. In an article on EU cultural policy she recounts the views of a national contact point for Culture 2000 in Italy. The person stated that EAV was about the level of cooperation and that European identity should be seen as an inclusive mental construct.127 Despite having their own understanding of the concepts discussed, the CCPs I met with did not consider themselves as having a

126 Since this section only includes three informants, they will not be individually referenced in the text. The codes are 24 OT–05 2012 and 37 OT–06 2013 for the CCPs and 12 OT–02 2012 for the consultant.
127 Sassatelli 2007: 34–35; see also Chalcraft and Sassatelli 2004.
great influence on the applicants’ translations. This does not mean that their advice had no effect, nor that all CCPs were of the same mind, but their reasoning corresponded with the ‘non-political’ stance taken by the Agency, where the vagueness of EU policy goals led to a broad but practical translation. Europe became a vessel that could be filled with a variety of things.

As it turns out, ‘gateways’ was a rather suitable term to describe the role of the CCPs. They hold a middle position, not being fully inside nor entirely outside of the box, able to look both directly at the applicants and the Commission. This made for a difficult position since the view towards the Commission was hazy. They did not always feel that they had the adequate information or appropriate insight into some aspects of the programme, limited in their communication with applicants and in reporting the success of the programme nationally. Thus, certain angles of the box were opaque even to those paid by the Commission to promote it. The whole thing becomes a bit paradoxical considering that one of the reasons for the Commissions dislike of private consultants was that there already were CCPs active in each participating member state. Seeing as the CCPs recognised applicants’ need of further assistance and the high administrative demands of the programme, they did not themselves see the consultants as a problem, other than in the sense that few can actually afford to hire them.

Unauthorised assistance: the consultants

‘Why are you talking to them?’ a Commission official asked in a reproachful tone after I had just told him that I would interview the owner of a specific consultancy. I explained hurriedly that I just wanted to get the other side of the story. He frowned and said that he did not understand why, that they had nothing to do with the programme and were not interesting. I left with a feeling of having disappointed and upset my informant.128

In the fieldnotes taken during my time at the Agency culture unit I had jotted down several times that consultancies did not seem to be very appreciated by the culture unit staff and that they did not like to see them in the applications, but that they could not really forbid it. The reasons why were manifold, but overall the staff thought that some consultancies were too controlling, that they took financial advantage of the projects and did not do a good enough job in the process. According to two of the project participants I have talked to, the Agency culture unit staff delivered ‘friendly warnings’ about this in personal meetings after the project was accepted. To remedy the situation the rules for subcontracting were changed for all applicants, something the Agency staff felt was necessary although they did not like the idea of ‘punishing’ everyone for the sake of a few projects. Later on, a former culture unit employee conveyed to me that the main problem with involving

128 Fieldnotes, November 19, 2012.
consultants was that some of them were not transparent enough. Although, it was added that the Commission had ‘never liked them anyways.’ Leaving the Agency with a negative impression of the consultancy, I wanted to find out why people employed them, and how come they were able to partake in so many projects when the civil servants clearly found them objectionable.

I am conducting an interview with a consultant when a colleague walks into the room. My informant says: ‘so we were talking about how ‘Culture’ is working, and Elisabeth has been working at the Agency so she knows us *laughter*.’ The colleague makes a funny grimace of being terrified and goes: ‘So she is the enemy! *laughter*.’ My informant, catching on, says: ‘Or a spy! Maybe a spy! *laughter*.’

From the point of view of the consultant, the schism with the Agency was seen as the result of miscommunication or misunderstandings:

As you know they have been changing the rules … developing a very, I would say exclusive position towards consultants and external experts, because they pretend that the culture institutions have to deal with these projects alone with their own expertise, that they should have the capacity to do that.

He added that he was aware that the Agency staff thought of consultants as too controlling, but that this was not true. Instead, he argued, they actually helped meet the programme goals by making sure the project promoted the visibility of the EU as funding source. The image of the Commission as having an unachievable ideal of self-sufficient projects, in terms of both administration and content development, resonates with my own impressions. However, in this case it was also part of the consultant’s justification for his whole line of work. As supported by the accounts of the CCPs and project leaders, to create and implement these projects required staff dedicated to its administration. Consultants would offer to take care of this “boring stuff:”

You deal with the project, the content, with the management … We help you with all the practical, financial, technical issues that take a lot of time and that prevents you also from concentrating on what is the real topic of the project, developing cultural contents and enhancing European cultural cooperation.

Keeping in mind the widespread mental image of heavy bureaucracy, it is easy to understand why this deal sounds appealing to applicants. Additionally, the consultancy I talked to sometimes did not ask for money upfront. Only that they, though continued collaboration, got a percentage of the funds once the project went through. By way of these strategies they became part

129 18 EU–07 2012. Personally however, he did not mind them as long as they secured quality.
130 Fieldnotes, June 25, 2012.
of many projects, and as long as the black box sustained its image, that of an opaque machinery with complex rules, their business did well.

That the bureaucracy and the demands did not match with the realities of the fields they are supporting was also recognised by a number of experts and was something I discussed with colleagues at the Agency. It is a lot of public money after all, one colleague protested when discussing the applicants’ complaints about budget rules, so it should take some effort to get it. They were aware that this made it difficult for smaller organisations to apply. Ironically, the Commission could not make adjustments to allow for such organisations (issuing smaller grants for short term projects), since the administration would then cost the Commission more than the actual grant. The system would trip over its own feet.

According to the consultant, it was not just smaller operators that had trouble. Most of their clients were larger institutions connected to universities or museums. As knowledgeable as a professors may be, they still might not know how to draw up a detailed budget for a three year project. Consequently, if they can afford it, applicants often turn to consultancies. Ultimately, the Commission feeds this market. As one Commission official told me: facilitating these consultancies was an unforeseen by-product.

Yet, this is not only about bureaucracy. As discussed above, the CCPs and the Agency culture unit staff did offer a lot of guidance. There existed multiple documents, tutorials and workshops to assist applicants. What consultancies could do to a much greater extent however, was precisely what the CCPs could not: to do part of the job for them. Of course, the consultants would not independently set up a whole proposal for their clients, but they could get more involved in the writing process and even headhunt for possible partners:

So we are not just doing excel sheets or things like that, we are really into the project and we try to discuss with the people if the project they would like to develop really corresponds to the criteria of the EC.

For them, unlike the help tied to the Commission, this is about applying their expertise in a direct way and with regard to a personal investment. In fact, because of this investment they allegedly said no to some proposers, deciding to only work with potentially successful candidates.

So, what does someone with a background in heritage, who previously worked for the Commission in different capacities, and who has assisted more than 30 projects with cultural heritage partners co-funded by the Culture programmes, have to say about the ‘language of the juries’ and the notion of EAV? The applicants get a ‘textual spin’ by using ‘clever agencies’ said one of the experts quoted in the previous sub-chapter.131 Upon asking
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131 30 EX–05 2013.
the consultant whether they apply a certain kind of language when they write EU applications and reports, and if there is a discrepancy between these texts and how the projects work in real life, he expressed himself in very diplomatic terms. ‘You have to be political a little bit,’ he argued. Since projects go through a lot of organic modifications, the final report has to be written in ‘a practical way;’ not lying, but not saying it has been a catastrophe either. The writing used in the application was said to be more ‘prospective,’ full of promises in order to ‘sell your project to the Commission.’ On the more leading question of the importance of ‘buzzwords’ he answered that:

You have to be precise and at the same time you have to strike the attention of the assessors, using some specific words and putting the right words in the right place.

Two examples were given of projects that had failed the first time around, but subsequently succeeded after the consultants had redrafted their projects according to clear-cut structure, demonstrating how objectives, activities and expected results answer to each other and to the situated logics of the programme. One reason for this need to pin down the right words and set up a rigid structure was that, as the consultant was aware, the assessment procedures tended to change and new trends appeared (such as public outreach, communication and cultural marketing). Another reason was the unpredictability of the outcome. At times a very technical project would pass without problems while a project focused on ‘European heritage’ would not, and vice versa. By this he meant that there are certain patterns to the funding cycles. A strong suspicion they had been harbouring at his firm was that reviewers did not always have knowledge about the topic or field of the project. He also knew about the time pressure of the panels. Thus, while many experts are very much aware of the cleverness of consultants in terms of wording, the consultant also knew some of the dynamics of the panels and approached the task of application writing accordingly.

What we can draw from this is that there is a certain logic of application writing that this consultancy has developed based on their knowledge of the black box, and that this knowledge was converted into a rather successful product. In one sense, it is the same logic that the experts are trying to see through in the evaluation: Are the applicants ‘telling you stories’ or creating an umbrella to try to ‘sell you something as a European project?’\(^{132}\)

So far, nothing has been said about the criteria. As with the experts, the criterion intercultural dialogue was put forth as the most difficult one to address. Along with the other objectives of the programme was described as ‘absolutely not operational.’ EAV was identified as something quite complicated and ‘experimental,’ being about the unique dimension brought about

\(^{132}\) 30 EX–05 2013.
by the cooperation. However, it was added that that this was a very important dimension, because it draws the line for what should be supported by the Commission. The interpretation echoes the texts in the guidelines and the answers of the Commission officials, although both geographical participation and the chosen topic was considered important for EAV.

The applications I have studied in which consultants have been included as partners, have dealt with everything from tracing the idea of a European identity back in time to building networks and sharing data. Asking the about the relevance of notions such as European identity, I got the answer:

What brings together all these institutions is the opportunity to work together, not the European idea, this is very seldom brought into the project – just for communication purposes.

The indication that the ‘European idea’ was more used for communication purposes is interesting and something to keep in mind as we move to chapter five, which deals with the project narratives and their different audiences. As far as EAV is concerned however, it appears to have been viewed quite pragmatically, in terms of cooperation. In relation to this, the European frame was recognised as a limiting factor, but not as a problem. The context is of course ‘politically very precise’ I was told, it is a ‘European programme supporting European cooperation.’

The frustrations of translations
The CCPs recruited by the Commission displayed frustration over having a limited view of the black box. They were both supported and limited by their enabler, happy to help applicants and promote the programme but unable to provide any ‘inside’ information. What caused this situation was, according to one CCP, the taciturn bureaucratic culture of the Commission. The consultant on the other hand, the Commissions’ unwanted child, was sustained by this bureaucracy and by the opportunities the programmes presented. He also experienced the programme as a black box from certain angles, such as the expert panels, although for them it was advantageous that not everyone could easily understand the process. Operating on the edge of the box, the consultancy had spent years working with its output, interacting with its different nodes and networking with their customer base of professionals in cultural heritage. They had figured out the system and the ‘logic’ of application writing. Although discredited and disliked by the Commission (whether due to the quality of their work or that they wielded too much power), consultants became privileged actors in this network, while the CCPs were disadvantaged due to regulations. Ultimately, whether these actors performed their tasks well or not, they both aided cultural heritage professionals in in the application process, thereby feeding the box with tailor made input. As such, they are important circuits in the machine.
This brings us to the last point, of the role of the CCPs and the consultants in the translations of EU wills, especially EAV. If they are selling the project to the Commission, what are they actually selling? As it turns out, both actors were very open in their interpretations of the award criteria. The main difference was that the CCPs could only provide hints and more general advice while the consultants actually co-wrote the applications. They used a customised logic of writing, adapted to what they knew (or guessed), about the dynamics of the expert panels. The consultants’ effect as translators were therefore stronger than the CCPs. They co-created the projects with the applicants and in so doing they helped to construct the meaning of EAV.

Consultants also had the most to gain from the success of the project, and they were therefore more likely to fundamentally adapt the applications according to the programme and to insert, as stated earlier, the right words in the right place. At that point the pressure lies in the precision of the task, of getting an application through rather than building allegiances and stable content. Having employed or partnered up with someone who is an expert on rules and format, a layer is added between the applicant and the EU, obscuring the political nature of the programme. Even if academics and cultural heritage operators are well aware of the political nature of certain institutions, employing middle hands may still work to depoliticise the funding context, making recruits unable or unwilling to see the forest for all the trees.

From application to implementation: the projects

In the sequence of translations covered in this chapter we have now reached the role of applicants and their proposals. In the network which comprises the black box of the Culture programme they represent both the first and the last cogwheel in the machinery. Without applicants there can be no programme, and without their projects there is nothing to show for when it comes to building new programmes. As remarked upon by experts and observed during fieldwork, because of this system the Commission sometimes pushed through projects with a low score in order to spend all the available funds. Otherwise they could not get the same amount or more in the next budget. In this sense, just as with most political funding tools, applicants are desperately needed not only to ensure a good outcome and influence on the fields it support, but also to legitimise involvement in the sphere and uphold the positions and interests of the persons in charge. As stated by Gerald Britain, in the end ‘the most basic goal of any bureaucrat or bureaucracy is not rational efficiency, but individual and organizational survival.’

The input of archaeologists and heritage professionals was vital, and even if they decided their own topics and activities, they became part of the political econ-
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omy of culture in the EU through their participation. So how did project leaders and participants look at the ‘strings attached’ and criteria like EAV?

**The black box: situated perspectives**

While I did not ask any direct questions about the functioning of the programme itself (as a black box or otherwise), the manner in which project participants described their own experiences, the process of applying and their views on other EU projects who achieved funding, was revealing. Two connected things stood out as particularly important.

Firstly, supported by the accounts of CCPs and consultants, it was clear that creating a project and applying for EU co-funding took a great deal of time and effort. EU funding programmes are too much work for too little outcome, one person explained. Bureaucracy was stated as one reason for this, some saying that the application process and running of a Culture programme project had become more complicated over time, more fixed on ticking boxes and estimating numbers. A person whose project had applied twice and received funding the second time assigned the role of policing to the experts, saying that they had liked the content in the first one but that they needed more ‘sustainability,’ leading them to ‘really follow the rules’ the second time around. Uneasiness about the composition and reliability of the expert panels and their judgements, was also visible among successful project participants. After having been to Brussels and meeting with other project leaders, when learning of the variety of different topics, one project leader reflected:

> I am pretty sure that they don’t have a reviewing board which is specialised for every one of these topics so I guess the same reviewer has to review an archaeological project and a theatre project and that makes it … kind of wobbly in a way.

This insecurity leads us to the second issue that came up in interviews; a fair deal of critique was directed towards other projects that had achieved funding from successful and unsuccessful applicants alike. Interestingly, the critique echoed the concern expressed by some of the experts about the European umbrella created by proposers who, in reality, were just a bunch of big institutions joining up under a common flag to do their own things. Former applicants talked about how new projects were not “European enough” in their outlook, how they were not actually cooperating the way the programme meant them to. Although the promotion of one’s own project is
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inevitable when discussing it with a person doing research on EU funded projects, there were stories offered that seemed to confirm this view, like in this description of how one archaeological project came together:

He called some of his buddies … and we got together and off it went. We put together a good application but it was a very mixed bag, it was everybody’s hobbies and then sort of mixed and distilled a little bit and there … So we could do more or less what we wanted to do and it has worked out very well, a lot of publications and research has been done that is useful but I couldn’t believe that it got funded so easily!137

In relation to such practices, another project leader argued that for some projects, ‘if you really looked at the content then you would see that this is not really a European project, this is just a one-university project with some added satellites to give you the credibility for a EU proposal … really it is just triggering a new industry of faking sides.’138 The projects produced by this system were accused of copy-pasting their initial objectives into the final report, smoothing over any inconsistencies. The tendency of EU funding programmes to privilege larger institutions – through maintaining complicated rules and bureaucratic procedures – played into this critique. An unsuccessful applicant stated that this was what made programmes like Culture 2007–2013 ‘too political,’ that they mostly supported projects built on large and influential institutions. Although these topics of conversation were tinged with some bitterness, when it came down to who was to blame for the sometimes unfair process or haphazard output of the box, criticism was mainly directed towards the box itself, not fellow applicants:

It is points! Points you get through indexes and it is all extremely formal it is not really about content, it is about following rules … [the] rational for that is fighting corruption … [but] Increasing bureaucracy does not fight corruption it just excludes those who are not good at being corrupt.139

Upon asking who might be good at being corrupt he answered that, rather than worrying about the use of consultants, it is organisations which can afford their own EU experts or know the system that really ‘can rip off the EU.’ In fact, among the project leaders and participants I have been in contact with, over half used some type of consultancy when creating their proposals or included them as partners in their projects. Even project leaders who had not done so in previous projects, claimed that nowadays you had to because of the complicated bureaucracy. In a project where a consultancy firm was a partner, a participant said that compared to applying for ERC funding, the Culture programme was not so hard, especially ‘if you make
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sure you have a slick character like [a consultant] around.’ Others stated that without consultants they would be lost. Someone involved had to know ‘the pitfalls of European regulations,’ even if they were aware that ‘the EU Agency is not very happy with these companies.’

The project leaders’ awareness is interesting in light of the schism mapped out in the previous section between consultants and the Agency culture unit. Apparently, in two of the projects I contacted, the persons in charge had been warned about using consultancies and efforts had been made during visits from the Culture unit staff to try and dissuade them from doing so. Ironically, one of the reasons why the consultants were considered so valuable to have around – aside from navigating the heavy bureaucracy – was because they were better at answering questions and solving problems than the assigned officer at the Agency culture unit. The rotation of personnel at the Agency fuelled this complaint, as three of the project leaders I talked to described how their contact persons as the Agency had changed twice or more during their implementation period.

Taken together, the attitudes and experiences connected to EU funding in general and the Culture programmes in particular reveal a sense of frustration with EU bureaucracy and a mistrust towards the projects generated by it, rather than a denouncement of other applicants. As the source of the problem is triangulated back to the Commission, the circle is closed. The alliances formed to resist controversies – like stricter budget rules and heavily standardised application procedures – worked in the opposite way, creating a need for specialised support or to encourage sophisticated pretenders. The Commission shot itself in the foot, working against rather than toward the goal of supporting self-sufficient projects with a “true” European outlook.

Then again, in a larger perspective, this too works in the Commission’s favour. The applicants’ stereotypical critique of the EU as an ‘evil bureaucracy’ works to sustain the black box. As argued by Herzfeld, the ‘symbolic roots of Western bureaucracy are not to be sought, in the first instance, in the official forms of bureaucracy itself … they subsist above all in popular reactions to bureaucracy.’ The ability to draw on a ‘predictable image of malfunction’ or impenetrability is key to institutions like the EU and applicants alike. Comic dread is expected when speaking of bureaucracy and they provide people with a means of coping with disappointment, a socially acceptable way of explaining failure. As a result, the culture of complaining about bureaucracy actually removes such systems from real critical inspec-
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tion; in other words, ‘I surrender to bureaucracy, who knows why the proposal failed.’

**Translating European added value: application poetry**

When it comes to content, some project leaders expressed disappointedly that the Commission did not care about the content of the projects. This presents an interesting paradox when examining the application texts. While some project leaders (putting their own projects in front of more “flawed” ones) presented themselves as stewards and promoters of “real” European cooperation, the rules of the Commission was said to not always favour such projects. Although they were recruited of their own accord to translate the wills of the Commission, some found that what the Commission wanted in terms of content and what they actually assessed and promoted were different things. At the same time, everyone agreed that content, as far as the words and formulations used in the application goes, was paramount. What you write and how you write it was important, but it did not necessarily need to have anything to do with reality. While this latter claim will be questioned in chapter five, it is worth taking a closer look at what applicants had to say about the art of application writing and the meaning of criteria like EAV.

*Today I had my first interview with a project leader. I was unsure about how my research topic and questions would be received. After all my topic has already raised some eyebrows among my colleagues at home. But I had nothing to worry about. He was really forthcoming and the most interesting thing was a concept he used. When I asked if there is a certain language you have to use for EU applications, he answered with a conspiratorial smirk that ‘Yes, ‘application poetry’ we call it.’*

Poetry, Eurospeak, buzzwords: during my interviews many phrases were used to describe the tactics involved in EU application writing. Out of all of them, the phrase suggested by the project leader above, *application poetry*, stuck with me. After posing the same or similar questions to other interviewees I realised that the topic resonated instantly among people working with EU support, as well as with experts and civil servants. It triggered tales of frustration and cunning, of failure and victory. One project leader stated:

*Yes! *laughter* It is an art … one of the main things you have to know is how to spread the right buzzwords in your application … which is hip and not.*

It was stated that a degree of adaptation was always necessary with the EU, that ‘of course the content has to be tempered …to make sure that your application fits well into the main strategies and targets … you just give it dif-
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ferent labels so that the labels fit.'147 This knowledge of how to write an application, especially in the context of the Culture programme, was considered as a type of skill that you have to acquire. If you do not have the skill you have to include someone who does, such as a consultant or someone who ‘knows their way around Brussels.’148 A project leader who had not been in charge of writing the application text agreed that there was indeed a certain language, but that:

I don’t know it *laughter*… But he [the person in charge of the text], knows how to put words so that they fit the idea of the European Commission, what they actually expect … I am too straight forward.149

Although buzzwords change over time (‘sustainability’ and ‘creative industries’ have been popular lately), the criteria of the programme have remained more or less the same. When I pointed out this longevity of EAV in a conversation with a former project leader, he objected:

Yes but then you get five lines in the application form where you explain what the added value is for Europe and what is the European content of it … it is more or less camouflage … don’t do anything inventive because then we have to think about it, just tick the box *laughter*.150

He connected EAV to a European content, but also recognised that the criterion was there due to the lack of a solid policy framework for EU cultural actions, only being able to deal with culture in a way so as not to interfere with the policies of national governments (subsidiarity). In other words, the EAV has to be there and it is of great importance, but it is mostly for show as far as the application goes. Some project leaders offered less cynical reflections:

That is one of the things, how do you define EAV? … I can see that they are very keen on the outreach of those projects which I really feel is important. I mean we are getting taxpayers’ money and I feel that we need to give the taxpayers something back for their money. So it shouldn’t be something that we are doing in our ivory tower of archaeology but it should be of interest for the general public as well.151

While the first person considered the EAV to be connected to the European content and to the Commission rules, claiming at the same time that this content was uninteresting to the Commission, the second connected it to
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outreach and a type of tax-return. Overall it can be said that the interview material reflects the ambiguity and variety of the experts’ responses and those of Commission employees. Taken together with the phrases rehearsed in the application texts, one might ask: what then did the project leaders consider to be European about their projects? Was the political frame or the idea of Europe discussed?

The idea of Europe

Contained within the ‘European’ part of EAV, a similar tension to that discussed in the section about experts emerged, the tension between symbolic ideas of Europe and more technical understandings. According to one project leader, the meaning of Europe in this context depended on which way you looked at it. When it came to the administrative or financial aspects, it was the political borders of the EU that were in focus, but when it came to the project content he stated: ‘…it is more the European idea that I have in mind, the idea of a Europe without borders but still having its own local or regional cultural diversities.’ As archaeologists, he continued, ‘we of course know that there were no borders until well, historical times,’ although he reasoned that it was precisely because of this lack of modern borders that it could be connected to the European idea in the present. There are differences in language and traditions, he added, but ‘we still are all Europeans.’ However, he was not positive toward the idea of ‘Fortress Europe’ and pointed out that we need to stay connected to the rest of the world, that the Europeanness of the project was also based on ‘exchange of ideas, knowledge, expertise, and contacts.’ The project – which focused to a great extent on methodological development – looked to the future and had a pragmatic stance on Europeanness, but the EU premise of ‘unity in diversity’ played a key part.

During some of the interviews I was able to draw on texts that the projects had themselves produced. In two cases, the topic of Europe was approached by asking what they meant by specific phrases they had written, such as: ‘telling the European story.’ In this context it was explained that people on the local level are generally not interested in the regional or European level, but that this can change if they see that European money is invested in their region, if Europe is made part of their surroundings:

How we related to people in all these different European countries and different European regions was actually through story-telling … they do not have an abstract view of Europe, but if you can draw them into the stories … then they understand very easily that it all relates.
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During our talk it became clear that, application poetry aside, the goal of the project was partly to bring European citizens closer to each other by promoting the idea of a diverse but shared past. Another person, in charge of the content of a different project, also explicitly referred to ‘the European story’ as a way to connect the past and the present. This time, a line was drawn from the historical period up until the EU.\textsuperscript{155} As it turns out, this take on the idea of Europe caused some discussion among the partners. Having talked to several participants, it became evident that the Central or Eastern European partners had a different view than those in Western countries and that this had played into decisions about the content:

Some partners were involved from the beginning and they are much more into this ‘EU identity’ … I don’t remember the year we came into the EU but for example Croatia just entered Europe this year … also in the [historic time period] we were on the borders … we had to explain also this in our project.\textsuperscript{156}

Nevertheless, the conflict was valued as a good experience because it forced them to rethink the topic. As a solution, one participant said they had decided to use the EU slogan ‘unity in diversity,’ so that every site could choose to develop a theme based on one out of the two. ‘We have diversity,’ he stated.\textsuperscript{157} By building a connection between the past and present in which modern day Europe and the EU play a role, these two story telling projects clearly connect to the more symbolic understandings of Europe.

The difficulty of coming together in a shared approach towards Europe in the present and the past, was also addressed by another project leader. Referring to a \textit{Culture 2000} project that had dealt with three archaeological sites, he said:

To be honest … It was very, very difficult to get the scientific connection between these three sites from the overall European perspective … breaking it down to the general public, this was simply, well I mean it was more or less at the same period and one could compare how things were done in various parts of Europe at a certain time.\textsuperscript{158}

What can be concluded from this discussion is that, although many stated that the Commission cared little about content and that the application text was full of poetry, it did not mean that there was no such ‘European content’ or that EU ideas of a common heritage did not have an effect. Thus, going back to the comment made by the expert about the applicants not believing that which they themselves are writing, it is true that they wrote in a specific way to increase their chances of funding, but a European perspective was
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still there. Whether this was something inspired by the programme goals or pre-set ideas about Europe is another question. I would say somewhere in-between.

*On ethics*

One of my first thoughts upon reading project descriptions of some Culture programme projects was: ‘surely they cannot mean this?’ Aims such as creating a European identity via access to rock art sites made me wonder about the moments of compliance and resistance involved in the project development. As demonstrated, there are many ways to look at the funding context. Some saw buzzwords or criteria like EAV as boxes to be ticked off, a formality at best, while others viewed them as food for thought. From the discussion of what was European in their projects it became clear that, when scraping the surface, everyone had a lot to say about the idea of Europe. With this in mind, returning to the question of the political context of the programme, what did project leaders have to say about ethics?

Sitting on a hotel patio in 2013, a project participant had just explained to me with pride in his voice that they had simply taken the EU objectives listed in the policy texts and fashioned their project in their image. I blurted out somewhat clumsily: ‘So if you took the goals of the programme as your starting point, did you discuss any ethical aspects about that?’ He responded:

> When you participate in a programme like that you know that’s the underlying purpose. We did not discuss that. We discussed only how we could come up with a proposal that would give us maximum chance of getting money, so it was very practical.\(^\text{159}\)

It was also added that from the archaeological side they rarely met with any critique framed in those terms: ‘It is not often that you meet people who concentrate of the problematical side of things’ and ‘anyway the nature of heritage is political, there is no way around it, so better have it out in the open as the EU usually does.’ This awareness was reflected in the replies of other informants. When it comes to the connection between telling the European story and *Culture 2007–2013*, one project leader reflected:

> What is the real aim? The real aim is, why they give money for heritage is, because they want that Europe comes closer to the public by using the past … If you don’t do that work you cannot be paid. It is a little bit like in the 19th century when they used also the past to – perhaps also in Sweden – to make the idea of real nations … it is really the same thing as in the 19th century but now the level is bigger, there is more control on the results, that Europe becomes not a dictatorship or Nazi continent.\(^\text{160}\)
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Not surprisingly, the persons I talked to were well aware of these aspects, and the general line of reasoning was that heritage is always political and at least the EU is a ‘good cause.’ One person who had considered this in both past and current EU projects took the argument further. During a long argumentative conversation in para-ethnographic style, about how ideas of European identity might work to exclude certain groups in society, the project leader objected resolutely:

You only can be inclusive if you have a very strong identity! … the scientist simply has to say where he stands. If they know where you stand then they can evaluate what you say. It is like with the newspapers … people need to know what is my political point of view … If we know that archaeology can be misused … then we have to very carefully think about that … so if I write about Europe as an archaeologist or about European identity then I always say that I am a believing European … if I am anti-European I should say it as well.161

Stating your premises and point of view aligns with most ethical guidelines in the humanities and hard sciences, but can our writings really be compared with those of journalists? And, just because the whole idea of heritage is inherently political, should we just choose the “better” side and get on with it? In some ways these views resonate with Christopher Tilley’s longstanding call for ‘Archaeology as socio-political action in the present’ (1989b). Crushing the myth of value-free research, he talks about the need to recognise knowledge as practical and strategically relevant, and to understand material culture in relation to power and ideology in the past and present. However, the question remains as to whom, how and to what extent such action should be carried out. Drawing on Marx, he states that ‘archaeology has so far only interpreted the past; they should undertake to change it in service of the present,’ and that the past ‘is not in any sense fixed… it is to be strategically reconstructed in relation to contemporary social and historical conditions, to be actively reinterpreted and re-inscribed within the present social order.’162

While pleas such as Tilley’s and that of the informant generally rest on emancipatory platforms, the question is whether the translation of EU wills in projects dealing with the past – in the service of both the archaeological discipline and a united Europe – can afford to be as disruptive towards the idea of Europe as the material and the inclusive standpoint call for. Everyone has their own leanings, but to what extent should these be embraced and to what extent should they be confronted? There is no easy answer to this, but the political nature of heritage should never be an excuse not to challenge boundaries, including the European one.
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Summary and conclusions

In this chapter I have examined the different components which form programme Culture 2007–2013, focusing on aspects associated with the support of projects in cultural heritage and archaeology. The metaphor of the *black box*, a system that requires input and produces outputs but obscures (intentionally or not) what goes on in-between, has been used as a framework for these discussions. Added to this, the concept *translating wills* and the recruitment of actors to perform these translations, have been used to articulate what happens from the time participants read the call for proposals to the time the funding decision is sent out. In particular, this chapter has focused on the translations of EU wills as embodied in the award criterion EAV, understood as an operational delineator for EU involvement in the field of culture and as an expression of *what the EU wants citizens to want*.

The different components, dealing in turn with the Agency, the expert reviewers, the consultants and CCPs, and the applicants, have therefore been approached as interconnected nodes in a relational network of influence. Through their various interactions – inputs, outputs and feedback – these nodes work (for the most part) to uphold and enable each other, or ‘to resist

*Figure 18. Interconnected nodes in the network sustaining the black box.*
controversies,’ but they can also destabilise one another and cause dispute. Ultimately it comes down to how information modifies and is modified by persons, papers and machines along the way.

Starting with the first cogwheel (figure 18), I argued that from the perspective of the applicants, the EU bureaucracy – including the application process, the budgetary rules, reporting activities and communication with the Agency culture unit – was experienced as something difficult to manoeuvre and not very transparent. They were investing in and becoming dependent on the function of the box through their participation, but felt that the work effort did not make up for the outcome. Large institutions were seen as favoured by the system, and the focus on numbers and points was seen as having a corrupting effect. Because of this, many had decided to employ consultants who specialised in the regulations and goals of this specific programme, a strategy to make the box more manageable and increase the probability of success.

The consultant I spoke with had a better view of the box. While being uncertain as to the more detailed functioning of the expert panel, the experience gained by studying the input and output of the box, as well as being a part of many Culture programme projects, made consultants into one of the most influential circuits in the machinery. It was advantageous for them that not everyone could easily understand the process. As a result of the denseness of the box consultants recruited new actors and interpreted the wills of the Commission in their tailor-made input, enabling cultural heritage professionals to apply for co-funding. This turned them into a bit of a problem for the Commission, who sometimes saw them as ‘cheating the system.’ They were a consequence the programme designers had not foreseen.

In the second cogwheel we find those actually authorised to inform about and promote the programme in the member states, the Cultural Contact Points. Their view was blurred due to the secrecy of the Commission, who only gave them access to official information. Again, the expert panels were brought up as one of the least transparent nodes. This created some frustration, as well as a certain measure of understanding for why applicants who could afford it choose to use consultants. Among the positions occupied between the applicants and the Commission, I found that the CCPs were more disadvantaged than other actors, limited due to their ties to the Commission, its lack of transparency and the ideal of self-sustaining projects. The irony of this situation was that a lack of transparency was precisely the reason for the Commission’s dislike of consultants. They unintentionally sustained the consultancies. Meanwhile, the black box stayed black.

The experts participating in the review panels, one of the circuits most hidden from the outside, actually had a good view of the part of the box that they were involved in. They had seen hundreds of proposals and assessed them based on the wills of the programme. Outside of that however, when it came to the everyday operation of the Agency culture unit or the implemen-
tation of the projects, their view was blocked. Frustration was caused by the fact that all money had to be handed out each year even though the projects received low scores, and by the strict format of the award criteria. This created peculiar projects trying to fit everything into their proposals, twisting their texts to match the programme. At the same time the criteria were considered quite vague, something related to the way the EU operates by setting frames and introducing notions rather than deciding content. Although a lot of things went into the judgement of an application, the panels seemed to be working to uphold the box without much friction. Their output was sometimes scrutinised and opposed from the applicant side, occasionally putting the whole functioning of the box under the spotlight, but these protests were quickly dealt with by the Agency.

Finally, in the third cogwheel we find the Agency culture unit, whose staff you would think had a good overall view of all the circuits that made up the box. In one sense they did, being the node in charge of the administration, forming the guidelines, giving advice to experts, applicants and project leaders, but they were also just a node in a much larger box. The codependent relationship between the culture unit at the Agency and its supervising parent unit in the Commission, was defined through the separation of strategic and policy related task, versus technical and administrative tasks. In reality, the status of the Agency unit as non-political can be seen as one of the strongest alliances to resist controversy inside of the box.

The first consequence of the division was that without an official voice, the agency of the Agency sometimes passed by unnoticed. The shades of grey in which they operated enabled them to develop intricate strategies in regards to the appointment of experts and attribution of projects. Secondly, as the Agency was meant to insulate the funding action from changing political contexts and short-termism, it worked to depoliticise the programme. In the very place where policies had direct impact on the outside, the Commission took their hands off.

The Agency culture unit was the place where applications were transformed into ‘successful’ or ‘unsuccessful’ applications. Here, the most significant translations were those connected to guidance and form. The staff had to translate and explain the rather vague aims of the programme, which were originally decided by another node, and present them to the experts and applicants in printed guidelines. As evident from the discussion about the black box, these translations were not entirely successful in terms of clarity. Yet a common approach was established, strong enough to be able to showcase projects who had formulated them in a ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ way.

The understanding of EAV proved hard to estimate as the staff, when asked, said that this was the domain of the experts. However, based on my own experience it was a rather technical understanding focused on geographical spread and level of exchange rather than any symbolic aspects. The topic of cultural heritage was treated as any other topic and was, if anything, con-
sidered to be quite boring. Another important way in which the Agency culture unit affected the translations in the other nodes was through setting the timeframe of expert evaluations, or the frames of the application form, where big ideas had to fit into small boxes in digital documents, encouraging or even demanding the use of standardised phrases and buzzwords.

Moving back to the middle cogwheel, it was clear that the translations in the expert panels were of great influence in this network. First through individual assessments and later through a subsequent joint consensus meeting with another expert who had read the same projects, hundreds of pages of information were turned into points and a final numerical score was calculated. The conditions for and products of these translations were both the common configuration of norms inside the panels and also a great measure of personal agency. These conditions were dependent upon dominant personalities, fields of interest, nationality and background or pure individual preference. Other important variables were time pressure and the sometimes uneven distribution of applications in relation to the expertise of the reviewers.

The dynamics of the expert panels were intricate, and power plays and hidden strategies of bargaining over points were part of it. On the whole, everyone was concerned about endorsing the best quality projects and had a clear idea about what those projects should look like. Of particular interest were the differences in the interpretation of EAV in relation to the topic of cultural heritage. Although all experts “knew” what EAV should entail in relation to heritage, and many expressed that this is something all experts know, a tension was found between symbolic and more technical interpretations. Every expert agreed the EAV had to be a mix of several things, but some meant that in relation to heritage it should be considered more in terms of history, culture or religious aspects, while others insisted that it had more to do with the depth and geographical spread of cooperation.

Another discovery in relation to the award criteria, was that experts found them at the same time too vague and too controlling. Application poetry and buzzwords were said to be frequent and everyone agreed that you had to adapt the application to the programme goals quite extensively to achieve funding. The real issue, from the expert point of view, was whether the applicants actually meant what they wrote or if it was just a superficial front established in order to apply. Ironically, the experts had therefore developed ‘detective strategies’ to see through the phrases originally encouraged through the policy base, the call for proposals and the award criteria. In other words, please feed the box with input, deal with the administrative demands and adapt your application to our wills, but be sure to mean it!

Moving on to the CCPs, the authorised translators of the will of the Culture programme, they recognised the existence of something like application poetry in the sense that there are always certain expressions used in project applications. The consultants, on the other hand, had well developed strategies and displayed a great confidence with regard to the translations they
assisted in. Like the CCPs, they were very open in their interpretations of the award criteria. The main difference between the consultant and the CCPs was that the CCPs could only provide hints and more general advice, while the consultant had a lot to gain (or lose) based on the success of the application. The latter often co-wrote the applications using a customised logic that was adapted to what they thought the experts wanted to read. Thus, in transforming project ideas to fit the framework of the programme, the effect of consultants as translators was much stronger than CCPs. As a by-product of this process, they also helped construct the idea of EAV for cultural heritage. Although the content of EAV was thought to vary between projects, the applicants’ way of redistributing the task of translation, worked to depoliticise the strings attached to the funding source.

When it came to the applicants themselves it was clear that words and formulations, named as ‘application poetry’ by one project leader, were considered important in order to get high scores. What you wrote and how you wrote it mattered, but mostly it came down to pretty words. Nevertheless, the aims of the programme did seem to have had an effect on the way the project leaders talked about their projects. There was definitely an awareness and a level of reflexivity regarding the funding context, but when asked to describe the Europeanness of their projects, the EU motto of ‘unity in diversity’ and the notion of a borderless Europe – in the past and the future – were offered. So too was a certain ‘European potential’ in archaeological sites, something that could be highlighted through storytelling or be embodied in the consortiums. Interestingly, there was also disappointment in the lack of interest in the proposed European content from the Commission side.

In terms of the nature of this content and the translation of EAV in regards to heritage, two directions were visible among experts. One emphasised the European symbolism of the project topics, while another focused on exchange patterns and mere practicalities. This division also surfaced among applicants who, in feeding ‘the box’ with input, were more concerned about EU aims of cultural integration than the funding source itself seemed to be. The applicants were advantaged actors in the sense that they received financial backing, but disadvantaged in the sense that their output and feedback did not seem to matter.

Taken together I have shown how the box and the translations take different shapes in terms of influence and transparency, depending on from which node in the network you are viewing it. As Susan Leigh Star has argued in a critique of Latour, the very understanding of how a particular network functions (and what meaning an actor is taken to transmit) depends upon the situated perspectives of advantaged and disadvantaged actors.\textsuperscript{163} It comes down to position; of who makes decisions, who bears the cost, who can take part and who gets to watch. Although the Commission decides the general

\textsuperscript{163} Star 2001.
framework and bears the cost (in reality the taxpayers do), the Agency culture unit and the experts wield the power of selecting where the money goes. They do this based on the basic premises set up by the former but as translated though their various conditionality’s and strategies to avoid controversy. Who can participate is defined based on the outcomes of this soup of personal and collective influences on the process. The consultants are not supposed to take part but still manage to transform their location from that of disadvantaged actors to more privileged ones, using the needs produced by Culture 2007–2013 modus operandi: the black box. The applicants are those who get to watch at first, but who, once accepted, become one of the most pragmatic translators of EU wills through their activities, reports and use of EU logotypes.

One could be fooled by this into thinking that the whole system is chaotic and that it is all up to chance, but there is an influential framework in place. The case has been made in this chapter, that the box is more of an ‘arena of interest struggles’ than a corporate actor with a well-defined aim. Still, that something is vague does not mean that it has no influence or direction. As pointed out by Annabel Black, many civil servants are trained to express themselves in a clear language ‘except where ambiguity is of the very essence.’ It can be argued that the EU strategy of ‘open coordination’ and ‘soft law’ extends to soft goals, soft instructions for applicants and soft guidance of experts. Ambiguity is of the very essence when you want recruited actors to start thinking through concepts like EAV. As expressed by two media scholars:

While actors instrumentally frame situations so as to press their case, their very understanding of what is instrumental is shaped by taken for granted frames … frames are both strategic and set the terms of strategic action.

This is why cultural policies can be effective technologies in shaping the relationship between individual and society. As argued by Shore and Wright, such ‘policies not only impose conditions, as if from “outside” or “above,” but influence people’s indigenous norms of conduct so that they themselves contribute, not necessarily consciously, to a government’s model of social order.’ The question is whether this should be seen as an obstacle

\[164\] In line with Braun 1998: 811.
\[165\] Black 2001: 260.
\[166\] The open method of coordination (OMC) is a framework for cooperation between the member states to direct national policies towards certain common objectives. OMC involves so-called ‘soft law’ measures which are binding on the member states in varying degrees but are never forced (Borras and Jacobssen 2004).
\[167\] Polletta and Ho 2006: 190.
or a productive force. More clearly defined criteria and articulations of value would most likely work to decrease variety and rinse out potential subversive elements. In terms of heritage and archaeology, the inclusion of anything and everything under the banner of the Culture programmes has, as I will touch upon in the chapters to follow, led to the funding of many archaeological projects with non-mainstream topics. Thus, as King contended in the 1980s critical debate about the US assessment guidelines for archaeological sites, authorised notions of value such as EAV, may prove useful ‘at the nitty-gritty level of dealing with agencies that seek every excuse to avoid having to identify and think about historic properties.’

Besides, so what if thinking through concepts like EAV and adapting proposals to the goals of the programme fosters European approaches? There is nothing strange about, for instance, ancient Greece being connected to EAV. Especially not by archaeologists and heritage professionals working for institutions, and within disciplines, which have themselves relied on the value of such narratives for society in order to justify their expert mandate. Likewise, increased cooperation across borders is not a negative thing per se, and when it comes to integration there is nothing to suggest that a European identity would somehow be incompatible with national, regional or local ones. As argued by Thomas Risse, it could be seen as but one layer in the ‘cake’ of individual and common identities.

While this is all true, what is lacking is a continuous discussion about the filling of this cake and an active engagement with the legacies and specificity of archaeology in the construction of a common EUrpean heritage. Participants and project leaders, although aware of the political wills of the programme, often did not see it as worth dwelling on. Although much was left undefined in the Culture programmes, it did define that cultural heritage is a ‘vehicle of cultural identity.’ It was included for a reason and it belongs within the domain of culture, as it is in itself a cultural practise, but theatre plays and stories about ‘Europeans’ in prehistory have different consequences. The act of involving tropes on European origins in the translation of EU political visions of creating a ‘European cultural area,’ ties cultural heritage to discourses of belonging that are rooted in territory and ethnicity. Thereby the figure of archaeology is reaffirmed. As long as the box feeds expert economies and project participants continue to polish their application poetry, the critical discussion about EUrope in archaeology needs to continue, and the aspects discussed in this chapter ought to be recognised as components of its political ecology.

173 For the figure of archaeology, see chapter three.
Chapter 5. European Pasts and Presents in Project Narratives

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 … This 5 year project starts from a historical case study: the Realm of Francia Media … The motivation for this choice is that the countries that belonged to the Middle Carolingian realm also stood at the cradle of the European Union in the middle of the previous century. The project intends … to highlight the importance of Europe’s geo-cultural past in the functioning of contemporary European society. It also aims at linking the processes of identity creation, the sense of belonging and the intercultural dialogue to the valorisation and understanding of the remains of our past…¹

The excerpt above presents a plot. The Realm of Francia Media sets the stage upon which the lead character – the ‘phenomenon Europe’ – is to be born, connecting this significant life-event to the much later one of becoming the EU. It is also claimed that heritage can justify Europe as a geo-cultural entity. How can it be, I thought when reading this project description during my time in Brussels, that such a prospective narrative can still be presented in a discipline which supposedly lost its innocence in the 1970s? What would happen if we exchanged the word Europe for Asia or Africa? Or for any given nation state? Simplification aside, it seemed to me that archaeologists exclaiming ‘Europe!’ got away with it where others, in other political settings, certainly would not. After decades of postcolonial critique and confrontations with methodological nationalism, such attempts to mobilise a distant past for the political needs of the present struck me as provocatively outdated and extremely interesting. They raised questions about what conditions had made such formulations possible, what intent lay behind them, and what kind of narratives the projects produced for other audiences.

Up to this point, this thesis has been concerned with the first of these, the conditions. Chapter two sought to showcase the part played by Europe in influential archaeological narratives, chapter three set out to locate archaeology within the political economy of culture in the EU, and chapter four ex-

¹ Project description, Cradles of European Culture (CEC) 2010–2015 (ID: 93).
examined the processes of translation occurring within the EU Culture programmes. Based on these analyses, I argued that application poetry is more than just cosmetics, a claim that will now be put to the test as I turn to the projects themselves. Using concrete examples from archaeological projects that have benefited from co-funding under Raphael, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013, I will consider to what extent and in what ways this particular funding source and its goals are used, negotiated or debated in project outputs. Therefore, this chapter begins with the project descriptions published on EU dissemination platforms. These are used to discuss common themes based on the archaeological periods and phenomena studied in the projects, and for each identified theme a number of projects have been chosen for a closer study.

On narratives and archaeology

At the end of the day, most of professional archaeology is not in the education but in the story-telling business.²

In archaeology, just as in other disciplines, texts are written within certain discursive and administrative environments, which may favour some ideas and forms over others. In the search for EU-funding, benefactors and beneficiaries become part of each other’s storylines. These storylines are the object of this chapter. Here, the analysis focuses on specific aspects of texts and visual presentations. In order to do so, I have used an intertextual discourse approach combined with narrative analysis. This means that I have considered narrative structures as strategies to create a sense of continuity, coherency, and meaning.³ Taking the intertextual ‘cut and paste’ tactics seriously, I have tried to locate Europe-making events within project outputs by analysing how Europe as a signifier is used to frame archaeological content or to tie together and past and present. A simple definition of narrative as ‘a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events,’ has been used.⁴ I have studied meta-texts – texts written by the projects about the project itself – as well as representations of the past. These representations are not restricted to books or reports, but can consist of exhibition material, posters and logos. Thus, the coherence of a narrative could be given by simply posing three periodic illustrations with prehistoric scenarios next to each other. Depending on the audience, they can represent a common-sense view of the world.⁵

So what constitutes a narrative structure, aside from coherence and continuity? Rather than active actions and characters, the key ingredients in ar-

---

² Holtorf 2006: 172.
³ White 1987.
⁵ Pluciennik 1999; Joyce 2002.
chaeological narratives are often passive events, places, groups or societies, and chronologies. Although they are often applied unconsciously, the selection of settings, dates and events are not ‘innocent.’ They serve a fundamental ideological function. Mark Pluciennik has studied the structure of several archaeological accounts, concluding that they often present ‘not only a characteristic narrative chronological position and tense – that of hindsight offered as a sequential story of, rather than in, the past – but also a markedly external or bird’s-eye view.’ As in the following example, they are often descriptive and told in the third-person to provide a sense of objectivity:

The European continent, so pregnant for the future of mankind, owed much to geography … the Pontic steppes formed a broad corridor linking eastern and central Europe to Caucasia and Turkmenia; and northern Europe formed a reservoir of peoples whose vigour more than compensated in the end for their cultural retardation … the Atlantic sea-board, which in pre-history transmitted cultural influences of ultimately Mediterranean inspiration, provided during the historic period a base for the expansion overseas of European power and influence, an expansion that was ultimately to create a word market and a single nexus of scientific and historical awareness.

In this text by Clark, a sense of continuity is created through the narrative structure, and Europe is passively endowed with symbolic qualities. Starting from a position of hindsight, the past is set against the backdrop of modern progress, valuing both outside influences and peoples on an evolutionary scale, with Europe at its centre. The choice of space and chronology, jumping between a Europe in prehistory and the present, serves an ideological function. It forms a ‘preferred meta-narrative, pre-understanding, or worldview – which presupposes the existence of particular types of entities and hence ways in which the world works and may be described, grasped, manipulated, explained, or understood.’ It also marks an endpoint. Hayden White argues that unless historical narratives can convey a sense of closure and ‘be shown to have had a plot all along,’ they appear less trustworthy. This, he states, is why ‘the plot of a historical narrative is always an embarrassment and has to be presented as ‘found’ in the events rather than put there by narrative techniques.’ It is from this meta-narrative perspective that I have approached the project outputs analysed in this study.

---

6 In archaeology, unlike anthropology, these aspects have mostly remained intuitive. Exceptions are Hodder (1989) on excavation reports, Thomas (1993) on the changing associations and content of the term ‘Neolithic,’ and Tilley on inaugural lectures as genre (1989a).
7 Barthes 1970; White 1987: 35.
8 Pluciennik 1999: 667.
Material and method

In any qualitative research project with an exploratory approach, the selection of examples for closer study has to do with more than finding a ‘representative sample.’ As stated in the introduction, I have chosen to work with the programmes Raphael (1997–1999), Culture 2000 (2000–2006) and Culture 2007–2013 due to their relevance to my questions. However, within these programmes there are different components, some supporting larger cooperation projects and others aimed as special fields such as book translations, festivals and EU ambassadors (support for particular European organisations). Among these I have focused on actions supporting annual and multiannual cooperation projects between three countries or more. These categories represent the majority of those funded through the programmes and contain most cultural heritage projects.

In order to manage and analyse the information collected a database was created, containing information about the projects from EU dissemination platforms.12 From this information I have extracted data about the following:

- Acronym
- Name
- Focus period
- Main objective
- Duration months
- Geographical focus
- Start year
- Project description
- Programme
- Lead partner: name/country
- Amount of EU co-funding
- Other partners: name/country
- Sub-field/Archaeological component
- Website URL

The first issue I encountered during this work concerned the definition of ‘archaeological projects.’ Many of the co-funded projects were most often interdisciplinary and varied widely in terms of topic, goals and project design. Even if this is the nature of larger ventures in archaeology and heritage, a line had to be drawn somewhere. So I decided to rely first on their self-definitions and the involvement of archaeological partners, and secondly on the nature of the activities, if they related to archaeological museums, materials or sites. Thus, in choosing my research material I followed the famous saying of David Clarke: ‘Archaeology is what archaeologists do.’13

The second issue was the format and length of the information included in the EU lists of successful project proposals. For the Raphael programme some of the lists from 1997–1999 were sent to me as image PDF-files by a Commission staff member. The content of each list varied in both detail and language (French, English and German). Unfortunately, no information about funding amounts was included. For Culture 2000, lists were accessible

12 See list of projects in Appendix 3. The full database remains with the author. Information can be accessed by other researchers upon request.
online as scanned PDF-files, but here too the language and the included information was inconsistent.\textsuperscript{14} Partner organisations were sometimes missing and abstracts varied in length.\textsuperscript{15} For \textit{Culture 2007–2013}, the information was richer and more accurate. The early years were available as PDF-files,\textsuperscript{16} and the later years were published in an online platform.\textsuperscript{17} For year 2007, however, only lists on project partners and funding amounts were available. To bridge this inconsistency, I have often pieced together information from other sources, such as project websites and publications. When it comes to quoting the material, I have, when necessary, translated selected passages into English while keeping the original text in the footnotes. The frequent spelling errors in the project abstracts have not been corrected.

When choosing examples for more detailed analysis from amongst these records, I did not seek a representative sample. It can be argued that ‘typical’ cases are not the richest in information, and that if you can pick only a handful, it is more useful to select those which offer an interesting, unusual or particularly revealing set of circumstances.\textsuperscript{18} Nonetheless, certain criteria were followed in order to secure variety. The first one was a division based on the most common themes in terms of time periods and archaeological objects studied in the projects. The second was the length of the project, the amount of partners and the programme under which the project applied. Therefore, annual and multiannual projects starting between 1997 and 2013, with 3–15 partners, were included for consideration. The third principle concerned accessibility and richness of information. In some cases, the decision came down to availability of content. As the amount of information and outputs varied considerably between projects, I included both small projects that had kept their websites running for decades and larger projects that had little general information available, but with many publications. When available, the following information was collected for the selected projects:

- EU application/proposal
- Final report
- Website texts and images
- Publications and papers
- Public outreach material
- Meta-texts
- Logotypes
- News articles and other media
- [Interviews – project leaders]
- [Interviews – project participants]

\textsuperscript{14} The problem of finding this type of information is reflected elsewhere. In the external evaluations of the programme it was remarked that only half of the requested files had been provided and among those ‘few files contained all the documents’ (ECOTEC 2008b: 14).

\textsuperscript{15} Link to lists for \textit{Culture 2000} can be found under ‘Culture programme materials.’

\textsuperscript{16} Link to lists for \textit{Culture 2007–2013} can be found under ‘Culture programme materials.’

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Creative Europe project results}, URL: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/projects/ (accessed 2.5.15).

\textsuperscript{18} Flyvbjerg 2006: 229.
Since the list could not be completed for all projects, I decided to combine the analysis of the database material with the analysis of project contents, rather than using the projects as separate case studies. I have used the information gained from interviews as a way to understand the projects and their background. For ethical reasons, I have refrained from using quotes and involving specific voices of project participants. That would make informants easily identifiable and detract from the aim to analyse representations (not individuals). Furthermore, I have not quoted the unpublished parts of the project proposals as this is a semi-confidential, ‘third-party’ document requiring approval from all project partners.

The mystery of the missing lines
While analysing the collected abstracts I realised that the early ones, from the Raphael programme and Culture 2000, were somehow too streamlined and often formulated in third person. Although short and impersonal abstracts are common in academia, phrasings like ‘In this project they will’ made me wonder who actually wrote them. Was it the project applicants themselves or the Commission staff? The question led to a critical assessment of the sources, and an interesting observation.

In the most recent programme Culture 2007–2013, the summaries were copied from a specific box in the application form or offered by the applicants upon request once projects were approved for funding. The text, limited to 2000 characters, was accompanied by a notice that the EU had the right to use it for dissemination purposes. After checking the online information against full application texts, I could confirm that they correlated. Similarly, the Culture 2000 application forms included a section called ‘Brief description of the project (maximum 10 lines) in English or French.’ In this case, a comparison between original application texts and the EU lists revealed a slight dissonance. A similar pattern emerged for other projects, and based on the knowledge gained during my fieldwork, I concluded that the changes in the abstracts had likely been made by EU civil servants in order to shorten the texts for publication. For instance, the following formulation in the original application:

Sharing and highlighting of common cultural heritage of European significance, and the promotion of mutual knowledge of culture and history of European people; the use of state-of-the-art technology to make European heritage more visible and accessible to all; improving access and participation in culture and in new technologies for citizens of the EU, including young, elderly and people with physical impediments; PR initiatives and cooperation activities between cultural operators and technological experts, for spreading European culture through the newly established International network.

Was shortened to:
Sharing and highlighting the common cultural heritage; the use of state-of-the-art technology to make European heritage more visible/accessible; improving access and participation in culture and in new technologies; initiatives and cooperation activities between cultural operators.

Thus, when the (most likely hurried) shortening of the summaries was done, information on the content and main activities of the projects was kept relatively intact, while lines copied from EU policy such as ‘cultural heritage of European significance, and the promotion of mutual knowledge of culture and history of European people,’\textsuperscript{19} were considered superfluous.\textsuperscript{20} Such phrases were likely considered commonplace enough to be rendered expendable. This is a sign of the dominance of a discourse. That these things did not merit mention indicates that the EU staff already operated fully within its limits. At the Agency I often noticed how concepts like common heritage or European identity were only used occasionally at promotional events, and rarely brought up in daily work. Others had surpassed them in the hierarchy of concept demanding articulation, like ‘synergy effects’ and ‘economic value of heritage.’

With regard to source criticism, this shortening action has been taken into account when looking at specific projects. From 2007 and onwards this is not an issue, but for the years 1997 to 2006 the level of adaptation to EU goals can be more difficult to assess without complimentary texts from web pages and publications. However, rather than the shortened texts distorting the original objectives of the projects, the problem for my analysis is that vital information concerning applicants’ ways of interacting with EU policy aims could be missing. In any case, I see no obstacle in citing and discussing the information that actually is included in the collected abstracts.

\textsuperscript{19} Original in Art. 128 of the Maastricht Treaty: ‘improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples; conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance.’

\textsuperscript{20} In another example the line: ‘increasing awareness of the common European heritage by promoting Rock art,’ became summarised to: ‘promoting the common heritage of rock art.’
European times and things

The task of reading and collecting EU listings on proposals selected for co-funding can be rather confusing. In some ways, the 161 projects that made it into the database are so strikingly similar that it is hard to tell them apart. In others, they are peculiar enough to become firmly lodged in your memory. They are similar because they all include two or more of the following:

— A database, a new research platform or an innovative approach.
— Networking and exchange between professionals and scholars.
— Awareness actions targeting the public, especially young people.
— Exhibitions and didactic material, especially travelling exhibitions.

They are peculiar because they often deal with themes or objects which are, if not unconventional, at least not representative of mainstream trends in archaeology and cultural heritage. For instance, there are more projects in the fields of underwater, aerial and landscape archaeology than projects dealing with site studies and excavations.\(^{21}\) Many heritage projects also incorporate archaeology under topics such as the study of antique murals or 19th century mining complexes. One project containing archaeological aspects concerns something as particular as ‘the production and consumption of olives.’\(^{22}\)

There are several reasons behind these similar yet varied topics. The programme guidelines and calls for proposals established some of the basic parameters for each application. They have always required exchange of information, innovation and outreach to young audiences. For Culture 2007–2013, the ambitions of the Commission did not stretch much further than that. Refraining from content specific or thematic calls with regard to cultural heritage, they relied on general criteria applicable to all topics covered by the programme. These included the promotion of transnational mobility, intercultural dialogue and the circulation of artworks and products. It is therefore easy to forget about the specificity of some of the calls in Raphael and the first years of Culture 2000, for which the instructions were sometimes so detailed that they would fall under ‘applied research’ today.\(^{23}\)

For these earlier programmes, certain priorities were plotted out beforehand through preparatory studies and meetings in the EU parliament and

---

\(^{21}\) The agendas promoted through UNESCO’s *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* (2001) and CoE’s *European Landscape Convention* (2000) were vital.

\(^{22}\) ELEA – *Producing and Consuming Olives: a contribution to European culinary heritage* (Raphael 1997, ID: 121).

\(^{23}\) In the final external evaluation of Raphael, it was stated that applicants had been unhappy with the detailed themes, and that they were not satisfied with the new *Culture 2000* either. They said there was an ‘inadequacy of the thematic approach … compared to the expectations of operators, leading them to contort their project presentations in order to be selected,’ and that it was ‘irrelevant’ (GMV Conseil 2003: 54).
with specific stakeholders in heritage and archaeology. Each call then highlighted specific themes such as antique murals, pre-industrial heritage, landscapes or underwater archaeology, sometimes even suggesting the time periods the projects should address (for instance Greco-Roman). In one extreme example, the Raphael call for 1997 included a section for thematic networks between European museums, welcoming projects on ‘textiles, weaving and traditional costume,’ ‘history of landscapes,’ ‘sea routes and inland waterways and vessels in the Middle Ages’ and ‘European funerary rites and traditions.’ Several archaeological projects managed to tie into these categories. Similarly, in the second year of Culture 2000, projects dealing with ‘concrete pieces of conservation and restoration work’ had to involve ‘civil, military or religious elements of non-movable heritage of European significance from the 10th to 15th centuries.’ Furthermore, if choosing to apply as an awareness-raising project during that year, applicants needed to ‘highlight the common European roots and dimensions of similar or comparable elements of the non-movable and archaeological heritage.’ Again, a surprisingly large number of projects involving archaeological sites and professionals managed to fit into this mould.

Naturally, these conditions had an effect on the applicants’ interaction with the goals of the funding source. This is because they outline certain priorities in terms of structure (comparisons of similar things) and content (period and topic), and because they communicate to the applicants what the EU ‘wants them to want’ in terms of integration. Ultimately, this is what the EU wants them to make other people want. In this sense, they have made for an interesting source material, representing a midway translation between the programme decision and the detailed guidelines for applicants. The calls are more interchangeable and dynamic than both of the former categories, something which has to be taken into account during analysis. This means that it is not so much a question of whether projects adapted to EU goals, but how they interacted with and translated them. Despite the sometimes itemised themes, it was up to the projects to create something out of the process.

**Buzzing with Europe**

Starting with the most pressing question, how did the calls for proposals translate the policy goal of promoting a common European cultural heritage, and how did the applicants respond? Raphael, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013 all rested on the will first expressed in the Maastricht treaty, stating that ‘the Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity

---

24 See 1996–2006 under ‘Call for proposals.’
and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.’ Translated into calls for proposals, this wide aim was actualised in slightly different ways for each programme. In Raphael, it could be phrased as:

… to encourage cooperation through events of a European dimension which bring to the fore the common European cultural heritage roots and currents in a variety of sectors (e.g. archaeology, architecture, rock art, ethnography, crafts, etc.)

… to increase European citizens’ awareness of the importance of the protection and enhancement of their rich and diverse cultural heritage through which one can witness the considerable similarities and common roots of Europe's civilisation.\(^{28}\)

In Culture 2000 the main aim simply became ‘the promotion of a cultural area common to the peoples of Europe,’\(^{29}\) while phrases like addressing ‘the common European roots,’\(^{30}\) or ‘linking the past and the future,’\(^{31}\) still guided applicants. By 2007 it had evolved into ‘enhancing the cultural area shared by Europeans and based on a common cultural heritage … with the view to encouraging the emergence of European citizenship.’\(^{32}\) Talk of European roots, common traits and a European civilisation – phrases that were never included in the original policy base to begin with – was removed and the focus was increasingly shifted away from confirming a European past towards building a European present.\(^{33}\)

---


\(^{33}\) See chapter three for the evolution of EU cultural actions relating to archaeology and heritage.
Several interesting observations can be made when looking at the responses to these expressions in project descriptions. A simple keyword search reveals that the most common word used is ‘European,’ closely followed by cultural, heritage and archaeological (figure 19). While the pattern may be far from surprising, it definitely indicates the hierarchy of words considered important. Added to this, more than half of the projects use Europe or European in their title, such as *Early Farmers in Europe*, OPPIDA – *The Earliest European Towns North of the Alps*, or ECSLAND – *European Culture Expressed in Sacred Landscapes*.\(^{34}\) Thus, a practice of naming things as European already becomes visible already at the outset. If we look closer at the potent phrases from the calls for proposals, they appear to resonate on different levels in the project descriptions. Appeals to a certain ‘commonness’ are frequent:

Objectives: Facilitate the access of different public groups to a common European cultural heritage, the ancient pottery.\(^{35}\)

The project goals are to: improve European cooperation regarding scientific data, interdisciplinary dialogue and work on this important part of our common heritage; improve … public awareness of the Roman heritage.\(^{36}\)

OpenArch connects 10 archaeological open air museums, furthering pan-European interest in our local and common European past.\(^{37}\)

Of course there were projects, especially among those with shorter descriptions in the early programmes, which did not mention anything about a common heritage. One project simply stated its goal as: ‘the conservation and valorisation of four archaeological parks from the Roman period … partners will carry out excavations to throw light on the urban phenomenon in Roman society.’\(^{38}\) A handful of projects also had a different take on the when and where of this commonness. One working with archaeological archives turned towards archaeology itself:

European archaeology constitutes a common cultural, scientific and socio-economic heritage … the role it has played in the construction and consolidation of identities at regional, national and transnational levels, are of direct concern and interest for all European citizens.\(^{39}\)

---

\(^{34}\) ID: 157; ID: 62; ID: 206. Out of the 161 collected projects, 69 use Europe or European in their titles. Frequently project titles have been shortened in the EU documents. In 12 cases I have discovered that the full titles used by the projects did in fact include Europe.

\(^{35}\) 2006, ID: 65.

\(^{36}\) 2006, ID: 69.

\(^{37}\) 2010, ID: 99.

\(^{38}\) 1998, ID: 139.

\(^{39}\) 2005, ID: 63.
When it comes to the Commission’s desire to link ancient sites and objects across member state borders, one of the most frequent starting points for the projects, this was also done in different ways. Some allured to European similarities in the past:

The aim of this project is to highlight the Viking maritime heritage in the countries and regions of North-West Europe and to identify similarities and common European roots.\(^{40}\)

This project aims at showing the European public the existence of a common culture for prehistoric men from different regions throughout Europe through the promotion of rock paintings.\(^{41}\)

It will interpret the mutual cultural history and development of 3 centres of power on the Atlantic rim of northern Europe during the first millennium AD. They will demonstrate that these areas shared common systems of dealing with power, influence and transition.\(^{42}\)

Others took it a step further, making the wished-for connection between past, present and future.\(^{43}\)

The project aims to make tangible, informative and fun parallels between three ‘cultures’ of the Iron Age … The tool of this awareness is archaeology, which discoveries have revealed to the public the cultural continuity of Europe.\(^{44}\)

Objectives: To enable organizing countries to improve the state of knowledge on a twofold technological and human phenomenon [prehistoric flint blades]; Allow the general public to become aware of a certain uniqueness of Europe well before the establishment of the European Union.\(^{45}\)

[The European music archaeology project] will establish a lasting flagship for ancient European music culture and the development of a supra-national sense of citizenship through a deeper awareness of Europe’s interconnected past, achieved through the power of sound…\(^{46}\)

---

\(^{40}\) 1997, ID: 118.
\(^{41}\) 1999, ID: 163.
\(^{42}\) 2002, ID: 23.
\(^{43}\) This link was only specified in Culture 2000 calls from 2002 to 2004.
\(^{44}\) 2013, ID: 107. Translation mine. Original in French: ‘Le projet vise à rendre tangible, instructif et ludique le parallèle entre trois “cultures” de l’Âge du Fer … L’outil de cette prise de conscience est l’archéologie, dont les découvertes ont révélé au grand public la continuité culturelle de l’Europe.’
\(^{45}\) 2006, ID: 67. Translation mine. Original in French: ‘Objectives: Permettre aux pays coorganisateurs de faire un état des connaissances sur un double phénomène technologique et humain; Permettre au grand public d'avoir connaissance d'une certaine unicité de l'Europe bien avant la mise en place de l'Union européenne.’
\(^{46}\) 2013, ID: 108.
In certain cases all of the above elements were woven into a narrative that resonated with tropes on European origins:

This travelling exhibition presents an overview of prehistoric art in Europe and provides an insight into the cultural roots of the continent’s first Homo sapiens populations and the forms of artistic expression common to them. The project aims to stimulate an awareness of European identity, particularly amongst young people … documenting some of the events and experiences which form the very foundations of European civilisation.\(^47\)

Based on the analysis of the policy-inspired phrases and EU buzzwords used in the collected project descriptions, exemplified here in this brief overview, I would like to introduce some initial observations which warrant further investigation.

— Firstly, archaeological projects often appropriate the language of the policy base, the programme decision and the calls for proposals, even when not directly prompted to do so, sometimes turning the notion of a ‘common heritage’ into a common or European past in the process.

— Secondly, in the pursuit to compare common elements and reveal likenesses (encouraged in calls up until 2003), the related EU creed on ‘diversity’ is often missing, and when urged to pick something ‘European’ as an object of study, few projects aimed at increasing the knowledge of the past choose topics that challenge the idea of a common heritage.

— Thirdly, when a leap is made between past and present, a narrative structure is often used to bridge the gap.

— Fourthly, it is primarily when citizens (especially young people) are to be made aware of the type commonness studied or promoted through the projects that notions of a European past or identity become activated.

Bearing these observations in mind, it is time to look at what these projects were about and if they continued to interact with EU notions on a common European heritage after achieving co-funding. If we begin with the idea that the Commission was the exclusive target and intended reader of the descriptions discussed here, then how did the projects describe their activities and research in other forums? As main points of entry for the following discussion I have decided to use two discernible thematic directions among the collected projects, which at the same time correlate to archaeologically relevant points of entry, namely: European times and things.

\(^{47}\) 1997, ID: 124.
European times

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.\(^{48}\)

In the quoted campaign folder, originating from the initiative *The Bronze Age: the first golden age of Europe*, it is suggested that the Europe of today can be linked to a specific archaeological time period. Recounting how they came to settle upon the Bronze Age as a means to increase public awareness of archaeology, a representative of the campaign stated that out ‘of all possible epochs of the past, the Bronze Age was regarded as the most appropriate for this specific purpose. It is the most glorious and rather unobserved period in European prehistory. It has conspicuous monuments all over Europe and trade routes.’\(^{49}\) Based on their project descriptions, many collaborations co-funded by the Culture programmes have reasoned in a similar way when deciding upon the scope and theme of their projects, seemingly without much hesitation. Although the Bronze Age has acted as a focal point in the archaeological grand narratives of Europe as well as for researchers taking issue with EUforic representations of the past,\(^{50}\) this study shows that periods such as the Roman Era and the Early Middle Ages have been far more relevant when appealing to a common European heritage.

![Figure 20. Graph of the distribution of time periods among 161 projects.](image)


\(^{49}\) Trotzig 2001b: 4.

\(^{50}\) Gramsch 2000; Gröhn 2004; Hølleland 2008.
As can be seen in the chart (figure 20), more than half of the projects dealt with prehistoric times; that is to say up until the Early Middle Ages (as defined in the projects). Some projects within this category had a very wide focus that did not allow for finer temporal definition, but at least ten concerned the Palaeolithic, seven the Neolithic, 11 involved the Bronze Age (three on Minoan Bronze age), four the Viking Age, seven on Iron Age and four the Celtic Era. Another big piece of the circle represents the parallel time period Classical Antiquity. Within this category, 11 projects worked with various aspects of the Greco-Roman period (Etruscans, Ancient Greece, Thrace, Picenum and early Byzantium) and at least 28 with the Roman Empire. Among the projects studied, the ones dealing with the Middle Ages are almost on par with those studying the Roman Era. Within this section there were few sub-divisions, aside from two projects working with the times of the Crusades and two with the Carolingian Empire. The small but diverse category of projects dealing with the period from the Renaissance up until mid-19th century included two on the 15–16th century (Synagogues and Ships) and two on pre-industrial heritage (mines and hydraulic complexes). In the recent history group, the focus was mostly placed on the late 19th to mid-20th century, with one project concentrating on the World Wars and four on archaeological archives (out of which three were actually the same consortium receiving funding several times). The group named Mixed Periods hides a great variety of projects with time spans that either breach the (artificial) prehistoric-historic divide, like one developing archaeological models of the Alps from prehistoric to historic times, or projects which sought to improve archaeological survey methods for better site management in general. Within these narratives, we find many replies to the question ‘when was Europe?’ and I will now take a closer look at three possible answers: the Palaeolithic, the Roman Era and the Early Middle Ages.

The first Europeans
Among the co-funded EU projects dealing with early periods of human history, especially the Palaeolithic, I found several which spoke of ‘Europeans’ and rehearsed policy phrases about a common heritage. Considering how far back some of these projects reached, it made me wonder wherein the commonness resided. Was Europe simply used as a geographic frame, or did they actually mean that something dating back a hundred thousand years was

---

51 Projects were divided based on subject and stated time period after which the categories Prehistoric and Historic were superimposed. As many concerned methods, networks and best practice, projects focused on, say, management of medieval castles, were marked as ‘Middle Ages’ and projects creating a European standard for 16th century shipwreck sites as ‘Historic.’

52 Classical Antiquity is in a sense also prehistoric, but it is used here to designate the interlocking spheres around the Mediterranean at the time of ancient Greece and the Roman Empire, including the colonies and neighbouring peoples.

53 Three ‘Mixed Period’ projects dealing in part with the Roman Era have been included.
connected to present-day Europe? Amid the projects studying early hominids and their material culture we find two cooperation projects involving museums and universities. They were funded under calls for proposals that asked applicants to emphasise common cultural themes or trends in relation to European heritage, but without any specification of temporal period.

The first is named Europ@ncestors. In the project EU abstract the objectives stated include ‘The creation of a common European heritage’, and their research focus was with human fossils, early tools and artistic representations of ‘early man.’ Two databases were promised, one scientific and one ‘mainstream.’ What was not clear from the EU project description, although this could be assumed based on several partners being museums, was that creating an exhibition was a key activity. On the partner websites, the project output was described as a virtual museum about the developmental history of people in Europe, a history said to represent a ‘common prehistoric heritage.’ An updated catalogue of human fossils found in Europe as well as databases for the general public and scholars were listed as final outcomes. To see when Europe might be found in this project, I started by taking a tour of the virtual museum.

![Figure 21. Affirmation of EU backing before entering Europ@ncestors website. Screenshot, URL: www.kbinirsnb.be/europancestors (accessed 1.1.16).](image)

54 ID: 110. Financed under Culture 2000 (call for ‘Experimental Actions’ 1999). Duration 1 year. Coordinator: Institut Royal de Sciences Naturelles de Belgique (BE). Co-organisers: Università di Torino (IT); Musée national d’histoire et d’art (LU); Musée national de Préhistoire les Eyzies (FR); Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum (NL); Neanderthal Museum (DE), The Natural History Museum London (UK).

55 The role of archaeology was smaller than that of physical anthropology, but the French partner had an archaeological profile (URL: http://musee-prehistoire-eyzies.fr/en/researchers/ [accessed 16.2.15]) and several archaeological publications are included under ‘Papers’ on the web platform (American Journal of Archaeology; Antiquity; International Journal of Osteoarchaeology; Journal of Archaeological Science; Journal of Field Archaeology etc.).

Upon entering the web platform, the project logo swoops in from the side-lines and an EU flag appears, accompanied by a text identifying the EU Culture programme as financial backer (figure 21). Only after this procedure is it possible to reach the page. Under the tag called ‘project’ I found the following text:

Europ@ncestors, the virtual museum of the first Europeans, brings together pieces both rare and scattered over several countries. It offers thus a global vision of a heritage common to all Europeans: fossils, original reconstructions, and artistic representations. The Evolution of Man in Europe in four clicks!  

These four clicks are: history, science, culture and representations. Stepping into the first part of the museum, the history theme, we find the whole world as the stage but Europe as the place of important discoveries, and Europeans as ‘great men’ of science (not a woman in sight). This is noted already in the introduction to the theme outlining the plot: "Europe occupies a central position in the history of human palaeontology. It is indeed in Europe that the first remains of fossil Men were brought to light."  

In the sub-sections, a line-up of more than 20 scholastic characters anchor the scientific history, beginning with the early collections of curiosities in the 18th century and ending with the rewriting of the stages of hominisation through new methods like mitochondrial DNA analysis. The section ends with a note on how new theories have rendered older ones toothless, but that at least, during the last 50 years ‘the first theories suggesting the transformation or replacement, 35 000 years ago, of Neanderthal Men into or by modern Men were based on the European discoveries.”

The science section is devoted to biology, and here the hominids are first introduced as one primate among many on a global scale. The focus gradually resolves until it reaches the last section called ‘The first Europeans,” a narrative told through images of skulls plotted on a map of the European continent (figure 22). For every skull there is a story of the scholars, the excavations and the interpretations of the finds. In the case of the Homo Heidelbergensis the text tells us that he ‘was considered for a long time as the oldest European’ but was trumped by another find later on.

In the next section, called ‘Culture,’ the visitor is presented with a teleological timeline beginning with the lower Palaeolithic and ending with the ‘European neolithization.” Here Europe acts as the frame for a passive narrative of steady progression in which tools, burials, art, clothes, animal keep-

---

57 Europ@ncestors, URL: http://www.kbinirsnb.be/europancestors/ (accessed 16.2.15).
ing and dwellings all come together as a whole.\(^{60}\) The sense of completeness is due in part to the nature of the display, dealing with a huge time span with short bits of text on each topic, making it seem more like a chronicle than a saga. This linear time scale and small bits of text are typical of how narrative structure can work to create coherence where there is little to be had. Europe still acts as stage in this narrative, and things are rarely named as European. Instead, it is highlighted that both agriculture and domesticated animal species spread from the Middle East.

![Figure 22. Project web-platform. Web clips. Left: Entry to ‘The first Europeans’ exhibition. Right: Skulls plotted on map of Europe in ‘The first europeans’ section. URL: http://www.kbinirsnb.be/europancestors/ (accessed 15.3.15).](image)

The final section differs from the other three in that it discusses popular representations of early hominids through time and how they change according to contemporary ideas.\(^{61}\) 20\(^{th}\) century racial interpretations, placing Europeans at the top of an evolutionary hierarchy, are addressed, as are notions of prehistoric men as savages, beasts and pioneers. A study of hominids illustrated on stamps is included, five of which portray ‘the first Europeans.’ Here, in the recent past and with a critical twist, the story ends.

The next question is whether this European frame was also applied in the more academic output of the project. Based on my examination of the publication listed in the abstract and featured on the website, *Neanderthals and modern humans: discussing the transition*,\(^{62}\) the geographical frame remained in place, but without any developed storyline. In the compilation, which consists of scientific papers from a conference held at one of the partner institutions in March 1999, Europe is a de facto continental frame. When directed towards colleagues and without any narrative ambitions, ‘the first


\(^{62}\) Orschiedt and Weniger (eds.) 2000.
Europeans’ becomes ‘the emergence of anatomically modern man in Europe.’ In fact, no connection to the EU project is made.

The second project, called Archaic Europeans and Neanderthals/The Homo Project: hominids, technology and environment in the Middle and Early Upper Pleistocene, also describes their aim in the EU abstract as creating an ‘exhibition about the life and environment of the first Europeans.’ In this case it was a physical exhibition which travelled between the partners. It was said to be ‘didactic and multidisciplinary, with material chosen to make young people aware of this heritage.’ The topic was narrower, dealing mainly with the deposits of Neanderthal remains found on the archaeological sites of Sima de las Palomas and Black Cave, located in the community of Murcia in south-eastern Spain.

Although there is far less information available about this project, a general picture can be constructed based on photos and exhibition texts from the coordinator’s website. Here, no larger aim appealing to a common heritage is presented. The project is simply described as an international exhibition financed by the European Commission. The theme is angled more towards archaeological interpretation than defining biological origins. Starting from a global perspective on human evolution as it occurred in Africa, North America and the Middle East, the story proceeds to list the earliest evidence of human presence in Western Europe, as represented by the selected sites. What comes next is the real focus of the narrative, the Neanderthal man, dubbed the ‘the lead actor.’ From then on, under titles like ‘Lifestyles of the Archaic European’ the exhibition elaborates on appearance, physical and mental abilities, subsistence strategies, material culture and rituals surrounding the deceased. Unlike the first project, there are no contemporary aspects included. In fact, connections to Europe as well as present times are sparse. This is probably the result of the exhibition being a means of displaying the results of a much larger research project with extensive excavations and publications, rather than an independent initiative.

After looking at these two projects about the first Europeans, the question ‘when was Europe?’ remains uncertain. According to both projects, there

63 Orschiedt and Weniger (eds.) 2000: 7 (introduction).
were indeed Europeans during the Paleolithic, and by that logic there was also Europe. Being the ‘oldest European’ or an ‘Archaic European’ appears to be a source of some prestige, but the stories presented relate more to tropes of human evolution in a general sense. As demonstrated by Misia Landau, who has analysed the plots of scientific texts on human origins, such narratives often build on the universal hero tale in folklore and myth.66 These include nine steps, Landau argues. In summary, they introduce a humble hero (a nonhuman primate) who sets off on a journey (leaving the native habitat), and obtains vital help or equipment from a benefactor (natural selection). From there on the primate goes through a series of tests (harsh climate, predators or competitors) – aka ‘slays a dragon’ – and finally arrives at a higher and more human state.67

In the project exhibits, Europe becomes the stage upon which these heroes – the early hominids – come to life. In the sections dealing with material culture this stage is filled with props, but it is still the location of finds that matter rather than their European qualities or types. The only part using European as an adjective is the Europ@nestors segment celebrating the pioneers in the field, demonstrating excellence and progress through their scientific undertakings, traits traditionally connected to the West (oddly, this was kept separate from the critical part about popular representations, perhaps reflecting the different interests of the persons involved). Ultimately, what makes these particular heroes European is simply that they were found within the borders of what we now call Europe.

Nevertheless, even if the words Europe and European predominantly work as geographic delineators in these projects, their meaning is expanded in the interaction with the EU. Educating young people about ‘the first Europeans’ takes on new significance in a funding programme seeking to stir a sense of belonging to Europe and to create a cultural area common to the European people(s). No explanation is offered as to why Europe should be studied separately as a spatial or cultural container, and the joining of potent words like Europe and ancestors in Europ@nestors certainly activates the idea of a common origin.68 Simultaneously, when ancient human fossils are designated a ‘heritage common to all Europeans,’ the potential of these phrases to be used as mechanisms of exclusion is amplified.69 Although the references to EU policy are consigned to the packaging of the projects – such as titles, logotypes and introductions – first impressions matter. Many visitors never engage beyond that level.

68 See Ascherson 2008 for discussion of Europe as a ‘container.’
69 According to Wolpoff and Caspari (2013), racialist legacies haunt the disciplines studying human evolution, making words like ‘European’ precarious.
70 In the case of Europ@nestors this packaging was even more prominent on their own web platform than in the texts collected from EU platforms.
The Roman Empire as the first common European space

For the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire we have the opportunity to unite Europe.\(^71\)

Such were the hopes of Commission president Romano Prodi in 1999, ahead of the upcoming enlargement of the EU. Like many political constellations over the last millennia, the EU and its representatives have often drawn upon the legacy of the Roman Empire, in political speeches as well in the distributions of funds. The very signing of the treaty which founded the Community took place in Rome, among frescos of Roman history. At this time, and in subsequent commemoration events, the symbolic importance of the location was highlighted.\(^72\) The allure of Ancient Rome as a usable past has subsisted in its model of citizenship and inherited aspects of its legal system, and perhaps even more in its ability to “unite” a vast and culturally diverse territory. Since this territory also corresponded somewhat with the borders of the Community up until the 1990s, its popularity as a cultural reference among MEPs and EU officials is not startling, particularly when taking the historical influence of Italian representatives on EU cultural actions into account.\(^73\)

Of course, the Roman Empire did produce a lot of material remains for archaeological projects to gather around. One example is the long running project *Frontiers of the Roman Empire*,\(^74\) which central target was the *Limes*, an archaeological feature running through numerous member states.\(^75\) Such physical features, combined with the fact that Italian institutions have dominated the list of participating countries within the projects studies, makes the Roman Era a predictable choice. Nevertheless, attaching the signifier Europe and the political institution of the EU to events so far back in time requires a large measure of ‘creative anachronism,’\(^76\) and in projects studying this period I found the links drawn between the past and present to be quite distinct.

\(^72\) Hansen-Magnusson and Wüstenberg 2012.
\(^73\) See chapter three for the most influential member state and representatives in EU discussions on heritage.
\(^74\) ID: 64. *Culture 2000* (call 2005). It was led by Historic Scotland and originally consisted of 11 partners from different countries. Stated objectives were to create ‘European standards for the creation of a European database on archaeological sites,’ ‘guidelines for best practice in the field of archaeology and virtual reconstruction,’ ‘exchange between archaeologists and between archaeologists and other experts,’ ‘educational projects addressed to the general public and youth.’
\(^75\) According to Meier (2013), the project revived the dichotomy between ‘us, the civilised’ and ‘those, the barbarians,’ by using the border as a divider.
\(^76\) Lowenthal 1985: 363.
The first project that caught my eye was Simulacra Romae: Roman provincial capitals – a common European heritage. The EU description states that the project will carry out a ‘Comparative exam of the different Roman provincial capitals; through their big works and public monuments.’ The rationale offered is that the architecture of these colonies has ‘marked the character of a “common” past in the history of the different mediaeval and modern European nations.’ The main objectives were research on urbanisation processes and dissemination of knowledge, foremost through the creation of a website and the organisation of an international congress to ‘frame the different archaeological evidences.’

Figure 23. Project website, Simulacra Romae. Screenshot, URL: http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/bib/portal/simulacraromae/ (accessed 1.4.15).

77 ‘Simulacra Romae’ means ‘Images of Rome.’ Again there was some confusion regarding the full name of the project. In the EU lists it is only named Simulacra Romae. On one of the partner web pages the English version is put forth as Simulacra Romae: Rome, the provincial capitals and the development of the first European urban landscape, while the final publication is named Simulacra Romae: Roma y las capitales provinciales del Occidente Europeo: estudios arqueológicos (2004). In this text I have used title from the website.

78 ID: 15. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2001). Duration 1 year. Coordinator: Consorcio Urbium Hispanie Romanae (ES) Co-organisers and Associate partners: Cultura Provincia di Venezia (IT); Ayuntamiento de Cordoba, Oficina de Arqueología (ES); CNRS Archeometrie et Archeologie Lyon (FR); Instituto de Arqueología de Merida (ES) Sovrintendenza dei Fori Imperiali (IT); Universidad de Cordoba (ES); Service Regional d’Archeologie d’Aquitane (FR); Unidade d’Arqueologia Universidade do Minho (PT); Museo Arqueológico de Cartagena (ES); Universedad de Murcia (ES); Groupe de Recherches Archeologiques du Narbonnais (FR).
The theme of the project is elaborated upon under the presentation section of the project website (figure 23). Rome is described as a power that forcefully imposed their authority in the formation of provincial space (200 BC – 100 AD), but which also created new cultural and social elements that can be considered ‘the first common European space.’ The elements were: a ‘single political entity’ that could accommodate diversity within, the ‘unification’ of the free populace under one law and a unique kind of ‘citizenship,’ and the building of a ‘common economic area’ with common administrative and fiscal mechanisms and a shared army. The presentation also covers the meaning of the terms colony and province, the types of sites examined, and the need to develop good practices and methods in terms of their protection, preservation and presentation. It concludes by stating the aim to present research of public interest from a scientific and informative aspect, and by affirming the link to Culture 2000.

In another description written by the Venetian partner, included on both the project and the partner website, participation is said to be based on:

…sharing the idea that the full integration of all the states of the European Union can only be achieved through the recognition of the common historical, cultural and social heritage.

According to the partner, the comparative research sheds light on ‘a historical journey of extraordinary importance for the birth and evolution of a first common European space,’ unifying people under one political entity. Two options for how to understand the Romanisation process are offered: one of European social and cultural unification and one of resistance to forced assimilation by the Imperial power. Either way, it concludes, the influence of Romanisation on the formation of European nations cannot be denied.

The website is shaped like an archive of sorts, collecting a wide range of resources from each city and their numerous sites. Looking at the rich content, the references to commonness fade away and the promised comparison seem to consist of presenting cities next to each other according to a common design (chronology, history, documentation, related publications, con-

---

nected museums and institutions as well as visitor information). By way of a list of cities or alternatively the interactive map, we are guided through images and thick descriptions of the objects and sites that have been assigned the ‘character of a “common” past:’ Roman aqueducts, forums, theatres, baths, circuses, memorials and road works. Yet, each presentation is site specific, without visible links to other sites or to Europeaness.

Seeking a fuller picture, I turned to the published proceedings of the project congress, said to convey a ‘purely archaeological perspective.’ I found that it mirrored the structure of the website, each contribution dealing with questions on urbanisation, political and economic context, or the current state of research on a specific site or place. The last contribution consists of a presentation of the website. Here the compartmentalised design is explained by stating that the project aim was simply to perform a comprehensive data collection. The role of the network, it states, was to guide and comment objectively on published content, letting readers draw their own conclusions.

In other words, the project did not make comparisons as much as provide a base upon which to make comparisons possible. As a result, the website and the introduction to the volume is the only thing clearly tying the project together, at least from an outsider’s point of view. The introduction contextualises the project and elaborates on the shared problem of dealing with preservation and protection in cities that are constantly expanding. In relation to this problem, it states the need for new ways to enhance archaeological heritage for the public, making it possible to present it ‘under a common prism that help us understand the origins of our European entity.’

Thus, although commonness is never built by explicitly comparing the sites, the theme of a common European heritage underlines the reasoning in the passages defining the purpose of the project. In several places, explicit references linking ‘the first common European space’ to the Europe of today are made. At the most basic level this effect follows from the use of ‘first’ or ‘birth,’ or by emphasising characteristics like unification, citizenship and a common economy over the aggressive and imperialist aspects of Romanisation. It is implied that the EU is a second common space. This space is tied to the present by using phrases like ‘the origins of our European entity.’ The Venetian partner also formulated European integration as something to be fostered through knowledge about Romanisation processes. Taken together it is clear that Europe is not solely an operational concept in this project. It is not the scene upon which the story is played out, but a geopolitical entity.

---

82 The Roman cities were: Roma, Tarraco, Emerita, Córduba, Chartago Nova, Bracara, Narbo, Lugdunum, and Burdigala. Modern cities involved: Rome, Tarragona, Córdoba, Mérida, Venezia, Cartagena, Braga, Lyon, Bordeaux and Narbonne.
84 Fernández 2004: 346.
85 Ruiz de Arbulo 2004b: 8. Translation mine. Original in Spanish: ‘mostrado a la población bajo un prisma común que nos ayude a entender los orígenes de nuestra entidad europea.’
reincarnated in the present. Even if references to Europe as a space are frequent, it is the idea of Europe that structures the narrative.

This picture is consistent with the follow-up project, *Simulacra Romae II*, which started in 2007 (this time without EU funding). It included both old and new partners and resulted in another symposium, held in Reims 2008. I bring it up because of an interesting passage in the foreword of the symposium publication. After going over the aims and implementation of the first project, using the same phrases of a ‘common past’ and the ‘first common European space,’ the text turns toward the question of Rome as a culturally charged idea and how it has been used over the ages. Its role in romanticism and nationalism are mentioned but so too are current times. ‘The interest of the European Union for this project is proof,’ it states, that ‘the remains of these cities must indeed be shown to the public under a common prism that helps us understand the origins of the idea of Europe, and a first draft of what is now called globalization.’ This is followed by reflection about how, in the age of postmodernism, the history of their own research will certainly not escape scrutiny and that the time is now ripe to nuance and challenge the utopian image of Roman colonisation. There was clearly awareness about the funding context and a genuine will to contribute to the development of the EU, as well as to reflect upon the idea of EUrope.

There are several projects that at first sight seem strikingly similar to *Simulacra Romae*. The multiannual project *Transformation: the emergence of a common culture in the northern provinces of the Roman Empire from Britain to the Black Sea and up to 212 A.D.* and *Rome's Conquest of Europe: military aggression, native responses and the European public today* are two of them. Both introduce a narrative of European unification in the

---

86 Villaescusa and Ruiz de Arbulo (eds.) (2010).


88 ID: 48. Financed under *Culture 2000* (call 2004). Duration 3 years. Coordinator: The Museum for Ancient Shipping, Mainz (DE). Coorganisers and associated partners: Tyne & Wear Museums, Arbeia Roman Fort & Museum (GB); Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurland- schap en Monumenten (NL); Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Wien (AT); Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem – Régészettudományi Intézeté Budapest (HU); Institutul de Arheologie şi Istoria Artei, Academia Română Filiala Cluj-Napoca (RO); Arheologicheski Institut s Muzej pri Bulgarskata Akademija na Naukite Sofia (BG); Universytet Warszawski – Instytut Archeologii (PL); Archeologický ústav AV ČR Brno (CZ); Slovenské Národné Muzeum – Archeologické Muzeum, Bratislava (SK). Other partners: Departamento de Ciencias de la Antigüedad de la Universidad de Zaragoza (ES) Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes Paris (FR); Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche del Mondo Antico, Università di Pisa (IT).

past in their EU abstracts, albeit with a slightly different emphasis. *Transformation* seeks to ‘show in detail how one cultural sphere from the Atlantic Ocean to the Black Sea came into being for the first time in European history.’ However, rather than stressing unity, the project will ‘propose that integration does not automatically eradicate regional characteristics.’ The presentation on the website stays true to this.\(^90\) In the EU description to *Rome’s Conquest of Europe*, the phrasing and goal is very similar to that of *Simulacra Romae*, even creating the dual perspective of how Romanisation as both an aggressive and a positive coming together:

The only time in history when most of the population of Europe and the Mediterranean formed part of a single political entity for centuries was under Roman rule. The material traces of this unification through military aggression as well as through successful political integration form part of our common cultural heritage and are of truly European significance … The project will focus on three sites, which form ideal case studies to demonstrate how European cultures were progressively integrated into the Roman world. Objectives: The project will address the citizen through innovative display techniques and encourage reflection on what lessons emerge from our shared European past for future integration.

The anchoring to policy is very clear in this text, as is the tying together of past, present and future under the keywords common heritage, integration and European cultures/past. Unfortunately, there is no remaining website, but only a few descriptions in other sources. In a meta-text written by the German partner, the goals from the abstract are listed, although in even more general terms.\(^91\) One of the goals replicated from the EU Treaties is interpreted in a very liberal way, stating that they would promote ‘mutual knowledge of the history of other European countries’ by simply ‘informing the public about this project.’\(^92\) According to the text this is exactly what happened, the three sites did their own exhibitions and publications in which they also displayed information about the EU project.\(^93\) Thus, to a higher degree than in many other projects, the policy inspired language seems to boil down to application poetry.

\(^90\) Home, URL: http://www2.rgzm.de/transformation/home/FramesUK.cfm (accessed 3.3.15).


\(^93\) Sites were: a Celtic Town in Dünsberg, Sanisera at Menorca and Alchester Roman Town.
Transformation had as part of their goal the creation of an online database and a travelling exhibition. The website and database are similar in style to that of Simulacra Romae, with extensive information on areas and ancient cities arranged under uniform subsections. In this case however, the organising principle is not names and categories from the Roman past, but ‘Modern Countries’ and ‘Themes’ (figure 24). Under countries, the information is site-specific, with chronology, historic developments and archaeological remains, but under the thematic entry we come as close to a comparison as we have yet encountered. For each theme, such as production, costumes, and cults, we find interpretations from the different areas listed side by side.

The posters that make up the travelling exhibition offer a condensed version of the database, highlighting comparable elements from different places and tying them together through bits of text explaining similarities and differences. References to Europe are sparse however and the narrative has no clear ending. The frame is filled with cultural content and through comparisons a wider perspective emerges, but aside from the suggestive promise to present how ‘one cultural sphere … came into being for the first time in European history,’ the signs of European commonness and importantly, diversity, remain in the past.

Taken together, if Simulacra Romae and Rome’s Conquest of Europe build on the idea of Europe, Transformation balances between the idea and the operational use of Europe as a geographically defined space. All three projects tend to remain in the past. They interact with the goals and context of the funding source and allude to a European continuity, some more manifestly than others. The main emphasis, however, lies on Romanisation pro-
cesses as a knowledge bank which can contribute to better integration in the EU, not on Rome as the direct ancestor of the political project. Overall, the answer to the question ‘when was Europe?’ is clear in these projects: Europe came into existence for the first time under the Roman Era.

The Early Middle Ages as the cradle of EUnorpe

Alongside the Roman Era, the Middle Ages stood out as a central theme among the projects studied. This is in part a result of the general preoccupation with monuments and buildings within EU discourses on cultural heritage, of which this period has plenty. It can also be seen as a political and academic response to the need for a past more suited to the EU space after successive enlargements. As demonstrated by Ian Wood in The modern origins of the Early Middle Ages (2013), exhibitions on the Middle Ages (many of them EU-funded), have – since the fall of the Berlin Wall – marked the ‘reintegration of Central Europe into the Western European tradition.’

Although not a perfect match, the Carolingian Empire and the sphere of Catholic Christianity – features long highlighted as pivotal to the emergence of modern Europe – have grown increasingly popular as feature of a Euorpean past. Moreover, just as in the case of the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages produced a lot of material culture and enduring structural elements (such as village layouts) that bear striking similarities across the continent, making direct cultural references all too tempting. To exemplify how the EU political project worked its way into project narratives of the Early Middle Ages, I will now to turn toward the project used to introduce this chapter: Cradles of European Culture (CEC). This five year collaboration was granted funding in the same year that I worked for the Commission Agency in Brussels. I have therefore been able to follow it during its implementation period, both from a distance and through conversations with participants.

In the EU abstract it is promised that cultural heritage can assist in the EU integration process, since it represents the ‘evidence and justification of Eu-

94 Wood 2013: 326.
95 Wood 2013.
96 See contributions in Geary and Gábor (eds.) (2013) for discussions on the similar material culture of the Middle Ages that the nation-states “revised” when forging their own histories.
97 The programmes also coincided with an increased interest in European cooperation among medievalists in archaeology, who, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the emergence of the “new” EU, created the Medieval Europe Congress in 1992 (now MERC) (Carver 2014).
98 ID: 93. Financed under Culture 2007–2013 (call 2010). Duration 5 years. Coordinator: Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia (SI); Coorganisers: Provinciaal archeologisch museum Ename (BE) Provinciaal Archeologische Museum Velzeke (BE); Université de Provence (FR); Gemeente Nijmegen (NL); The Monument Board of the Slovak Republic (SK); Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences IBACN (CZ); Emilia Romagna (IT); Roman-Germanic Commission of the German Archaeological Inst. (DE); Research Institute for the Heritage (NL); Ename Expertisecentrum voor Erfgoedontsluiting vzw (BE); University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences (HR).
rope as a geo-cultural entity.’ If this is recognised, it argues, the influence of heritage institutions could increase, but first the boundaries of the nation-states have to be transcended. The Realm of Francia Media, ‘extending from the Mediterranean to the North Sea going through the heart of Europe between 850 and 1050,’ was therefore chosen as the main object of study. This is a region said to signify the very ‘cradle of the European Union.’ Using the Early Middle Ages as a starting point, the aim is described as showing the continuous effect of Europe's geo-cultural past on European society, linking our knowledge of physical remains to questions of identity, belonging and intercultural dialogue. In relation to this, the selected archaeological and historical sites are baptised as true ‘Cradles of European Culture.’ Core objectives are research, and finding new ways to make sense of, and present this period to the public and especially young people. Aside from educational programmes and exhibitions, ‘European interpretation centres’ and a Francia Media heritage route are listed as outputs.

As presented in this text, the aims of CEC stand out as hitherto the most politically ambitious. The project interacts intimately with its funding context. The connection is particularly interesting since it was co-funded under Culture 2007–2013, a programme where abstracts were left intact and no detailed conditions dictated the subject matters of the projects. Of course, the programme still sought to encourage the emergence of European citizenship and spoke of a common cultural heritage, but the calls and guidelines from this period only included overarching criteria. Out of these, only the phrase ‘intercultural dialogue’ was borrowed. What this project attempted could thus be seen as a mix between historical revisionism and a kind of heritage activism or ‘archaeology of action,’ an approach that recognises our situated roles, using them to create the world we want.99

Looking at the website under the section ‘Project,’ the purpose remains consistent with the EU abstract.100 The common past is portrayed as having fallen victim to centuries of nationalist history writing, something that needs to change if we are to address contemporary unrest and increase togetherness in the ‘European zone.’ Emanating from the scientific community and spreading outwards, heritage institutions are to become vehicles of change. The explicit connection between Francia Media and the EU takes a winding path (figure 25). Francia Media is a political territory defined through the Treaty of Verdun 843 when the Frankish empire was divided into three kingdoms after a civil war between the grandchildren of Charlemagne.101 It was partitioned again in 855, after which Francia Media (or Middle Francia) only became a geographic term, although the project stated its ending point as 1033. Starting with medieval commercial routes, described as zones of

101 Riddle 2008: 209.
exchange and innovation, the project description emphasises the linguistic and cultural diversity of the region and its neighbours. This, in turn, is linked to the growth of Renaissance and humanist values. The last centuries, it continues, although marked by nationalist conflict, brought with it the ‘European idea,’ a long development crowned by the Treaty of Rome in 1957.

Figure 25. Francia Media heritage route. Map with the locations of the sites and partners. After Callebout 2013: 202 [attributed to Tom Nevejan]. Also available in a project information folder from 2012, and at the project website, URL: http://www.cradlesec.eu/cec_4/Activities/HeritageRoute.aspx (accessed 1.2.16).
It concludes by stating that the founding member states of the Community all belonged to this territory, making it an ‘ideal opportunity for the European citizens to find the roots of a concrete European identity in all of its unity and diversity.’\(^{102}\) The introduction to the website repeats this mantra. By shedding new light on the selected archaeological and historical sites, it is pledged that the ‘scientific endeavor will show that the European dream has far deeper roots than one might imagine.’\(^{103}\)

Outlined before us is a teleological narrative featuring Francia Media as the historical container of the EU political project and the muse to the different characters in the story, from Charlemagne and his heirs to the founding fathers of the EU. In a united present or future Europe, despite facing many hardships along the way, its destiny is finally to be fulfilled. Now compare this to the statement below, offered by a project participant in the catalogue for one of the project exhibitions:

As CEC, too, has demonstrated, no ‘European’ cultural heritage actually exists and above all we do not need cultural heritage as a source of identity, just as we do not need anything that focuses on unity, but rather something that analyzes complexity…\(^{104}\)

What happened here one might ask? And does this really represent a conclusion drawn in the project as a whole? Looking at how ideas of Europeaness are transmitted in the different project outputs, the answer is both yes and no. Narratives of a common European past, extending from the Early Middle Ages to the present, co-exist with more self-reflective texts that put a question mark behind these notions. They are often presented side by side, but rarely interwoven.

When visiting the online heritage route aimed towards the general public, we are told it ‘consists of a network of ten European sites, which demonstrate that today’s unity goes back to the Early Middle Ages.’\(^{105}\) For each site there is information about its history, places to see, practical visitor information and a gallery. ‘History’ is the section knitting the narrative together. It creates site biographies spanning from before AD 850 to the present, extending far beyond the ‘in-situ’ archaeological and historical contexts.\(^{106}\) Taking the hilltop settlement Gradišče in modern day Slovenia as an example,\(^{107}\) the subsection ‘850–1050’ links it to the larger narrative by designat-


\(^{104}\) Guermandi 2014: 42.

\(^{105}\) Heritage route, URL: http://www.heritage-route.eu/ (accessed 3.3.15).

\(^{106}\) The sub-categories for history are: Before the year 850 (landscape and early settlement), 850–1050 (history, archaeology, art and architecture, international connections), 1050–Modern Era (historical developments on the site/area), Modern Era–Today (archaeological research, current site), and Personalities (historical personas or scholars connected to the site).

\(^{107}\) An archaeological site with settlement phases from the 4\(^{\text{th}}\)--6\(^{\text{th}}\) and 8\(^{\text{th}}\)--10\(^{\text{th}}\) centuries.
ing the area as the early medieval Carniola, a place of some interest for the Frankish Kingdom due to its inhabitants involvement in Slavic rebellions. Archaeology is used to confirm that the site corresponds with the time period (AD 790–990), and that the styles of certain excavated objects are connected to Carolingian influences. More threads are tied together under the heading ‘international connections.’ However, as the story moves forward in time, from 12th century countesses to 19th century hunting lodges, it loses its footing. It ends in a local setting, describing the excavation history of the site and famous personalities linked to the area.

In this project output, the critical questioning illustrated earlier is missing. As in many of the other projects analysed, when the time comes to make sense of dissimilar sites in widespread geographical locations, Europe turns into a passive frame filled with content rather than forming a coherent narrative. Linking the local to the European level was part of the original plan for the project, but when starting from a site-specific angle, attempts to connect to the larger narrative go astray. Here, unity is lost in favour of diversity, but this is not a subversive action as the premise of demonstrating a European unity is left unharmed.

Looking at one of the physical exhibitions produced by the project, The Legacy of Charlemagne 814–2014, the parallelism re-emerges. The exhibition was originally meant to deal with a narrower theme, however the fact that 2014 marked the 1200th year since the death of Charlemagne made it politically and thematically attractive to extend the theme. In the exhibition leaflet, visitors are promised the story of the forgotten realm of Francia Media, the home of the ‘founding fathers of the European idea.’ To this a twist is added, saying that the exhibition will show how the Carolingian past has been used to legitimise struggles to bring ‘unity in diversity’ to Europe. The EU motto ‘unity in diversity,’ runs as a red line through the project and here it is used as a way to highlight European unification attempts over time.

---

108 Since this is one of the sites not actually within the historic realm of Francia Media, the links made are few and rather weak. At other sites, like Prague castle, the link is more taken for granted: ‘Bohemia was annexed to the Empire in 805 and despite political changes has since then been a natural constituent of the Western European cultural sphere’ (URL: http://www.heritage-route.eu/en/prague/850-1050ad/#.VOt4ufnF9u0 [accessed 3.3.15]).

109 Mostly, these personas are archaeologists or local celebrities. For Prague Castle, St Adalbert and St Wenceslas or St Ludmila are included, the latter said to have played a ‘symbolic role as the first “Czech European” at the accession of the Czech Republic to the EU’ (URL: http://www.heritage-route.eu/en/prague/personalities/#.VOt5bfnF9u0 [accessed 3.3.15]).


In relation to the concept, it is remarked that ‘the European Union is the ultimate embodiment of this aspiration and the exhibition will show how it finally came into being.’ Again, the preamble is already set; a myth of origin for the EU is in the making.

In the exhibition itself, as the story goes, Europe was budding in the Roman Era, an empire acting as inspiration for Charlemagne. Under his rule a type of unity grew, owing much to Christianity. This unity suffered fragmentation under the rule of Charlemagne’s descendants, but within this fragmentation a unity in diversity re-surfed in the realm of Francia Media. After this, new dreams of Europe were created and broken, dreams in which Charlemagne and his realm became fuel to legitimise the visions of Charles the Bold and Napoleon. In the 20th century the dream became a nightmare and Europe was abused in war, with fascists and Nazis using symbols of ancient Rome and the Carolingian realm as propaganda. Here and elsewhere, the correlations between historical events, such as the frontlines of the world wars lining up with the borders of Francia Media, are pointed out. The story ends in the present and with the EU political project. Standing in front of an EU flag placed in a glass showcase, visitors are asked to reflect upon the future of the Union: if its search for unity in diversity will succeed.

The focus on symbols and narratives as tools of legitimisation and the use and abuse of Carolingian heritage makes the exhibition story more complex than the one told in the online heritage route. The parallelism occurs when a politically motivated connection between Francia Media and the EU is sought, while simultaneously identifying other such attempts as propaganda. Charlemagne and Francia Media are lifted mainly as positive things, the Nazis and fascists’ uses of these as symbols as negative, while the EU becomes a force of good.

Looking at the exhibition catalogue, the parallel narratives become more visible. A photograph of the head patron of the project, the president of the European Council (EU) Herman Van Rompuy, initiates the volume (figure 26). His introductory note, a reflection on Charlemagne as a forefather of European integration, explains that his legacy is not just the stuff of historians but an important symbol in the building of post-World War II Europe.

---


114 This paragraph is based on the exhibition catalogue (Callebaut and van Cuyck eds. 2014), Exhibition flyer (2014, note. 112), and the ‘virtual visit’ section on the exhibition homepage, URL: http://www.expocharlemagne2014.eu/index.php/en/virtual-visit (accessed 1.5.15).


Prize he was soon to receive in Aachen. The project itself is introduced using a similar text to that of the EU abstract, adding that in a society of constant change, they want to make the European idea clearer and more recognisable to people.\(^\text{117}\)

The rest of the 414 pages offer a bricolage spanning from archaeological and historical case studies on Rome, Charlemagne and Francia Media, to texts deconstructing the uses of the past. Some celebrate the legacy of Charlemagne, making clear connections between then and now,\(^\text{118}\) while others turn the perspective around by stating that Francia Media instead can be viewed as a conflict zone and that, in the end, ‘Every iteration of Europe creates its

\(^{117}\) Callebaut, Pirkovič and Karo 2014: 7.
\(^{118}\) Bauer 2014.
own idea of Europe.’ In the five texts dealing with the EU, the connection to Charlemagne and Francia Media weakens. Instead, general topics like the political history of the EU, or specific questions like if the EU is worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize are discussed.

In the end note the storyline is puzzled back together by Dirk Callebaut, one of the central figures in the project. He explains that the theme of the exhibition, indeed the project itself, expanded far beyond the original outline, enriched by the outside specialists engaged to tell the story of Francia Media through a multitude of angles. He insists that the themes did work to show how a certain unity was created within the diversity of this historic setting, just as the project was meant to show. Ultimately, he states, the exhibition successfully addressed the urgent European problem of unity in diversity, showing that culture ‘really can substantiate the pursuit of unity on all levels and help to define the idea of Europe.’

This construction/deconstruction dynamic, or dissonance, is also visible in more straightforward academic contexts. In 2011, when the project had just started, the annual conference of EAC was held at the site of the Belgian partner. The theme, which was developed in relation to the CEC project, was ‘heritage reinvents Europe.’ It is clear from the abstracts and the published proceedings that the theme attracted highly critical contributions, undermining ideas such as the ones presented in the project. In the introduction, when the project participants present the different contributions, they relate to the critical sides by stressing that all stories are constructions and that this goes for their ‘unity in diversity’ story as well. They also emphasise that scholars need to be aware of the ‘interpretative dangers’ of ideological approaches and consider the Europeanisation of sites critically. In light of this, it is interesting that the last contribution in the volume, dealing with the CEC project itself, presents its purpose as questioning if and to what extent heritage is able to bring Europe closer to its citizens. The main goal is stated as stirring public debate on Europe.

In fact, the conference and the questions it provoked appear to have been formative for the self-reflective aspects of the project. Examples of discussion events that were initiated are the presentation in the European Parliament under the heading ‘Culture: an abused justification for national identity and European unity?’ and a colloquium called ‘Critical biographic approach

---

120 Callebaut 2014b: 441.
121 Callebaut 2014b: 422.
122 During 2013; Meier 2013.
123 Callebaut and Maříková-Kubková 2013: 11.
124 Callebaut 2013.
125 It is referenced in critical project contributions like Guermandi 2014.
of Europe’s past.\textsuperscript{126} However, the pattern was not consistent as the critical incentives seemed to come mainly from outside influences. During the 2013 conference of the EAA I sat in on a session that was organised to fill the needs of the project in relation to the Early Middle Ages. Contributors were asked to make comparisons and to investigate the possibility to ‘redefine’ basic chronologies in light of new findings and ‘revision excavations of various sites,’ thereby changing ‘our traditional view of early statehood in Central Europe.’\textsuperscript{127} Here it was all about making connections in the past and about content creation. Papers mainly dealt with archaeological objects or site-specific research, and did not include any questioning of the theme or deconstruction efforts.

After looking at the various narratives produced by this project, twisting and turning the different perspectives presented, the project still leaves me feeling confused. Some conclusions can be drawn:

- EUnore started its career as Francia Media in the Early Middle Ages (because there are clear cultural historical evidence linking it to the founding fathers of the EU or because each Europe creates their own Europe and they all have the fact that they are ‘Europe’ in common.
- EUnore needs heritage to successfully become one with itself. Either by making people aware of a persistent \textit{unity in diversity} through the ages, or by using it as evidence of the multicultural complexity that underlies a Europe based on values.
- Europe is expressed foremost as an idea, but what exactly it is that is \textit{European} about the diversity in Europe or about the historical attempts at unity on the continent remains unclear. Answers vary from geographical location, historical power houses, trade routes, Christianity, to Charlemagne himself.\textsuperscript{128}
- The critical questioning of the project theme is more prominent in the multi-author published volumes than in narratives connected to the heritage trails and exhibitions.\textsuperscript{129}

Overall, it creates an interesting dynamic when a project simultaneously constructs a narrative, deconstructs it and then neutralises the deconstructions so that they somehow fit into the narrative of the project anyway.

\textsuperscript{127} Chevalier and Maríková-Kubková 2013: 175.
\textsuperscript{128} Even in the most critical contribution, the meaning of Europe’s history is said to reside in its specificity, making heritage an important tool to show diversity in the past (Guermandi 2014). Yet, as such diversity marks the whole world: what makes the diversity of Europe European?
\textsuperscript{129} The thick exhibition volumes are aimed at both academic audiences and the public, although in style they lean more towards academic research than popular writing.
Clearly, the different perspectives can be assigned to different voices within; their dissonance is never fully in tune. Of course, this is to be expected in a big project where a multitude of actors are recruited to translate the wills or themes of the initiative, the full picture resting on who gets the last word and whose translations are privileged. Here, the parallel narratives never interlace since the first aim, to prove– and the second, to question a European identity and ‘unity in diversity,’ were incompatible. How do you reconcile the idea that Europe should pursue a policy ‘founded on the present without seeking historical justifications,’\textsuperscript{130} with the goal to increase the public consciousness ‘on the heritage commonalities and shared cultural identity between the European countries,’ and make them aware ‘that member states did share a common historical past some 1000 years ago’?\textsuperscript{131}

Projects change during their implementation and this one certainly has, but the critical incentives came after the premise was set and did not manage to overturn it. There are self-reflective and critical texts dealing with the EU in the published volumes,\textsuperscript{132} but the project’s own political ambitions and uses of the past to change the present are still perfectly in line with the goals and self-image of the EU, as a saviour with deep roots, stepping up for the complexity that is Europe at its time of need.\textsuperscript{133} To carry out a true archaeology of action or ‘heritage activism,’ this project would have to be more at peace with itself and address why they have chosen Europe as the container for their narrative and made the EU goals their own, becoming ambassadors for European integration.

Before moving on to the next section, it should be added that highlighting Charlemagne or the Early Middle Ages as a cradle for the EU is not new. As a historical figure, Charlemagne has occupied a key place in EU rhetoric as well as academic writing on this period.\textsuperscript{134} Restoration work on Aachen Cathedral, where he was buried, has even received EU-funding based on the ‘symbolic importance of this monument in particular to European unification.’\textsuperscript{135} In 2000, the large campaign Charlemagne: the making of Europe increased the popularity of the topic further,\textsuperscript{136} and in 2008 the EP and the committee of the aforementioned annual Charlemagne Prize, launched the

\textsuperscript{130} Guermandi 2014: 38.
\textsuperscript{132} Egberts 2014; Guermandi 2014.
\textsuperscript{134} Riddle 2008; Story 2005; Wood 2013. The popular narrative of Charlemagne as ‘Pater Europae’ is also mentioned in chapter two under ‘Once upon a time there was Europe.’
\textsuperscript{136} Wood 2013: 319. See pages 311–327 for discussion on exhibitions about Charlemagne and the Early Middle Ages since the second half of the 20th century.
European Charlemagne Youth Prize, recognising contributions toward European integration.

There were several other heritage projects focusing on similar themes with similar ambitions. Examples are Il cammino di Carlo Magno: il territorio e i paesaggi della prima grande stagione di unificazione europea\textsuperscript{137} and Foreigners in Early Medieval Europe: migration, integration, acculturation.\textsuperscript{138} The first one, ‘The path of Charlemagne’ already promises in the title to look at the territory and landscapes of the first great age of European unification. Its aim was to identify archaeological sites dating from 775 to 900 and to provide, with the help of archaeologists, art historians and anthropologists, new research on three selected territories and their European connections during the Middle Ages. Not much remains of the project. The main publication signals that the project used Europe as an umbrella. The research remained compartmentalised, dealing with specific objects, sites or regions from the period.\textsuperscript{139}

The second project looks at mobility and new ethnic groups in Europe during the Early Middle Ages, a period ‘important in the formation of Europe, as we know it.’ The objective is to collect archaeological data and make it available, thereby linking ‘the past with the present by showing how the past has formed the present, highlighting common cultural heritage and learning lessons.’ Foreigners in Early Medieval Europe did create a large database based on the graves of ‘foreigners’ from AD 400–800.\textsuperscript{140} The narrative plot in the project introduction on the website tells of migrations, alliances, personal motives, economic incentives and wars, bringing people of different origins together during this time. ‘The fusion of different cultures into new communities clearly is not a phenomenon of the 20th and 21st centuries’ it concludes, and it is added that the research carried out may shed light on ‘stages of acculturation, from old identities ‘to the development of a new, common culture.’ The references to the EU political project are not subtle in this context, but the analogy is a bit halting since, as it turns out, the foreigners in the narrative are the conquerors of the territories concerned, not disadvantaged groups, ‘outsiders’ or people who were forced to relocate (as many ‘foreigners’ in today’s Europe). Interestingly, the end note includes the recognition that archaeological sources differed greatly between areas in Europe. So much so, in fact, that they had to abandon the grand narrative and interpret grave forms and customs on a case by case basis.

\textsuperscript{139} Gai and Marazzi (eds.) 2005.
\textsuperscript{140} Foreigners in Early Medieval Europe, URL: http://www2.rgzm.de/foreigners/frame.cfm?Language=UK (accessed 1.4.15).
European things

About the same time … in different parts of Europe, using different materials and techniques, men cut large flint blades.\footnote{Marquet and Verjux (eds.) 2012. Editors’ introduction. Translation mine. Original in French: ‘Sensiblement à la même époque… dans différents lieux de l’Europe, en utilisant des matières et des techniques différentes, des hommes ont taillé de grandes lames de silex.’}

Having examined the proposed origins of Europe and EUrope in projects taking certain time periods as their starting point, I will now turn toward projects dealing with specific object categories. Are there any specific elements that can be considered particularly European? Or things that stand out as especially advantageous to draw upon in these funding programmes? In the EU abstract of the project quoted above, it is promised that the study of flint blades will make us aware of ‘a certain uniqueness of Europe well before the establishment of the European Union.’\footnote{ID: 67. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2006). Translation mine. Original in French: ‘d’une certaine unicité de l’Europe bien avant la mise en place de l’Union européenne.’} To see how such points might be argued, this section will look into two categories that have frequently appeared among the projects: prehistoric art and landscapes. Rock art or cave art, a rather specific area of research, is listed as the topic of at least ten projects,\footnote{The Commission documentation from the Raphael programme does not include the heritage laboratories. These have only been analysed when other reliable sources have been found.} while 11 focus on landscapes: from the ground up, from the air or via cultural perceptions (figure 27).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{wordcloud.png}
\caption{Word cloud, European things. Words sized according to frequency, starting at two. Landscapes highest at 11. Extracted from 98 project descriptions with specified object categories. The other 62 dealt with themes/sites based on spatial/temporal categories or methodology.}
\end{figure}
Between a rock and a hard place: Europe and prehistoric art

Projects working with prehistoric art have been surprisingly successful in the application rounds of the EU cultural programmes. There are several reasons for this, however a main one is to be found in the programme design and calls for proposals. As a result of stakeholder meetings with heritage professionals ahead of Raphael, rock art came to be listed as a topic of its own alongside ‘archaeology.’ Since cultural heritage and European art have been central themes in the subsequent programmes, talking about prehistoric art can be seen as a way to kill two birds with one stone. Another reason has to do with the already tight international networks and institutional interests existing in the field. The EU has always related to, and sought compatibility with the goals of UNESCO when designing their heritage activities. In that context, rock art is an area with strong advocates, and the ICOMOS international scientific rock art committee has played an active role in several of the co-funded projects.

Lastly, a handful of driven individuals have influenced this pattern. Looking at the partner organisations, it becomes clear that many have received funding multiple times within Raphael and the other Culture programmes, as well as other EU funding schemes. Among these ‘regular customers’ who have participated in (or led) several projects, Portuguese and Italian institutions connected to world heritage sites like Côa Valley and Valcamonica are particularly well represented. Other recurrent partners come from Sweden, Spain and Belgium. Using these programmes as a strategic source of funding, researchers have been able to sustain cooperation around a network of sites for over 15 years. With this in mind, I have chosen to look at projects situated within slightly different partner clusters. Two of these deal with data compilation, documentation and networking and one deals with exhibitions.

The first project consists of the two consecutive projects called EuroPreArt – Past signs and Present Memories and EuroPreArt – Memories Looking into the Future: signs and spaces. Aside from being funded sev-
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145 At least seven projects consist of more or less the same set of partners. I.e. Centro Camuno di Studi Preistorici (IT), Instituto Politecnico de Tomar (PT), Centro Studi e Museo D’arte Preistorica (IT), Instituto Português de Arqueologia (PT), La Cooperativa Archeologica Le Orme dell’Uomo (IT), and Centro Universitario Europeo per i beni Culturali (IT).
146 ID: 3. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2000). ID: 22. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2002). Coordinator: Instituto Politecnico de Tomar (PT). Coorganisers and associate partners: Arqueojovem Associação Juvenil para a Preservação do Património Cultural e Natural (PT), Acosiacion Cultural Colectivo Barbaon (ES), CEIPHAR Centro Europeu de Investigacacorda Pre-Historia do Alto Ribajeto (PT), CESMAP-Centro Studi e Museo D’arte Preistorica (IT), Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientifica (ES), La Cooperativa Archeologica Le Orme dell’Uomo (IT), Centro Universitario Europeo per i beni Culturali (IT), University College Visby (SE), Université de Liege (BE). Same partners as in 2000 with the exception of Arqueojovem disappearing and two new associate partners: University of Ferrara (IT) and University College Dublin (IE).
eral times, *EuroPreArt* caught my attention due to its visual profile. Based on first impressions alone, there is no way to mistake the project as anything but EUropean (figure 28). The website, set in blues and yellows, clearly draws on the figurative language of the EU. The logo, as noted on the page shows ‘prehistoric glyphs … within the stars of the European Union flag.’

![EuroPreArt website screenshot](http://www.europreart.net)  
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147 *FAQ*, URL: [http://www.europreart.net/structure.htm](http://www.europreart.net/structure.htm) (accessed 4.4.15).
This branding did not fully resonate with the project content. In the EU abstract, the aim is presented as creating a database of documentation about European prehistoric art, promoting dialogue and best practices between scientific partners, and to ‘increase the knowledge of prehistoric art as a common European heritage’ by offering the public a ‘collection of European prehistoric art in a new way.’ Thus, there are some buzzwords in the mix but nothing explicit with regard to their meaning.

In the project description on the website, these goals are justified on the grounds of the lack of initiatives trying to coordinate this knowledge, and the vague awareness among Europeans about the variety and importance of prehistoric art. Their ‘false ideas,’ of rock art as consisting of a few major sites, needs to be corrected it argues. Public engagement is also mentioned as a problem, however, giving rise to issues about how to protect sites. 148 Concerning the nature of European ‘commonness,’ the presentation clarifies matters to some extent with the statement:

Prehistoric Art is among the most important components of the European Heritage. It stands as an example of the diversity of the cultural memories of the European territories, but it also witnesses a common trend, a radical unity, in the emergence of symbolic behaviour.149

Thus, prehistoric art represents both diversity, connected to Europe as a place resounding with multifaceted memories, and a unity associated with the ways in which humans developed symbolic activities, marking their presence in the landscape over time. This clearly aligns with the EU motto *unity in diversity*, also applied within many other projects. As we have seen, the diversity side is usually easier to motivate than the unity side. As to what is European about these ways, there is no clear answer other than that ‘this is to be found, first in the world, in Europe.’ Due to these discoveries, especially at the site of Altamira, research related to European prehistoric art proliferated. This motivation suggests that Europe, despite the emphasis in the quote above is used more as container than a particular quality.

Looking at the main project output, the large database, a familiar pattern begins to emerge, a pattern that resonates with other projects working with data compilation.150 In the web interface, data on prehistoric art – in caves, on megaliths and other stone surfaces – can be accessed through an interactive map (figure 28), a list, or via a search tool with filtration options for things like time period and type of art. Unlike in the Roman Era project *Transformation*, the database and bibliographic archive is not adapted to any
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148 EuroPreArt: the project, URL: http://www.europreart.net/prese.htm (accessed 15.2.15).
149 EuroPreArt: the project, URL: http://www.europreart.net/prese.htm (accessed 15.2.15).
150 Available as CD-Rom and website. European prehistoric art online database, URL: http://europreart.net (accessed 15.2.15).
particular research themes, it is only meant to be a combined pool of information. This framing and compartmentalised presentation is consistent with the later publication EuroPreArt I, which contains a number of separate case studies.\textsuperscript{151} The only cohesive creation appears to be the guide to best practice (figure 28), presented as a ‘framework and a unified European Form.’\textsuperscript{152} It contains a visitors’ etiquette with recommendations like ‘do not touch’ the rock surfaces and respect the ‘tranquillity of the site,’ as well as some suggestions for researchers.\textsuperscript{153} While it refers to a common heritage and ‘our forefathers,’ the emphasis is on prehistoric art as the heritage of all humans.

As a whole, a European plot is clearly visible in the imagery of the project, yet weakly anchored to the content. In the descriptions, European prehistoric art emerges as distinct because it is located on the European continent, and because of how symbolic behaviour developed there: between prehistoric art as European in terms of place and idea. In the database, the European continent acts as a container of site-specific content, remaining unarticulated in the background. With regard to the public, it must have had a limited effect, seeing as it was the simple existence of the database that was the dissemination strategy, much like in the project Simulacra Romae. The main focus was on research and networking, and it was nestled in a cluster of similar projects.\textsuperscript{154} Its greatest impact is therefore likely found within archaeological infrastructures.\textsuperscript{155}

However, a few points deserve to be repeated. Using the landmass as a container means that content relating to phenomena that in reality transcend continental boundaries is effectively circumcised, just as with the map of the first Europeans in Europ@ncestors. This vessel obtains new connotations in relation to the funding context, a connotation augmented, in turn, by the adoption of the visual identity of the EU. This use of EU symbols is not uncommon among the projects. However, as this project dealt specifically with symbolic behaviour it adds a certain poetic quality to the output.

The next project, RockCare – Tanum Laboratory of Cultural Heritage,\textsuperscript{156} was supported as a European heritage laboratory. This strand within Culture

\textsuperscript{151} Oosterbeek 2006. Published within the project ARTRISK (ID: 33).
\textsuperscript{153} Seglie (ed.) 2001b: 9.
\textsuperscript{154} Other projects on prehistoric art involving the same partners are ARTSIGNS – The Present Past: European Prehistoric Art, Aesthetics and Communication (ID: 55), ARTRISK - Risk Control of Monuments, Art and Computer Appliances for Landscape Organization (ID: 33) and PALEOPANTHEON - Nameless Gods of European History (ID: 78). Furthermore, partners such as Centro Universitario Europeo per i beni culturali (IT) simultaneously enjoyed funding from EU ‘operating grants’ and other EU schemes such as Leonardo.
\textsuperscript{155} To see an example of what the project meant in a Spanish context see Navarrete 2002: 384.
\textsuperscript{156} ID: 8. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2000) (also Raphaël 1998/1999 but no EU funding agreement was found). Coordinator: Riksantikvarieämbetet RAÄ (SE). Coorganisers and associate partners: Centro Camuno di Studi Preistorici (IT), National board of Antiquities (FI), Parque Arqueologico Vale do Côa (PT), Instituto Português de Arqueologia (PT).
2000 aimed to conserve and protect ‘exceptional’ cultural heritage of ‘European significance,’ and to promote accessibility, dissemination and innovative methods at European level. Projects were funded on a yearly basis and set up around specific sites, co-selected with national representatives. Rock Care, supported from 1998 to 2001, focused on the UNESCO world heritage rock art site in Tanum (SE). In this case the visual identity is not connected to the EU as clearly as in EuroPreArt, but the logotype certainly makes a reference to the stars of the EU flag (figure 29).

The EU abstract introduces the aim as securing ‘the rock carvings in Tanum for the benefit of future European citizens’ and to improve documentation, preservation and presentation. Among the anticipated results, the ‘promotion of European identity by facilitated access to and improved knowledge of common cultural heritage’ is listed. Here, a passive approach to the concept of identity is signalled. It is the knowing about and experiencing rock carving sites that would stimulate a sense of European togetherness rather than any direct strategy or storyline developed by the project.

Figure 29. Front cover image of project report with RockCare logotype in the middle (Bertilsson and McDermott eds. 2004a [layout: Ann Winberg]).

In a longer introduction to a published report, Europe is mentioned in relation to the assertion that the Tanum rock carvings ‘represent the peak of artistic and symbolic stylisation in the European Bronze Age.’ It then widens the scope, pointing out the continuous threats facing ‘European rock carvings’ today. The main aims are the same as in the EU abstract, but with an added emphasis on protection against environmental degradation. It also adds the goal to develop a database and standard European documentation strategy that could act as ‘reference material all over Europe.’

In this presentation, ‘European’ is used to denote a group of rock carvings and an archaeological period, but without any qualities attached to this delineation.

The main activities in the project were the yearly ‘documentation seminars’ or ‘Valcamonica symposiums,’ held both at the main site in Tanum and in Valcamonica in Italy. On the back of one report, it is written that ‘according to historical tradition people from Scandinavia visited Valcamonica and Lombardy in prehistoric times’ and that even though this is not certain, the carvings in the two places are ‘strikingly similar.’ Inside the introduction however, the fact that the seminars were held in both places was described as vital ‘since local contexts and settings highly influence the success of the different methods.’

The emphasis on the necessity of accurate method development was more clearly emphasised in this project than in the former, which appealed to a commonness in the past. The database that was developed collected documentation and damage inventories of rock carvings in Europe, but instead of searching for similarities and differences the underlying premises was that of European heritage under threat. This trope of a common heritage in crisis – soon to be irrevocably lost – can be equally powerful. As demonstrated in chapter three, this is how the EU successfully motivated their early involvement in the heritage domain.

Even this connection is faint, however. Looking at the reports produced by the project and the remaining information about the website and database, there is little to indicate that there is anything especially European about rock carvings at all. The reports contain several published papers on rock art in places all over the world, and based on the case studies and topics in the seminars, the borders of Europe was breached again and again. One reason for this can be found in the link to ICOMOS scientific rock art committee and the project participants’ international ambitions, but also in the less strict conditions of the heritage laboratories scheme. By placing empha-
sis on ‘sites of European significance’ rather than a common heritage, they allowed for a more unbalanced cooperation in terms of financing and division of work. Moreover, although the project involved students and some educational initiatives, there was no major public outreach involved and thus no ‘story’ to be told. Perhaps these conditions facilitated the development of an international approach instead of a continental one.

The next project, *L’arte Rupestre D’Europa: 40.000 anni d’arte contemporanea*, was a travelling exhibition aimed at the public (figure 30). The coordinator of the project also had a central position in *RockCare*, and indeed the first reference I found for the project was on the list of activities on a published screenshot of the *RockCare* website. Here, the contrast between the earlier projects regarding the role played by Europe in the narrative is striking. The aim, as described in the EU abstract, is ‘to stimulate an awareness of European identity, particularly amongst young people, and bring people into contact with our considerable cave-art heritage.’ In the short text, the ‘cultural roots of the continent’s first Homo Sapiens populations and the forms of artistic expression common to them’ is also linked to the notion of a ‘European civilisation.’ Using the language of the *Raphael programme*, a connection is made to roots and commonness. Prehistoric art is recognised as a shared phenomenon among the early peoples on the continent, a commonness located in the past, while the bridge between this time and the creation of a contemporary European identity is built through the title, signalling a 40,000-year-old continuity.

As with many older projects, the website and exhibition are no longer available, but descriptions of the project narrative in other forums provide some insight. The travelling exhibition seems to have taken some time to build, as a catalogue and the first news about were published in 2000. It was then shown in Milano in 2000, Brussels 2003, and Brescia from 2005 to 2006. According to a news piece on the exhibition in Milan, the exhibit contained photographs, summary tables, and a video produced by the project leader. Ideograms and pictograms was also said to accompany scenic of everyday life in prehistory, giving visitors a chance to reproduce and play with the symbols using copy markers or frottage-rubbings.

On the website of the project coordinator, the plot is outlined: ‘European art is 40,000 years old’ the heading tells us, and the visitor is promised a
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166 Robertson 2004: 178.
look into the expressions and roots of the first peoples who lived in Europe, through rock art sites in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy and Scandinavia.\textsuperscript{168} The story unfolds in a linear fashion, with cave art from 30,000 BC initiating the story, followed by the fragmented early post-glacial rock art and the ‘awakening of artistic creativity’ during the 6\textsuperscript{th} to 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC. This is followed by more complex art spanning the Neolithic and the Iron Age. Europe stars, initially, as the scene upon which events take place, but as the narrative develops it becomes the story. According to the outline, there was a type of basic European unity in the past, augmented by the common traits once existing in the figurative, symbolic and ideological elements of rock art, said to possibly indicate a common culture or belief system. This grew into more complex patterns as languages and ethnic groups changed and diversified. Through these stages, the text argues, the exhibition gave an overall view of the development of ‘modern European society,’ defined by its economical complexity and increasingly personalised cultural patterns. Prehistoric art thereby worked to fuel a trope of European origins, turning periods from the distant past into a sort of golden age, something to reflect and draw upon in the current EUrope.\textsuperscript{169}

Through the visual languages of early Europeans a vision of the origins of the European culture gives us a new image of this continent and its people; 40,000 years of human creativity … offers a novel perception of history and a new awareness of European identity. Europe has acquired its present shape in this long sequence of millennia.\textsuperscript{170}

\textbf{Figure 30.} Exhibition poster image. 40.000 anni d’arte contemporanea. \textit{In: Edizioni del Centro} 2005. \textit{URL:} http://www.ccsp.it/ (accessed 27.2.15).

\textsuperscript{169} See Smith 1997 for the creation of national ‘golden ages.’
\textsuperscript{170} 40,000 years of contemporary art, \textit{UNESCO} (text by Ariela Friedkin who was connected to the organisation leading the project). \textit{URL:} http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=8417&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed 2.12.15).
Thus reads a recommendation of the exhibition publication on the UNESCO website, an introduction that correlates well to the coordinator’s introduction of the volume. ‘Europe is searching for its unity’ it starts, a quest marking the latest chapter in a long story of war and friendship stretching from the times of Etruscans, Celts, Gauls and foremost the Romans, all providing Europe with the basis of its cultural identity. But what about before that, the text asks: What is the history of Europe from its origins, from the times of the bands of mammoth hunters? In other words, the printed volume continued this type of rhetoric in a quest to deepen the story of Europe (at least as a marketing strategy), to adorn it with prehistoric art as one of the early common denominators of European cohesion.

Without access to the exhibition texts it is hard to tell if the project was really as concerned with European origins as all of these clues suggest. An Italian online review suggests that in reality the exhibition talked about ‘messages left in every inhabited part of the world.’ The published volume is not of great help either since it, aside from a joint introduction, consisted of separate case studies on different sites and areas.

Regardless, these potent presentations emphasising European origins, roots and identity were part of its public profile and transmitted into a number of different forums. In a notice for the Milan opening, the exhibition is said to allow visitors to create a historical and cultural reconstruction of the common origins of the peoples of Europe, and according to a notice on a web page of the Italian authorities in relation to the Brussels exhibition – held at the European parliament in 2003 – the presentation seems to have followed the same pattern. The exhibition was sponsored by MEP Monica Frassoni, who had talked at the opening event, stating the importance of preserving the memory and consciousness of the ‘roots of our culture,’ and the need to take into account both differences and ‘heredity’ in contributions to a common European identity. In this case, from an outside perspective, the funding context, the story plot and the political allegiances worked to render prehistoric art European rather than a phenomenon once developing on the European continent.

173 La Creatività Preistorica Dell’Europa 40 Mila Anni Di Arte Contemporanea. URL: http://archiviostorico.corriere.it/2005/dicembre/19/creativita_preistorica_dell_Europa_mila_co__0_7_051219041.shtml (accessed 4.3.15).
European landscapes

Cultural landscapes have long been objects of study in archaeology, but since the 1980s ‘landscape archaeology’ has grown into an ever more distinct field. Land development, changes in laws on land use, and new archaeological information and methods – wider access to spatial data, large scale surface studies, GIS – have solidified this interest, leading archaeologists to both study and engage politically in the protection of cultural landscapes. The adoption of CoE’s European Landscape Convention (ELC), came about in part as a result of such activities and has acted as a driving force (and point of contention) in archaeological landscape studies since the early 2000s. In its preamble, it is noted that the landscape contributes to the formation of ‘local cultures,’ to ‘human wellbeing’ and the ‘consolidation of the European identity.’ The EU, long committed to regional development and landscape management alongside or together with CoE, has been keen to support this work. Heritage projects dealing with landscapes became targets for both Raphael and Culture 2000. As with the category of rock art, cultural landscapes were highlighted under the definition of cultural heritage, on par with ‘archaeological heritage.’ Therefore, it is more by design than happenstance that the Culture programmes have become a platform for landscape projects. Among those run by archaeologists, frequent sub-themes have been the development of survey methods, aerial archaeology and landscape characterisation, and landscape biographies.

The project called [European] Pathways to Cultural Landscapes (PCL) belongs to the ‘bottom up’ category, working from a multi-regional perspective and addressing local populations. In it, I found a similar kind of tension as in CEC, between viewing Europe as an idea, a continent and political

175 David and Thomas (eds.) 2008. See also Willems 2001.
176 Also called the Florence Convention. It promotes the protection, planning and management of European landscapes, and acts as a hub for cooperation in the field. It was adopted on 20 October 2000 and came into force on 1 March 2004 (CoE Treaty Series no. 176).
177 ELC 2000 preamble. For a discussion on the Europeanness of landscapes in relation to the ELC see Meier 2013.
179 For additional examples of landscape projects see Niklasson 2013b.
180 Sometimes just ‘Pathways to Cultural landscapes.’ ID: 7. Financed under Culture 2000 (call 2000). Duration 3 years. Coordinator: Archaeological Spessart-Project, Museen der Stadt Aachaffenburg (DE). Coorganisers and associate partners: Archäologisch-Ökologisches-Zentrum (AÖZA) (DE); Lancashire County Council, English Heritage (UK); Gwynedd Archaeological Trust, Country side Council Wales (UK); Odense City Museums (DK), Estonia National Heritage Board (EE); Finland National Board of Antiquities (FI); The Discovery Programme, The Heritage Council Kilkenny (IE); Natural Park Paneveggio, Pale di san Martino (IT); The Bronze Age Society, County Museum of Halland (SE); Halland County Administrative board, County Council of Halland (SE); Prachenske Museum, Czech Academy of Sciences Institute of archaeology (CZ).
space. It also had a EUropean visual language on par with EuroPreArt with a website in yellows and blues and a logo mimicking the EU flag (figure 31). The project began during the Raphael programme under the name European Cultural Paths (ECP) in 1997, after the participants had met during the CoE Bronze Age Campaign (1994–1997).

For ECP there is no EU abstract available, although project introductions in other texts states Bronze Age landscapes and monuments as its main focus, with goals including research, protection of cultural heritage and the creation of cultural paths. Keywords were ‘knowledge,’ ‘care’ and ‘communication,’ and Europe was emphasised both in relation to the Bronze Age as the ‘first golden age of Europe’ and to the kind of cooperation that the project promoted in the present. As a European heritage, cultural landscapes were linked to concepts like roots and identity, but the content appears to have remained on a regional scale.

![Figure 31. PCL. Welcome page on project website. Web clip, URL: http://www pcl-eu.de/ (accessed 27.2.15).](image-url)
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181 ID: 138. Financed under Raphaël (call 1997). Duration 2 years. Coordinator: The Bronze Age Society, County Museum of Halland (SE); Odense City Museums (DK); Archaeological Spessart-Project, Museen der Stadt Achaffenburg (DE); the Municipality of Karmøy 'Av-aldsnes Project' (NO); Estonian National Heritage Board (EE).

182 See also Gröhn 2004 for added information and an analysis of ECP and PCL focussing especially on the Bronze Age theme.

In the EU abstract of PCL, the focus is placed on sustainable management, communication and contribution to the new field of landscape archaeology. A lack of common standards and good outreach strategies is stated as the main motivation for the project, and the trope of a European heritage under threat is used as justification, underscored by the then recently drafted ELC. Concerning EU goals on integration, ‘diversity’ is the buzzword highlighted at the expense of terms like unity and European identity. The EU abstract was fully aligned with the aims stated in the full grant application, in which the EAV of the project is described as: increased comparability of results through mutual understanding and common solutions, a new appreciation of landscapes otherwise neglected, and a European approach that can be used when lobbying the cultural landscape to foster community interest.\textsuperscript{184} The emphasis on European approaches as a base for commonness, and landscapes as a base for diversity is reproduced in the presentation of both projects and on the PCL website. In line with this, the task of lobbying is extended from the active engagement with the public to include decision-makers in political and economic spheres. This shifts the focus from the otherwise common strategy of informing European citizens about a particular time period, site or phenomenon, to an approach requiring participation. The strong link to the ELC is repeatedly expressed, and a European heritage under threat becomes a connector, something all the partner landscapes have in common.\textsuperscript{185}

The tension mentioned earlier, between Europe as idea and place occurs when attempts were made, nevertheless, to argue that the 12 landscapes of the partners all had a European character. This is done in the project’s philosophy on landscape characterisation:

Identifying likeness as well as difference will help to define what makes our 12 areas European despite their differences.\textsuperscript{186}

And in the final publication:

We think this is one of the prime characteristics of Europe’s cultural landscape: any area is simultaneously locally distinctive and unarguably European.\textsuperscript{187}

A certain Europeanness of landscapes in Europe is suggested, and the set phrase unity in diversity is put to work once more to create a sense of coher-

\textsuperscript{184} PCL Grant application, provided by the project leader. \textit{Culture 2000, Action 2: integrated actions covered by structured, multiannual transnational cultural cooperation agreements.}

\textsuperscript{185} Agenda, URL: http://www.pcl-eu.de/project/agenda/index.php (accessed 10.3.15).

\textsuperscript{186} Draft Philosophy on Landscape Characterisation, URL: http://www.pcl-eu.de/project/agenda/philo.php (accessed 10.3.15).

\textsuperscript{187} Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 5.
ence. In another text, the uniqueness of the English historic landscape is said to stand out when seen from a European viewpoint, a contrast to landscapes elsewhere, marking it as European. This unclear statement is followed by the assertion that this ‘unifying diversity reflects several thousand years of common cultural practices that are arguably more important in forming perceptions of landscape than the natural differences of topography or geography.’

Thus, it appears that landscapes in Europe have little in common, but what makes them European is that people in Europe have treated them and thought about them in similar ways.

Looking at the outreach activities, including cultural paths, volunteer groups, exhibitions, educational initiatives and presentations, this dynamic or distinctive Europeanness does not really manifest itself. However, the symbolism of the EU does. I first came across the cultural paths in 2012 during a day trip from Brussels to the town of Aschaffenburg in northwest Bavaria (DE). I was there to meet with the project leader of PCL, but stopped by the tourist information to ask about the pathways. I was handed a selection of folders with different historical routes to take in the area. All bore the distinct project logotype from the website, displaying a rock carving motif set inside the EU stars. Inside the folder, images and informational texts supplemented numbered sites on a path outlined on a map.

During my visit I explored Route 2 Schweinheim, following the ‘EU-ships’ that marked out the routes in the physical landscape. The ship was the logotype of the first project and had remained as the symbol for the paths (figure 32, logotype). Signs containing information on the background of highlighted memorials, buildings and historical sites of local production stood at seven spots along the route. However, except for the EU symbols used, the path did not take me to Europe. Instead the focus was on or neighbourhood biographies and local landscapes, which only rarely linked to larger narratives.

Based on other folders and signs studied, the local focus was the same for the paths and landscapes of the other PCL partners. Some wider connections appealing to a European dimension were made, such as the role played by the town of Frammersbach in the Spessart region, representing an historic intercrossing of trading routes which affected the geopolitics in certain parts of Europe.

Still, it was more of a regional story than something that could be connected to a European past or a EUropean present. In this regard, I noticed a slight difference between the folders from the first and the second
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188 Fairclough 2002a: 10.
190 Frammersbach, Route 1 Herbertshain. Aschaffenburg City Museums, ECP 1999. Reproduced with the logo of PCL. See also Prehistoric Hessian-Bavarian Truckers, URL: http://www pcl-eu.de/virt_ex/ (accessed 12.3.15).
project (figure 32). In a general information folder of ECP, the EU-ship logo-
type is said to symbolise movement and international communication, and
therefore in line with the project aim:

to stress the close and far-reaching contacts between Bronze Age people and
to link prehistory to our present day life communicating its heritage…\textsuperscript{191}

In the later project, presentations emphasised diversity over similarities and
connections. In two folders concerning the same landscape, that of Bjäre in
Sweden (dominated by Bronze Age barrows, ship settings and rock carv-
ings), the story in the early folder names the period as a European golden
age, with intimate links between the Mediterranean and Scandinavia, while
the later folder remains in Bjäre.\textsuperscript{192} It seems that when landscapes were fixed
to a certain archaeological period, tropes like the Bronze Age as a European
golden age were more easily integrated. When a broader temporal perspec-
tive was applied, like in PCL, the tropes and grand archaeological narratives
evaporated, and the Europeanness was transferred to the present.

The approach employed in the later project, in which diverse and situated
pasts were presented in EU wrapping paper but not intimately related to a
European past, is consistent with the exhibition panels and posters used in
other public outreach activities.\textsuperscript{193} A virtual exhibition on the website tells
the visitor a number of imaginative but disconnected stories about the differ-
ent landscapes and their passage through time. The narratives deal with eve-
erything from ‘Golf-Age landscapes’ and Trolls to Neolithic settlements,
megalithic tombs and archaeological finds of butter in Irish bogs.\textsuperscript{194} Related
school projects focused on getting to know local landscapes through presen-
tations and the creation of joint art exhibitions. In Untamala, Finland, chil-
dren photographed the landscape from their point of view, and in Arfon,
Wales, children attending the Rhostryfan primary school explored the ‘im-
ages and feelings’ they attached to their surroundings, the things that made
the place special.\textsuperscript{195} Other than the focus on landscape perceptions and biog-
raphies, the projects EU-inspired visual identities were the only common
denominator.

\textsuperscript{191} Paths to the Bronze Age. Fact sheet/folder, ECP 1998.
\textsuperscript{192} Bronsåldern på Bjäre: Norra slingan. ECP/Bronståd Association 1999; Europeiska Kultur-
\textsuperscript{193} Exhibition panels: Årtusendena i Vakka-Soumi, the Untamala Archaeological Information
Centre (2003); Understanding the Cultural Landscape, at the ‘Natural Experience Market’
(Schleswig-Holstein/AÖZA 2002) and the Main-Spessart-Fair (Spessart 2002); Kulturland-
schaft Begriefen, at Kindergarten St. Elisabeth (Spessart n.d.). Posters: Rohstryfan Summer
Walks (n.d.); Bäres Kulturlandskap i våra hjärtan (n.d.); Bäres Framtid: historiens djup i
värt kulturlandskap (n.d.).
\textsuperscript{194} Virtual Exhibition, URL: http://www.pcl-eu.de/virt_ex/index.php (accessed 12.3.15).
\textsuperscript{195} Didactics, URL: http://www.pcl-eu.de/didactic/index.php (accessed 12.3.15).
Looking at the academic narratives produced, there are some notable differences from the public initiatives. Research activities involving archaeological sites, excavations and surveys, appear to have made even less of a connection to Europe and the EU in general and the policy goals in particular, while studies focused on creating common frameworks for landscape characterisation, using GIS and aerial photography, worked with Europe as delineator.\textsuperscript{196} The overall focus in these texts was on change as an inherent quality of cultural landscapes,\textsuperscript{197} demanding new flexible approaches for its man-

\textsuperscript{196} Publications were mostly focused on specific landscapes and regions. They were also published separately in national forums (Final report ECP 2000 and Final report PCL 2005).

\textsuperscript{197} For instance, the project aim was stated as, to manage change within the ‘European landscape in ways that respect both diversity and unity, both rare and typical areas. PCL could be a model … to understand and monitor the historic landscape … a clear appreciation that the landscape contains our roots and our stories but that it offers many different narratives and identities’ (Fairclough 2002a: 11, see also Fairclough 2002b).
agement and study. Several project participants were also politically active in CoE forums concerning sustainability and planning, laws of protection and developing compatible frameworks. Therefore, a lot of texts deal with management issues and ways to apply the ELC, which already endorses a European Identity and common European heritage.\textsuperscript{198} Political agendas were incorporated in such narratives as a matter of course. On the whole, stories appear to be something local communities should be told, rather than heritage professionals.\textsuperscript{199} They were instead told about best practices and methods, interpretations and landscape management.

At this point, after taking the public outreach activities and the academic output into account, I was still no closer to solving the riddle of the proposed distinctiveness of the diverse European landscapes. In an attempt to find an answer, I analysed the English version of the final project publication, \textit{Pathways to Europe’s landscape}.\textsuperscript{200} It was angled towards a general audience, and specifically to local politicians in the partner countries. Described as the product of a collaboration involving seventy archaeologists and ‘landscape scientists,’ it attempts to interlace no less than 36 landscape stories into a ‘cumulative narrative about how landscape can be constructed from an archaeological and historical perspective.’\textsuperscript{201}

The book starts off following the same pattern as many other final publications co-funded by these programmes, with a foreword strongly referencing the EU, titled ‘Pathways to a European Union.’ It talks about Europe’s cultural landscape (mostly in singular) as a diverse heritage ‘matched by an equally rich common heritage that unites our landscapes and makes them very recognisably and distinctively European.’ The cooperation itself is said to illustrate how landscapes can be ‘a strong and vital part of European unity.’ This ‘work for the European idea,’ it proclaims, is worth expanding in the future.\textsuperscript{202}

In the introduction chapter, a fuller explanation is offered. Landscape is an idea, it affirms, not an object, and the European landscape becomes cultural through peoples physical and mental interaction with it. European landscapes therefore embody history, culture and identity, making them guides to the past – ‘to the origins and long development of our culture that has grown in Europe, relatively uninterrupted, over ten thousand years.’\textsuperscript{203} Thus, if you let them guide you, the stories resting there can be extrapolated, and in dis-

\textsuperscript{198} Fairclough 2002b, 2003; Fairclough, Rippon and Bull (eds.) 2002; Nord 2009. See also papers in virtual library, URL: http://www.pcl-eu.de/project/virt_lib/ (accessed 2.3.15).
\textsuperscript{199} Although the final publication was meant for both audiences.
\textsuperscript{200} Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003 [English version]. The book was translated into ten languages, and for each version the partners in that country were listed as editors.
\textsuperscript{201} Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 113.
\textsuperscript{202} Foreword by Ermischer and Trube (Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: IV).
\textsuperscript{203} Joint introduction (Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 1). This statement differ from those made in other parts of the publications, where change and fluidity is highlighted.
covering the perceptions and make up of cultural communities across Europe over time, ‘a true understanding of the European cultural landscape,’ and of ‘European identities’ can be reached. A couple of things are specifically mentioned as connectors:

— The physical: A shared ‘geography, geology and topography that often ignores international boundaries.’
— The cultural: Family, ethnic and tribal connections; Language and its traditions; Trade of goods, of ideas, and of people; Political, economic and social systems; Religious and spiritual beliefs; Artistic, architectural and industrial traditions; Proximity and shared borders; A long, shared ‘history’ (taught and perceived).

After this exposé, the stories presented throughout the book – dealing with everything from early agriculture, bog-lands, and historic glass trade to meteorite showers and local legends – are worked into this larger narrative. Through a creative effort, all landscapes in Europe become European. The breaking point comes when a connection is made to the world outside, in stating that this logic can be applied to other places too, that ‘every continent has its own unique, long-lived culture and landscape.’ This is then reaffirmed in the conclusions, stating that through the project they have learnt that landscapes are connected physically and culturally, and that each one is unique but melts together in ‘an ultimately seamless single European landscape moving from mountains to shore, from agriculture to industry, from town to country.’ In connection to this, it is stated that national borders are ‘meaningless in terms of landscape,’ that nations are ‘imagined communities,’ and that regions make a better focus.

A critique of methodological nationalism is used as an argument for what could be equally called methodological continentalism or continental exceptionalism. European landscapes are ‘witnesses,’ ‘tools’ and ‘vessels,’ that change based perceptions and appearances. They are also considered diverse, personal and local, but always European. This all-encompassing logic is very close to the one promoted by the EU, where all citizens are considered part of one big, diverse, and slightly dysfunctional family. The trick performed by this narrative is to connect such a family to a temporally fluid but culturally delimited space, in which everything changes except for the European-ness of the landscapes.

Taken together, there is a contradiction in the way that landscapes are portrayed and communicated in the project. The use of EU symbols speaks its clear language, but what is European about the ‘unique’ landscapes varies

---

204 Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 3.
205 Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 5.
206 Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 5.
207 Clark, Darlington and Fairclough (eds.) 2003: 106.
between the different outcomes. However, the separate focus of the different partners was a deliberate feature of the ‘European approach.’ Commonness was predominantly sought in the present, tied to issues such as the threats and negligence facing cultural landscapes. A certain we-feeling resulted from the prestige that participants, politicians and publics connected to the EU as a brand: to the financial backing, and to the fact that EU officials and experts considered these landscapes a worthwhile investment. In this way, the project generated good will, as many of those involved became more positive toward the EU.\textsuperscript{209} In the final publication, the ‘European’ put in front of landscape did not just refer to a geographical area, but to a preferred meta-narrative. In contrast to projects like CEC, however, diversity took centre stage from the start and the engagement with the political wills of the EU was not insinuated but clearly articulated.\textsuperscript{210}

Conclusions

In the section called ‘Buzzing with Europe,’ four observations were made. It was noted that projects tended to:

\begin{itemize}
  \item use policy buzzwords and phrases from the call for proposals.
  \item focus on likeness rather than difference.
  \item use narrative structures to link the past to the present.
  \item involve ideas of a European past, roots and identity especially when the public was to be addressed (particularly young people).\textsuperscript{211}
\end{itemize}

Going back to these observations after taking a closer look at 12 projects, it is clear that some remain valid while others need modification. Regarding the language used, the EU buzzwords on a common heritage and European identity were used consistently in descriptions on project websites and in the beginning of publications. At this level, they were woven into their objectives, activities and methods. Looking at the content of the projects, it became clear that the EU notions were applied to varying degrees. The most obvious was in the delineation of project scope and content. In projects like \textit{Europ@ncestors} and \textit{EuroPreArt}, the content was circumcised by a map of the European continent and filled with substance, but there were no immediate comparisons made and neither objects nor sites were given any particularly European qualities. In other cases, Europe was a continental container.

\textsuperscript{209} See Ermischer 2002 and 2005 for a description of outreach activities and the affects on local populations and in one of the partner areas.

\textsuperscript{210} For a reflection on the project narratives in relation to the EU, see Ermischer 2013.

\textsuperscript{211} Interestingly, although project activities and target groups changed in response to the broader focus of \textit{Culture 2007-2013}, notions like European roots and identity persist in project descriptions after they disappear from the calls for proposals in 2002.
with a cultural destiny, leaning towards understanding Europe as an idea rather than a place. The project *Transformation* struck a balance between the idea and a geographic use of Europe, while *Simulacra Romae* and *Rome’s Conquest of Europe* conjured the image of Rome as the birth of Europe as we know it. Overall, their focus remained in the past while looking toward the future. The interaction with the funding context was limited to a passive contribution to European integration through raising awareness and informing European citizens about their common heritage.

The projects CEC and PCL both interacted actively with the goals and context of the funding source, their content and strategies echoing the EU motto of ‘unity in diversity.’ In different ways, they forged a European continuity through narrative strategies, referring to Europeanness as an idea and quality enclosed in landscapes, or in the historical realms Francia Media. Both projects exhibited self-reflective and critical sides, but did not fully incorporate critical reflections into the overall storylines.

Both of these directions can be linked to a continental thinking, which is not that different from taking the nation state as a starting point. As discussed in chapter two, Europe is not and has never been a ‘horse.’ It is not an autonomous object but something dependent on the creation of negative Others.\(^\text{212}\) The question about what kind of Europe is summoned therefore becomes important. As demonstrated in many of these projects, if not explicitly addressed, Europe is often reproduced as a natural space and a given frame to cram with ‘culture.’

As concerns the tendency to focus on likeness rather than difference, it turned out that most projects were not, as they claimed in the EU abstracts, concerned with making comparisons between sites or the information gathered in databases. Most final publications were compilations of separate case studies and the databases were not structured according to analytical themes. Of those who did make attempts to compare the input of the different partners, like *Transformation* and *Foreigners in Early Medieval Europe*, interesting contrasts were provided but did not result in any coherent thesis. In the latter project, it was even concluded that all things considered, a case by case analysis had been the only way to approach the research questions. Furthermore, these publications and databases were mostly directed towards the academic community.

This makes for an interesting contrast to other activities like exhibitions, where the key target group was the public in general and young people in particular. The majority of the projects studied wrote that they would address these target groups, but only a few actually did so. Among those who did, narratives tended to link the past with the present by using notions like European identity and culture. Projects like CEC and PCL engaged with schools, communities and volunteers on different levels, as well as politi-

\(^{212}\) Borneman and Fowler 1997: 489; Malmborg and Stråth 2002: 7.
cians. In doing so, narrative structures and modes of representation created a sense of continuity, coherency, and meaning around the idea of Europe. One starred Charlemagne as the hero, whose legacy was destined to be used and abused over time, finally ending up as a formative inspiration for the EU political project. It reinforced an already popular origin myth for the EU by cherry picking from the archaeological and historical record based on a clear intent of proving the link. PCL sought to convince that no matter how different the landscapes of Europe may look; they are all part of a European diversity that stretches back in time. Europe was endowed with culturally determined symbolic qualities and the past was set against the backdrop of the EU integration as an ending point and way forward, thereby neutralising the political order of the present. Of course, as we have seen, none of these projects are without nuance and they clearly reflect on their own constructions. However, when telling stories of Europe, they underline both the traditional figure of archaeology in the eyes of publics and politicians – of archaeology as a domain that can perform the feat of creating identities for Europe – and support the biography that the EU has created about itself, as peace project and saviour of the continent.

Lastly, among the projects that leaned toward application poetry, the references to phrases in EU documents were mostly consigned to the packaging. Perhaps the strongest ‘prose’ was found in the projects way of embracing EU visual characteristics, and in the joining of potent words like in Europ@ncestors. Although superficial, such features still worked to create a meaningful link between a European past and present, and aside from storytelling, images are some of the strongest communicative devises we have.
Chapter 6. EU-funding in the Political Ecology of Archaeology

The European Commission has long been interested in labelling goods, systems and places as ‘made in the EU.’\textsuperscript{1} Remains from the past are no exception, the adoption of the European Heritage Label (EHL) in 2011 being the most recent example of such a strategy.\textsuperscript{2} When visiting archaeological sites in member states the EU flag is often present, either flying from a flagpole next to the national flag or printed at the bottom corner of information signs, on folders and in books. Every so often you also find it carved on a plaque attached to the visitors centre or monument (figure 33). Most visitors probably pay little to no attention to this common occurrence, but for professionals working in the domain (and for politicians), it signals that the place, or people connected to it, has received financial support from the EU. This, I have found, comes with far more assumptions and expectations than that of a couple of Euro bills changing hands.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{eu_plaque.png}
\caption{EU plaque at the museum quarter in Vienna, 2014. Photo by author.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1} See for example Pieterse and Kuschel 2007.

During my fieldwork, I noticed early on that project participants usually spoke about their projects as ‘EU-projects,’ not as international cooperation projects or in terms of their focus (e.g. ‘rock art projects’). As shown in the previous chapter, many also emphasised the link in their narratives and visual language. The financial backing from the EU Culture programmes – even if only representing half of the total sum – seemed to define them. As stated by a Commission official:

We have strong organisations in Europe, they can walk on their own legs. They would probably even exist without European support, but they sort of look for a European label.3

This observation prompted me to ask project leaders and participants if they placed any significance on the fact that it was the EU, rather than a different institution or source, backing the project. They did, and their answers drove me to explore how the EU was ‘casted’ in their text and oral accounts. Rather than playing the villain or the hero, I found that the name and political nature of the funder played a complex role, at times minimal, at times symbolic, and at times instrumental.

Therefore, this chapter aims to show how EU logotypes and lines like ‘co-financed by the EU’ can become useful in the political ecology of archaeology and heritage. Instead of asking how EUrope is manifested in narratives about the past, the focus is placed on how EU-funding has worked as enabler and capital for archaeologists, both in governmental and academic settings. Using reflections offered in interviews and ‘meta-texts’,4 I have focused on three groups of functions that stood out as particularly important:

— EU-funding as necessity
— EU-funding as political capital
— EU-funding as a factor in building cognitive authority and professional capital.

All groups relate to legitimacy and prestige. While tied together, they will first be discussed separately. The first two are more outward looking, relating to administrative and governmental settings and the third more inward looking, concerning professional spheres and hierarchies within the domain. Throughout, the focus remains on the European Commission Culture programmes, but the discussion has bearing on EU-funding as a ‘brand’ in a wider sense.

3 20 EU-02 2012.
4 The stories written by the project participants about the project itself (meant to promote, inform or offer advice to fellow archaeologist as well as publics and politicians).
The bare necessities

Even with these funds we cannot cover all the expenses. Without any [EU-] funding I don’t think it would be possible.5

One of the most instrumental functions of EU co-funding is the money itself. Representing about half of the individual project budgets,6 it plays a decisive role in their initiation. For many countries, especially in Eastern Europe, state funding is meagre and directed towards national monuments and research, while private foundations or institutes are close to non-existent. In some cases, EU-funding is one of the few ways to make projects happen at all, particularly when it comes to projects which transcend national borders. The project leaders and participants I have talked to all agree that without the EU funding the projects would have been hard or even impossible to carry out. This is supported by the fact that, once established, constellations of partners often reapply to the programme rather than turn to alternative funding sources.7

Aside from the money, I found that another basic need facilitated by the Culture programme was that of collaboration. This was not just between member states in different parts of Europe, as was the very condition to apply, but also across territorial and judicial boundaries between neighbouring countries or regions within a country. One project leader in Southeast Europe explained that a key advantage had been the possibility to work with and learn from colleagues close to home. Ever since Yugoslavia was divided in the Bosnian War (1992–1995), cooperation had been limited and the national heritage offices, once part of the same system, had become more isolated. EU funding enabled such cooperation, since national funding was committed to state activities.

Another project leader explained that prior to considering EU funding they had tried to cooperate with colleagues across federal states within Germany. Their offices had only been separated by three kilometres, but the border was so rigid that before contact was made the offices knew little about each other. Once the idea to collaborate was set, they went to their respective local and regional authorities to request support, but without success. Instead they were advised to contact the state offices, with a promise of support if they managed to get them on board. The state offices turned it around, advising them to contact the regional authorities and promised support if they succeeded in convincing them first.

---

5 26 PJ–07 2013.
6 The other half consist of local, regional or national funding, or alternatively by partners own capital or for example working hours put into the project.
7 Evaluation ECOTEC: 2008b.
In both cases, the EU funding became a ‘loophole’, a solution to sidestep administrative and legal obstacles. In the first case, cooperation between archaeologists and heritage professionals who were once part of the same state was made easier. In the second, a small civil unit in Germany could ‘bypass local and regional problems by taking a detour through Europe.’

This first function, as enabler, is linked to the supranational level of the funding source rather than the EU as such. But, as we shall see, the enabling function is entangled with other meanings that have everything to do with the nature of the funding source.

Political capital

Aside from the bare necessities, the German example sheds light on an additional function. Once EU funding was achieved, the attitude from local and regional authorities changed:

I went to the same politicians … and told them we have got an EU project, we need some co-financing to make it really work, please cough up the money. And the interesting thing is they did because it was an EU project … That was important! One of the councillors actually said: well now it is different, now it is political.

EU funding became the leverage the participants needed to bring additional capital into the project. One project leader even attested that for every single Euro they received from the EU, they were able to generate seven in local funding. Another explained a tactic called ‘the pincer movement.’ According to this manoeuvre, the EU was assured that the project had national support while the national funding source was assured the project had EU support. If all went according to plan, both would come through at about the same time. Even though such strategies are in themselves interesting testimonials to the bargaining and heterogeneous engineering that goes into conducting archaeological research, it seems to be particularly related to this type of funding source.

In a recent study on the role of EU-funding in relation to hospitals, the partners in the projects studied were found to ‘play the European card’ when trying to obtain backing for their project in national and regional settings. EU-funding became a bargaining chip. They also found that actors would add the EU flag and logo in certain contexts, such as on official documents and invoices, using the visual language in a strategic or even manipulative

---

8 03 PJ–01 2011.
9 03 PJ–01 2011.
10 39 OT–07 2014. A pincer movement, or double envelopment, is a military manoeuvre in which an enemy formation is attacked simultaneously from both flanks.
11 Glinos and Baeten 2014.
way to make sure they were reimbursed and taken seriously. This can be compared to the way the whole visual identity of some projects mimicked the symbolic language of the EU. Why is it, then, that EU-funding could work effectively as door opener and leverage?

…now it is different, now it is political.

One answer lies in the legitimacy associated with EU-funding, due to its legal status. It is a well-known and secure financier, a source that governments on different levels generally trust and know to provide large amounts of money. Added to this, its political nature makes it a potentially useful as a tool. An EU-funded project can be used as political capital, promoted in speeches or included in evaluations, signifying that a place and its leaders are engaged in matters above regional or state level. Among the projects studied, the EU link was also cited as a source of pride and legitimacy for local residents: ‘to get people to invest in heritage management and in managing their own cultural heritage, it was extremely important that we had the European emblem.’ If the EU cared about their heritage, then it had to be important. Because of this, the volunteers participating in the project was said to have continued using the EU logo on signs and printed materials even after the project ended.

In the hospital study, this political capital was put forth as a reason for why Europe was used in naming. Names like ‘European Clinical Centre’ or ‘European University Hospital’ were said to ‘add credibility and seriousness in front of other regional and national players.’ Among the projects studied in the previous chapter, names like Europ@ncestors or EuroPreArt could have a similar function, signalling the type and status of the project to people both inside and outside the domain, although most likely it was also thought that this would appease the sponsor. Either way, using the EU visual identity and using Europe in the project name was a strategic move, a way to take advantage of the political capital afforded to them by the funding source. Therefore, it is not surprising that the EU connection was demonstrated in this way among many of the projects examined in the previous chapter.

We try to find the help of politicians, without politicians you are nothing.

Aside from using the legitimacy of the funding source to bring in more money, how could this political capital be used? In chapter four, looking at the
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12 Glinos and Baeten 2014: 23.
13 03 PJ–01 2011.
14 03 PJ–01 2011.
15 Glinos and Baeten 2014: 23.
16 05 PJ–03 2011. In line with this another informant emphasised the importance of ‘winning the hearts and minds of politicians (41 PJ–12 2014).’
EU Culture programmes as a black box, the need expressed by applicants to have someone who ‘knew their way around Brussels’ was highlighted.

Complicated rules and application processes were discussed as a mechanism causing controversy, creating a market for EU consultancies, but also something that held the box together. Apart from experts and consultants, I found that some of the project leaders had themselves developed such expertise and acquired a more political profile. Sometimes, increased involvement was spurred when the European Commission selected a project for valorisation, showcasing it as a role model on websites, at information events and in Commission publications. Archaeologists then had the opportunity to promote both themselves and the project in stakeholder forums and at political events, becoming influential as representatives of something more than just the co-funded archaeological activities.

At other times, a more directed effort was involved. Many had travelled to Brussels to talk to EU officials about their project, both before achieving funding and after, both in private meetings and at stake holder meetings.

[In Brussels] I simply went to the regional offices of all our partners … I said this is your project not our project, fight for it … that paid off.

Some projects, such as L’arte Rupestre d’Europa and Cradles of European Culture also established connections to the European Parliament by contacting members and holding presentations, workshops and exhibitions in Brussels. This signals a level of engagement above that usually exhibited when supported by national funding schemes. Setting up an archaeological exhibition in the government assembly hall in Sweden is not a common practice. Turned around, it was customary to invite EU officials and members of parliament to opening events for sites, exhibitions and heritage trails, generating attention from media and added interest from local politicians. One project, as seen in the previous chapter, even made efforts to secure Herman von Rompuy as their official patron. Project leaders thereby used the legitimacy and capital that came with the EU-label to gain influence, promote their project and learn how to deal with people and situation in Brussels.

However, it is important to remember that this political capital was not desirable to all archaeologists engaged with in this study. Some discarded the whole idea of applying for such funding, endorsing the observations made here by stating that: ‘it is too political.’ Furthermore, one project participant explained that in order to gain influence in terms of European politics on heritage you had to become political yourself and devote most of

---

17 A hidden machinery that is difficult to deal with or to understand. See chapter four.
18 This was also the case with the project Pathways to Cultural Landscapes (ID: 7).
19 03 PJ–01 2011.
20 Rompuy was President of the European Council (EU) December 2009 – November 2014.
your time to administration, promotion and negotiation. The participant considered this scenario highly unappealing, as it removed him from the “real” archaeology, the reason he got involved in the field in the first place.

**Professional capital and cognitive authority**

Another reason why the EU brand was seen as beneficial was the prestige it stood for. Aside from the political capital, the majority of those interviewed considered it to be a stamp of quality. This was mainly due to two reasons. One was the perceived challenge involved in obtaining this type of funding, especially in light of the peer-review process:

> It is always a prestigious thing, because you go through a very hard application process, so going for an EU project is seen as a peer reviewed project…basically it is always a good thing and it gives you a reputation.\(^{21}\)

The second was the management skills needed to make the project run smoothly:

> I think that the European logo is very, yes it is certainly an added value to the project, certainly. Because it is hard to get a project and for those who got a project it is hard to manage the project. Maybe we should develop a T-shirt saying: I survived a European project *laughter*.\(^{22}\)

To achieve funding after a long application and review process became a source of academic prestige, a sign of *rigour*, while a successfully managed project indicated a level of *cunning*. On the one hand this prestige can be connected to the reproduction of cognitive authority in academia, where ‘excellence’ is judged based on peer-review points and where more peer reviewed funding equals more possibilities to spread your ideas, thereby rising in the ranks and gaining even more funding.\(^{23}\) On the other hand, it can be connected to more practical sides of the political ecology of archaeology, collecting professional capital in the form of experience and new competences. Due to the EU machinery functioning as a black box, the organisation of a transnational project in terms of communication, monitoring expenses, fulfilling reporting demands, was seen as an extra challenge. Hence the accomplishment: ‘I survived a European project.’

Of course, the cognitive and professional aspects are interwoven. To achieve funding, both ‘EU-smarts’ and a convincing research plan – set within a recognised discourse that can pass through the filters of potential gatekeepers – are needed. Yet, the increase in rational knowledge is still

\(^{21}\) 03 PJ–01 2011.

\(^{22}\) 12 OT–02 2012.

\(^{23}\) Addelson 2003[1983].
often considered disconnected from the politics of archaeology. Being a good broker and manager does not always mean added prestige in terms of excellence, and vice versa. In light of this, what was the prestige good for? Boosted by the legitimacy aspect discussed earlier, it worked mainly as means to increase one’s own status and facilitate networking:

It is a big reference for me … I communicate with other colleagues from our institute that have different European projects. I know the system … Before I started I never thought that I will work on the European projects.24

When I was trying to find new partners to broaden the network in the beginning I was asking people: wouldn’t you like to join us? At the moment there are more people approaching me … There might be different reasons to do so, some of them might just want to have this logo, that: we are partner in an EU project.25

Based on the fact that many participants reappeared in other EU-funded projects and on transnational platforms such as CoE, the board of the EAA or EAC and in UNESCO committees, this seems to have worked well. Cognitive authority and professional capital may also have been amplified by the trend of favouring international networks in national contexts. The combined prestige and legitimacy factors has led some universities and institutes to value EU-funded activities above others. In Sweden, it has even been suggested that the academic success of universities be measured based on the amount of EU grants their researchers pull in, even over the quality of their output.26

So far the image painted makes EU-funding out to be something purely beneficial, but there is reason to nuance this, especially in view of the special profile of the Culture programme and the black box. Both, I have found, could call a projects level of excellence and professional capital into question. Just as in the case with the political capital discussed above, the EU logo could be interpreted as a stop sign, something to avoid:

I was talking to a project partner in Romania and the structure of their institution has changed … now the heads say: we don’t want to be involved in all this EU stuff … it costs so much time and we don’t get anything out of it, it is only this new modern stuff which we don’t like anyway.27

Here, both the management aspects and the content of EU-funded projects are cited as a drawback. The first angle, motivated by the black box machin-

25 08 PJ–04 2011.
26 Flodström 2011.
27 08 PJ–04 2011. Similar statement: ‘Especially in Belgium it is a prestigious project … but it depends because there are many differences between the partners (26 PJ–07 2013).’
ery, is familiar. That some would rather not get into the fight at all, finding EU-funding undesirable, takes some prestige away from the idea of ‘surviving’ an EU project, but it also reinforces it. Without opposition, there could in fact be no base for sustaining the notion of running an EU project as walking a maze. Interestingly, the popularity of the EU as a political project overall seemed to matter little. The black box issues, although connected to a general image of the EU as a bureaucratic bully, overshadowed any specific Eurosceptic objections.

The second disadvantage, relating to content, is a more serious accusation and something that affects the prestige relating to cognitive authority. This is the idea that having a project funded by the EU is somehow not conceived as doing “real” archaeology. EU-funding initiatives based on explicit policy agendas such as the Culture programmes, along with certain actions within the framework programmes for research,\textsuperscript{28} are designed to substantiate notions like creativity, innovation, sustainability, intercultural dialogue and public awareness. Addressing such ambiguous terms, while at the same time adhering to the different wills and competences within a multinational effort, often makes these projects come off as fuzzy. They are hard to place in any acceptable academic category.

This is especially true for the Culture programmes, where ‘this new modern stuff’ could refer to the comparatively new archaeological fields or methods which appear to have flourished in this setting (especially the study of landscapes and digital applications). Three project leaders told me they had at times received critique in regard to their research themes being too broad or their new methodological approaches being of no use to archaeology. However, more often the downside was perceived to be the conflation between ‘academic archaeology’ and heritage matters and the extensive public engagement that the Culture programme called for.\textsuperscript{29} This is a dynamic which created tension:

I think that this group of pure academics who see EU projects as secondary because they are not purely scientific are dying out as a species, they are the dinosaurs … We want to do science together with people [community volunteers] with a very strong participation, and of course in our own academic world that was viewed with great scepticism.\textsuperscript{30}

It is a problem to explain to partners that we need another interpretation and another presentation of the site than scientific … In my country this type of European projects are really not well accepted, because it must be hard core science, hard core archaeology.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} FP1 to FP5 1984–2013 and the current Horizon 2020 running from 2014–2020.
\textsuperscript{29} This is specifically evident by the order of peer review criteria, placing excellence third, after EAV and the ability to meet the programme goals.
\textsuperscript{30} 03 PJ–01 2011.
\textsuperscript{31} 27 PJ–08 2013.
In some contexts, academic gatekeeping had consigned EU projects to a lower position in the pecking order due to the subjects and the importance placed on outreach, provoking a defensive stance from the project participants. In these contexts, the prestige obtained through the peer-review process was nullified as the thematic focus was not, using the words of Foucault: "within the true." The claims and approaches did not meet the "requirements that a proposition must fulfil to be able to belong to the grouping of a discipline." Thus, although not necessarily expanding the idea of Europe (as seen in chapter five), EU-funding became an arena for projects challenging the disciplinary borders of archaeology, in terms of both content and target groups. These ingredients worked to turn EU-funded projects into a specific type of project, prestigious for some but not in everyone’s taste. While this meant that the projects were only considered advantageous in terms of cognitive authority in certain settings, the prestige connected to the international scope and the ‘EU-smarts’ still held.

Based on research by Claske Vos on an EU-funded regional heritage programme in South East Europe, this particular type of project could perhaps be extended to include a particular type of sites (in essence a particular type of European past). Just as in the examples made here, she points to a certain disbelief in the EU-programme among national representatives, some considering it too administratively difficult and offering too little money. This caused a division between the ones for and against the initiative, and the persons who stuck with the programme said it was in order to gain experience for future jobs abroad. Because of this, she argues, the sites chosen for restoration and development in Serbia became those that the national institutions laid no claim to, like industrial or modern heritage sites. In the end, sites that local populations knew little about got millions of euros in support.

Archaeologists and Network Europe

Considering the functions presented so far, what might the long term effect of EU-funding programmes be in the political ecology of archaeology? Based on my own EU experiences and knowledge of actions in cultural heritage, one of the most compelling replies to that question is changing people:

There is a virus that has taken these people … I am sure that there is a difference between people who have never done European projects and people who have done European projects, there is a real difference and probably that’s the main results of these projects.

32 Foucault 1971: 25.
33 Foucault 1971: 25.
34 Vos 2011a; 2011b.
35 12 OT–02 2012. EU consultant.
Ever since the Maastricht Treaty (1992), EU cultural initiatives have been preoccupied with supporting networks. Aside from the general momentum of the concept, as a postmodern zeitgeist linked to discourses on globalisation, networks has also been a good way for the EU to fit their activities within the established subsidiary rules (avoiding the tangible by dealing with intangible structures). Despite this focus, scholars like Tobias Theiler have argued that the networks supported through the culture programmes have remained invisible and short lived, going so far as to call them ‘ad hoc formations’ created for and driven by the prospect of EU-funding. Even though the funding part may hold true – as discussed in chapter four in relation the ‘European umbrellas’ created by some projects – the ad hoc part does not seem to apply to projects in archaeology and heritage.

Not only did the people involved in the studied projects create, modify and solidify relationships on a EUropean level, but they seemed to do so lastingly. Many of the constellations that were formed at the turn of the century, during Raphael and the early years of Culture 2000, continued in one project after another, featuring a familiar group of archaeologists and heritage professionals at their core. The list of institutions collected in the project database shows how the same associations, university departments and academics reappear in slightly different groupings or in successor projects where the leadership has been rotated. Out of the projects I have been in contact with, only one was created by persons who had not previously worked with EU funding. The project leaders in the different constellations also knew of each other. It is the ‘bunch of usual suspects,’ one project leader explained when asked about the colleagues involved, while another talked of calling some ‘buddies’ when organising the project. I was assured that there was a lot of new blood coming in as well, but overall it appears that if EU-projects are something of an acquired taste, it is one that makes you crave more. All of this relates to the wider question of Europe-making.

Looking at it from the perspective of ‘Network Europe’, a term used in European or EU-studies, it could be argued that these projects have created a setting which calls into question the national logic and hierarchies of archaeology and heritage. Although most often applied in relation to the European

37 Theiler 2005: 75.
38 Furthermore, when it comes to the question of projects being created only to apply, a consultant stated that while the opportunity attracted some applicants who looked at the amount first and thought of a project idea later, this was not the most common way. Since their clients were mostly large institutions with a lot on their hands, they had no time to browse for funding by chance, but had at least some idea of a project beforehand (12 OT–02 2012).
Information Society (EIS). Network Europe has acquired a wider meaning, representing a node in the new deterritorialised relationships between people, places and things. This node is linked to the EU, but is just one out of many in an increasingly globalised, technology driven world. Archaeologists and heritage professionals have long since become part of this network cluster, in aspect from cooperation between national heritage boards – on laws or campaigns on EU level (European Heritage Days or digital platforms like Europeana) – to EU-funded cooperation platforms in research and culture. Some argue that the new relationships forged in Network Europe cannot be circumscribed within spatial or scalar confines such as the nation-state. Instead, they pierce traditional forms of bounded social organisation (territorial/scalar).

This could apply to the Culture programme projects in several ways, the act of travelling in itself being one of the most basic aspects. In the last decades, the average distances between the places of residence of people within networks have increased exponentially in European countries. Schengen and other mechanisms favouring EU citizens have created exceptional conditions to forge network clusters on a European level. The world of archaeology and heritage has always been ‘small’ but new communication techniques and the increased ability to travel have made it even smaller.

The interpersonal relations that have been developed, the certain taste for Europe … that’s concrete results … they become real kind of Europe addicts.

John Urry has argued that travel is always social and, although most of the work today is carried out online, networks are sustained by the trust and social relationships that can only form over face to face meetings. Meetings and small conferences, or ‘tribal battles face to face across a shiny table,’ were crucial to the projects studied. Excursions, culinary experiences and nights at the pub are more important than emails and phone calls.

---

39 The European Information Society (EIS) emerged in the 1970s as a reaction to Japanese and American advances in Information and communications technology. From the 1980s the EU has focused a lot of resources toward the wiring of Europe, building ‘information highways’ (but leaving it up to the private sector to implement). The information society became a discourse in which it was possible for the EU integrate many disparate ambitions, from competition policy to cultural diversity, all while adhering to subsidiary rules (Servaes ed. 2003).
40 See Axford 2009 for an overview.
41 Sassen 2006.
43 12 OT–02 2012. EU Consultant.
44 Urry 2003: 165.
45 Archaeological ventures has been compared to tourist experiences, where persons mostly engage with the participants in the own group, experiencing new foods and cultures. They are ‘authentic’ travellers, seeing places and things others see (Pluciennik and Drew 2000: 94).
not have done much to further European integration on a large scale and the relationships were definitely not always harmonic:

We are many people from many different environments, from academic and so on … It is a question of unity and diversity: people’s mentalities are very different in Europe. In one project we worked with German people and with Italian people and it is very complicated.46

But they did become something more than the sum of their parts, creating a cluster of social networks tied to a node in Network Europe, positioned within the domain but outside of national hierarchies. Increasingly, important forums like the annual conference of the EAA became part of the infrastructure sustaining the networks. So too did the positions in transnational European heritage organisations, acquired by project participants in part through the political capital discussed earlier. Yet question remains: is this ‘something more’ actually something new? As stated by an archaeologist interviewed by Sassatelli in regards to the promotion of European identity in Culture 2000:

That is said to be what Brussels likes. But actually, the community of academics to which I belong has always been so supranational, international, and we all feel European.47

As research into the history of archaeology has shown, networks at European level had already started to form in the early days of the discipline, fuelled through participation in world congresses from the late 19th century onward.48 These social worlds were made and remade over time. The political divides into East and West Europe during the 20th century – in which Western archaeologists enjoyed more freedom – has unquestionably had an effect on the nature of such formations. So has the disciplinary divides of Anglophone, French, Soviet and Central European archaeology. Yet, in a wider sense, as stated by Thomas Meier: ‘There is no archaeology but European archaeology.’49 It is basically a European invention. Above and beyond Europe as territory and continent, archaeology and its social networks have always been connected to Europe as an accepted extension of the nation-states. And, more importantly, to a European rationality.

46 27 PJ—08 2013.
47 Sassatelli 2007: 35.
49 Meier 2008: 36.
Figure 34. Top map shows the countries of all participating organisations in 154 projects (from 1–222) co-funded by Raphaël, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013, including associate partners when information was provided in the EU documents.

Bottom map shows the countries of leading organisations in 154 projects (from 1–39) co-funded by Raphaël, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013.

Seven projects had no listed country.
Plotting the countries and institutions of 154 Culture programme projects on a map shows that the connections made until 2013 was quite uneven in terms of spatial distribution of power (figure 34). The coordinators (leading partners) are mainly concentrated to South-Western Europe while the co-organisers and associate partners are spread throughout the EU territory and to some candidate countries, decreasing rapidly eastwards. To be sure, this pattern corresponds to the gradually extended borders of the EU and therefore the legal conditions of participation in the programmes. Even if not a surprising result, it effectively points to the tension between the idea of Network Europe as a deterritorialised smooth and limitless space, and the firm external borders of the EU, summoning the image of virtual ‘monotopia.’

Although networks are still constituted in national practice, constructs like ‘Fortress Europe’ are far from imaginary and funding initiatives seeking to connect EU member states will unavoidably have a clustering effect. In this case, this clustering does not appear to have noticeably challenged already existing archaeological infrastructures within Europe.

Figure 35. Exhibition at the Commission historical archives. Brussels 2013. Photo by author.

50 For a graph of exact amount of projects per country, see figure 9.
51 Jensen and Richardson (2004) use ‘monotopia’ to denote EU spatial policies aimed at creating a seamless space of zero friction. See also Delanty and Rumford 2005.
Conclusions

This chapter set out to explore how EU-funding has worked as enabler and capital for archaeologists, both in governmental and academic settings. In the initial discussion I sketched out three basic functions: bare necessities (enabling cooperation, money), political capital (leverage, influence) and professional capital (cognitive authority, networking). The balance between these functions, I argued, turned the Culture programme projects into a specific ‘type’ of project, more valuable in terms of political influence and networking than cognitive authority.

Placed in the context of Network Europe, the idea of a borderless social space fuelled by digital society and EU policy – I found that the networks created did build a new dynamic together – a European closeness apart – and that this dynamic included contacts and information flows from outside of EUrope. Although few networks challenged the legacies of Europe in archaeology, they contested disciplinary borders in terms of addressing the public. In the interaction with EU funding sources, archaeology and its figure has been translated into a different environment.52 Archaeological sites or professional alliances that were previously considered international, national, regional or local become ‘European heritage sites’ and ‘European collaborations.’ While this epithet may be freshly acquired to some extent, its content is not. Personal relationships were already formed before most projects started, and the Culture programme thereby intensified already existing patterns of cooperation. The consortiums came off as select EUropean clubs. I believe it is in this context that issues of reflexivity and accountability have to be addressed, and from where archaeologists need to work consciously on the margins of any suggested European boundaries (figure 35).53

52 See chapter 3 on the figure of archaeology.
53 In line with Pluciennik 1998.
Chapter 7. Conclusions: Funding Matters

During my time in Brussels I often attended lobbying events. Except for the offer of free food (which always ensured the attendance of a large number of interns), I enjoyed observing the game of wits being played out between politicians and stakeholders. My thoughts often return to an event organised by European State Studs Association, who were in Brussels to promote National horse breeding traditions as a European cultural heritage, including the actual fertilisation practices. There was an exhibition, a presentation and a panel discussion on the Europeanness of stallions. The invited representative of the Culture programme struggled to say something thoughtful on the matter. When asked about potential funding, she reassured the association that since heritage is a part of European identity and these horses are part of a common heritage, it would surely be possible, adding that: ‘we have already funded a project on fishing as European cultural heritage, so why not horses.’

Heritage is a matter of the heart and not the brain, David Lowenthal once said. For heritage to make sense, you have to follow the advice of the Queen in Alice in Wonderland: you have to believe as many as six impossible things before breakfast. The memory described above, of an association’s desire to be recognised and the use of European identity as a short-hand in offering such recognition, reinforce such beliefs. If the right actors were recruited to legitimise the stated cause, under the proper ritual circumstances, it could henceforth be branded as ‘European heritage’ and the chances of acquiring EU funding would increase. The event was, in a sense, a laboratory of European heritage-making. To identify and explore such laboratories, from the situated viewpoint of the domain of archaeology, has been the task of this dissertation.

This research started from two matters of concern. The first grew from the observation that, when filling out applications for the EU Culture programmes, archaeologists and heritage professionals often used potent phrases about European identity or roots, seemingly without regard for the legacy of Europe as a cultural club and ethnically conditioned space. The reasons and rules behind these translations seemed important, and although research into archaeology and EU policy had been conducted before, few studies had addressed both the archaeological and the intra-institutional sides of the relationship. These issues gave rise to two questions:

1 Fieldnotes, November 16, 2010.
— How, and for what reasons, has the EU interacted with the domain of archaeology as a component of cultural heritage?
— How, and with what outcomes, have archaeological projects co-funded by the EU funding programmes in culture interacted with constructions of Europeanness?

The second matter concerned the paucity of research on the value and functioning of archaeology in the everyday work of bureaucratic machineries such as funding agencies. One of the most important moments in the research process, the one deciding whether a project can happen at all, had largely been left unexplored within studies on the sociopolitics of archaeology. This led me to ask:

— What processes of translation characterise this interaction, and where does the power to define Europeanness lie?

Building upon ethnographic observations, interviews and EU documents, these questions have been addressed in five sections. Qualitative coding techniques and comparisons have been used to identify meaningful junctures in the material, while discourse analysis and tools from Actor Network Theory have allowed me to structure and conceptualise these findings. Chapter two set the stage by providing a brief overview of the cultural history of the Europe as a concept and some traditional methods of ‘Europe-making’ in archaeology. Chapter three, five and six were devoted to the first two questions, examining the role of archaeology as part of the political economy of culture in the EU on the one hand, and the role and affect of the EU culture programmes in archaeological projects on the other. Chapter four was devoted to the third question. Envisioning the programme Culture 2007–2013 as a black box, it identified specific actors and translations that have bearing on the process of European heritage-making in relation to archaeology.

The life of a project proposal

In order to break with the order of the thematic chapters while still staying close to the intertwined nature of the results, I will now exemplify and recap my points by outlining the observed elements of interaction between archaeology and the EU that take place before, during and after the creation of an archaeological project proposal. From what happens before its arrival at the Commission to its implementation. The journey is divided into three stages: the pre-application phase, the application phase and the post-application phase. For each phase I will address the central conditions, motivations and strategies that have bearing on the meaning of archaeology in this setting, as well as the different actors and their translations. The goal is to showcase the role of archaeology in the construction of Europeanness in the EU institutions and the potential implications of this relationship for the domain.
To understand the setting that this proposal would enter into, the best place to start is at the ‘call for proposals.’ This type of document represents a condensed version of the different wills that go into the making of a programme. It is a recruitment action, offering financial support to project constellations that are able produce a good enough translation of the expressed goals.

In chapter five, it was noted that the calls for the three selected EU programmes – Raphael, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007–2013 – varied in detail and scope from year to year.3 If we choose the call for Culture 2000, the minimum requirement of the proposal would be ‘to highlight common European cultural heritage (movable and non-movable heritage, architectural and archaeological heritage).’ If a constellation applied as a multiannual cooperation project or a heritage laboratory, the project would have to involve ‘relics of European significance’ and promote a ‘European dimension’ through their work. In addition, if choosing to apply as an awareness-raising project, we would need to ‘highlight the common European roots and dimensions of similar or comparable elements of the non-movable and archaeological heritage.’4

The call, written by officials in the Commission directorate dealing with education and culture, was based on the goals set in the programme decision, placing emphasis on the ‘history, roots, common cultural values of the European peoples and their common cultural heritage.’5 Neither in the decision

---

3 If addressed to the Raphael programme (1997–1999), this application would have to describe how the project would increase awareness of the ‘rich and diverse cultural heritage through which one can witness the considerable similarities and common roots of Europe’s civilization (2001).’ In the later programme Culture 2007–2013, it would have to integrate the goal of fostering ‘transnational cultural links’ and ‘intercultural dialogue’ (2010).


nor in the legal base was the connection between archaeological heritage and Europeanness made explicit, however. The treaty clause upon which all three programmes rested, simply stated that the EU 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.6

Policy scholars who have analysed this paragraph often argue that it designates the EU aim as celebrating diversity, not building a homogenous European culture.7 And yet, somewhere along the way, highlighting the common cultural heritage turned into European roots and a search for likeness in archaeological monuments and sites. Despite the fact that the EU has changed its approach to culture and identity since the time tangible heritage first became a Community concern, this association has lingered. Particularly, it has appeared in translations with fewer actors involved such as the call for proposals. Emphasising these concepts has been a way to demonstrate the importance of the topic, promoting the status of the Commission representatives or units in charge.

In chapter three we learned that this was not a coincidence. Through inspecting historical EU budgets, searching for investments in cultural heritage and their respective justifications, I was able to demonstrate how tangible heritage in general, and archaeology in particular, had been accompanied by homogenising terms like roots, origins and identity since the 1970s. While other parts of the cultural sphere such as literature or visual arts were described as creative and forward looking, cultural heritage was seen as static, devoted to the care and study of the material reflections of a European culture. The expected contribution of sites and monuments to a sense of European belonging was based on their intrinsic value and ability to confirm a European commonness already in existence, but yet to be recognised by the public. Sites and monuments were also, unlike other areas, regarded as being under constant threat, something which made it possible to frame Community involvement as more of a duty than a choice.

Neither the image of a common European heritage in crisis nor that of sites and monuments as raw material for building a feeling of togetherness emanated from the political actors within the Community. Rather, it was an outcome of the wedding between continental chauvinism and the figure of archaeology. As argued in chapter two, the adoption of the concept of Europe into the name and purpose of this post-World War II economic and political Community marked the first time that Europe as a signifier met with “real” political interest. Despite the fresh focus on European values as

the glue between the member states – or at least more so than blood and territory – the signifier was adopted in a passive manner, with all its previous meanings included. As pointed out, legacies of Europe as a unique continent defined by racial, ethnic and religious elements have re-emerged in justifications for cultural action and debates on EU enlargement.

By and large, the domain of archaeology shares these European connotations and ideological foundations. The emergence of the discipline in the 19th century was one of several responses to modernity’s fear of losing one’s past. During the rise of nationalism, marked by an obsession with ethnic origins and mythical golden ages, archaeologists were entrusted with the role of interpreting and protecting the material evidence of past societies. In this role, they could make authorised claims with bearing on the present. In part, this is why the domain met with political interest in the first place. Alongside a critique of older premises from within the discipline, the expectations on the domain from the outside, what I have chosen to call the figure of archaeology, have remained much the same. This widely recognised image is not only upheld by politicians and the public, but also by professionals in the domain. They often make use of it to advocate the importance of the topic and the need for funding. Thus, when this figure met with the desire to build a European polity, tangible heritage became a promise and a useful strategy.

This is because, as argued in chapter three, EU interests in heritage and archaeology have rarely been a sign of any real devotion to the topics themselves. When it was first highlighted as a Community issue in the 1970s, the attraction lay in the power to bring the topic of culture onto the political agenda. The interest in culture was twofold. Firstly, the economic cooperation had not resulted in the popular support previously hoped for. When facing both an economic crisis and a crisis of legitimacy, some actors in the Commission and the EP argued that what was missing was a sense of cultural unity. In this context heritage became a promise and a potential solution. To foster a cultural belonging was the goal, sites and monuments the means. From the late 1980s, this developed into an articulated discourse on European identity and personhood,8 which was later incorporated into the Culture programmes.

The second and more determining factor was the interest in culture as a growing economy. Certain Commission officials wanted in on this market, both due to potential financial benefits and to raise their own standing in the institutional hierarchy. As a result of the potent combination of Europe and archaeology, the rhetoric of a European heritage under dire threat became the most effective way to push this agenda in the parliament. In the decades to come, this strategy would chiefly be supported by those member states that had the most to gain financially and symbolically from heritage actions, such as Greece (cradle of democracy) and Italy (Roman legacy, rule of law).

---

8 See Hølleland 2010.
Nowhere is this more clearly phrased than in the draft proposal for the *Culture 2000* programme, in which the aim of the treaty clause cited was interpreted as: ‘to capitalize on the cultural area common to the European people by highlighting cultural characteristics common to the European people.’

These inferences, many of which are supported by previous research, become especially interesting when combined with the observation that archaeological entities were some of the most potent bargaining chips within the social construction of a common European cultural heritage. Pointing to a longue durée, they were considered one of the strongest aspects of a ‘commonness,’ and due to damages caused by land development they were considered to be in urgent need of attention. At the same time archaeology was, because of its firm place within national politics of belonging, one of the most sensitive aspects of heritage. This was something unlikely to be willingly shared amongst the member states, even in a symbolic way. As such, it has also hampered the development of EU cultural policy. During the last decade, as the EU has turned towards diversity and intangible heritage, the very aspect that made heritage attractive to the EU in the first place – allowing it to get involved in the economic field of culture – now made it unattractive in the context of EU cultural policy. In *Culture 2007–2013* the domain became increasingly stuck in the EU past, deemed too expensive as and having too conservative a workforce.

Ultimately, this dual nature of archaeological heritage within the EU cultural actions was both a result of the figure of archaeology already present in the minds of EU officials, and the underpinning of this figure by stakeholders in heritage and archaeology. After all, the ‘call for proposals’ used as an example here, was designed based on meetings with experts in the field, and priority areas like subaquatic archaeology and European archives was a response to their wishes and those of member state representatives.

This brings us to the final observation relating to this phase: that the different EU actors have remained unwilling to define what a common European heritage should consist of in terms of actual sites and monuments. In reports and documents it is often stated that the EU wanted to leave the selection and definition to the experts in the heritage field. The stakeholder meetings that took place ahead of the *Raphael* and *Culture 2000* programmes are examples of this. By doing so, vagueness became a type of approach in itself, creating a frame and supplying the key aims but not the content. Thus, it is clear what made passages on ‘common European roots’ and ‘similar or comparable elements’ of archaeological heritage possible to write, but not what became of them. That was up to the recruited applicants, translating these concepts into their site nominations and project proposals.

---


The application phase can be said to represent a microcosm mirroring the events of the pre-application phase. Here, the different motivations and strategies started to work towards a single point: that of the funding agreement. In the course of my research I have studied many peripheral actions tying into this phase, such as the promotion events hosted by the Culture programme in order to court potential applicants, and stakeholder lobbying events aimed at the Commission. Only the ones deemed most central to the outcome of the selections and the project narratives made it into this thesis. The actions considered can be divided into two main groups. One concerns the sphere of archaeologists and heritage professionals, and the creation of the project proposals. The other focuses on the Commission side, their administration and evaluation processes.

Starting with the application document itself, the form used for Culture 2000 included a number of boxes to check. An applicant had to indicate if their project aimed to further training, exchange and research, use new technologies, and raise awareness of the ‘history, roots, common cultural values of the European peoples and their common cultural heritage,’ as well as their ‘cultural diversity.’ Academic gatherings, public campaigns and educational activities relating to monuments and sites were listed as ways to achieve these goals. There was also a section in which applicants were urged to describe the European added value (EAV) of the project. As the first one listed out of the three most valued criteria of the Culture programmes, it was essential to the outcome of selections. Although used in most EU programmes and actions as a way to mark the boundaries of EU jurisdiction, it was given special meaning in relation to culture. Budget documents stated that EAV should contain a ‘visionary’ aspect, and recommendations by the Council

12 Grant application form Culture 2000, provided by applicant.
explained it as relating both to structure and content, economic value and social cohesion. Because of its importance and various meanings, it was used as a prism to recognise potential Europe-making events.

So how did applicants go about forming a multinational project in the first place? When setting out to contact potential partners from three or more member states and combining everyone’s interests into a single idea that aligned with the call, the first place to look for help was in the ‘Programme Guide’ and the ‘Instructors for Applicants.’ They were practically oriented translations of the programme decision and the call, providing further information about the rules and terminology of the programme. While they explained the evaluation criteria and concepts like co-organiser and cooperation agreement in greater detail, the meaning of overarching concepts like ‘European significance’ was left out. The instructions were therefore often considered vague or unhelpful by applicants and expert reviewers.

These feelings were linked to a general frustration expressed by many archaeologists regarding their lack of insight into EU procedures, as well as the administrative hassle it meant to run an EU-funded project. From the perspective of both successful and unsuccessful applicants, the Culture programmes would sometimes appear as a black box, a machine that turned applications into points, but whose circuits were hidden from view. While the EAV became a key to identify translations of Europeanness, the metaphor of the black box allowed me to articulate the functioning of the different nodes in the network that sustained Culture 2007–2013.

In chapter four I argued that rather than being a specific trait of the Culture 2007–2013 (which was the target of analysis), the reason for this image of a black box could be found in the self-perpetuating functions of bureaucratic systems. Anonymous civil servants would develop and uphold administrative procedures, which became a goal in themselves. Their motivation was to make sure the machinery ran as smoothly as possible in order to ensure its success. All the money received during a budget year had to be distributed in order to motivate the same sum or more the year after, even if the quality of project proposals was deemed low by experts. In so doing, they would provide justification for the continuation of the programme and consequently their own jobs, a need that was amplified in this context due to the low prestige of EU cultural actions compared to other Commission areas.

There were several strategies in place to ensure this status quo, or what Herzfeld has called ‘a social production of indifference.’ One way this was done was through separating the political and administrative sphere within the Commission. The planners and decision makers were detached from the personnel monitoring the selection processes and the day to day supervision of the projects. As demonstrated in chapter four, this division caused tension, but it also worked efficiently to depoliticise the programmes. The non-

---

political profile of the Agency made their actions, such as changing the programme guide, selecting expert reviewers, performing the expert briefings and other rituals surrounding the evaluation panels, seem highly technical in nature. Many informal strategies developed to avoid controversy, such as choosing experts known to be easy to work with, sorting and distributing successful projects to Commission contact persons based on National prejudices, and avoiding to involve people higher up in the hierarchy when problems arose. It also worked as a way to escape blame, according to the typical formula: we do not make the rules, we just follow them. In reality, projecting this image of a coherent machinery, or when needed – ‘a predictable image of malfunction’ – took a lot of work.

In response to the black box, applicants developed their own strategies and alliances to increase their chances of securing a funding agreement. One such strategy was application poetry. It was the name used by a project leader to describe a form of writing thought to match the preferred language of the Commission and the expert reviewers. The method of placing the right buzzwords in the right places to tell funding bodies what they like to hear is certainly not a practice restricted to the Culture programmes or to EU-funding, but it was perceived as an extra challenge in this context due to the bureaucracy and ambiguous concepts supplied by the Commission. This application poetry, combined with the general challenge of developing multinational collaboration projects, led many archaeologists to hire independent EU-consultants to assist in the project design and the translation of the programme goals. They were unauthorised alternatives to the national information points created by the Commission. In chapter four I argued that their unique position, being involved in several archaeological projects at once, made them highly influential translators of EU wills.

As demonstrated in chapter five, the outcome of strategies like application poetry was that a sizable portion of projects inserted phrases from the call or from EU treaties directly into their own objectives. Meanwhile, they filled the set frames with their preferred archaeological content. This content mostly consisted of joint databases and web-platforms, used for exchanging information and making comparisons between sites from a specific period or certain archaeological object categories. Projects usually included educational activities, development of new analytical or visual presentation techniques, and exhibitions. It was primarily when European citizens were to be addressed, fostered or made aware of the theme studied in the projects, that notions of unity in diversity, a common heritage or European identity became activated. Motivations for EAV often included these terms as well, although what was considered European about this value varied, from geographical scale and archaeological content, to public awareness and econom-

---

14 Herzfeld 1992: 3.
ic benefits. Overall, the translations looked very similar no matter the topic and few challenged ideas about European commonness.

One reason for this is simply that, for many archaeologists, an emphasis on European roots and similarities may not be seen as something unreasonable or even worth noticing. As one project participant told me, if you do not like the EU, then perhaps you would think of concepts like European identity as problematic. Otherwise, she argued, why would they be? After all, as illustrated in chapter two, narratives of Europe have been written in archaeology since long before the EU political project adopted it as a signifier, and there already exists a discourse about a unique Europeanness in prehistory – generally located in the Bronze Age and the spread of Indo-European languages, or in Classical Antiquity. Also, within the critical debates that arose in reaction to CoE’s campaigns in the 1990s, there were voices that defended the relevance of Europe as a scientific frame for interpretation, or alternatively, argued that politically relevant prehistories are deeply needed and who ought to construct them if not archaeologists?

Although common ideas about the origins of Europe in archaeological grand narratives correlated, at least to some extent, with the archaeological time periods and objects studied in the projects, the aim of creating a European identity or a common heritage was rarely expressed as a goal in interviews with project leaders. Just one person I spoke to was openly committed to European integration as a political cause. On the contrary, several informants reflected that EU goals on cohesion were potentially problematic in relation to archaeology. As seen in chapter six, the actual reasons to apply included everything from financial needs, research interests and networking ambitions, to career advancement. Based on the conclusions drawn there, one of the strongest motivations was the wish to use the EU-label as leverage to secure other types of funding and to enable networking within largely predefined academic constellations, not to bring a common heritage to the fore. Thus, just as the EU used tangible heritage as a strategy to achieve other goals, many archaeologists used the EU to achieve their own.

By studying the circuit considered most hidden, the expert review panels, I found another set of strategies. During *Culture 2007–2013*, the only programme I have been able to study in action, each application was evaluated individually by two experts on site in Brussels. The evaluation, involving up to 40 reviewers for every panel, was mainly defined by consensus seeking and co-created norms on what a “good” and a “bad” project was. These norms were configured as a result of socialisation processes occurring during the Agency briefings, the coffee breaks and dinners, and most importantly at the final negotiation between two experts in which the score was set for the projects. Personal agendas, level of competence in the topic and strategies that involved bargaining over points influenced this process. However, the main concern was fairness. One important finding was that reviewers expressed frustration with application poetry, making it their goal to see
through buzzwords and applications that looked “too good.” The conclusion was that the outcomes of the evaluation had a lot more to do with time pressure and the sometimes uneven distribution of applications in relation expert competences than with reinforcing ideas of Europeanness.

Nevertheless, a significant pattern became visible with regard to the criterion EAV. Based on my observations as moderator during the Culture programme panels, I had noticed how motivations for EAV varied. A projects EAV would sometimes be graded based on how well it represented a common European heritage or appealed to European identity building, and at other times based on the power balance and geographical spread of its partners. A similar tension was found among the experts I engaged with in my study. They agreed that EAV was a combination of things. Yet, some argued that in relation to heritage it should be considered more in terms of history, culture or religious aspects while others insisted that it had more to do with the project design and the extent of the cooperation. More than this single criterion however, I found that the criteria and conditions set by of the programme were considered at once too ambiguous and too controlling, and that this affected the quality of the project proposals negatively.

This pattern repeated itself. Just as in the pre-application phase, the EU frames provided a general direction and set the outer limits of Europeanness, but the rest depended upon the person in charge of the translations and their motivations. The process was defined by vagueness, and a number of actions worked, not intentionally but by design, to depoliticise the wills of the EU and project the image of a black box.

Notably, no one in this phase was concerned with creating a homogenised idea of a European past. Some of the archaeologists I talked to were actually disappointed that the Commission was not more interested in the European content, but only in numbers and points. Still, the application poetry was in place, European dimensions was said to be boosted and a common heritage that could act as a base for a feeling of belonging to EUrope were promised. By this means, the figure of archaeology – that is to say, the image of archaeologists as producers of evidence of past societies and of ancient things as carrying intrinsic cultural/ethnic properties – was used to gain an advantage. Even if most expert reviewers considered this rhetoric entirely unnecessary, not all of them did, and either way it reinforced these ideas in the eyes of the Commission. What happened, then, when the projects made it above the funding line and emerged on the other side as ‘EU-projects’?
The post-application phase, the one that all the different translations of will from the previous steps lead up to, is about the project narratives and outputs. In chapter five I used information about 161 projects, to draw conclusions about the most frequent ‘times’ and ‘things’ addressed in the co-funded projects. Based on the trends visible regarding these archaeological time periods and object categories, I took a closer look at 12 projects to find out how they had chosen to translate the promises made in regard to European commonness or identity in outputs targeting other audiences than Commission officials and expert reviewers. Ultimately, the goal was to find out what, if anything, became ‘European’ as a result of their activities.

In terms of archaeological period studies, the broad category of prehistory included about a third of the projects. The Palaeolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age were represented in almost equal numbers. The next largest category, Classical Antiquity, contained 39 projects, out of which 28 dealt with the Roman Era. Notably, the Middle Ages were represented in over 20 projects. Based on this, the clearest answers to the question ‘when was Europe?’ became the Roman Era and the Early Middle Ages.

This pattern did not fully correlate to the archaeological discourses on European origins discussed in chapter two. Classical Antiquity was, as could be expected, a prominent period. However, the Bronze Age, which occupies a central place in this discourse and which has previously been studied in relation to archaeological constructions of Europeanness, was not popular. The matrix of wills and the vague frames that marked the previous phases discussed would not have hindered its success as a topic. Then again, perhaps the critical backlash after the CoE campaigns had, as Hølleland has
suggested, made Bronze Age researchers more wary of political uses of the past in relation to the construction of EUrope.\(^{15}\)

In another way, the fact that the Roman Era and the Early Middle Ages were so frequent was not surprising. First of all, they both correlate to political realms and historical events that have long been part of the established canon on the development of Western society as we know it. Secondly, the architecture and material remains of these periods bear strong similarities over large parts of geographical Europe and therefore form convenient points of connection between archaeologists. Thirdly, these are both periods that have been adopted by the EU as part of their rhetoric of EUropean origins. The Roman Empire is often put forth as the first attempt to form a EUropean unity in history, passing the flag on to Charlemagne, a historical figure who has been crowned a founding father for the political project. That the analysed project *Simulacra Romae* spoke of the Roman Empire as the ‘first common European space’ and highlighted the notions of citizenship, unification and a common economy, should therefore be seen both as a strategic move and as a likely reaction to the wills presented in the Culture programmes. The same can be said for the project *Cradles of European Culture*, which connected the heritage of Charlemagne and the later historical territory of Francia Media to the founding of the European Community, arguing that Charlemagne’s inspirational influence and the geographical correlation offered an ‘ideal opportunity for the European citizens to find the roots of a concrete European identity in all of its unity and diversity.’

When studying projects dealing with object categories or archaeological phenomena, I found that the answers to the question ‘what is European?’ were foremost architecture, landscapes and rock art. Within projects in these categories, attempts to highlight the Europeanness of the phenomena under study were often grounded in the notion that despite their great diversity sites and objects can be endowed with and carry intrinsic European properties. However, here the link to established ideas of Europeanness was less clear however, and a key motivation for the choice of topic was found in the political activities surrounding CoE’s *European Landscape Convention* and networks of rock art specialists tied to UNESCO.

Stepping back to the launch of the projects, one of the first things the constellations of partners would do, was to develop a website and a logo. As demonstrated in chapter five, these were often tied to the visual identity of the EU, featuring a stylised version of a specific object related to the topic encircled by stars on a blue background. This logo and the mandatory recognition of the EU as co-funder was thereafter present on outreach materials, publications and in exhibitions. Furthermore, despite the fact that half of the funding originated from sources other than the EU, the projects generally referred themselves as an EU-project. As argued in chapter six, this was not

\(^{15}\) Hølleland 2008.
just to please the European Commission. A few project participants may have thought it gave extra points when they applied the next time, but most considered it to a prestigious symbol. The political nature and perceived legitimacy of the funding source made it seem a secure investment in the eyes of other potential funders and something politically interesting to be involved with.

The EU-brand also indicated that the project had gone through peer-review, something generally thought to boost the academic authority of the members involved. However, and this turned out to be rather important, such gains were minor when it came the Culture programmes. Due to the focus on awareness-raising and other activities that differed from more academic pursuits, the project leaders and participants stated that their projects were often not seen as real archaeology by their peers. Instead, the main gain was what I refer to as ‘political capital.’ The cunning involved in the feat of having extracted a signed funding agreement from the black box, was a commodity in the political ecology of archaeology. It could land you new opportunities in other projects, and more EU projects in the future. The EU-label would also assist those looking to get involved in international stakeholder organisations, and provide opportunities for project/self-promotion in the Commission and the EP.

The EU-label was important as a trademark, but what of concepts like common heritage, roots or European identity? Did they only amount to application poetry or was there more to it? Within the projects studied in chapter five, I found that such phrases were mainly used when projects presented themselves on websites, in the beginning of academic publications and in exhibition texts. The foreword of several project publications featured a politician patron connected to the EU. This might be the place where archaeologists considered it most likely that Commission administrators looked when preforming the final evaluation of the project– ahead of the last funding instalment – but by the same logic it would also be the first thing most other audiences laid eyes on.

When it came to the other parts of the academic publications, the content would not differ substantially from any other archaeological publications, with a joint introduction followed by separate case studies. Digital outputs like databases or interactive maps were circumcised by the geographical frame of the European continent and filled with substance. The content was generally organised based on a fixed set of categories, making certain types of comparisons possible. Nevertheless, for the most part, sites and data remained illustrated side by side with few attempts to search for likenesses or link them together. Two projects which did attempt to make such links leaned more towards understanding Europe as a culturally conditioned place, a common heritage that European citizens needed to better comprehend.

Projects working with Europe in this passive way started from a position where they thought Europe without thinking, from a point of methodological
continentalism, if you will. Their work was based on the premise that, for instance, rock art is a unique European expression, that Rome is the cradle of Europe as we know it, or on the idea that Europe is a good frame into which Palaeolithic tools and early hominids can be plotted. Most projects ended up in this category, more focused on the past than on emphasising continuity until the present. The majority of these wrote that they would address the public and especially young people, but few actually did so actively.

Two of the projects analysed differed due to their more active translation of EU aims and concepts. They based their narratives and presentation techniques on the EU motto ‘unity in diversity,’ and built a sense of continuity and meaning through narrative structures. In one project, Europeanness became a quality that landscapes could possess, and in another the link between a European past and the EUrope of the present was established by invoking the legacy of Charlemagne. They both engaged actively with local communities and politicians. However, projects in this category did not think Europe without thinking. They were, in different ways, politically devoted to the construction of a common European heritage.

By and large, in the projects in which Europe predominantly worked as container and where the content was case-study based, the academic community was the target, while the goals relating to EU integration were more manifest in projects working chiefly with outreach activities. In the latter Europe was created through exhibitions and in texts directed to the public, both at the planning stage and in the output. Later on, when Commission sought to use projects as good examples and embodiments of EAV in publications or on so-called Valorisation events, these messages of a particular Europeanness rooted in the past were passed on. To estimate the impact of these narratives on the public is outside the scope of this thesis, but when it comes to the attitudes expressed by the Commission officials interviewed, projects working actively with the public and with creating EUropean narratives were perceived as attractive, while cultural heritage in general and disciplines like archaeology was otherwise considered backwards. I would argue that the images of the past and the links drawn in the more politically involved projects have changed the figure of archaeology in terms of the perception of what archaeologists do (extending it to include public engagement), but not necessarily what archaeology is politically useful for. The Culture programmes became an arena for projects challenging the disciplinary borders of archaeology, but not the ideas of ‘Europe.’ In the places where it really mattered – such as the interaction with publics and politicians – their narratives worked to confirm the existence of a cultural, spiritual and ethnic Europeanness rather than to contest it. They thereby reinforced the expectations that constitute the figure of archaeology, in which objects and sites, due to their presumed intrinsic cultural properties, are seen as raw material for creating a European identity.
When turned around, as argued in chapter six, the impact of the EU Culture programmes within the professional domain of archaeology was to bring people together, and to do so over and over again. The mysteriousness of the black box created a certain culture around EU-funding. Although applicants were sometimes guided by independent consultants, or “shamans,” attaining an EU grant became a rite of passage. Many archaeologists involved in EU culture projects stayed within the EU-funding sphere for decades. They turned into ‘Europe-addicts,’ as one consultant phrased it. As a result, many came to be advocates of EU-funding and ambassadors of European cooperation. Some also returned to the Commission in the role of expert reviewer. In this way, the projects became something more than the sum of their parts, creating a cluster of social networks tied together in European nodes. In the long term this may affect archaeological infrastructures, creating wider networks, but with new borders, which can be equally problematic. On the other hand, as the networks created through the projects often came off as exclusive clubs, the greater risk is that networks solidify further and borders to ‘non-European’ issues and cooperation are reinforced.

Implications of applications

What central points can be distilled from this description and what are the overall implications of this research? The first point is that starting from a specific domain such as archaeology can be more effective when attempting to understand Europe-making in the present than starting from EU identity discourse. Previous research on heritage and the EU has often adopted EU classifications as their own.\(^\text{16}\) If policy texts have spoken about cultural heritage and European identity, the “meaning of cultural heritage in EU identity discourse” has been taken as a point of departure. My research has demonstrated the importance of recognising the background of different disciplines when studying their interaction with political institutions. Although archaeology has always been a part of the wider notion of cultural heritage in EU cultural actions, it has, due to its own heritage, functioned in specific ways. Archaeology’s long-standing commitment to validating claims to territory and ethnic identity has made it a promise and a problem for European identity building. A promise due to expectations of archaeology to provide a cultural ‘glue,’ and a problem due to its perceived inflexibility, expense and firm place within national politics of belonging. More so than other aspects of cultural heritage, archaeology has demonstrated the political tensions and intellectual futility surrounding the creation of European “we-ness” based on a shared past. Because of this, to be frank, archaeology has never been of any great importance to the EU. Its position in cultural heritage has fluctuated but there has never existed any grand scheme to create a European past or

\(^{16}\) Sassatelli 2007; Calligaro 2013; During 2010.
a united voice when it comes to promoting heritage in the union. Instead national representatives, MEPs and Commission officials have, at different times in EU history and when opportune for other aims, drawn upon cultural heritage, bringing archaeology with it. Due to the reluctance of member states to commit to a joint heritage policy in the EU, the strategy used to keep cultural heritage within the Community’s sphere of influence has been that of vagueness. That is, to formulate goals in such a manner that all member states can agree to them. In this climate, leaving room for interpretation has been crucial. This vagueness has later been translated into the funding programmes and award criteria used in peer review panels.

This brings me to the second point. By starting at the level of treaties and other policy texts, scholars have often accepted the image of (in)coherence produced by funding programmes like that of Culture 2007–2013. However, as it is in fact a function of bureaucratic systems to ‘black box’ themselves it is vitally important that we look beyond this image. My research has demonstrated that by looking inside the black box of Culture 2007–2013, the notion of the EU as an unpeopled machine driven by intentions dictated in policy – as often described to me by archaeologists – evaporates. EU cultural actions become the sum of a myriad of persons recruited to translate the wills pinned down in the treaties, translations guided by personal agendas and official strategies – all working to resist controversy and maintain influence. Together they form a consensus-driven atmosphere where the path of least resistance is sought, embodying the strategy of vagueness. As a result, expert reviewers, consultants and applicants are left with the task of filling the frames with content. They shape their activities as they see fit but under the mantel of Europeaness. It has had the effect of making experts and applicants think through concepts like EAV while formulating them based on their own understandings. How these translations are performed matter for the value assigned to archaeology in the EU, affecting where the money goes and the image of what archaeology and heritage at large can do for society.

Lastly, and most importantly, the connection between EU cultural actions and the domain of archaeology has never consisted of a straightforward benefactor–beneficiary relationship. The task can therefore never be restricted to critical assessments of what “they” are up to in Brussels and how “their” actions affect archaeology. EU involvement in culture has always necessitated the participation of authorised voices. The selection of a common heritage and the definition of ‘European significance,’ have been up to national heritage board representatives, archaeological stakeholder organisations and other experts in the heritage field. Through their participation, they have co-developed and legitimised EU funding initiatives in culture, advocating priorities and definitions that have coincided with their own needs. Archaeologists have also been part of the review panels in charge of evaluating how well the applicants respond to these priorities and goals. The co-funded projects are therefore only a small piece in a chain of interaction starting well
before and extending far beyond their completion. As this research has shown, the priorities agreed upon in stakeholder meetings and what is written in a project application may have a greater impact on the production of cultural heritage as a matter of concern for the EU than the results of co-funded projects.

This is, above all, why funding matters. Even if this thesis has not revealed any fundamental changes in regards to how archaeologists produce narratives or any re-emergence of exclusionary frameworks (those are already there without any help of the EU or archaeology), many still respond to concepts of identity, roots, and culture by rehearsing the figure of archaeology, writing the application poetry they believe is needed. In the 1990s, such EU phrasings were a wakeup call for many archaeologists to start reflecting upon Europeanness as a construct. Yet, this reflexiveness means little if it is not applied in the right contexts. By not engaging critically with Europe as a signifier in texts aimed at the EU, archaeologists perpetuate the tendency of placing authority in the past, evading responsibility in the present, and thereby lessening the chance that the expectations placed upon archaeology will change in the future.
Sammanfattning
Arkeologin och det förflutnas politiska ekonomi i EU


Denna avhandling undersöker hur Europa skapas i gränslandet mellan arkeologi, pengar och politik inom EU. Fokus ligger på de kulturpolitiska finansieringsprogram som syftar till att öka europeisk integration och förära fram ett gemensamt europeiskt kulturarv. Genom att lyfta finansieringspraktiker som en av hörnstenarna i arkeologiska aktiviteter, visar studien hur EU-tjänstemän, expertgranskare, konsulter och arkeologer alla deltar i utformandet av arkeologiska problemställningar och byggandet av professionella nätverk. De är medskapare i de representationer av det förflutna som tar form i samtiden.

Problemformulering och mål

De första frågeställningarna tog form för ett antal år sedan när jag fann an- sökningstexter ställda till EU:s kulturprogram. I en arkeologisk projektansökan uttrycktes forskningsmålet att öka samhörigheten mellan dagens européer genom en europeisk identitet i det förflutna. Efter att ha letat upp fler projektbeskrivningar kopplade till programmet visade det sig att europeisk identitet åtföljdes av andra laddade termer, som ‘europeiska rötter.’ Här verkade den i sig orimliga slutsatsen, att man kan spåra en europeisk gemenskap ända till forntiden, vara bestämd på förhand. Mot bakgrund av de senaste decenniernas kritiska forskning om arkeologins roll i skapandet av nationella identiteter, samt i legitimeringen av koloniala anspråk och imperialistiska visioner, undrade jag hur dessa formuleringar hade kommit till och på vilka premisser.


— Hur och varför har EU engagerat sig i arkeologi som en del av ett europeiskt kulturarv?
— På vilka sätt och med vilka resultat har arkeologiska projekt finansierade av EU:s kulturprogram interagerat med Europa som plats och idegods?
— Vilka översättningsprocesser äger rum inom denna interaktion, och vem eller vad har makten att definiera vad som blir europeiskt i slutändan?

Målet är tudelat. Dels vill jag visa hur föreställningar om vad som är europeiskt aktiveras och formas i utrymmet mellan arkeologins eget arv och det som förs fram inom EU:s tillhörighetspolitik. Dels vill jag vidga synen på arkeologins politiska ekologi och därmed öka kunskapen om dess värde och funktion inom byråkratiska system såsom den Europeiska Kommissionen.

Arkeologins politiska ekologi

Politiska intressen har alltid varit en del av arkeologin. Trots det gör arkeologer ofta skillnad på själva utförandet (utgrävning, tolkning, artikelskrivning) och sammanhanget det utförs i (genom EU-finansiering, i konflikthårjade länder eller politiskt laddade situationer). Med denna inställning blir
saker som finansieringskällor, grävstillstånd och möten med myndigheter betraktade som nödvändiga, men för forskningsprocessen helt ovidkommande omständigheter.


**Metod, material och avgränsningar**


Den tidsmässiga avgränsningen för studien sträcker sig från 1970-talet fram till år 2013, och det tematiska området avgränsas till kulturpolitik.


1 Alla informanter har anonymiserats i studien. Det främsta skälet för att undanhålla deras namn är att det inte bedömts tillföra något till analysen, men etiska överväganden har också haft betydelse. Studier som involverar människor i deras roll som representanter för olika institutioner kan betraktas som särskilt skadliga för professionella identiteter.
Europa som konstruktion


I den andra delen av kapitel två använder jag exempel ifrån arkeologiska narrativ för att visa hur Europa har framställts inom arkeologiska tolkningar av förhistoriska kulturer och samhällen. Mot bakgrund av dikotomin barbarism/civilisation diskuteras alltifrån hellenismens hyllande av antikens Grekland som den europeiska civilisationens vägga, till idéer om en typ av ‘primitiv kapitalism’ som ska ha uppstått redan under neolitikum. Urvalet av texter baseras på vilken inverkan de kan sägas ha haft inom disciplinen, varför fokus hamnar på texter skrivna inom en anglo-skandinavisk tradition.

Den viktigaste frågan för arkeologer som tagit ett helhetsgrepp på Europeisk förhistoria har varit om en europeisk “civilisation” har uppstått till följd av en inhemske utveckling eller som ett resultat av diffusion, alternativt migration, ifrån öst. I samband med denna fråga lyfter jag bland annat resonomang ifrån Oscar Montelius (1843–1921), V. Gordon Childe (1892–1957),


Sammanfattningsvis understryker jag i kapitlet det grundläggande men viktiga fakta, att vid sidan av nationalstaten som ram för arkeologiska tolkningar har det även funnits ett kontinentalt tänkande. Inom detta tänkande ligger de skillnader mellan européer och icke-européer som upprättades under 1600-talet och framåt fortfarande kvar. Arkeologer borde med andra ord fortsätta ifrågasätta huruvida Europa är en relevant kategori för att organisera vår kunskap om det förflutna.

Arkeologins roll inom EU:s kulturpolitiska satsningar

maktstruktur flyter samman. Därmed avspeglar diskurer inte enbart sociala praktiker utan kan även förändra dem.


kulturellt Europa och samtidigt föra fram ett gemensamt europeiskt kulturarv. Detta gav EU mandat att ta större initiativ på området.

De dokument som låg till grund för Raphaelprogrammet utsåg med all tydlighet arkeologiska platser som bevis för en gemensam europeisk kultur, men de visade också på en ny inriktning där kulturarv blev till en formbar och pedagogisk resurs. Istället för att satsa på monument med en europeisk dimension blev yrkesverksamma och medborgare målgruppen. Ansvaret för vad som skulle föras fram som ett europeiskt kulturarv låg fortfarande på arkeologer, kulturarvsarbetare och nationella representanter.


Sammantaget visar jag i kapitlet hur arkeologins figur har gjort fältet till både ett löfte och ett problem inom EU:s kulturpolitiska ekonomi. Fysiskt kulturarv har fungerat som ett slags ankare som har förtöjt tanken om ett gemensamt europeiskt kulturarv i någonting solitt. Samtidigt har just denna bild av arkeologins nyttan käppat i hjulen när EU sökt etablera ett nytt Europeiskt kulturområde.

Översättningar i den svarta lådan


formuleras i ena änden av ett nätverk, och översätts via ett antal rekryterade aktörer; medvetet eller omedvetet, lydigt eller subversivt. Resultatet av dessa översättningar, kallas sammansättningar.


När det gäller själva översättningarna lyfter jag särskilt fram det första kriteriet utav tre som expert-granskarna måste bedöma, nämligen om projektet tillför ett europeiskt mervärde. De två viktigaste punkterna kom att handla om den dubbelhet som blev synlig i förståelsen av begreppet och den
strategi som av arkeologer kallades ansökningsprosa. Officiella beskrivningar av europeiskt mervärde inkluderade en mängd olika aspekter, dels sådana som hade med projektens tema att göra och sådana som handlade om geografisk spridning eller jämlighet mellan de deltagande organisationerna. Redan i intervjuer med EU-tjänstemän som arbetade med policy och programuppbryggnad framkom olika tolkningar, där vissa fokuserade på det symboliska och andra på det tekniska. Dualismen återkom inom den administrativa byråns och expert-granskarnas uttolkning av begreppet, särskilt i fråga om kulturarv och arkeologi. Vissa granskare kopplade europeiskt mervärde till europeisk identitet eller kulturella likheter, medan andra såg det strikt som geografisk spridning. Denna dubbelhet bör förstås som ett resultat av kombinationen mellan arkeologins figur, där fältet länge förknippats just med identitetsskapande funktioner, och den medvetna vagn som bakats in i EU:s bedömningskriterier. Andra faktorer som påverkade översättningspraktikerna var dominerande personligheter och tidspressen under utvärderingen.

Vagheten och tolkningsmöjligheterna uppmuntrade enligt granskarna användningen av buzzwords och policyinspirerade formuleringar, något de utvecklade strategier för att genomskåda. Arkeologer å andra sidan uppfattade att just denna ansökningsprosa var avgörande; att de var tvungna att följa spelreglerna. Detta innebar att formuleringar om europeisk identitet, europeiska rötter och ett gemensamt kulturarv användes flitigt, och att arkeologer ibland tolkade europeiskt mervärde som ett gemensamt förflutet. Även om denna prosa var väl utvecklad hos konsulter och sökande fanns det också en tilltro till EU som politiskt projekt och en önskan att vara del i dess utveckling. Arkeologers engagemang i projekt efter projekt, år efter år, fick mig att undra om de egentligen borde ses som en aktör inne i lådan.


Europeiska förflutenheter: projektens narrativ

I kapitel fem analyserar jag projektens beskrivningar av sig själva, samt deras valda fenomen och tidsperioder. Jag undersöker de sammansättningar
som skapats i utrymmet mellan projektens mål, arkeologins eget kulturarv och EU:s tillhörighetspolitik. Dessa kan bestå av en notis i slutet av en publikation eller EU-inspirerade loggor, såväl som forskningsfrågor och narrativ som söker bevisa en typ av Europeisk samhörighet i det förflutna. Målet är att ta reda på hur den ansökningsprosa som diskuteras i kapitel fyra såg ut, och om den hade någon vidare betydelse efter projektens tillkomst.


Med dessa iakttagelser i åtanke, och utifrån de två arkeologiskt relevanta ingångarna tidsperiod och studieobjekt, undersöker jag i kapitlets andra del 12 projekt närmare. Bland de 161 projekten visade det sig att den romerska perioden och tidig medeltid vara särskilt populära val, och när det gällde studieobjekt var samarbetsprojekt om hällbilder och landskap vanliga. Projektens valdes därför utifrån dessa tendenser. Dessa tidsperioder och till viss del även objekten, uppvisar stora likheter i materiell kultur över kontinenten. De hör till de gångse svaren på frågan om Europas uppkomst och det är därför inte förvånande att de dök upp i detta sammanhang. Det intressanta är hur de motiverade kopplingen till EU.


En intressant skillnad visade sig i samband med vilken målgrupp projekten riktade sig till. I projekt som främst arbetade med datainsamling och nätverksbyggande fullföljdes sällan de jämförelser mellan förhistoriska platser och material som utlovades i ansökan. Materialet sammanställdes enbart och de flesta slutpublikationer var antologier med separata fallstudier. Detta utgjorde en kontrast till de projekt som skapade utställningar och utvecklade aktiviteter för allmänheten. Där länkades Europa förr till EUropa idag genom
att hoppa i tid och plocka russinen ur kakan. Dessa narrativ bekräftar arkeologins figur som en legitimerande kraft och källa till identitetskapande. De sammanföll också med EU:s egen historieskrivning som fredsprojekt och räddare av kontinenten.

EU-finansiering som varumärke inom arkeologi


En viktigare funktion av EU-finansiering var dess användbarhet som spelpjäs i sökandet efter fler finansiärer. Det är ofta därför EU-finansierte projekt skriver in Europa i namnet. EU ansågs vara en säker och politiskt intressant sponsor. Projektets trovärdighet steg och andra finansiärer kunde använda projektet i sin retorik om internationalisering och lyckade EU-samarbeten. Detta politiska kapital användes även av projektdelegugarna själva. Flera hade utvecklat en konsultliknande kompetens på området, en kunskap om EU-finansiering som gav dem politiskt kapital och makt. De bjöds in att föreläsa påämnet, deltog i internationella kommittéer och var aktiv i andra organisationer som Europarådet.

EU-loggan sågs även som en kvalitetsstämpel. Detta berodde både på den administrativa och logistiska utmaningen ett EU-projekt utgjorde, samt på peer-review processen. På grund den hårda granskning EU-projekt genomgår kan de skapa kognitiv auktoritet. Även om alla var överens om att det såg bra ut på deras CV och att det gett dem många värdefulla kontakter för en framtid karriär, visade sig den kognitiva auktoriteten dock vara lägre inom kulturprogrammen än i andra EU-sammanhang. Detta eftersom projekten
innefattade många publika aktiviteter och hade väldigt breda fokus. Flera informanter menade att de fått höra att deras projekt inte var riktig arkeologi.

Sammantaget visar jag att balansen mellan dessa funktioner skapade kulturprogrammens projekt som en särskild typ av projekt, mer värdefulla när det gäller politiskt inflytande och nätverkande än kognitiv auktoritet. Utifrån dessa observationer för jag ett resonemang om hur nätverken kan förändra eller påverka arkeologins politiska ekonomi över tid. Med stöd i informanternas egna reflektioner argumenterar jag för att de människor som deltar påverkades i högre grad än representationerna av det förflutna. På listan över de institutioner som samlats i databasen återkom flera om och om igen i nya eller liknande projekt. Projektledarna kände till de andra projekten och refererade till personerna och institutionerna som det gamla vanliga gänget.


**Slutsatser**


Svaret på frågan om varför EU engagerat sig i arkeologi som en del av ett Europeiskt kulturarv har egentligen lite att göra med ett genuint intresse för ämnet. Till en början låg dess attraktionskraft i att det ansågs tillräckligt viktigt för att kunna etablera kulturindustrin som ett ekonomiskt samarbetsområde. Vissa tjänstemän vid kommissionen ville ta del av denna marknad. Dessutom hade det ekonomiska samarbetet inte lett till det folkliga stöd som förväntats. Anledningen till att det fysiska kulturarvet ansågs vara lämpligt för att adressera båda dessa bekymmer, menar jag har att göra med arkeologins figur: de sällan artikulerade men alltjämt kvarvarande förväntningarna på vad arkeologi och kulturarv kan stå till tjänst med. En potential ansågs ligga i arkeologiska platser inneboende europeiska värde. De behövde bara visas upp och förmedlas till befolkningen. Denna inställning skapade en spänning mellan på förhand antagen samhörighet och en som ännu återstod att skapas. Medan andra delar av kulturområdet, som litteratur eller konst, ofta beskrevs...
som kreativt och framåtblickande i EU:s dokument, sågs kulturarv som statiskt. En ständig upplevd kris låg också till grund för kulturarvets behov av stöd. Att gynna området formulerades som en plikt snarare än ett val.


Denna ambivalens och dess konsekvenser är en av de viktigaste observationerna i avhandlingen. Under de tidiga finansieringsinitiativen, ända fram till Kultur 2000 så deltog representanter ifrån fältet i designen och valet av prioriteringar för programmen. Medan EU-tjänstemän och parlamentariker satte de europeiska ramarna för programmen så var det arkeologer och kulturavsesbetare som fyllde idén om ett gemensamt europeiskt kulturarv med innehåll. I och med denna mjuka styrning hamnade makten att definiera europeiskhet i spänningsfältet mellan kulturpolicy och arkeologer. Denna samverkan har varit effektiv för både EU och för arkeologer då den uppmuntrat deltagare i samfinansierade projekt att tänka i europeiska termer.

Även om detta på många sätt kan ses som någonting positivt, så visar jag i avhandlingen att det innehåll ramen fylldes med ofta förstärkte arkeologins figur, det vill säga idén om att arkeologi är ett verktyg för att skapa territoriell legitimitet och kulturella/etniska identiteter. Arkeologer som sökte till EU:s kulturprogram, kopplade ofta idén om ett gemensamt kulturarv till (för)historien, antingen som ansökningsprosa eller på grund av ett uppriktigt politiskt intresse. Återigen fanns spänningsfältet där. De ansökande tänkte att denna prosa var nödvändig för att lyckas. Även om deras bild inte stämde överens med experternas – de försökte ju se igenom sådan prosa – så var det EU:s byråkratiska maskineri som skapat förutsättningar för missförstånd genom upprätthållandet av den svarta lådan.
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Appendix 1: Interviews

All audio recordings and transcriptions remain in safe storage with the author. Anonymised versions of transcriptions can be obtained upon request.
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<th>Date</th>
<th>Relevance for the thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06 EU–03 2011</td>
<td>2011-11-30</td>
<td>European Commission: Culture programmes, policy and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 OT–01 2012</td>
<td>2012-03-08</td>
<td>Archaeologist with long experience in EU settings. Participated EU evaluation panels during the <em>Raphael</em> programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OT–02 2012</td>
<td>2012-06-25</td>
<td>Consultant: working with and advising EU projects in archaeology and cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 OT–03 2012</td>
<td>2012-06-26</td>
<td>Europa Nostra: representative of international heritage organisation co-funded by the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 OT–04 2012</td>
<td>2012-11-14</td>
<td>Reflection group on EU and cultural heritage within European Heritage Heads Forum: representative of national heritage board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 EU–02 2012</td>
<td>2012-11-19</td>
<td>European Commission: Culture programme policy and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 PJ–06 2012</td>
<td>2012-11-28</td>
<td>Project coordinator: heritage project funded within the policy area of Information Society and Media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 OT–05 2012</td>
<td>2012-11-29</td>
<td>Cultural Contact Point: national information officer for the Culture programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 OT–06 2013</td>
<td>2013-12-17</td>
<td>Cultural Contact Point: national information officer for the Culture programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 OT–07 2014</td>
<td>2014-05-12</td>
<td>Archaeologist with long experience in EU settings. Mainly within the EU framework programmes in research but also involved in Raphael and Culture 2007–2013 in some capacities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Interview Questions and Themes

The content of the semi-structured interviews varied based on what type of actor I talked to and their individual experiences. Before each interview I did background research on the institutional contexts or the projects the persons participated in, and adapted my questions accordingly. Outlined below are the raw version of the questions and themes developed.

European Commission and European Parliament

Development and promotion of programmes and cultural initiatives.
— The role and importance of cultural heritage in cultural initiatives.
— Collaboration with other EU bodies in this area, and with the CoE.
— Lobbying activities and cooperation with the stakeholder organisations in heritage.

Position of cultural heritage within Cultural actions:
— Key challenges – it is an easy or difficult topic?
— Similarities and differences compared to other supported areas.

What are the key benefits of supporting cultural heritage?
— Economy.
— Social/cultural integration.
— Symbolic value (European identity).
— Protection/preservation.

On the role of the Culture programme in supported heritage projects:
— Perceptions by applicants: Administration, guidelines and process.
— Willingness of projects and organisations to affiliate themselves with the EU label.
— Willingness of projects and organisations to affiliate themselves with goals on culture and integration.
— Attitudes and perceptions toward the programme, as experienced on events and in meetings.

Working with Culture policy: Language, criteria, concepts and slogans:
— Unity in diversity, balance and meaning.
— European Identity, European added value and a common heritage – meaning and applicability.
— Differences in interpretation within the Commission.
— What is a common European heritage? Examples?

Power and agency:
— Dependence and freedom in regards to interpreting the EU treaties.
— The importance of personal commitment.
— Effect of personal agendas within the Commission and Parliament.

Project leaders and participants of co-funded EU projects

Project background:
— Why an EU project?
— Coming up with the idea.
— Thematic choices.
— Selecting partners.
— Use of consultants?

The application process:
— Meetings and administration when setting up the project proposal.
— Interpretation of award criteria, especially European added value.
— Writing techniques and buzzwords used in the application.
— Thoughts on the review process.

Implementation and dissemination:
— Importance of EU co-funding for the development of the project.
— Challenges and benefits relating to scope: European/regional/local.
— Differences between Eastern and Western European partners.
— Coordination and linking results between partners.
— Communicating with publics and national/regional politicians.
— Communicating with European Commission representatives: reception, valorisation and feedback.
— Reactions from other archaeologists: prestige and academic capital.

On a common European heritage:
— Attitudes toward the goals of the programme, especially the promotion of a common heritage and common cultural area – importance and meaning for archaeology.
— Understanding of Europe in the project: an idea, a cultural unit, a geographical unit or geopolitical space?
— Breaking borders and reinforcing borders. International versus a European perspective in terms of collaboration and networking, data collection, interpretation, and writing narratives.
Registering as an expert for the EU and the Culture programme:
— Why did you sign up?
— How many times have you participated?
— Have you worked as an expert for other EU programmes?

Positive/negative aspects about working as an expert evaluator:
— Social aspects, new experiences, stress, income etc.
— Are new friendships or professional networks built?
— Is the knowledge gained useful outside of the evaluation panels?

The Culture programme and heritage:
— How would you describe the benefits and shortcomings of the programme? Is it a good programme? What could be better?
— How does the topic of cultural heritage and especially archaeology fit in with or compare to the other topics of the programme?

The selection process:
— Does the individual evaluation and consensus procedure assure that the “best” projects get funded?
— Did you feel independent or restricted when you worked as an expert for the Culture programme?
— Does it matter if the expert is knowledgeable in the project topic?
— Does personal preferences and willpower matter when working with other experts?
— Can you think of any examples of hard negotiations over proposals that you have evaluated?

The criteria (European added value, excellence of the proposed activities, relevance to the specific objectives of the programme etc.):
— Do they assure that the “best” projects achieve funding?
— Which criterion is the most difficult to assess?
— Which criterion is the hardest to agree upon?
— Based on your impressions, to what extent do projects adapt their own goals after the EU programme goals and criteria?

European added value:
— How should European added value be defined in relation to cultural heritage and archaeology? In geographical, geopolitical, economic, cultural or symbolic terms (or something else)?
— Are the instructions of the Culture programme clear on this point?
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<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MoSS – Monitoring, Safeguarding and Visualising North-European Shipwreck Sites: common European underwater cultural heritage, challenges for cultural resource management</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AREA – Archives of European Archaeology</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Archaeological Records of Europe: networked access</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Walled towns: from division to co-division</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Peregrinus Project</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FMP – The First Millenium Project</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>foreigners in Early Medieval Europe: migration, integration, acculturation</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ubi erat Lupa</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Un laboratorio alle terme</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Taller arqueologico y arquitecetonico Europeo</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MOMENTPAST – Landscape Producers: symbols and architecture marks of past</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Getaria: equipamientos culturales y recursos arqueologicos</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cultura in Corso: Torre Alemanna</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>From Underwater to Public Attention</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The Significance of Cart-ruts in Ancient Landscapes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>European Fluvial Heritage</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CHASM – Cultural Heritage, Archaeological Surveying Models</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Living and dying in the Roman Empire: new perspectives of funerary archaeology – cultural influence on the periphery exerted on the centre</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Citadels – Conservation and integrated documentation of fortified towns through advanced digital elaboration systems</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The Heritage of Serenissima</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>FAITH – First Aid for Wetland Cultural Heritage Finds: Tradition and Innovation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>European Vernacular Architecture: cultural heritage exchange</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Delpi – House of Questions</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>VIROM – Vikings and Romans: the life of and contacts between Europeans in the first millennium AD</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>INTEGRATIO – Places of Cultural Integration in Tradition and Perspective: from visiting to meeting – the Coast, the Upper Ribatejo, The Golden Coast and the Dobrogea Province</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Orpheus – A virtual museum</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I segni delle diviltà pre-romane nel territorio e nel paesaggio</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Il cammino di Carlo Magno: il territorio e i paesaggi della prima grande stagione di unificazione Europea</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>AlpiNet – Apine Network for Archeological Sciences: best practices to increase public and scientific awareness to the common past of the cultural diversity of the Alps</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>European Landscapes: past, present and future</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Recovery and valorisation of medieval historical sites of the 14th and 15th centuries in order to better understand the creation of different European countries</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A Laboratory at the Hot Springs: research, utilisation and new communication languages applied to archeological hot spring areas</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>History Lost: the looting of European heritage</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rome's Conquest of Europe: military aggression, native responses and the European public today</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Cultural landscapes of the Past: recovering crop fields and gardens in archeological parks of Europe</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mens, Lands and Seas: research models applied to the study of archaeological Mediterranean coast sites</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>The Heritage of the Serenissima: presentation of the architectural and archeological remains of the Venetian Republic</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ARCHSIGNs – Building Space and Place in Prehistoric Western Europe</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>AREA – Archives of European Archaeology</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>FRE – Frontiers of the Roman Empire</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>South-Eastern European Pottery: archaeology and scientific techniques</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Piceni and Europe: the role of a prehistoric community in shaping of European cultural heritage</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>L'Europe, déjà, à la fin des temps préhistoriques: de grandes lames en silex dans toute l'Europe</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Organized By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>To Touch or Not to Touch</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Stone-relief-inscription: integration, public access and long term availability of inter-disciplinary data regarding Roman stone monuments</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The Villa-society in Europe: from the Roman time to Western modern civilization</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Monastiraki: a nursery of European culture</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The Vanished Cities</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>An Opportunity to Learn by Living our Past</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mittelalterliche Burgen im Rhein-Donau-Raum als Schützenwertes Kulturelles erbe einer Europäischen Kernlandschaft</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Netconnect – Connecting European Culture through New Technology</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>MACHU – Managing Cultural Heritage Underwater</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>LIVE ARCH</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Un patrimoine Mediterraneen syncretique: chateaux et fortifications de l'époque des croisades</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>PaCE – Plants and Culture: seeds of the cultural heritage of Europe</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>DressID – Clothing and Identities: new perspectives on textiles in the Roman Empire</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>ACE – Archaeology in Contemporary Europe</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Musicability</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sur et Sous: la ville européenne, le patrimoine archéologique et architectonique dans le contexte urbain de villes de taille moyenne</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Heritage Without Borders: redefining cultural values through the built heritage of SE Europe</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>EX ORIENTE</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Suspended Spaces</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Art and Parks</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Archaeolandscape Europe</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>CEC – Cradles of European Culture</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>T-PAS – Tourist Promotion of Archaeological Sites along the road Aquileia-Viminacium</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan 3D</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenArch</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Conflict Archaeological Landscape Reappropriation</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clash of Cultures</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Volunteers in European Heritage Discovery</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archéologie et cultures de l’Âge du Fer en Europe</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAP – European Music Archaeology Project</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEARCH – New Scenarios for a Community-involved Archaeology</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Culture 2007–2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europ@ncstors</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology and Europe (AREA)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Navi antiche di Pisa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced On-site Restoration Laboratory for European Antique Heritage Restoration</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalization of the Carthusian monastery of at Zice</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderne Erforschung und Präsentation von Burgen</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSSINGS – Movements of Peoples and Movement of Cultures: changes in the Mediterranean from ancient to modern times</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Culture 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloque international de peinture murale antique: exposition au royaume des ombres</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERA ASHES – A Datumline for European History</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA 98 – Les jeunes et la sauvegarde du patrimoine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ELEA – Producing and Consuming Olives: a contribution to European culinary cultural heritage</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>RITROVA – Reconstruction Inphographique de la Topographie de Rome et des Vestiges Antiques</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>L’arte Rupestre d’Europa: 40.000 anni di arte contemporanea</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>ЛЯСНДЕОСОЗМОЗ – Educational presentation of ancient coins and mosaics from the ancient town of Dion</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>MINE – Mining and History in Europe: the European mining heritage</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Seafaring Textiles: interdisciplinary approach</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Landscape changes in relation to the human-environment relationship in Southern Europe during the Pleistocene</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Museological and Archeological Network on the Revitalisation of early Ship-finds</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Tombs of the Bronze Age and Iron Age in Europe</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Un art funéraire tyrolien en Luxembourg: les pierres tombales de Recht XVIII/XIX siècles aryrolux</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Funurary Tradition in the Mediterranean</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Proyecto para mejorar la formación y molividad de los profesionales en el ambito de la conservación del patrimonio cultural Europeo en el yacimiento arqueológico de Santa Maria</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Formation théorique et pratique pour la connaissance des techniques de préservation et de restauration des décors muraux intérieurs réalisés à base de chaux</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Survey Exploration and Protection of the Archaeological Heritage</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Plan de revalorizacion del complejo preindustrial hidráulico de Agorregi</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Treasures of our Common Past in Europe: history written in the earth (Luftbildarchäologie in Zentraleuropa)</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Pilots Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>European Cultural Paths (ECP)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>URBANITAS – Cultural and Touristic Development of Antique Towns</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>ARCHAEOLive</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Keltische Siedlungsarchäologie im europäischen Vergleich: Schulung im Rahmen der Ausgrabungen in Manching</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>AIHAE – Akamas International Heritage and Archeology Exchange Project</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>THASOSPISTYROS – Exchange of professionals who work in the excavation sites of Thasos and Pistyros</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>La roue du temps</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage, Technology and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Les grands navires de la Renaissance</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>VII Congrès international sur la céramique médiévale en Méditerranée</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>FRAME – Fragments du moyen âge</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Commercial and Cultural Routes between the Mediterranean and the Baltic Sea</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>URBANIS</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>MIPS – I Muestra Internacional Audiovisual del Patrimonio Cultural</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>ECCL – Europe’s Celtic Cultural Legacy</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Navis II</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>PRAD – Digital Reconstruction of the Ara of Domitian</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Mapping the Future of the Past: new information technologies for managing the European archaeological heritage</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Holistic approach and digital recording of the structure, technology, decay, conservation and promotion of archaeological and historical leather artifacts and natural history collection specimens</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Early Farmers in Europe</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Digitale Rekonstruktion Mittelalterrücher Synagogen</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>PEPEE – Préhistoire et Pédagogie en Europe</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Gateway – The Well of Husaby in a European context</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Interscientific course of study for the selection of conservation methods compatible with research on organic archaeological materials</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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