



UNDERSTANDING EU
A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

石坚 易丹 / 编

文化视野中的

欧盟



重庆大学出版社
<http://www.cqup.com.cn>



UNDERSTANDING EU
A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

石坚 易丹 / 编

文化视野中的

欧盟

重庆大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

文化视野中的欧盟/石坚,易丹编. —重庆:重
庆大学出版社,2011.8
ISBN 978-7-5624-6562-1

I. ①文… II. ①石… ②易… III. ①欧洲国家联盟
—文化事业—研究 IV. ①G150.2

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2011)第 016384 号

文化视野中的欧盟

Understanding EU — A Cultural Perspective

石 坚 易 丹 编

责任编辑:杨 琪 版式设计:杨 琪
责任校对:邬小梅 责任印制:赵 晟

*

重庆大学出版社出版发行

出版人:邓晓益

社址:重庆市沙坪坝区大学城西路 21 号

邮编:401331

电话:(023) 88617183 88617185(中小学)

传真:(023) 88617186 88617166

网址:<http://www.cqup.com.cn>

邮箱:fxk@cqup.com.cn(营销中心)

全国新华书店经销

重庆升光电力印务有限公司印刷

*

开本:787×1092 1/16 印张:25.75 字数:610 千

2011 年 8 月第 1 版 2011 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-5624-6562-1 定价:59.00 元

本书如有印刷、装订等质量问题,本社负责调换
版权所有,请勿擅自翻印和用本书
制作各类出版物及配套用书,违者必究

PREFACE

In the implementation of Jean Monnet Chair Professor Project (Jean Monnet Chair 2008-2753), we have offered a comprehensive series of graduate studies courses for the students at M. A. and Ph. D. levels from interdisciplinary backgrounds, and the students of economics, political science, linguistics, literature, cultural studies and history take same classes and participate in discussions. This kind of interdisciplinary learning platform is a wonderful starting point to guide the graduate students into a wider and up-to-date perspective for their academic studies of EU, making them acquainted with the current issues in European and EU studies, and helping them in their practical research work in the area. In the lecture series and existing courses, the professors, guest speakers and scholars both international and home have noticed that the students in one way or another lack a comprehensive knowledge about EU and EU integration, and they, with their various discipline backgrounds, need a common ground for their discussions. For this purpose we have decided that compiling a Reader for the students of European Studies is necessary, and either for a course or to those students who have the interest to explore EU, particularly EU integration, a collection of academic papers would be most helpful.

We have at the beginning set up a basic question for the compiling work, wondering what the students should first get to know and how to help them to be aware of the current agenda and issues, and then how to explore further the possible research fields in the EU studies. There are almost infinite topics to be touched upon answering this question, political, economic, strategical, cultural and etc. What we have decided, however, is focusing on the distinguishing characteristics of an integrated organization such as EU, as opposed to other international organizations that governments join, and its unique process of evolution. The EU integration has witnessed the creation of a “supranational organization” in which member states would transfer some policy decisions to a political body of all member states, the decisions of which are binding on all members and have to be followed, a fresh organizational mechanism that was not practiced ever in the history. To help the students understand this, we have decided a “cultural” perspective would be a good start.

The European integration movements and its evolution towards today's

organization since the Second World War marks a new era in the history of Europe and in the history of the world. To understand it politically and economically is by all means most important and, in terms of the functionalistic pragmatism, comparatively easy, yet to explain the process historically, culturally and philosophically would require much more complex thinking. To understand fully the unique organization such as European Union, it is necessary to explore the ideals and ideas of Europeanism, the historical thinkings on the essence of the European integration, and the cultural characteristics that underline, explicitly or implicitly, the evolving process. European politicians and scholars have been writing extensively about idea of Europe and Europeanism for centuries, and they have been also writing extensively about European integration for years. Tracing back to Europe as an idea and an identity, a further look into its history, the ideas and ideologies surrounding European integration, a touch-down exploration in the ways of theorizing European integration and an examination of the practices, together with the emerging problems in the process of the implementation of the integration ideas, all these aspects are basic considerations that form the guideline for our searching and choosing of the academic papers and monograph chapters for this Reader. The Reader is divided into three sections, the Overview, the Critique and the Practice, and the three sections have all centred upon the issues that might explain the EU integration in a cultural perspective.

EU studies has in its process gone through a “theoretical turn” and more recently a “policy turn” and a “governance turn”, so that more and more agendas of academic research are available and are more difficult to handle as well. Due to the dramatic changes brought about by the Treaty of Lisbon, brought about by the current European financial crisis, EU studies will get more impetus and there would be more for us to explore. To compile this Reader is just a start, while providing the Chinese students with a perspective, it also intends to encourage the students to embark on a journey of life long learning. Understanding EU has always been and will always be a complex academic endeavour, requiring great dedication and tremendous effort. If the Reader could inspire more students, inviting them to explore a more comprehensive knowledge about EU, and reinforce an interdisciplinary study that could integrate their diversified research achievements, we would be more than satisfied.

The Editors

CONTENTS

Part One The Overview	1
The Ventotene Manifesto	2
Reconstruction, Reconciliation, and Integration, 1945-1957	6
A Ferment of Change	35
The Emerging European Union, 1993-1999	42
European Union and Globalization	87
The Lisbon Treaty: The End of the European Community, after a Long and Glorious Life?	98
 Part Two The Critique	101
Cultural Studies, Complexity Studies and the Transformation of the Structures of Knowledge	102
Multiculturalism and Political Integration in Modern Nation-States — Thematic Introduction	112
Some Europe in Their History	129
Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe	145
Citizenship and European integration	158
European Identity — Between Inclusion and Exclusion	168
The Debate on European Values and the Case of Cultural Diversity	186
Voiceless Submission or Deliberate Choice? European Integration and the Relation between National and European Identity	206
 Part Three The Practice	239
EU Participation in the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions: Some Constitutional Remarks	240
Consuming European Identity : The Inconspicuous Side of Consumerism in the EU	269
EU Film Policy: Between Art and Commerce	287
“United in Diversity”: The Church’s Experience and the European Union’s Identity Motto	302
The “Cultural Industries”: A Clash of Basic Values? A Comparative Study of the	

2 Understanding EU — A Cultural Perspective

EU and the NAFTA in Light of the WTO	<i>343</i>
Timescapes: An Artistic Challenge to the European Union Paradigm	<i>361</i>
Nation, Citizenship and Immigration in Contemporary Spain	<i>377</i>
Appendix: A Selected Booklist	<i>403</i>

PART ONE THE OVERVIEW

This part contains discussions of history and background of EU from its earliest stages. The papers and chapters from monographs in this section are mainly from the “official” accounts of the EU affairs, together with some historical accounts by scholars.

The Ventotene Manifesto*

Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi

Visions of a united Europe have their roots in the political unity of ancient Rome and the ideological solidarity of medieval Christendom. In the twentieth century these visions grew to maturity in the harsh climate of modern war. When the Allies began to turn back Hitler's armies, Europeans of many political persuasions began arguing for a united Europe as a means of eliminating the possibility of war and preserving European civilization. The resistance movements fighting fascist occupation were especially vocal in their criticism of the nation-state system and their support for a unified Europe. Leading the way was a small group of left-wing intellectuals from the Italian Resistance Movement who illegally launched their drive for a federated Europe from a political internment center on the island of Ventotene.

Altiero Spinelli (1907-1986), a former communist and future academic and politician and Ernesto Rossi (1897-1967), an anti-fascist journalist, in consultation with several other prisoners, drafted what came to be known as the Ventotene Manifesto in June 1941. Ada Rossi smuggled the Manifesto to the Italian mainland, where the underground press published it in late 1947.^① In August 1943 Spinelli founded the European Federalist Movement, which adopted the Manifesto as its political program.

The Manifesto is ultimately a call to action. It begins with a critique of totalitarianism and its causes, then proceeds to call for a movement of workers and intellectuals to seize the opportunity offered by the war to create a "European Federation" equipped to provide security and social justice for all Europeans. The section of the Manifesto reprinted below which appeared under the heading "Post-war Duties: European Unity." — assesses the coming postwar crisis and asserts that a European Federation would easily solve "the multiple problems which poison international life on the continent." Finally, the authors sketch the outline of a federal state that Controls the armed forces of Europe, its economy, and its internal security, while leaving the states with sufficient autonomy to develop the political life of their people.

The version reproduced here is the 1981 Rome translation with further English clarifications inserted in brackets.

.....

Germany's defeat would not automatically lead to the reformation of Europe according to our ideal of civilization.

In brief, intense period of general crises (during which the fallen governments lie broken, during which the popular masses anxiously await a new message and are,

* Editors' note: one of the earliest articles that calls for an unification of Europe at the time of war, clearly indicating that today's EU came about, at the very beginning, under the circumstances of European conflicts.

① Walter Lipgens, *Documents on the History of European Integration*, Vol. 1: *Continental Plans for European Union 1939-1945*, ed. Walter Lipgens (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985), pp. 471-73.

meanwhile, like molten matter, burning, susceptible of being poured into new moulds, capable of welcoming the guidance of serious internationalists), the classes which were most privileged under the old national systems will attempt, underhandedly or violently, to quench the thirst, the sentiments, the passions groping towards internationalism, and they will ostentatiously [obstinately] begin to reconstruct the old state organ. And it is probable that the English leaders, perhaps in agreement that the Americans, will attempt to push things in this direction, in order to restore the policy of the balance of power, in the apparent immediate Interests of their empire.

.....

If this purpose were to be reached [achieved], the reaction would have won. In appearance, these states might well be broadly democratic and socialistic; [but] it would only be a question of time before power returned into the hands of the reactionaries. National jealous would again develop, and [each] state would again express its satisfaction at its own existence in its armed strength. In a more or less space of time the most important duty would be to convert populations into armies. Generals would again command, the monopoly holders would again draw profits from autarchy, the bureaucracy Would continue to swell, the priests would keep the masses docile. All the initial conquests would shrivel into nothing, in comparison to the necessity of once more preparing for war.

The question which must first be resolved, and if it is not then any other progress made up to that point is mere appearance, is that of the abolition of the division of Europe into national, sovereign states.

The collapse of the majority of the states of the continent under the German steam-roller has already placed the destinies of the European populations on common ground: either all together they will submit to Hitler's dominion, or all together they will enter a revolutionary crisis after his fall, and they will not find themselves adamantly distinct in solid, state structures.

The general spirit today is already far more [better] disposed than it was in the past to a federal reorganization of Europe. The hard experience of the last decades has opened the eyes even of those who would not see, and has matured many circumstances favorable to our ideal.

All reasonable men recognize that it is impossible to maintain a balance of power among European states with militarist Germany enjoying equal conditions, nor can Germany be broken up into pieces once it is conquered. We have seen a demonstration that no country within Europe can stay on the sidelines to naught. The uselessness even harmfulness, of organizations like the League of Nations has been demonstrated: they pretend to guarantee an international, law without a military force capable of

imposing its decisions respecting the absolute sovereignty of the member states. The Principle of non-intervention turned out to be absurd. According to it each population was left free to choose the despotic government it thought best, as if the constitution of each of the single states were not a question of vital interest for all the other European nations.

The multiple problems which poison international life on the continent have proved to be insoluble: tracing boundaries through areas inhabited by mixed populations, defense of alien minorities, seaports for landlocked countries, the Balkan question, the Irish problem, and so on. All matters which would find easy solutions in the European Federation.

.....

And, once the horizon of the Old Continent is passed beyond, and all the peoples who make up humanity embrace in a grand vision of their common participation it will have to be recognized that European Federation is the single conceivable guarantee that relationships with American and Asiatic peoples can exist on the basis of peaceful cooperation; this while awaiting a more distant future, when the political unity of the entire globe becomes a possibility.

The dividing line between progressive and reactionary parties no longer follows the formal line of greater or lesser democracy, or of more or less socialism to be instituted; rather the division falls along the line, very new and substantial, that separates the party members into two groups. The first is made up of those who conceive of the essential purpose and goal of struggle as the ancient one, that is, the conquest of national political power — and who, although involuntarily, play into the hands of reactionary forces, letting the incandescent lava of popular passions set in the old moulds, and this allowing old absurdities to arise once again. The second are those who see as the main purpose the creation of a solid international state; they will direct popular forces toward this goal, and having won national power, use it first and foremost as an instrument for achieving international unity.

With propaganda and action, seeking to establish in every possible way the agreements and links among the single [similar] movements which are certainly being formed in the various countries, the foundation must be built now for a movement that knows how to mobilize all forces for the birth of the new organism which will be the grandest creation, and the newest, that has occurred in Europe for centuries; in order to constitute a steady federal state, that will have at its disposal a European armed service instead of national armies; to break decisively economic autarchies, the backbone of totalitarian regimes; [an organism] that will have sufficient means to see that its deliberations for the maintenance of common order are executed in the single federal

states, while each state will retain the autonomy it needs for a plastic articulation and development of political life according to the particular characteristics of its people.

If a sufficient number of men in European countries understand this, then victory is shortly to be [will soon be] in their hands, because the situation and the spirit [people's minds] will be favorable to their work. They will have before them [as their adversaries] parties and factions that have already been disqualified by the disastrous experience of the last twenty years. It will be the moment of new men: the movement for a free and united Europe.

[From *The European Union Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*,
eds. Brent F. Nelsen and Alexander Stubb. McMillan 1998.]

Reconstruction, Reconciliation, and Integration, 1945-1957*

Desmond Dinan

A famous poster commemorating the birth of European integration depicts two men, Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman, standing together “at the beginning of the European Community (9 May 1950)”. The date in parentheses is the day on which Schuman, then foreign minister of France, announced an unprecedented plan to place “the whole of Franco-German coal and steel production under a common High Authority, within the framework of an organization open to the participation of the other countries of Europe”.^① Monnet, a senior French official, was the brains behind the novel initiative.

It is difficult to appreciate today the boldness and prescience of Schuman’s proposal. The intervening decades have virtually obliterated our awareness not only of the depth of distrust toward Germany in the immediate postwar years but also of the importance of coal and steel for European prosperity at that time. Schuman’s short, simple statement outlined a strategy to reconcile German economic recovery and French national security. By accepting the recently established Federal Republic of Germany as an economic equal and handing over responsibility for both countries’ coal and steel industries to a supranational authority, the Schuman Plan gave substance to the hitherto vague notion of European unity and integration. Fleshing out the Schuman Declaration resulted first in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and later in the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and the European Economic Community (EEC) — better known as the European Community (EC). Schuman Day is celebrated annually on May 9 in Brussels, Luxembourg, and Strasbourg as the birthday of what is known as the EU.

Celebration of Schuman Day and solemnization of the Schuman Plan bolster what can be called the “official history” of European integration, which depicts Monnet and Schuman as visionaries soaring above the squalor and squabbles of postwar Europe, pointing the way to the promised land of peace and prosperity along the prudent path of economic and political integration. Without doubt, Monnet and Schuman were men of vision who sincerely believed in the virtues of integration and the necessity of European

* Editors’ note: a historical account of the early stage of birth and evolution of EU.

① Pascal Fontaine, *Europe: A Fresh Start: The Schuman Declaration, 1950-90* (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1990), p. 44.

unity. But the declaration of May 9 owed as much to narrowly defined national interest as to broadly based international altruism and was rooted as much in the experience of the interwar years as in the unique circumstances of the postwar world. Just as the Schuman Declaration was itself the product of clever political calculation, the institutions to which it ultimately gave rise were the result of intense intergovernmental bargaining.

Table 1 Chronology, 1945-1957

1945	May	End of World War II in Europe
1946	September	Churchill's "United States of Europe" speech
1947	March	Truman Doctrine announced; Britain and France sign Dunkirk Treaty (defensive alliance)
	June	Marshall Plan announced
	July	Organization for European Economic Cooperation established
	October	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) launched
	December	International Committee of the Movements for European Unity established in Paris
1948	January	Benelux custom union launched
	March	Brussels Treaty (defensive alliance of France, Britain, and Benelux) signed
	April	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) established
	May	Congress of Europe held in The Hague
	June	Berlin blockade begins
1949	April	NATO treaty signed in Washington, D. C.; International Ruhr Authority established; Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) established
	May	Council of Europe launched; end of Berlin blockade
1950	May	Schuman Declaration
	June	Negotiations begin to establish the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC)
	October	Pleven Plan for a European Defense Community (EDC)
	November	European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed in Rome
1951	April	Treaty establishing the ECSC signed in Paris
1952	May	Treaty establishing the EDC signed in Paris
	August	ECSC launched in Luxembourg
	September	ECSC Assembly holds first session in Strasbourg

continued

1954	August	French National Assembly rejects EDC treaty
	October	Brussels Treaty amended to establish Western European Union
1955	May	Germany joins NATO
	June	Messina Conference to relaunch European integration; Spaak Committee meets for first time
1956	May	Venice Conference: Spaak Committee recommends a European Economic Community (EEC) and a European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom)
	June	Intergovernmental conference to negotiate EEC and ECSC treaties opens in Brussels
	October — November	Suez crisis
1957	January	The Saar rejoins Germany
	March	Treaties of Rome (establishing the EEC and Euratom) signed

Jean Monnet and the European Movement

At the time of the Schuman Declaration, Monnet was director of the French Modernization Plan. As its name implies, the plan was designed to overhaul the French economy, which had shown signs of serious sickness well before World War II. General Charles de Gaulle, leader of the provisional government formed immediately after the liberation, realized that France could never become great again barring a radical economic revitalization. Without improving its performance and competitiveness, France would be unable to satisfy the domestic demands for economic growth on which the postwar political consensus rested; nor would it be able to play the leading role in the emerging international order. Keenly aware of the need to increase national production, improving productivity, boost foreign trade, maximize employment, and raise living standards, de Gaulle charged Monnet with promoting these formidable objectives at the head of the newly established Economic Planning Office. ^①

Despite his unconventional background, Monnet was an ideal choice. Then in his late fifties, he had spent a lifetime working in the private and public sectors in France and abroad. Monnet's experience as a senior Allied administrator during both world wars convinced him of the potential of peacetime economic planning. Nor was he encumbered by political baggage. Atypically for a Frenchman who had lived through the

^① Jean Monnet, *Memoirs* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), p. 239.

intensely ideological 1920s and 1930s, Monnet had no party affiliation. Inasmuch as he was politically motivated, it was by the remorseless ideology of efficiency.^①

Monnet came to the conclusion early in World War II that the economic integration was the only means by which conflict in Europe could be avoided. In a note in August 1943 to the French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers, Monnet claimed that there would be no peace of Europe “if States reestablished themselves on the basis of national sovereignty with all that this implies by way of prestige politics and economical protectionism.” Instead, Monnet argued, “the states of Europe must form a Federation or a ‘European entity,’ which will make them a single economic entity.”^②

Although such sentiments may seem radical in retrospect, they were by no means unusual at the time. On the contrary, during and immediately after World War II public figures and political pundits on both sides of the Atlantic outdid themselves in their advocacy of European integration. Repugnance against the slaughter of two European civil wars in as many generations and the economic depression and political extremism of the intervening years fueled popular support for a reorganization of the international system. Words such as “integration”, “union,” and even “supranationalism” were bandied about as panaceas for Europe’s ills. The popular and political mood gave rise in the late 1940s to the European movement, a loose collection of individuals and interest groups ranged across the political spectrum, from the non-Communist left to the discredited far right, that shared advocacy of European unity.^③

The intellectual ancestry of the European movement may have stretched into antiquity, but its immediate roots lay in the interwar years. In 1923 an Austro-Hungarian aristocrat, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, buoyed by the success the previous year of his book *Pan-Europa*, launched an organization of the same name. Inspired as much by the devastation of the Great War as by the emergence during it of a powerful United States and a menacing Soviet Union, Pan-Eurpa quickly acquired an ardent following, not least among influential politicians. The zenith of the pan-European movement was a stirring speech by French foreign minister Aristide Briand at the League of Nations in 1929. But the lofty ideals of European unity were soon swept aside

① On Monnet’s life and career, see Monnet, *Memoirs*; Douglas Brinkley and Clifford Hackett, eds., *Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991); and François Duchêne, *Jean Monnet: The First Statesman of Independence* (New York: Norton, 1994).

② Monnet, *Memoirs*, p. 222.

③ For a comprehensive history of European integration and the European movement, see Walter Lipgens, *History of European Integration*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1981 and 1986); and Raymond Poidevin, ed., *Origins of European Integration: March 1948-May 1950* (Brussels: Bruylant, 1986).

by the flood tide of fascism in the 1930s. It took the bitter experience of defeat and occupation in 1939 and 1940 for pan-European ideas to revive and flourish in European minds.^①

The resistance movement, itself a loose collection of individuals and groups opposed to Axis occupation, took up the cause of European unity as one plank of a proposed radical reorganization of postwar politics, economics, and society. Resistance literature, secretly circulated in occupied Europe, espoused the goal of international cooperation and integration as a basis for future peace and prosperity. Altiero Spinelli, a fervent federalist and a leading player in what eventually became the European Community, drafted a manifesto in 1940 and 1941 for a “free and united Europe” while imprisoned on the Italian island of Ventoteno. Following his release after Mussolini’s ouster, Spinelli traveled secretly to Switzerland for a meeting of European resistance representatives. Out of that meeting, held in Geneva in June and July 1944, came the “Draft Declaration of the European Resistance,” which included a call for a “Federal Union among the European peoples.”^②

The legacy of the prewar Pan-Europa and the wartime resistance movements generated a groundswell of support for European unity in the early postwar years. Politicians of all persuasions espoused the cause of economic and political integration. One above all others came to personify the European movement: Winston Churchill, then Europe’s best known and most respected statesman. Renowned especially for his inspiring oratory, which had boosted British spirits during the dark days of 1940 and 1941, Churchill raised European morale by calling for a “United States of Europe” in a speech in Zurich in September 1946.^③

But Churchill advocated a far more limited and cautious form of European integration than did many of his Continental colleagues. The United Europe Movement, which Churchill launched in May 1947, promoted what became known as the “unionist” position, as distinct from the more radical “federalist” position of Spinelli and his Union of European Federalists. Differences between the unionists and federalists, based on political, geographical, and cultural considerations, came to the

① On the pan-European idea and the origins of the European movement, see Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Pan-Europa* (Vienna: Pan-Europa-Verlag, 1923); Arnold Zürcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe, 1940-1958* (New York: New York University Press, 1958); and Peter Stirk, *European Unity in Context: The Interwar, Period* (London: Pinter, 1989).

② Altiero Spinelli, “European Union and the Resistance,” in Ghita Ionescu, ed., *The New Politics of European Integration* (London: Macmillan, 1972), pp. 5-7.

③ Lipgens, *European Integration*, vol. 1, p. 319.