

The Devil is in the *Demos*:
The Identification of
European Citizens with
Europe

Kimberly Twist
Center for European Studies
New York University

Abstract

The European public's identification with Europe, or more specifically, the European Union, is necessary for furthering both legitimacy of EU institutions and integration of the political and social sectors. Their support for and perceived benefits from the EU do strongly correlate with their identification, but this fails to answer the larger question of *why*. Any European identity requires mass support, which can be fostered with by the EU with the help of the member states. While initiatives like the single currency and SOCRATES are indeed useful, they will be negated if national identification-inducing factors are stronger. It is possible, and even desirable, for the two levels to work together to enhance this European identification, through avenues like the creation of trans-European political parties and mass media. However, the likelihood that a widespread European identity will form is small, because of the vastly diverse histories and structures of the member states and the identities of their citizens.

Introduction

In 2004, 56 percent of residents in Europe identified themselves, to some extent, as “European.” Of those surveyed, six percent considered themselves to feel European first, and secondly, their own nationality; four percent considered themselves exclusively European.¹ While at first glance the latter two numbers may not be staggeringly high, they represent a departure from the traditional identification to the nation-state. In this paper, identifying with “Europe” is used to mean identifying with the European Union, though the varied meanings of the word are discussed below. Also, the phrases “identifying with Europe” and “feeling European” are used interchangeably throughout the paper.

After the legal unification of Italy in 1860, Massimo D’Azeglio announced that, “having made Italy, we must now make Italians.”² This is not unlike the sentiment of the European elite today, which, having “made Europe,” must now focus on “making Europeans.” The founders of the EU were driven by the desire to foster a European identity “that would overarch and thereby temper contending nationalisms,” a European identity which would coexist with nationalism.³ Nationalism, as defined by Ernest Gellner, “holds that the political and national unit should be congruent; it is a theory of political legitimacy, which requires that ethnic boundaries should not cut across political ones, and, in particular, that ethnic boundaries within a given state should not separate the power-holders from the rest.”⁴

Despite these intentions, the dismantling of barriers to the free movement of goods, capital and people took priority until about fifteen years ago, when officials realized that integration did not guarantee a cultural spillover.⁵ European identity has moved from a possible outcome of integration to a force determining the level of future integration, because without some identification with Europe on the part of the citizens,

¹ Commission of the European Communities, Eurobarometer 61 (2004, <http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb61/eb61_en.htm> 20 October 2005)

² Quoted, Berezin, Mabel, “Territory, Emotion and Identity: Spatial Recalibration in a New Europe,” (Berezin and Schain) 15

³ Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks, Multi-Level Governance and European Integration, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001) 51

⁴ Gellner, Ernest, Nations and Nationalism, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983) 1, 48

⁵ Shore, Cris, Building Europe: the cultural politics of European integration, (New York: Routledge, 2000)

the political actors will not move forward.⁶ The founders, in their plans to foster Europeanism, were able to appeal to elites who would agree with collective decision-making at a supranational level. The transformation and politicization of the EU over time has taken that “luxury” from officials and forced them to enhance the attachment of the mass public to the EU.⁷

Identification with Europe has significant implications. First, it fosters the legitimacy of European institutions as seen by the public, needed to combat the oft-cited democratic deficit. Legitimate political power is “acquired and exercised according to established rules, which are justifiable according to accepted beliefs,” including the “rightful source of authority, the proper ends and standards of government and recognition from other legitimate authorities.”⁸ According to Rousseau, citizens give legitimacy to a political community through a social contract, which is “maintained implicitly legitimate because citizens choose to identify themselves to their community.”⁹

Second, Europe’s identity has “come to the fore in recent years because it is being seen as a parallel development to the construction of a European Union,” particularly in its relation to national identity.¹⁰ National-level representatives are unlikely to forge ahead with political and social integration if their constituents are not in favor. Support for such integration will require the feeling of “Europeanness” throughout Europe, and probably at higher than the current 56-percent level. Legitimacy and integration are highly intertwined, as the issue of legitimacy is “by far the greatest obstacle to European integration today.”¹¹ The European Commission, Parliament, Council of Ministers and other supranational institutions depend upon authority and credibility to support “their claim to represent the ‘European interest’ over and above that of the individual member states.” This claim “presupposes a transnational European public whose ‘general will’ arises from common interests that can be represented and championed by these supranational bodies.”¹²

⁶ Hooghe and Marks 51

⁷ Hooghe and Marks 51

⁸ Beetham, David and Christopher Lord, “Legitimacy and the European Union,” (Weale and Nentwich) 15

⁹ Rousseau, Jean Baptiste, *Le Contract Social* (Geneva: Rey, 1762) Quoted Bruter, *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*, 1-2

¹⁰ García, “Europe’s Fragmented Identities and the Frontiers of Citizenship,” (García) 2

¹¹ Shore 19

¹² Shore 19

The existing research is inadequate in two ways. Most significantly, studies on the effects of variables at both the European and national levels are scarce, particularly quantitative studies. The majority of the debate is structured around whether or not there is a European identity. However, it is clear that a proportion of the European public identifies itself either primarily or exclusively with Europe. It is counter-productive to argue over the existence of such an identity, rather than explore its creation and components. To follow this, the few studies that do exist are at least a decade old, and are narrow in scope and sample size.¹³ The geopolitical changes of the 1990s have made a more current evaluation essential. Thus, to conduct a study based on a broad survey – the Eurobarometer – and quantitatively analyzed at a European-wide level, and ultimately qualitatively dissected at the national level, is to offer a timely and useful contribution to the existing work.

It is first necessary to discuss various theories about identity and the formation thereof, followed by a more specific review of the European myth and the idea of Europe. Next, thirteen hypotheses about factors which may affect European identity are explained, as well as the data and methodology of the study. The results of the fifteen-country analysis are outlined, with three country case studies and trans-European trends explored. Finally, the steps taken by the EU during the past fifty years are examined.

Theories about Identity

Identities are “the product of collective social fabrication over time... forged from traditions and aspirations as well as from exchange and reciprocity.”¹⁴ They require “recognition of and participation in a web of social relations or communities that envelop the self through which individuals feel themselves to be identical with others.”¹⁵ An individual’s political identity is “based on perceptions that are [not] rooted in nature, but

¹³ See, for example, Bruter, Michael, Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.). His survey included a total of 212 urban individuals from the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands, a sample size much too small for significant conclusions. Bruter himself admits that “First of all, only three countries were included in the experimental analysis, which does not account for possible comparative differences. Second of all, even the French, Dutch and British sample were obviously not representative of the general population of their countries, so that the results cannot be generalized to create instrumental variables.” (197)

¹⁴ Garcia, “Europe’s Fragmented Identities and the Frontiers of Citizenship,” 10

¹⁵ Berezin 11

are instead the result of ‘nurture.’”¹⁶ Our very “social existence requires an identity embedded in an institution,” such as the state, or in this case, the European Union.¹⁷ Individual identity is often situational; for example, one might consider himself Viennese, Austrian or European, depending on the context. Identity is based upon a sense of distinctiveness from other groups in society and it requires the definition of an ‘in-group’ and an ‘out-group.’¹⁸

There are two main components of all political identities: civic and cultural. Civic identity relates to political structures and the “set of institutions, rights and rules that preside over the political life of a community.”¹⁹ In contrast, cultural identity relates to the sense of belonging to a particular group, defined by ethnic, cultural or other social similarities.²⁰ The “liberal-political” theorists say the former may be built by elites who can create supranational structures similar to those at the national level.²¹ The “romantic” theorists reject this and insist an “organic ‘people’ must exist in order to be legitimately represented by an elite.”²² Civic identity involves a “group of individuals rationally united within shared structures of citizenship,” much like the aspects of the European citizenship enshrined in the Treaty on European Union.²³ The steps toward a European citizenship take root, particularly, in the free movement of persons throughout the member states of the EU. Because of this, Mayer and Palmowski call European citizenship the “*sine qua non* for a meaningful European identity,” and say it has “severely limited... the exclusivity of nationality.”²⁴

New political systems have for centuries been very aware of the necessity of generating a mass political identity to establish legitimacy. States that have failed to create this identity have “often experienced massive problems of a lack of civic cohesion

¹⁶ Spiering, Menno, “National identity and European unity,” (Wintle 98-132) 116

¹⁷ Berezin 11

¹⁸ Marcussen, Martin et.al. “Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities,” (Journal of European Public Policy, Volume 6, Number 4) 616

¹⁹ Bruter, Michael, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderless-ness,” (Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Volume 30, Number 1, January 2004) 26

²⁰ Bruter, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderless-ness,” 26

²¹ Hansen, Lene and Michael C. Williams, “The Myths of Europe: Legitimacy, Continuity and the “Crisis” of the EU,” (Journal of Common Market Studies, Volume 37, Number 2, June 1999) 236

²² Hansen and Williams 237-238

²³ Hansen and Williams 236

²⁴ Mayer and Palmowski 592

and exclusion.”²⁵ History is a key ingredient in the creation of an identity. It helps form an individual’s conception of himself as a member of the community, and “how people experience the past is intrinsic to their perception of the present.”²⁶ The dilemma associated with forming and promoting this history is discussed below.

The European Myth

According to Ernest Gellner, the formation of nationalism requires deliberate maneuvers to create a common feeling. It is not an “awakening of nation-states to self-consciousness; it invents them where previously they did not exist.”²⁷ Creating a European identity is much like creating a national identity, though, as outlined below, somewhat more difficult. The touted idea of “Europeanness” is a “collective identity that can transcend exclusively parochial and nationalistic loyalties and lay the foundations for a higher level of consciousness based on allegiance to European, rather than national, institutions and ideals.”²⁸

The 1957 Treaty of Rome has as a goal the “ever closer Union among the peoples of Europe,” a goal echoed in many later documents.²⁹ The inherent problem is that “Europe” is never defined; this definition is highly political, because depending on who is asked and at what time he is asked, the answers will be entirely different. Since the founding of the European Coal and Steel Community, two theories of integration have been touted. The first, intergovernmentalism, posits that the formation of European identity conflicts with existing national identities, yet never reaches the same status as national identity because it is without the rooted symbols and myths. In contrast, neofunctionalism argues that loyalties will gradually be transferred to the European level. This theory is based upon the assumption that national identities are not as deeply rooted as intergovernmentalists argue.³⁰

²⁵ Bruter, Michael, “Winning hearts and minds for Europe: news, symbols, and civic and cultural European identity,” (*Comparative Political Studies*, Volume 36, Number 10, December 2003) 1148-1149

²⁶ Shore 41

²⁷ Gellner, Ernest, *Thought and Change*, (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1996) quoted Shore 36

²⁸ Shore 21

²⁹ European Communities, “Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community,” (Online, 12 January 2005)

³⁰ Kostakopoulou, Theodora, *Citizenship, identity and immigration in the European Union*, (New York: Manchester University Press, 2001) 23

The long-standing assumption about the relation between national and European identity was that they were mutually exclusive, and that strong nationalism prevented continued European integration.³¹ Through quantitative analysis, Hooghe and Marks show that someone with a relatively high attachment to one community (be it local, regional, national, or European) is likely to have such an attachment to other communities.³² This contradicted the theory that an individual with a high level of attachment to their nation would, as a result, have a much lower level of attachment to Europe. National, supranational and sub-national identities can and do overlap.

Theories of multiple identities have two main models: the ‘nested’ model and the ‘marble cake’ model. The first implies a series of concentric circles, or nesting dolls, with one identity inside the next.³³ In this instance, local identities would be inside regional, inside national, inside supranational. The second suggests the many components of individual identity are mixed together and are interdependent.³⁴ As such, the same identity, be it ‘German’ or ‘Welsh,’ can mean very different things to everyone who holds it, based on the way his identities play off one another. Such is the case with Europeanness.

The European version of cultural identity would be in reference to the European continent or a European civilization. The EU is representative of the European civic identity.³⁵ Increasing the feeling of Europeanness requires fostering the “perception of the salience of Europe as an area of civic unity,” as focus group studies have regularly shown a majority articulating a predominantly civic view of Europe.³⁶ Essentially, most Europeans think “Europe” means “the European Union,” rather than making the leap between “Europe” and “a European *demos*.”

³¹ Müller-Peters, Anke, “The significance of national pride and national identity to the attitude toward the single European currency: A Europe-wide comparison,” (Journal of Economic Psychology, Volume 19, Issue 6, December 1998) 701

³² Hooghe and Marks 55

³³ Risse, Thomas, “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” (Journal of European Public Policy, Volume 12, Number 2, April 2005, P.291-309) 295-296

³⁴ Risse “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” 296

³⁵ Bruter, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderlessness,” 35

³⁶ Bruter, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderlessness,” 35-36

There are two major impediments to the formation of a European history or myth: the varied meanings of “Europe” and the unclear delimitation of its borders. The meaning and borders of “Europe” change depending on the context, be it cultural, political or economic. In his work on nations and nationalism, Benedict Anderson labels nations as “imagined political communities,” because even in tinier nations like Luxembourg, it is highly unlikely that members will ever know most of their fellow members, yet they believe in a common identity.³⁷ This imagined community becomes real when its members share values and a sense of a common history and common external boundaries. While the EU and a sense of Europe is real and very present for Europe’s elites, this is not the case for most of the public at large.³⁸

Some scholars argue that there are distinct European characteristics upon which a common identity can be built, while others argue that no such basis exists. Elements present in nation-building – common language, educational systems, a society with citizenship rights – are either in the midst of being created or will be impossible to create.³⁹ Furthermore, characteristics crucial to building national identity are often the ones that divide Europeans, rather than bringing them together. Smith asks if “Europe” is just the sum total of its national communities and identities, or if it is something more. If the latter is true, he asks what qualities distinguish Europe from anything else, things which can be called specifically ‘European experiences.’⁴⁰

Neither Europe nor the European Union have a “founding moment to define a common, positive and transcendent ideal of what the [EU] was about, and what it differentiated itself from,” which, as discussed in the previous section, is an essential component of identity formation.⁴¹ One of the largest, if not the largest, stumbling blocks on the road to any European identity is the lack of a common language. This hinders the everyday business of the EU as well as the identification of the public with the elites and with each other.⁴² Without a common language, the possibility of a

³⁷ Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (2nd ed., London: Verso, 1991) 6

³⁸ Risse, “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” 297

³⁹ Garcia, “Europe’s Fragmented Identities and the Frontiers of Citizenship,” 2

⁴⁰ Smith, “National Identity and the Idea of European Unity,” 68

⁴¹ Mayer and Palmowski 580

⁴² Mayer and Palmowski 581

common culture is very unlikely, as language is the “central medium of cultural identity.”⁴³

Factors Affecting Identity

Thirteen hypotheses are proposed for two sets of regressions: one for variables over which the EU has control and one for variables outside of the EU realm of power.

Hypothesis 1: People in countries that have been members of the EU for longer periods of time will feel more European.

Countries, at the time they joined the Union, had publics which were supportive of, or at the least, permissive toward integration. This support allowed elites in these countries to push forward with the process.⁴⁴ In a study about support for integration, Anderson and Kaltenthaler found that regardless of the timing of a country’s entry into the European Union, support increased over time.⁴⁵ Their theory was twofold: elites educate the public about membership benefits and the public becomes increasingly familiar with the institutions and rules of the EU.⁴⁶

Hypothesis 2: People from countries with federal systems of government will feel more European.⁴⁷

Identification and attachment in federal systems are often divided among the national and regional levels, with regional attachment being relatively high.⁴⁸ These states are “used to sharing sovereignty among the various levels of territorial governance,” and as a result, their publics may more readily form an identity with a

⁴³ Lepsius, M. Rainer, “The European Union: Economic and Political Integration and Cultural Plurality,” (Eder and Giesen) 218

⁴⁴ Anderson, Christopher J. and Karl C. Kaltenthaler, “The Dynamics of Public Opinion toward European Integration, 1973-93,” (European Journal of International Relations, Volume 2, Number 2, June 1996) 177

⁴⁵ Anderson and Kaltenthaler 190

⁴⁶ Anderson and Kaltenthaler 183-184

⁴⁷ Information on systems of government came from The World Factbook. By these definitions, only Austria, Belgium and Germany were federal systems (a republic, parliamentary monarchy and republic, respectively.) Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are called constitutional monarchies; Spain a parliamentary monarchy; Finland, France, Ireland and Italy republics, Greece a parliamentary republic and Portugal a parliamentary democracy.

⁴⁸ Hooghe and Marks 64

supranational layer of governance.⁴⁹ While in countries like Spain and the United Kingdom, devolution to varying extents has occurred, it differs from a formal federal system because these partially autonomous regions do not have the same ability to be represented at the European level. To operate at the European level is to symbolically appear as more than a region at home, which, “above all, explains the strong pro-Europeanism of most minority nationalists in the European Union.”⁵⁰ Identification with Europe will likely be higher in these devolved regions, but depending on the size of the region compared to the rest of the country, it may not be enough to have an effect on the overall level of identification.

Hypothesis 3: People from countries with more open citizenship policies will feel more European.

Citizenship is the final stage in a successful immigration policy. However, while economic factors primarily drive immigration policies, naturalization policies are almost entirely political. They require the “integration of strangers and the acceptance of different cultures and races,” as each state thereby “gives its stamp of inclusion to each person accepted into the nation-state’s inner circle of citizens.”⁵¹ The combination of emigration, declining birth rates and rising immigration numbers in Europe present a crisis of identity for many Europeans. Nationalism may rise and a large portion of the citizenry may view “immigrants as the final insult to national identity.”⁵²

Hypothesis 4: People from countries with higher levels of per capita GDP will feel more European.

Though it was assumed wealthier individuals would identify more strongly with their nation, recent studies have disproved this theory. Shulman proposes that national identity “can serve as an equalizer in the face of clear disparities between economic achievement and status,” thus making the common myths shared by citizens of the same

⁴⁹ Risse, “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” 300

⁵⁰ Keating, Michael, “Nations without states: Minority nationalism in the global era,” (Requejo) 50-51

⁵¹ Janoski, Thomas and Elizabeth Glennie, “The Integration of Immigrants in Advanced Industrialized Nations,” (Martiniello) 11

⁵² Janoski and Glennie 21

nation more relevant than their socio-economic status.⁵³ As a result, the economic status of a nation as a whole is more important when looking at identification than is the wealth of the individuals therein. Scholars largely agree that economic success and memories of such success can foster development of national identity.⁵⁴ With the introduction and success of the Euro, similar reasoning suggests that individuals across Europe may feel a common bond over their economies. However, citizens in countries outside the Eurozone are not excluded from the GDP-European identity link, as the spread of global economies can undermine the nation-state by making one's prosperity increasingly more reliant upon transnational factors.⁵⁵

Hypothesis 5: People from countries with higher unemployment levels will feel more European.

In addition to the above-mentioned international economic interdependency, the nations of Europe have been threatened by sluggish growth, large deficits and high unemployment since the late 1980s.⁵⁶ As a result, scholars theorize that citizens have begun to look to Europe and the EU to provide them with greater wealth and job opportunities. Additionally, some claim that the regions with the highest unemployment rates often benefit from the largest amounts of regional aid, which is directly associated with the EU as an institution, possibly increasing their support for and identification with Europe.⁵⁷

Hypothesis 6: People from countries with more politically centrist governments will feel more European.

The alignment of a government on the political spectrum is a key element in determining policy, because the beliefs and values of the leaders in office will guide the course of their administration's policies. Anti-EU rhetoric can be found on both ends of

⁵³ Shulman, Stephen, "Exploring the economic basis of nationhood," (Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, Volume 9, Number 2, June 2003) 46

⁵⁴ Shulman 26

⁵⁵ Shulman 47

⁵⁶ Shulman 26

⁵⁷ Mahler, Vincent A., Bruce J. Taylor and Jennifer R. Wozniak, "Economics and Public Support for the European Union: An Analysis at the National, Regional, and Individual Levels," (Polity, Volume 32, Number 3, Spring 2000) 442

the left-right political spectrum. Some on the left feel the EU does not go far enough in supporting social welfare policies and fostering identity, as some on the right think there has been too much compromising over national policies and identity. Across Europe, the parties generally most in favor of integration are Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, regionalists, and liberal. The parties most strongly opposed to integration are usually extreme left, green and agrarian and extreme right.⁵⁸ As a result, the more centrist the government, the more likely they are to be pro-European, which can both reflect and shape public opinion.

Hypothesis 7: People from countries with less support for extremist, anti-immigration parties will feel more European.

Continuing from the idea of citizenship and openness toward immigrants, the increasing influx over the past decades has created a “reactive, xenophobic kind of nationalism,” through which these culturally different individuals are perceived by the “indigenous population as a potential or an actual threat to national identity.”⁵⁹ The extreme right parties are considered highly nationalistic. Their post-war focus has been protecting the nation from outsiders, and they play on fears of a loss of tradition and of being challenged for limited employment opportunities. Since the 1980s, extremist parties have broken through in many legislative elections throughout Western Europe, and in some cases, joined governing coalitions.

Hypothesis 8: People from countries with larger lengths of borders shared with other EU member states will feel more European.

The twentieth century saw a world predominantly divided into bordered nation-states, economies and societies⁶⁰ Borders provide a basis for identity because of their symbolic importance. They imply sameness with the inside and difference from the outside. Through the years of integration across Western Europe, the state borders no

⁵⁸ Marks, Gary, Carole J. Wilson and Leonard Ray, “National Political Parties and European Integration,” (*American Journal of Political Science*, Volume 46, Number 3, July 2002) 187

⁵⁹ Llobera, Josep R, “The Role of the State and the Nation in Europe,” (García) 72

⁶⁰ Anderson, James, Liam O’Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson, “Why Study Borders Now?” (*Regional & Federal Studies*, Volume 12, Number 4, Winter 2002) 2

longer shut off individual states from one another, but encompass many interdependent European Union member states. Continued interaction with bordering countries can contribute to a feeling of commonality. This “we-feeling” is increased when political or economic cooperation is involved.⁶¹

Hypothesis 9: People from countries with greater support for the Euro will feel more European.

Twelve of the current twenty-five EU member states use the Euro as their currency, and have done so exclusively since 2002. A “large majority” of their citizens say they feel more European than they did when using just their national currencies.⁶² Coins and banknotes are, through their daily usage in nearly everyone’s life, among the most important methods of fostering identity. The symbols on them are carefully chosen to represent historical symbols of the common national myth. In the case of the Euro, the non-descript architectural images do not call any recognizable national figure or landmark to mind, and only the backs of the coins are personalized with a symbol from one of the Euro-zone countries. The Eurobarometer surveys ask individuals whether they are “for” or “against” the Euro, regardless of whether or not their country has adopted the single currency.

Hypothesis 10: People from countries holding the Council presidency will feel more European.

The presidency of the Council of Ministers is a six-month, rotating position: January-June and July-December. The duties of the country holding the presidency, with the head of government at the helm, include arranging and chairing most Council meetings, gathering support for initiatives and ensuring some consistency between its term and those of the other ‘troika’ members.⁶³ There are several advantages to holding the Presidency. Aside from an increasing ability to help shape and set the EU policy

⁶¹ O’Dowd, Liam, “The Changing Significance of European Borders,” (Regional & Federal Studies, Volume 12, Number 4, Winter 2002) 27

⁶² Risse, Thomas, “The Euro between national and European identity,” (Journal of European Public Policy, Volume 10, Number 4, August 2003) 494

⁶³ Nugent, Neill, The Government and Politics of the European Union, (5th ed, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) 161-162

priorities, the country finds itself with more international prestige. The head of government and top ministers meet with international dignitaries and statesmen on behalf of the EU, to media fanfare and interest. The citizens of the country holding the presidency are likely to be more aware of EU initiatives headed by their national leadership.

Hypothesis 11: People from countries participating in the Schengen Agreements will feel more European.

The “boundaries of inclusion no longer end at national borders”⁶⁴: the Schengen *acquis* is now a part of the European Union framework, though not all EU countries have adopted its policies and not all countries that have adopted its policies are members of the EU. From its entry into force in 1995, it “abolished the internal borders of the signatory states and created a single external border where immigration checks for the Schengen area are carried out in accordance with a single set of rules.”⁶⁵ In addition to the removal of internal border checks between signatory states, the rules for asylum and visa acquisition were harmonized and the Schengen Information System was established to share judicial and criminal information. Because citizens of signatory countries may travel freely between other ‘Schengenland’ states, they may, as a result, feel more European.

Hypothesis 12: People from countries with larger percentages of higher education students from other EU countries will feel more European.

The exchange of students in tertiary education across Europe can “make a major contribution to a European identity where national specificities are valued, rather than being suppressed.”⁶⁶ The Commission aimed to add a European dimension to all levels of education through programs for educational exchanges (SOCRATES.) It was hoped that these would increase European consciousness among the participants and those

⁶⁴ Laffan, Brigid, “The Politics of Identity and Political Order in Europe,” (Journal of Common Market Studies, Volume 34, Number 1, March 1996) 97

⁶⁵ “The Schengen *acquis* and its integration into the Union.” (SCADPlus, europa.eu.int) 1

⁶⁶ Picht, Robert, “Disturbed Identities: Social and Cultural Mutations in Contemporary Europe,” (García)

around them, just as education helped create national consciousness. The mobilizing of memory and history is central to this process.⁶⁷ The public in countries which receive higher levels of higher education students from other European Union countries are thus likely to feel more European as a result of their exposure to these students, as well as the aspects of culture brought back by their own students from abroad.

Hypothesis 13: People from countries with higher voter turnout for European Parliament elections will feel more European.

Studies have shown that individuals who are more active regarding the EU – voting in European elections, having greater knowledge of the EU political happenings – usually identify with Europe more than those who do not. Hooghe and Marks suggest that the “quality of participation” may affect the development of identity.⁶⁸ A person’s participation in elections and other public affairs “presupposes the recognition of actors as relevant, autonomous and self-determined,” which indicates that those who vote in European Parliament elections accord the EU and its institutions legitimacy.⁶⁹

Support versus Identification

Identification with Europe and support for the EU are two ideas often confused, and some suggest, “that the latter is only another expression of the former.”⁷⁰ This, however, is flawed. As discussed above, the word “Europe” can and does mean many different things. While this study uses “Europe” to mean the EU for the sake of evaluating effectiveness of EU initiatives, not all survey participants will have made the same linkage. Also, the relationship is somewhat cyclical: “does strong identification with Europe lead to support for integration and EU institutions, or does involvement and interaction with EU institutions lead to stronger identification with Europe?”⁷¹

⁶⁷ Shore 56

⁶⁸ Hooghe and Marks 65

⁶⁹ Giesen, Bernhard, “National Identity and Citizenship: The Cases of Germany and France,” (Eder and Giesen) 40

⁷⁰ Bruter, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderlessness,” 23

⁷¹ Risse, “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” 298

Similarly, the amount of people believing they have benefited from EU membership does not equal the amount of support for EU integration or the level of identification with Europe. It is not unfeasible that someone may have benefited from existing EU policies, yet be against continued integration, both of which – or neither of which – could affect how European he does or does not feel. For example, farmers benefit more than almost any other professional group in the EU, by way of the CAP, yet “there is no indication that they identify with the EU to any considerable degree.”⁷²

It is not enough to say “he supports the EU, so he feels European,” or, “she does not think she has benefited from the EU, so she does not identify with Europe,” because neither statement answers the crucial question of *why* this is so. Despite all this, it is probable that all three are strongly positively correlated, and that they will, in some capacity, affect European identification. This theory is tested and explained in the Results and Analysis section below.

Data and Methodology

The dependent variables come from the annual Eurobarometer studies carried out by the European Commission. The data set includes information for fifteen EU member states for the years 1992-2003:⁷³

Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom

There are five dependent variables: the percentage of citizens surveyed who identify only with their nationality, first with their nationality and secondly with Europe, first with Europe and secondly with their nationality, only with Europe, and with both their nationality and Europe, in either order. The independent variables are divided into

⁷² Risse, “Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration,” 297

⁷³ These years were chosen for the availability of the data. At the time of writing, not all data was available for the year 2004, and prior to 1992, questions about identity were asked inconsistently in terms of both frequency and phrasing of questions and answers. To include these would be to bias the data set. Some surveys attempt to estimate identity in these missing years, such as Bruter, ([Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity.](#)) To replicate identity, Bruter used level of support for Europe from 1970-2000 to run his regressions. Even he admits that this “surrogate” variable was used “in spite of clear conceptual and empirical differences between the two variables.” (197)

two categories, those that are part of EU initiatives to foster European identity, and those that are outside the realm of EU policy or are associated with feelings of nationalism.⁷⁴

To determine the level of support for the extremist right-wing parties in a country, the percentage of votes in national parliamentary elections for such parties was tallied, with data from the EJPR. The possible problem with such a method is that there are a variety of electoral systems in place in Europe, and a high level of support for a particular party may be indicative of the electoral system and could overestimate – or actually underestimate – the degree of support for the nationalist party.⁷⁵ These discrepancies, however, are unlikely to pose a problem for several reasons. First, nearly all of the countries in the study have proportional representation systems, making the comparisons more accurate. Secondly, because of the large number of political parties comprising legislatures in Europe, it is less likely that support for extremist parties can be seen as protest votes, or disenchantment with the two main parties.

The government ideology variable is based upon data from the EJPR and a method devised by Michael Laver and Ian Budge, expanded upon by Richard Fording and HeeMin Kim. Many elements of parties' manifestos are analyzed and classified, on a scale of 0-100 (with zero as the most right-wing and 100 as the most left-wing), according to their stance on issues like welfare systems and increased European cooperation and integration. This is considered the most accurate method for cross-country comparison. As Andrea Volkens says, "because the programmes are usually ratified by party conventions, they are authoritative statements of party policies and represent the whole party, not just one faction or politician. In addition, election programmes are published before every election. Thus, ideological movements of parties can be studied over time."⁷⁶

Kim and Fording have classified the manifestos of European political parties in seventeen western European countries through the 1999 election cycle. They devised a method to compute the ideology of a government, but had only done so through 1995,

⁷⁴ The data comes from a variety of sources, including the European Union's EUROSTAT database, the United States' CIA's World Factbook, and the Political Data Yearbook section of the European Journal of Political Research (EJPR).

⁷⁵ Cossolotto, Matthew, *The Almanac of European Politics*, (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1995) 3-6

⁷⁶ Volkens, Andrea, "Manifesto research since 1979," (Laver) 34

and not for each of the fifteen countries. To obtain the most consistent measures of ideology, their party ideology data and data on cabinet compositions from the European Journal of Political Research was used to obtain the measure of overall government ideology, based on the equation:

$$(ideology\ of\ party\ A)(\% \ of\ cabinet\ posts\ of\ party\ A) + (ideology\ of\ party\ B)(\% \ of\ cabinet\ posts\ of\ party\ B) + \dots + (ideology\ of\ party\ Z)(\% \ of\ cabinet\ posts\ of\ party\ Z)$$

Results and Analysis

The first through eight hypotheses above deal with variables that are either outside the realm of the EU or increase feeling of nationalism, or both (see Table 1). The F-tests strongly rejected the null hypothesis that the independent variables had no effect on identification with Europe. The length of time of a country's membership in the EU had significant coefficients at a 5% or better level and shows that the longer a country has been in the EU, the likely its public is to feel European. This supports Hypothesis 1. The federal structure of a country had a mostly significant effect, though correlation was mixed, meaning a federal system has both positive and negative effects on identity. This is contrary to Hypothesis 2. One possible explanation for the negative effect is that attachments are often "highest among contiguous territorial units," meaning that the "strongest associations for any territorial level are those with the next level up or down," such as from local to regional, regional to national, national to European, or the reverse.⁷⁷

The citizenship score of a country, outlined in Hypothesis 3, had a somewhat significant effect on European identity, with the significant regressions suggesting a negative correlation between it and feeling European; countries with more open citizenship policies were less likely to feel European, contrary to the hypothesis. This could be a result of citizens feeling their country being "invaded" by outsiders and, to protect their sense of identity, they increase their nationalist sentiments and hold more exclusively national identification.

Per-capita GDP had a moderately significant effect, with higher-GDP countries feeling more European, supporting Hypothesis 4. Countries with higher unemployment rates had a significant positive correlation to feeling more European and less exclusively

⁷⁷ Hooghe and Marks 56

national, supporting Hypothesis 5. The government ideology variable was mostly insignificant, yet the sets significant at the 5% or better level show a mixed correlation, supporting Hypothesis 6. Lower levels of votes for extremist parties were correlated with greater feelings of nationalism, and vice-versa, contrary to Hypothesis 7. A reason for this could be that though extremist right-wing parties received support in almost all countries, only in cases like the 2000 Austrian elections did politicians from these parties form part of a coalition government. A greater number of border area shared with fellow EU member states was positively correlated with a greater identification with Europe and was moderately significant, supporting Hypothesis 8.

Table 1: Effects of national issues on identity

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable				
	National	N & E	E & N	European	Both E & N
Years of Membership	-0.467** (0.061)	0.265** (0.046)	0.114** (0.013)	0.073** (0.019)	0.380** (0.051)
Federal System	5.029* (2.072)	-7.687** (1.538)	1.262** (0.445)	0.267 (0.626)	-6.514** (1.721)
Citizenship score	0.108 (0.058)	-0.162** (0.043)	-0.001 (0.012)	0.019 (0.017)	-0.164** (0.048)
GDP per capita	-0.000** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000** (0.000)	0.000** (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Unemployment rate	-0.659** (0.250)	0.300 (0.185)	0.116* (0.054)	0.165* (0.076)	0.415* (0.208)
Government Ideology	-0.098 (0.052)	0.048 (0.038)	0.004 (0.011)	0.037* (0.016)	0.051 (0.043)
Right-wing Votes	-0.328** (0.089)	0.368** (0.066)	0.004 (0.019)	-0.005 (0.027)	0.373** (0.074)
Border size	-0.001 (0.001)	0.002* (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.002* (0.001)
Constant	70.243** (4.705)	37.619** (3.491)	-1.631 (1.011)	-5.941** (1.421)	36.110** (3.907)
F-test	F(8,160) = 18.25 Pr. = 0.000	F(8,160) = 12.94 Pr. = 0.000	F(8,160) = 36.49 Pr. = 0.000	F(8,160) = 15.78 Pr. = 0.000	F(8,160) = 16.20 Pr. = 0.000

Notes: Standard error in parentheses. Pr. = probability. ** significant at 1% level in two-tailed test; * significant at 5% level in two-tailed test

Hypotheses 9-13 involve variables related to EU initiatives for fostering European identity (see Tables 2 and 3).⁷⁸ Supporting Hypothesis 9, the level of support for the

⁷⁸ As data for the percentage of students from other EU states is unavailable for the first few years, two sets of regressions were conducted to verify the accuracy of the results, two for each set of countries – two

Euro in a country was strongly positively correlated to the identification of citizens with Europe. Holding of the Council presidency was not significant at a five-percent or better level, yet the results show a positive correlation with feeling European, supporting Hypothesis 10. However, being a signatory of the Schengen Agreements did have an overwhelmingly significant effect on European identity, with the public in signatory countries feeling less exclusively national and more European, supporting Hypothesis 11.

Table 2: Effects of EU initiatives on identity

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable				
	National	N & E	E & N	European	Both E & N
Euro support	-0.364** (0.064)	0.298** (0.047)	0.040* (0.018)	0.013 (0.015)	0.340** (0.054)
Council Presidency	-1.971 (2.708)	0.531 (1.986)	0.042 (0.757)	0.360 (0.630)	0.610 (2.292)
Schengen member	-10.939** (2.773)	9.176** (2.034)	1.788* (0.774)	0.668 (0.646)	10.916** (2.347)
Foreign students	-0.164** (0.058)	-0.109* (0.043)	0.081** (0.016)	0.164** (0.014)	-0.028 (0.049)
Constant	78.139** (4.155)	17.920** (3.047)	1.401 (1.161)	0.858 (0.967)	19.224** (3.516)
F-test	F(4,84) = 23.53 Pr. = 0.000	F(4,84) = 19.97 Pr. = 0.000	F(4,84) = 13.66 Pr. = 0.000	F(4,84) = 45.87 Pr. = 0.000	F(4,84) = 21.35 Pr. = 0.000

Notes: Standard error in parentheses. Pr. = probability. ** significant at 1% level in two-tailed test; * significant at 5% level in two-tailed test

The percentage of foreign students (from other EU countries) in a country's higher education system had a largely significant but somewhat mixed correlation with European identity. The public in countries with larger percentages of these students was most likely to feel less exclusively national and more European, supporting Hypothesis 12, though some negative correlations were present. The level of voter turnout for European Parliament elections had a moderately significant effect on European identity (see Table 3.) Higher levels of turnout were positively correlated with feeling European, to some extent, and feeling less exclusively national, supporting Hypothesis 13.

adding the 'foreign student' variable with the Euro, Council presidency and Schengen variables and two omitting the 'foreign student' variable and using only the other three.

Table 3: Effects of turnout for European Parliament elections on identity

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable				
	National	N & E	E & N	European	Both E & N
EP Voter Turnout	-0.378** (0.116)	0.138 (0.077)	0.099** (0.030)	0.112** (0.034)	0.237** (0.090)
Constant	64.229** (6.805)	34.824** (4.519)	1.070 (1.792)	-1.543 (2.016)	35.894** (5.271)
F-test	F(1,28) = 10.71 Pr. = 0.003	F(1,28) = 3.23 Pr. = 0.083	F(1,28) = 10.52 Pr. = 0.003	F(1,28) = 10.60 Pr. = 0.003	F(1,28) = 6.98 Pr. = 0.013

Notes: Standard error in parentheses. Pr. = probability. ** significant at 1% level in two-tailed test; * significant at 5% level in two-tailed test

Finally, to address the claims made above in the Support versus Identity section, it is clear that people who support the EU and perceive greater benefits from it are more likely to feel European to some extent (see Table 4). These variables were negatively correlated with exclusive national identification and positively correlated with the other four dependent variables. Both support for and benefits from the EU had significant coefficients at a 5% or better level. The F-tests strongly reject the null hypothesis that the independent variables have no effect on identification, with the exception of the few cases where the results were not statistically significant. This supports the claim that support for and perceived benefits from the European Union do affect levels of identification, yet are not synonymous terms.

Table 4: Effects of ‘support for’ and ‘benefit from the EU’ on identity

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable				
	National	N & E	E & N	European	Both E & N
Support for EU	-0.884** (0.105)	0.391** (0.081)	0.188** (0.030)	0.188** (0.032)	0.580** (0.092)
Benefit from EU	0.582** (0.091)	-0.190** (0.071)	-0.146** (0.026)	-0.142** (0.028)	-0.336** (0.080)
Constant	61.506** (3.112)	32.146** (2.412)	3.510** (0.879)	1.052 (0.941)	35.592** (2.727)
F-test	F(2,153) = 37.06 Pr. = 0.000	F(2,153) = 15.63 Pr. = 0.000	F(2,153) = 20.29 Pr. = 0.000	F(2,153) = 17.59 Pr. = 0.000	F(2,153) = 22.85 Pr. = 0.000

Notes: Standard error in parentheses. Pr. = probability. ** significant at 1% level in two-tailed test; * significant at 5% level in two-tailed test

Taken as a whole, these hypotheses do advance our understanding of why one individual may feel more European than another from a different country or another from their own local area. While they are very useful, they do not show a complete picture. Once general pan-European trends are known, it is essential to then look at each country more in-depth to establish the nuances that play into their citizens' identifications with Europe. Three of the fifteen countries – chosen for their varied times of entry, locations within Europe, size, structure, importance within the EU, distinct national situations and level of overall identification with Europe – are explored below and presented alphabetically.

Case Study: Denmark

Danish politicians are faced with balancing their country's dependence on Europe and a citizenry largely skeptical about supranational integration. The low levels of European identification on the part of the Danes stem from three main sources: the unique small-state position of Denmark within the European Union, the presence of alternative options to European integration – unlikely as they now appear to be – and the mostly homogenous population.

The geographic position of Denmark and its close ties – to the Nordic countries, to the UK and also to the United States – have led to a long history during which options other than EU membership were at least perceived. The European Free Trade Agreement (EFTA) membership was never fully satisfying for Denmark, as it neither had a common policy for agriculture nor considered free trade in agriculture to be a goal. Furthermore, agricultural exports were, until the 1960s, more valuable to Denmark than industrial exports and the British market was the primary destination for Danish agricultural exports.⁷⁹ It was tolerable for the Danish to have one of their two major trading partners – West Germany – on the other side of the fence, as an EEC member, but it was not feasible to have both West Germany and the UK as members while remaining outside. Denmark's stated desire was to build a bridge between the EEC and Norden and leading politicians vehemently denied that Denmark had abandoned its neighbors to join

⁷⁹ Olesen 151-159

Europe.⁸⁰ This “bridge” argument has been used, often quite effectively, to silence critics of integration.

With the United Kingdom, Denmark was one of the two long-standing members states for which European integration would not build a greater state identity, and as such, is reluctant to move forward with political integration.⁸¹ Few other European countries have the same degree of public involvement, through referenda or public debates, as does Denmark. A convention has existed in Denmark since 1972 that referenda should be posed to the electorate when matters arise that involve major changes in the country’s relationship with Europe; the Maastricht problems strongly reinforced this trend.⁸²

Danish peasants assumed leadership in the nineteenth century, aided by the small size of the state after its 1864 defeat. Without the need to ‘nationalize’ the peasantry, a culture of consensus developed. This “peculiarity of the Danes” is a large part of why many feel deep-rooted national values will fall away when challenged by European integration.⁸³ The population of Denmark is “unusually homogenous,” with only “negligible” ethnic minorities.⁸⁴ The “pure nation-state” hypothesis put forward says that sovereignty will only reluctantly be given up, because the existing system has the broad support of the people.⁸⁵ Immigrants in Denmark comprise roughly four percent of the population. A large proportion of these immigrants does not follow the “unspoken Danish way of life” and challenge it “in ways never experienced before.”⁸⁶

National identity in Denmark fluctuates between that belonging to a “small state with a moral right to exercise influence because of its strong and coherent society and that of a small state with no influence of the world.”⁸⁷ A small state is defined as “one which recognizes that it cannot obtain security primarily by use of its own capabilities, and that it must rely fundamentally on the aid of other states, institutions, processes or

⁸⁰ Hansen 50

⁸¹ Laffan 87

⁸² Petersen 81

⁸³ Østergaard 159-169

⁸⁴ Branner and Kelstrup 14

⁸⁵ Branner and Kelstrup 14

⁸⁶ Østergaard 173

⁸⁷ Branner and Kelstrup 139-140

developments to do so.”⁸⁸ Danes see themselves as both part of a weak country as well as a country with great international influence in some areas and morally, high standards.⁸⁹ Most small member states welcome the EU as a protection from larger states who may otherwise overpower them or not honor agreements. Especially when compared to, for example, the Benelux states, as an older and economically advanced state, the Danes are far more skeptical about integration.⁹⁰

As outlined, for Denmark, integration never filled a “psychological need for a state identity.”⁹¹ Their legacy as a country of equals fits with a land which has not known the immigration of other European states and one which does not want outsiders or the supranational EU bodies treading on all it holds dear. The cleavages which exist now are along the supranational and intergovernmental lines. It is possible that the Danes, over time, will continue to realize the importance of allowing supranational intervention in their country and may shift additional identification to the European level. Based on current trends, however, that does not seem likely. The role in which Denmark finds itself could be a good fit – not a fully engaged member state, yet not as ‘outcast’ as the United Kingdom – and identification levels could remain among the lowest in Europe.

Case Study: France

The levels of identification with Europe in France are moderately high, which seems unlikely given some of the past conflicts between French politicians and the EU. The insistence on retaining intergovernmental cooperation led to the famous Empty Chair Crisis under Charles de Gaulle, for example. Paradoxically, the attacks on French sovereignty and identity – both from the EU as well as from immigration – have caused the French to look to Europe for determining what their identity will be in the “new France”. It is likely that identifying with Europe helps the French to reassert their

⁸⁸ Østergaard 141

⁸⁹ Østergaard 140

⁹⁰ Branner and Kelstrup 15

⁹¹ Laffan 87

Frenchness in a way consistent with “old France,” even as Euroskepticism becomes more prevalent.⁹²

In France, a “discourse on Europe is always a discourse on France, and the French quest for the meaning of Europe may be identified with the French quest for the meaning of France.”⁹³ After the French Revolution in 1789, the French felt their mission was to spread their brand of civilization to the world. Europe gave France an outlet to develop and spread both its cultural influences and military might.⁹⁴ The reality in France is quite different from, and not entirely compatible with, the collective memory and what many argue France should be again: a state with a thriving peasantry, no immigration, a protected economy and a shelter from Americanization, to name some developments. After the period of de Gaulle, the French suddenly found themselves in an unfamiliar position, one in which they could not be sure of holding on to their European influence.⁹⁵ Modern French identity involves questioning about “the France we have lost” and asks, “is France still France?” The breaks from past traditions have resulted in this line of inquiry, remarkable in and of itself, regardless of the actual answer.⁹⁶

The end of the Cold War and reuniting of Europe caused France to admit it depends on its neighbors for economic and security status.⁹⁷ The collapse of the post-war structure removed a large part of what it had meant to be French. The Fifth Republic notions of Independence and Grandeur were part of the sentiment that France had a special mission.⁹⁸ Any proposals which threatened these ideals were quickly negated; it was “easier to live the fiction than debate the reality.”⁹⁹

Unlike the other two large states in the Original Six, France aspired to supranational cooperation while keeping its strong national identity, while Germany and

⁹² A ‘Euro-skeptic’ may be defined as ‘a person who is not enthusiastic about increasing the powers of the European Union,’ with the term originally used in a British context but now applying to Europe more generally; Harmsen and Spiering 15

⁹³ Frank, Robert, “The Meanings of Europe in French National Discourse: A French Europe or a Europeanized France?” (Af Malmberg and Stråth) 311

⁹⁴ Frank 311-312

⁹⁵ Frank 322

⁹⁶ Kuisel 31-32

⁹⁷ Flynn, Gregory, “French Identity and Post-Cold War Europe,”(Flynn) 233-234

⁹⁸ Flynn 235

⁹⁹ Flynn 240

Italy were more willing to make their identities part of the supranational institutions.¹⁰⁰ The French wanted to retain their power in Europe and protect against a German resurgence. The “certain pedigree and legitimacy” of French Euroscepticism hails from its association with Charles de Gaulle and his stature in contemporary French politics.¹⁰¹ De Gaulle gave content to a deeper, long-standing French mythology of France as an autonomous state which was not subject to the same rules as its partners in NATO and the EEC, an acceptable role for one of the formerly great European powers.¹⁰²

French Euroscepticism is today found in, among other parties, the RPR and more famously, the Front National. The RPR views Europe as a core threat to national sovereignty and the desire to promote French national solidarity.¹⁰³ The Front Nationale leader, Jean-Marie Le Pen, called Maastricht “the end of France, the French people, its language and its culture.”¹⁰⁴ Euroskeptics on the left of the French political spectrum do not focus on the threat to national identity, instead citing social policy being sacrificed for economics and the lack of popular involvement in European decision-making.¹⁰⁵

Net immigration since the post-war period total about five million individuals and accounts for roughly one-third of the French growth in population during these years.¹⁰⁶ Non-European immigrants, usually living in highly visible concentrations, have not assimilated into French society as readily as did previous waves of immigrants from inside Europe. The arrival of the FN has caused the other parties to respond to its claims about sovereignty and national identity, though its importance is larger than this. It not only explains the form of the present-day hostilities around nation- and statehood but is also a symptom of these tensions.¹⁰⁷

By the mid-1990s, the ever-changing internal and external politics “heightened France’s sense of navigating without a rudder.”¹⁰⁸ While they supported European

¹⁰⁰ Laffan 86

¹⁰¹ Hainsworth, Paul, Carolyn O’Brien and Paul Mitchell, “Defending the Nation: The Politics of Euroscepticism on the French Right,” (Harmsen and Spiering) 56-57

¹⁰² Flynn 239

¹⁰³ Hainsworth, O’Brien and Mitchell 43-44

¹⁰⁴ Hainsworth, O’Brien and Mitchell 45-46

¹⁰⁵ Milner, Susan, “For an Alternative Europe: Euroscepticism and the French Left Since the Maastricht Treaty,”(Harmsen and Spiering) 76-77

¹⁰⁶ Crowley 95

¹⁰⁷ Crowley 98-99

¹⁰⁸ Flynn 242

integration, they did not want it to conflict with reestablishing what it means to “be French.” By using Europe to find France’s place in the system, the citizenry hopes to solve their immigration and sovereignty issues. It is for this reason that European identification can actually help identification with France, as it has done in decades past.

Case Study: Spain

Spain spent nearly forty years under the dictatorship of General Francisco Franco. The last Spanish involvement in European affairs before the transition to democracy dates back to the Napoleonic Wars, after its neutrality in the two World Wars and isolation under Franco. After his death, the almost unanimous top priority according to both the elite and the public was to “rejoin” Europe. This fact, combined with the support for Europe from the Spanish regions, the lack of an internal “Other” and the struggling Spanish economy, leads to the higher-than-average levels of identification with Europe on the part of Spanish citizens. Enthusiasm for Europe is common among supporters of the Madrid government as well as the regionalists and nationalists, though for very different reasons, as is explored below.

Despite becoming a member of the United Nations in 1955, the authoritarian nature of the Spanish state prevented entry into the European Economic Community and caused those who rejected Francoism to ally themselves with a new idea of “Europe,” that which included democracy and a modernization of their country.¹⁰⁹ “Entering Europe” represented Spain’s ticket to leave behind *el atraso* – ‘the backwardness’ – of her past and become a respected member of the West. More than simply a way to modernization, Europe was a guarantee against internal separatist and extremist threats. Europe appeared, and still appears, to the Spanish as a provider of peace and security and a way to go beyond internal divisions.¹¹⁰ Spain is the only EU member state, excluding the Original Six, whose political parties were entirely in agreement about membership, including the Communist Party.

Integration was also a crutch for Portugal and Greece, both of whom emerged from dictatorial regimes in the 1970s, as did Spain, which dated back to the post-war era. All three countries lagged behind the ‘core’ of Europe in their socio-economic

¹⁰⁹ Jáuregui 92

¹¹⁰ Jáuregui 79

development and hoped Europe would solve their domestic problems.¹¹¹ While the three countries' entries into the EC were similar, only in Spain did the goal of membership have enthusiastic support from all major actors. Its neighbor, Portugal, had not been as excluded as Spain as a result of its membership – under Salazar – in both NATO and the European Free Trade Agreement (EFTA) and did not have all hopes for a “return” rested upon the EC.¹¹²

Spain is neither a unitary or a federal state, but a hybrid of both; like France, Spain is a multinational state which involves non-Spanish nations but does not recognize them as such.¹¹³ The 1978 Spanish constitution invented the idea of “autonomous communities,” instead of “regions” or “nations.” It is based on “the indissoluble unity of the Spanish nation, the common and indivisible fatherland of all Spaniards, and it recognize and guarantees the right of autonomy of the nationalities and regions of which it is composed, and the solidarity among all of them.”¹¹⁴ In contrast to the federal systems of Austria, Belgium and Germany, there is no constitutional provision for ACs to participate in foreign affairs, which includes European Union affairs, more specifically.¹¹⁵ Democracy and decentralization have not been enough to satisfy regionalist factions in Catalonia, Galacia and the Basque Country, for whom the EU represents a chance to circumvent the central government and ultimately achieve their independence.¹¹⁶ Regions may see the EU either as a source of problems or as something that ameliorates their problems. These disparities may be a result of the varied responsibilities and powers of the autonomous communities.¹¹⁷

These regional differences are of a linguistic nature and, historically, Spain has long been a fairly homogenous state. The entire country now faces immigration, mostly from the Mahgreb area, which is small in overall numbers and heavily concentrated, but has provoked racial discrimination.¹¹⁸ All significant political minorities in Spain have

¹¹¹ Haller 274

¹¹² Powell, Charles, “Spanish Membership of the European Union Revisited,” (Royo and Manuel) 148-149

¹¹³ Kellas, James G, Nationalist Politics in Europe: The Constitutional and Electoral Dimensions (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) 95

¹¹⁴ Junco, José Alvarez, “Spain: A Product of Incomplete Nation-building,” (Hagendoorn, et al) 200-201

¹¹⁵ Closa, Carlos and Paul M. Heywood, Spain and the European Union, (New York: Palgrave, 2004) 84-85

¹¹⁶ Jáuregui 96

¹¹⁷ Closa and Heywood 34-35

¹¹⁸ Junco 208

been linguistically defined, not racially or ethnically.¹¹⁹ These new “outsiders” could weaken area nationalisms and contribute to an increased feeling of “Spanishness,” perhaps with the aid of Europe. The recent immigration phenomenon is too new and still not significant enough to be an internal other.¹²⁰ Thus, Europe remains Spain’s “Other” – the mark against which it compared itself.

Some argue that the EU has actually helped to establish a Spanish national identity. Integration is seen as “part of their national project, rather than as a project with its own specific purpose,” and Europe is a source of identification for Spaniards, though largely through its role as a basis for Spanish national identity.¹²¹ Spain has received a number of benefits from the EU, which certainly have inspired an identification with Europe. At the time of its accession, Spain’s per capita GDP was just over two-thirds of the EU average. Unemployment and inflation rates were more than twice the European average.¹²² Spanish elites argued that monetary union would be beneficial because it would bring stability, lower inflation, greater competitiveness and more economic growth and international prestige. By 1999, almost three percent of national GDP came from Cohesion and Structural Fund transfers.¹²³

Unfortunately for European elites, Spain faced a number of challenges in the 1990s which threatened to undermine its position in Europe, and as a result, its European identity at the expense of nationalist rhetoric embraced by the government. As the European Economic and Monetary Union gathered steam, Spain looked as if it would not make the requirements for participation. The impending Central and Eastern European enlargement would necessitate an internal restructuring of the EU through which Spain would have its relative power reduced. Further, sluggish international markets led not only to economic problems domestically, but also EU budget cutbacks and an insistence upon meeting the criteria before joining EMU.¹²⁴ The defense of national interests became a high priority and the unquestioning acceptance of Europe was in the past.

¹¹⁹ Junco 209

¹²⁰ Jáuregui and Ruiz-Jiménez, 79-80

¹²¹ Closa and Heywood 33

¹²² Farrell, Mary, Spain in the EU: The Road to Economic Convergence, (New York: Palgrave, 2001) 7

¹²³ Farrell 141-142

¹²⁴ Closa and Heywood 242

The previously unquestioned and unflagging support for Europe has diminished over time. The Francoist era has begun to fade into a forgotten past and the excitement of participating in European summits has dwindled. It is possible to argue that Spain wanted to be European more so that its citizens would avoid being left outside than because they wanted to be a part of a European identity.¹²⁵ Despite the difficulties, the degree of compatibility between European and Spanish identification is much greater than the EU average.¹²⁶ A feeling of both nationalism and Europeanness is usually found about ten percent above the European average, while exclusive Spanish identity is about five to ten percent below average.¹²⁷ These levels could decrease over the next few years, as the current administration employs more Euro-skeptic policies and continued enlargement diverts resources away from the Iberian Peninsula and toward the Eastern and Southeastern Europe.

Trends across Europe

There is a clear divide between north and south in Europe in terms of how they perceive Europe and their ties to it, according to studies conducted by the European Commission. The large south – states geographically in the south, center or east of the continent – sees Europe historically and as a place of culture that has produced diverse people with common roots. This culture is particularly enticing for the Latin countries, Belgium and Luxembourg.¹²⁸ These states, over time, have belonged to empires, like the Habsburg, Byzantine and Holy Roman, in which they mixed with dissimilar people. The northern countries – Scandinavia, the British Isles, and Germany – do not feel the same pull or desire to be part of a European culture. The study shows that over the past two decades, this split between north and south has widened.¹²⁹

The citizens of small states may be more aware of their government's somewhat limited ability to ensure protection, strong economic performance and a welfare system. To this end, they are thought to be more likely to both identify with the EU that can

¹²⁵ Díez-Nicolás 130

¹²⁶ Jáuregui and Ruiz-Jiménez 84

¹²⁷ Closa and Heywood 32-33

¹²⁸ Commission of the European Communities, "Perceptions of the European Union," (June 2001) 5

¹²⁹ Commission of the European Communities, "Perceptions of the European Union," 6

supplement these roles and, following from this, accept the legitimacy of the EU.¹³⁰ Additionally, small states gain a protection from larger states in decision-making, because they are given a proportionately larger share of voting rights. While all of this may explain high levels of identification with Europe in the Benelux countries and Ireland, the Scandinavian countries, with their small populations, are examples of small states with a prevailing skeptical attitude toward Europe, possibly because of their “intimacy as political arenas.”¹³¹ A citizenry’s perception of their country as a core or periphery member state is also likely to affect how greatly it identifies with Europe. The variables of being core or periphery are geographic, in terms of distance from Brussels, as well as their history and length of membership, by which account the Benelux countries and Ireland are more central and the Nordic countries more peripheral.

A European identity may be stronger in member states with greater internal divisions, be they in minority communities or as a result of “imperfect state formation,” where the state “has not succeeded in capturing all sentiments of political loyalty for the nation.”¹³² For example, Belgium is one of the most internally divided countries, with the Flanders and Wallonia communities each taking about half the population, and has one of the highest identification levels. Feelings of Europeanness are also typically higher in those regions and communities than the national average.

In times when a state is perceived to have failed to protect its citizens, identification with Europe may increase. The largest example of this is in times of war; there is a strong correlation between conflict and support for integration in the twentieth century.¹³³ Hooghe and Marks say that “organized coercion – above all, war and colonial domination” has done more to shape attachments to territory than anything else.¹³⁴ In wartime situations, a strong “us” versus “them” national mentality takes hold and triumphs supra- and sub-national identities. In times of peace, this “immensely powerful influence toward exclusive identity” is absent, allowing for greater multiple identities; in this case, European identity.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Beetham and Lord 23

¹³¹ Beetham and Lord 23

¹³² Beetham and Lord 23-24

¹³³ Beetham and Lord 24

¹³⁴ Hooghe and Marks 60

¹³⁵ Hooghe and Marks 61

The EU and Steps Toward Common Identity

Romano Prodi recently said that an identity for Europe is necessary, as the goal of the elite is to build a “true political Union.”¹³⁶ European officials have long struggled with a solution for turning ordinary peoples of Europe into Europeans. The problem, in their minds, is that “action is needed in the cultural sector to make people more aware of their European identity” and that it is necessary to “[stimulate] public interest in the European venture” to obtain the “direct involvement of the people in their own destiny.”¹³⁷ During the time of the ECSC and EEC, the projects were technocratic and elite-driven. The public had little interest in this idea of Europe and did not truly question the legitimacy of the decisions made, hence the existence of what is called a “permissive consensus.” Many elites feel that a technocratic European Union is not a problem; just as, for example, bureaucrats transformed “peasants into Frenchmen” under Napoleon, the European bureaucrats hope to transform “peasants” into “Europeans,” a process they believe starts among themselves.¹³⁸

After the signing of the Treaty of Rome, Walter Hallstein said, “we are not integrating economies, we are integrating politics. We are not just sharing our furniture, we are buying a new and bigger house.”¹³⁹ The obstacles to freedom of movement of people were removed from that point until the early 1970s, with, as one example, family members of workers gaining entry and residence rights. The Paris Summit of October 1972 introduced an “ambitious program to establish a political union,” and the following year’s Copenhagen Summit produced a “Declaration on European Identity,” which set out for the first time, “principles for the internal development of the Community, thereby furnishing a framework for the formation of a political conception of European identity.”¹⁴⁰ However, this conception involved much Euro-rhetoric and did little to formally define “European identity.” In December 1974, policy objectives for identity

¹³⁶ Prodi, Romano, Enlargement of the Union and European Identity, (Florence: European University Institute, 2003) 3

¹³⁷ Commission of the European Communities, “A People’s Europe: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament,” (Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 2, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 7 July 1988) Quoted Shore 25

¹³⁸ Shore 33-34

¹³⁹ Quoted Kostakopoulou 40

¹⁴⁰ Kostakopoulou 44-45

gave the 1973 Declaration more substance. Members of the EP were to be directly and universally elected and special rights would be bestowed upon citizens of the member states. The Belgian Prime Minister, Leo Tindemans, was asked to draft a report detailing the measures required for the “creation of a Europe of citizens,” though the Hague Summit reviewed the Tindemans report without any positive decisions.¹⁴¹

The passport union was created around this time, under which citizens of member states would carry uniform passports and rules about border control and alien rights were harmonized. This was one of the many symbolic measures undertaken in an effort to inspire the public to feel more European; the idea was that holding identical passports would create a common bond, though most people did not feel more like a member of a European community.¹⁴² Typically, by using symbols like currency, anthems, ceremonies and flags, members of a group are “reminded of their common heritage and cultural kinship and feel strengthened and exalted by their sense of common identity and belonging.”¹⁴³

The mandate of the second report of the Adonnino Committee, established by the Fontainebleau Council in 1985, was to “propose measures which would tend to reinforce the identity and image of the community in such a way as to make these conform more closely to citizens’ expectations.”¹⁴⁴ This report included propositions for identity-building and symbol-creation: a “comprehensive European inter-university program of exchanges” and asking member states to recognize of academic credentials of other states; the use of the circle of twelve gold stars on a blue background as both a Community emblem and flag; the playing of Beethoven’s “Ode to Joy” from the Ninth Symphony at European events; the issuing of postage stamps to commemorate important European Community events; and the redesigning of signs at borders to reflect the openness of the single market.¹⁴⁵

The adoption of the Schengen Agreements in 1985 by France, Germany, and the Benelux countries established a framework for the gradual removal of internal border

¹⁴¹ Kostakopoulou 45-46

¹⁴² Kostakopoulou 46-47

¹⁴³ Smith, Anthony, National Identity, (New York: Penguin Books, 1991) 16-17

¹⁴⁴ Odermatt, Peter, “The use of symbols in the drive for European integration,” (Leerssen and Spiering) 225

¹⁴⁵ Commission of the European Communities, A People’s Europe: Reports from the ad hoc Committee, (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1985) 23-28

restrictions between signatory countries. It would, ten years later, be enshrined of the Treaty of Amsterdam. The Single European Act of 1986 marked a turning point at which the European bodies “while remaining unaccountable to a European popular assembly, began producing a growing number of regulations, and the issue of legitimacy was raised.”¹⁴⁶ The Treaty on European Union showed a “realization that identification couldn’t be ordained, but had to be achieved through political and economic reforms and by fostering a new universalist ethos which would help transform the active economic actors’ rights into citizens’ rights.”¹⁴⁷ The problem surrounding the ratification of the Treaty on European Union was the first true conflict between nationalism and European identity.

Symbols are how ideas like “nation,” “citizenship” and “Europe” become tangible and understandable.¹⁴⁸ These invented traditions try to “inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by implying continuity with the past,” now that European elites realize that a supranational identity will not occur on its own as a byproduct of integration.¹⁴⁹ Though many treaties reference this European identity, none formally define it. A definition is a difficult task, as a too-narrow definition “risks excluding foreign goods, immigrants and entire countries,” while a too-wide definition “may dilute the very values that the European identity was intended to protect and project in the first place.”¹⁵⁰

Conclusions

The importance of having a European identity, whatever it may be, is apparent. The effects of identity are far-reaching, and can affect already-integrated sectors of Europe. Making the public more connected to Europe and to the EU is all but impossible without a “European people,” which differs greatly from “citizens in Europe”. The “constitutional process and the constitutional rhetoric inherent in the work of the Convention have been closely related to an attempt to express a European identity,” as constitutions are “also expressions of the moral and political identity of the *demos* they

¹⁴⁶ Castano, Emanuele, “European Identity: A Social-Psychological Perspective,” (Herrmann, Risse and Brewer) 41

¹⁴⁷ Kostakopoulou 54

¹⁴⁸ Shore 36

¹⁴⁹ Hobsbawm, Eric, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” (Hobsbawm and Ranger) 1

¹⁵⁰ Cederman, Lars-Erik, “Political Boundaries and Identity Trade-Offs,” (Cederman) 3

seek to define.”¹⁵¹ This lack of *demos*, according to some, is the reason for the cited lack of democracy in the EU, for “the democratic system without ‘*demos*’ is just ‘*cratos*,’ or power.”¹⁵² A *demos* certainly does not need to be an *ethnos*, but unless the members of the *demos* recognize each other as such, a common identity can not form. Bruter asks if it is “fair to create a European ‘citizenship’ and a fully institutionalized European political system if citizens do not ‘feel’ European yet,” and certainly, there are many who would say it is unfair to do so.¹⁵³

Prodi said that, “European identity is inextricably linked to a new type of citizenship based on multiple forms of allegiance, ranging from the local town to the Union. The single national identity would be replaced by complementary identities.”¹⁵⁴ However, because “nobody can become European without first acquiring a national identity... the new form of European citizenship and identity does not really transcend national identities, it is currently completely dependent on national identity.”¹⁵⁵ As a result, it is possible that the groups excluded from European national citizenships, either voluntarily or involuntarily, will turn to Europe for support and identify more strongly with Europe. This is seen already to an extent with the minority groups, discussed above. It is possible that a European identity will arise and overcome these obstacles, but it is also possible – and perhaps, likely – that the construction of a European identity will remain reliant upon, and largely secondary to, national identity. From the founding fathers through today’s leaders, the idea of an overarching European identity has remained ever-present.

European countries are increasingly defined as members of the EU, non-members of the EU, or aspiring members of the EU; this affects their position within Europe, and to some extent, internationally, as the EU becomes impossible to ignore or overlook. Using “Europe” and “the EU” interchangeably, as many in Europe already do, that means

¹⁵¹ Mayer and Palmowski 583; see also Weiler, “A Constitution for Europe? Some Hard Choices”

¹⁵² Herrero de Miñón, Miguel, “Europe’s Non-existent Body Politic,” (Miguel Herrero de Miñón and Graham Leicester, *Europe: A Time for Pragmatism*, London: European Policy Forum, 1996, 1-5) Quoted Shore 20

¹⁵³ Bruter, “On what citizens mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderlessness,” 22

¹⁵⁴ Prodi 3

¹⁵⁵ Jacobs, Dirk and Robert Maier, “European Identity: Construct, Fact and Fiction,” (Gastelaars and Ruijter) 31

the EU has “successfully occupied the social space of what it means to be European. One could then not be a ‘real’ European without being an EU member.”¹⁵⁶ The uncertain identity of Europe is reflected in the discussions over the countries that should or should not be part of Europe. No one would argue that Switzerland and Norway are not part of Europe, yet both of their publics have refused membership when asked. On the other hand, countries like Turkey are passionately committed to joining the EU, though their cultural and geographical ties to Europe are questionable.¹⁵⁷ Even the 2004 Eastern enlargement has not rectified the fact that the borders of the EU do not line up with the “borders of a European culture and civilization.”¹⁵⁸

There are two methods by which some form of supranational European identity may form, without any suppression of diversity or invention of new myths. The first is by the promotion of trans-European political parties, which would in turn promote policy at the European level and relay developments directly to constituents, cutting out the national-level ‘middleman.’ The situation today is that parties in the European Parliament act “predominantly or almost exclusively” as “actors of their respective national party systems.”¹⁵⁹ These parties should be the most important political advocates of integration, but they have little legitimacy or power of their own. If political parties would shift parts of their loyalty to the European level, integration could become more appealing to the citizens and increase European identification.¹⁶⁰

The second method is by creating a trans-European broadcast media. The broadcast media, by virtue of mode of operation, provide the public with symbolic messages, rather than expanding and expanding on information. Studies have shown that mass media exposure can influence the political party identification of individuals, which “makes it possible to claim that not only behavior but also attitudes are influenced by media messages, and suggest that perhaps, deeper identities may be influenced by political communication as well.”¹⁶¹ While this may be, in theory, an excellent way to disseminate and promote a European identity, it will, in practice, not work for several

¹⁵⁶ Risse, “European Institutions and Identity Change: What Have We Learned?” 255

¹⁵⁷ Decker, Frank, “Governance beyond the nation-state: Reflections on the democratic deficit of the European Union,” (*Journal of European Public Policy*, Volume 9, Number 2, April 2002) 264

¹⁵⁸ Bruter, *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity* 7

¹⁵⁹ Papcke, Sven, “Who Needs European Identity and What Could it Be?” (Nelson, Roberts and Veit) 82

¹⁶⁰ Papcke 85-92

¹⁶¹ Bruter, *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity* 28-29

reasons. First, there is no assurance that the public will interpret the media messages in the intended manner. Second, the media are centered around regions and nations; genuine trans-European media do not yet exist.¹⁶² Third, as most actors in European news represent the country in which the news is broadcast, the stories are presented with a national slant. However, citizens in Europe continue to identify television news as their most important way of learning about European issues.¹⁶³

The creation of a common European myth is complex and will remain so. Both top-down and bottom-up initiatives are necessary to construct a European identity. It is clear that neofunctionalist theory has its limits, and that spillover into cultural arenas does not happen as readily as originally thought. Despite the potential difficulties, European policymakers must push forward to foster the feeling of Europeanness so that integration into new sectors is possible. Based on the research above, it appears that much of the push needs to occur at the national level, as the factors outside of the EU's control have been shown to be, on the whole, more significant than those which the EU does control. If European elites understand which variables have the most significant effect on identification with Europe, they can use the information to better foster the European idea and identity, though it may be civic rather than cultural in nature. European identification may remain an elite affair, as they are often in better positions to take advantage of the opportunities presented by integration, opportunities seen as a threat to some of the public.¹⁶⁴ The problem remains that elite identification without mass identification is not enough to push the European ideal through the twenty-first century.

¹⁶² Bakir, Vian, 'An identity for Europe? The role of the media,' (Wintle) 183-192

¹⁶³ De Vreese, Claes H, Framing Europe: Television News and European Integration, (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2003) 161-165

¹⁶⁴ Herrmann, Richard and Marilyn B. Brewer, "Identities and Institutions: Becoming European in the EU," (Herrmann, Risse and Brewer) 15