Fil: Final paper to Istanbul 200608

Reflections on the national dimension of European cultural policy

Paper to ICCPR2008, Yeditepe University, Istanbul, August 20-24, 2008

By Peter Duelund

Word count of paper: 7.269 (including abstracts, keywords, institutional affiliation, footnotes etc. but excluding references)

Peter Duelund. Centre for Modern Culture and Cultural Policy

Department of Arts and Cultural Studies

University of Copenhagen

Karen Blixens Vej 1,

2300 Copenhagen S

Denmark

Phone: + 45 35328204

Mobil: + 45 51330583

E-mail: duelund@hum.ku.dk

Home page: www.hum.ku.dk

Peter Duelund

Director, Nordic Cultural Institute

Amalievej 15

1875 Frederiksberg C

Denmark

Phone: +45 33213653

Mobil: +45 330583

Email: nordkult@post1.tele.dk

Home-page, working papers, ordering of books:

www.nordiskkulturinstitut.dk

Abstract

In recent years the national dimension has been revitalised in the cultural policies of European countries. National cultural canons have been launched in Denmark and the Netherlands. Several national paradoxes are displayed in Turkish cultural policy. On the other hand the EU is increasingly arguing for cultural diversity and intercultural dialogues. Globally the UNESCO's Convention Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions has been ratified by a majority of European countries. This current European and global development raise a number of scientific and political questions relating to cultural policies: Which paradigms of nationality and identity are on the agenda in the human and social sciences? Do the have potentials for analysing the cultural policy? Does the development rise to new directions in cultural policy research?

Prelude

Historically, cultural politics has constituted a medium – possibly a medium more important than any other - to understand questions of identity and national self-awareness in modern Europe. Ever since the end of the 17th century the cultural policies of the European nation-states have provided a constitutional framework not only for the creation of art, but - more important - for the creation, evolution and reinterpretation of national identity and cultural practises within the individual nation-state. Historically, European cultural politics have therefore been decisive for the territorial merger of identity, language and nation and for the creation and consolidation of the various national ideologies and self reflections which characterise European societies today.

But nation-building as a mean of cultural policy is still a huge part of cultural policy. In Denmark, the Ministry of Culture has produced a canonical list of national monuments in the hope to underpin Danish identity. Revitalisation of the special Danish cultural heritage has dominated the cultural policy reforms in recent years. In the Netherlands, the Dutch government has launched a national

cultural canon, shedding many years of a predominantly multiculturalists perspective. Proposals have been made to publish an EU cultural canon.

In Great Britain, the New Labour and political movements on the left discuss prospects of a "progressive nationalism" in answer to the cultural policies of Anglo-Saxon conservatives and their nationalist investments in social and cultural discussions. France has given birth to a Ministry for Immigration and National Identity. Poland witnesses the creation of a new national self-awareness built on Catholic faith. In Serbia radical neo-nationalist movements are nourished by myths and propelled by demands to legitimise the return of lost territories.

The controversial paragraph 301 in the Turkish criminal code, which banded insulting to *Turkishness,* was cosmetically changed by the Turkish Parliament in April 2008. Now the banding refers to insulting to *the Turkish Nation.* Its is handed over to the Court of Laws to define what are the differences between to two formulations and the consequences for the law breakers.

Controversies between secularised and religious based public cultural policy has given raise to debates. In Turkey 2008 the AKP – government was convicted by the Turkey Institutional Court for breaking the spirit of the secularised Constitution due to a governmental proposal of allowing Islamic woman to wear scarf at universities and other public institutions.

The controversies between secularised and religious cultural policy has also been a lurking undertone of the Danish cultural policy– among others caused by the Governments revitalisation of Danishness and the publication of a Danish cultural canon 2006-2007 (Duelund 2008b, chapter 4).[1]

On the other hand the EU, post Maastricht has increasingly argued for a common European cultural policy based on unity through diversity and on intercultural dialogues. Globally the UNECCO -

---

[1] The year 2006 saw one of the most severe crises in post-war Danish foreign policy when a newspaper published a few caricatures of Mohammed, the prophet, causing violent reactions among the faithful with the mob setting fire to the Danish embassy in Damascus and numerous burnings of the Danish flag, boycott of Danish commodities throughout the Arab countries and official protests from Arabian foreign offices. The Danish premier felt the need to appear on Arabian TV in an attempt to make it clear that the publication of the drawings did not constitute a violation of religious rights but was an expression of the right to free speech in a secular democracy.

Convention *Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* has been ratified of a majority of European countries.

The current conflicts and the apparent contradictions between the cultural objectives in the EU and its national member states regions raise a number of general as well as specific scientific and political questions relating to identity, nationalism and cultural policies. These issues are pressing, and it is vital that cultural policy studies in the humanities and the social sciences help illuminate them in a transnational and interdisciplinary perspective.

Globalisation and nationality

In the ongoing debate of different cultural patterns, questions of globalisation and nationalism are often presented as closely interrelated (Hedetoft 1995, 1997). Globalisation implies a revival of nationalism as a defence against a possible loss of identity. Strengthening national coherence as an answer to migration and multicultural challenges is to day often argued as a vitally important dimension in the current national debates on cultural policy.

Societies remember their past, not just in the form of 'official' academic history-writing, but through a whole variety of practices. While collective memory may feed into formalized historical narratives, it is also kept alive in more or less informal commemorative practices, landmarks, ritual re-enactments, the historical accuracy of which is often at odds with the insights of academic historians.

As cultural practices are beginning to slip from the grasp of the nation-states, and they are themselves affected by patterns of globalization and localization, these processes alert us to the fact that in fact culture never was 'national' by default, but became nationalized as it was contextualized in the frame of the emerging nation-state, i.e. from the late eighteenth century onwards.

The emergence and subsequent erosion of national cultures in the last two centuries now begins to present itself as one of the more exciting challenges for large-scale interdisciplinary history. The process of cultural canonization or the 'cultivation of culture' involved the developing infrastructure of the modern state, with the centralization of libraries and archives, the reorganization of universities and academies, the professionalization of the humanities and philology, and the rising

sociability of an educated middle class.It involved the ideological emergence of romantic nationalism and national thought, with its interest in cultural identity rooted in language, folklore, and ancient and medieval history.

Cultural policies is a genuine and valid source of information, if one wishes to understand, analyse and interpret the dynamics and institutions of remembrance and canonicity and which paradigms of nationalism/multiculturalism are dominating in a given society.Cultural policies reflect the predominant set of values both in national and in international communities (Duelund 2003, Engberg 2005, Dahl & Helseth, 2005, Hodne 2002).

Paradigms of nationalism

Different paradigms of nationalism have been displayed in the humanities and social sciences in recent years: *The primordial, the modernistic* and *the ethno-symbolic paradigm.* The paradigms seem to be of huge interest in researching cultural policy. But very seldom the paradigms have been reflected in this scope.

In the *primordial* paradigm, nations are conceived as genetic and natural communities that always have and always will exist (Geertz 1973, Stack 1986, Grosby 1995). In this paradigm, strategic notions like cultural policies are therefore not seen as significant for the creation and change of identity. The primordial conception of the relation between identity and nation views unity in personal and national identity and social assimilation as essential phenomena that may be influenced in various ways, but which cannot fundamentally change through political strategies. Nations are conceived as natural and universal phenomena, implying a distinction between "us" and "them", which will always exist independently of constitutions, legal systems and cultural policies. Historically, the primordial position bases its views on a genetic definition of race. However, in modern theories, race is usually replaced by the concept of ethnicity, where the descent of man is not seen as genetically conditioned but in cultural terms.

In the *modernistic* paradigm, the conjunction of identity and nationalism are viewed as social and historical constructions resulting from the industrial need for coherence (Gellner 1983), from technological and language innovations and (Andersson 1993), from the fight for survival of small nations against big nations (Hobsbawm 1990) or from political power politics and manipulations

(Breuilly 1993). Perceptions of identity and nationalism are seen as relative phenomena that may be abandoned, changed or reconstructed by constitutional means like cultural policies. Social-constructivist research in questions of nationalism and identity is therefore primarily concerned with relations that play a part in the formation of nationalist perceptions in the historical and modern societies and in the various consequences resulting from the different cultural and social policies.

During the past few years, a third national paradigm, *ethnosymbolism*, has been introduced by the British scholar Anthony D. Smith (Smith 1991, 1995, 2001). In this paradigm, recollections, values, emotions, myths, rituals, symbols, stories etc. are seen as having an independent and irreversible significance for the construction of national identities. National and ethnic *emotions* are viewed as expressions of authentic experiences and perceptions, a cultural background knowledge that may be influenced in various ways, but which cannot be disregarded or reinterpreted by changes in outside conditions, like cultural policies. The ethnosymbolic approach is not primordial in the sense that feelings of national identity are interpreted as natural phenomena. On the contrary, national identity is both an historical construct and the outcome of myths and symbols acquired by a people through generations via aesthetic artefacts.

Thus, national identities may be subject to reinterpretation and change. Ethnosymbolic research in identity and nationalism therefore stresses the importance of collecting, investigating and understanding national perceptions and outlooks in any given society, but without reducing symbolic expressions to specific premises like cultural policies or artistic production. The ethnosymbolic approach is seldom interested in the effects of changes from the outside, such as the implications of specific cultural policies for the national identity of a given population.

In his later works the German social Philosopher Jürgen Habermas has addressed the irreducible fact of pluralism in contemporary societies in his paradigm of *constitutional patriotism* [*Verfassungspatriotismus*] (Habermas 1996: 491-515). The concept of constitutional patriotism includes analyses and reflections of the huge influence of both nationalism and the religion dimension in late modernity. He argues that although societies are *culturally* divided, e.g. along ethnic, secularised or religious lines, it is possible to integrate them through *a shared political culture*. This is the main point of cultural policy around his paradigm of constitutional patriotism summed up in the following quotation:

"As examples of multicultural societies like Switzerland and the United States demonstrate, a political culture in which constitutional principles can take root need by no means depend on all citizens´ sharing the same language or the same ethnic and cultural origin. A liberal political culture is only the common denominator for at constitutional patriotism (Verfassungspatriotismus) that heightens of both the diversity and the integrity of the different form of life coexisting in a multicultural cultural society. In a future Federal Republic of European States, the same legal principles would also have to be interpreted from the perspectives of different national traditions and histories. One's own tradition must in each case be appropriated from a vantage point relativized by the perspectives of others traditions, and appropriated in such a manner that it can brought into a transnational, Western European constitutional culture. A particularist anchoring of this kind would not do away with one iota of the Universalist meaning of popular sovereignty and human rights. The original thesis stands: democratic citizenship need not be rooted in the national identity of e people. However, regardless of the diversity of different cultural form of life, it does require that every citizen be socialized into a common political culture (Habermas 1996: 500).

Recently especially the controversies between *secularism and religion* has Jürgen Habermas has been approached in a dialogue with the Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (Habermas 2005a). His conclusion to this huge issue in post secular societies is among others (my translation):

The human society will have to reflect the cultural and societal secularisierung as a bubble learning process, which forces as well the tradition of enlightenment as the religious agendas to reflect on the respective borders and limitations …With regards to post secular societies following serious questions are raised: Which cognitive attitudes and normative expectations will and ought the liberal state demand of the behaviour between religious believers and non- believers (Habermas 2005: 19)?.… *The constitutional liberal, pluralistic society's idea and interpretation of tolerance demand not only, that the believers in the dealing with other believers will have to recognise as reasonable citizens that differences of opinion and religion will still exist. On the other side you will have to demand the same knowledge of the non-believers in the dealing with religious believers in the framework of a liberal political culture* Habermas 2005: 41)… *Constitutional patriotism imply, in contrast to a widespread misunderstanding, not only assimilate in an abstracts way the principles of the constitution, but do it*

concretely on ground of there own national history's historical context. If the moral content of the constitutional rights will have to foothold in the change of hearts, the cognitive process is not sufficient (Habermas 2005: 27)

The very point in this constitutional conceptualisation of religion and secularism is that the neutrality of the State guarantees equal ethical liberty for *all* citizens. Secularised individuals, as far as they act as citizens, will have to recognise religious pictures of the universe potentials of truth and not deny religious citizens civic right to participate in public discussions. An authentic *liberal political culture* in democratic societies governed by law can also expect secularised citizens to participate in common efforts to translate adequate religious contributions to a public accessible language (Habermas 2001).

In his recent work *Between Naturalism and Religion* (Habermas 2008) this perspective between secularism and religion has been sharpened and intensified in analyses of the controversies between two countervailing trends mark the intellectual tenor of our age – the spread of naturalistic worldviews and the revival of religious orthodoxies. On the one hand, he defends a naturalistic understanding of cultural evolution that seeks to justice to the normative character of the human mind. At the same time he calls for an appropriate interpretation of the secularizing effects of a process of a social and cultural rationalization increasingly denounced by the champions of religious orthodoxies as a historical development peculiar to the West. His reflections on the enduring importance of religion and the limits of secularism sets the scene for an extended treatment of the political importance of religious tolerance and for a further major contribution to debates on cosmopolitanism and a constitution for international society.

- Does it make sense to use some of the paradigms of nationalism in researching mentioned above in cultural policy research in the light of nationalism and controversies between religious dogmas and secularism?

- Is it possible to operationalise the paradigms to be used in empirical studies?

- Is the reflexive framework in later works of Jürgen Habermas (Habermas 1998, 2001, 2008a, b) appropriate in analysing cultural policy?

A tentative reflection on the ongoing debates on nationality in Denmark, the Netherlands, Turkey and the EU can, hopefully, indicate a few hints about the analytic potentiality of using the different paradigms.

The Case of the Denmark

Since the VKO government was constituted in 2001, cultural policy in Denmark increasingly has been transformed from a sectored policy focusing on art and cultural activities to a societal value policy in favour of revitalisation of the national dimension. This guideline continues to be pursued by the new VKO coalition government appointed, November 2007(Duelund 2008: chapter 4).[2]

Two quotations of the Prime Minister introducing the value based societal policy in 2003 and the Cultural Minster introducing the Danish Cultural Canon in 2005 and its publishing in 2006-2007, is a huge illumination of the general value transformation in recent Danish culture policy:

> *I am convinced, that putting and controlling the agenda of the basic value debate in society, will transform the society more than thousands of laws changes. I am speaking of culture in broad sense of the word. It is the outcome of the cultural battle which will form the future of Denmark. The transformation is not about the economy. Not about technocratic adjustments of laws. The decisive and crucial thing is, who successfully will put the agenda in the societal value debate.*
> (Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen Weekendavisen 17. januar 2003)

The Danish cultural Minister Brian Mikkelsen stated in a speech to the Conservatives National Congress June 25, 2005 just after the initiation of the Danish Cultural Canon project following reflections on nation, identity and democracy:

---

[2] Denmark's Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen called general elections on October 24th 2007. The elections were held on November 13th 2007. The government did not resign with the call for elections. On the contrary, Denmark's liberal party *Venstre* (V) and the conservatives *Konservative* (K) went to the polls on basis of their continued coalition in government which also includes the politic responsibility for public cultural policy in Denmark. The outcome of the elections resulted in the continuation of the governmental constellation between the Venstre and the Konservative parties and supported, as during their previous mandate, in parliament by the ultra nationally orientated Dansk Folkeparti (O).

> *A medieval Muslim culture has in our home never been likewise as valid as the Danish culture, which has grown on the old Danish soil, placed between Skagen [Northen part of Denmark] and Gedser [Southern part of Denmark], between Dueoddde [Eastern part of Denmark] and Blåvandshug [Western part of Denmark] … The Danish cultural heritage enrich one's life and intensify our identity as Danish citizens in a time dominated of globalisation and migration. Cultural rearmament is the strongest vaccine against non-democratic movements in society.*

Furthermore the Minister blew the trumpet to battle against *multicultural ideologies*. In general the speech was dominated by a warlike rhetoric. The Minister made it clear, that there were a lot of battles to fight. The front of the battle was to combat *parallel societies, in which minorities are practising medieval norms and non democratic thoughts.*

In April 2005, Cultural Minister Brian Mikkelsen appointed 7 canon committees corresponding to the 7 main art forms within the Danish Ministry of Culture's remit: literature, music, performing arts, film, architecture, visual arts, design and crafts. The *Danish Cultural Canon* was published and circulated by the Ministry in 2006- 2007. The Danish cultural canon is according to official presentation the Ministry *a collection and presentation of the greatest, most important works of Denmark's cultural heritage*. The explicit intention was:

- To *serve as a compass showing the directions and milestones in Denmark's long and complex cultural history.*
- To *serve as a platform for discussion and debate.*
- To *give us reference points and awareness of what is special about Danes and Denmark in an ever more globalised world.*
- To strengthen *the sense of community by showing key parts of our common historical possessions.*

[Further information is available on: www.kum.dk/kulturkanon/english]

The cultural canon was published as a book with a DVD and CD ROM and distributed as free class sets to all *primary & lower secondary schools*, *upper secondary schools*, *business colleges*, adult *learning centres*, *folk high schools*, higher education establishment and libraries. At the same time, the canon was distributed for sale in retailers.

To ensure that the canon reaches all interested citizens, especially the target group of young people, the ministry has therefore developed a special canon website: www.kulturkanon.dk. The primary purpose of the canon website is to present the canon works in the very best way through sound and picture and to make use of the digital medium's interactive possibilities.

In 2008 the Danish Cultural Canon consists of 108 works spread over nine different categories of art forms. Finally it was decided to draw up a Danish *Canon for children's culture* of 12 works aimed specifically at children.

The Netherlands

The desire to revitalize national identity by help of cultural canons is not a new phenomenon or a special Danish dimension of cultural policy. E.g. the Dutch government in 2006 also launched a national cultural canon, shedding many years of a predominantly multiculturalists' perspective

The 'Canon van Nederland' (Canon of Dutch History) describes 50 important developments or events in Dutch history put together by the ' Commissie Nederlandse canon' (Government Committee Dutch canon) as a canon of Dutch History for all Dutch people. The committee's report was presented to the Minister of Education, Culture and Science on 16th October 2006 [Further information is available on: www.entoen.nu].

One of the members the Dutch Commission on the historical national Canon concludes on the idea and values behind the canon as follows, when the final report was delivered in 2006:

> *In the Netherlands, the debates about the canon evolved from the feeling -- justified or otherwise -- that somehow, we had lost the perception of what it was that made us Dutch, that it had been blurred, perhaps even repressed. And out of a great unresolved integration problem evolved the necessity, and even the urgency, to do something about that deficiency. The canon was made to identify the historical and cultural events that have made the Netherlands what it is today, and its purpose is to add this collection of common events through education and culture to the divided spiritual luggage of the different groups in Dutch society* (Legêne 2006).

Basically the Dutch canon exists in a tableau with 50 so-called windows that are supposed to open up at 50 telling aspects of Dutch history, culture, landscape and society. These are presented next to each other on a poster designed for children aged 10 to 12 in primary school as the first target group. Next to the poster the Dutch canon was published as two books and an interactive website for teachers, parents and cultural institutions.

Together, the books, poster and website of the dutch canon suggest topics for lessons in history, language and literature, religion and philosophy of life, science, constitutional history, geography, environmental issues, art, and/or economy. The themes on the poster do not offer a concise art or history curriculum, although a historical chronology forms their frame. Basically, however, the themes are placed in the framework of contemporary Dutch society, where each window can be approached in a diachronic way.

The canon aims in the first place to help structure a debate *about* Dutch history, culture and society. It is meant to be a point of contact between teachers and parents, between school and academia, the education system and the politics. And besides it intends to function as a cross media concept, which offers an organized place for experiments in education where teachers instead of the commercial firms, are in control of the national canon content.

But also Europe is very present in the Dutch canon. It provides a view on the history of the European Union and the Dutch: from the European Coal and Steel Community and the Rome Treaties, until the recent referendum on the draft European Constitution in 2006. But Europe is also visible behind almost each other window: the book printing and cartography, the wars on land and sea or the peace keeping missions, colonialism and slavery, the economic developments from the so-called Hanseatic League to the Port of Rotterdam, the railway, social security, archaeology, philosophy, art, law, and a lot more could be mentioned, related to almost all 50 windows.

All these elements of a *Dutch* story developed in the context of *European* developments. They refer to what has been labelled as the spiritual and moral heritage of the Union in one of the first clauses of the *Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union* (signed 2000). Other windows, like the archaeological ones, illustrate what the draft European constitution describes as Europe's cultural

heritage. As such the canon is an exponent of the process of European nation building which is relevant today: The current discussions about Turkey and Europe, or about the NATO, the not-so-easy relationships between the Mediterranean Countries of Europe, North Africa and the Middle East, the recent wars in the Balkans, the political changes in the European part of the former Soviet Union: all these tensions in one way or another have roots in this 'turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth century history'.

Besides, the authors have tried to touch on this contemporary issue by directly addressing the windows on *Cultural Diversity*. The canon-committee deliberately tried both to historicize the various immigrant experiences in today's society, linking them to other national histories as well as avoiding easy oppositions between bright and dark sites of Dutch national history.

Finally Dutch colonialism is placed as a theme behind various windows.

Differences
The two approaches to national canons in Denmark and the Netherlands differ in various ways. To put it strongly, the Danes presented a list of best quality, whereas the Dutch presented a structural framework a public debate on identity and nationality. The Danish intended to teach an understanding of the essential meaning of Danish heritage and Danish cultural traditions. The Dutch stressed the context of creative processes and generalized discourses on history and present national challenges. And most importantly: The Danish canon is limited to a national Danish context to improve a well rooted Danish identity among the ethnic Danes and assimilate the *new Danes*.
The Dutch displayed the national issues and discourses in a European and global context.[3]

The Danish and Dutch canons are illustrative cases of different paradigms and interpretations of the how nations come into existence and of national identity and democracy. The Danish is apparently

---

[3] In order to place the Dutch approach in a broader perspective the Dutch Service centre for International Cultural Activities (SICA) in collaboration with the European Network of National Cultural Institutes (EUNIC) invited politicians, specialists and thinkers from various European countries to consider the potency of the idea of a European Cultural Canon. A two days conference The Inspiration of a European Cultural Canon and a Unifying European Political Policy, organised at in Amsterdam, December 8-9, 2006.The aim was to initiate a discussion on the cultural policy potentials and implications of the creation of a European Cultural Canon, not to draw up lists of works that might belong in a European Canon: Is it possible? Would it be desirable from a political and artistically point of view? What would de the consequences for Europe as a part of the World?

primordial in its approach. The Dutch is marked by a constructivist approach to nationalism and national identity.

However, why invest a huge energy in publishing canons of Danishness and Danish identity if these phenomenons are conceived as genetic and created by nature. Are figures of modernism (Anderson), political constructivism (Hobsbawm) or power manipulations by political elites (Breuilly) also lurking behind the initiation of the Danish canon?

Turkey paradoxies

The different paradigms of nationalism seems also relevant in analyses of the paradoxically and complex cultural policy situation in Turkey anno 2008. In a discussion on the state of cultural canons in Europe a Turkish observer introduced some of the canonical paradoxes in Turkey as follows:

The Kemalist idea was actually building up a Turkish Canon and it was more or less what with the word 'myth' It was a myth created in fact. And a myth is always created at the expense of someone else. Europe is created at the expense of whatever is not Europe. This is comparable to Turkey. The idea of Turkey was created saying: 'we are one nation', 'we speak one language', 'we have one common idea' and this was a very, very selective history. And until now Turkey is refusing to face the issues of the Ottoman past. Either qualifying it or completely rejecting it, when it comes to the Armenian issue for example. People don't want to hear and talk about it. Another example: the Muslim minorities, Kurds, Sirkasjem. This Turkey, this Kemalist Turkey was created at the expense of these people losing their identities (Erdogan 2006).

- Is it valid to interpretate these Kemalist myths as constructed phenomenon?
- Is it adequate to analyse the myths in a primordial, ethnosymbolic or religious perspective?
- Does the paradigm of constitutional patriotism in its normative approach imply a appropriate potential to find valid scientifically and political solutions to the paradoxes?

Controversies between secularised and religious public (cultural) policy has given raise to huge debates. E.g. the Islamic based AKP – government was convicted by the Turkey Institutional Court for breaking the spirit of the secularised Constitution due to a governmental proposal of allowing Islamic woman to wear scarf at universities and other public institutions

Furthermore the Turkey EU membership is a scenario filled up with paradoxes. It is quite ironic that a political party AKF with so called "Islamist" roots have steered Turkey closest to prospects of EU membership. It is also ironic that the EU has played a very central role in assisting Turkey's

transformation while at the same time many in Europe are using religion as a means to keep Turkey's membership at bay. This creates a paradoxical situation (Kirisci 2007).[4]

Finally the controversial paragraph 301 in the Turkish criminal code has in 2008 given raise to a huge debate on nationalism, identity and democracy. The paragraph 301 is banding public insulting to *Turkishness.* For years the political elites has used the paragraph to proceed against citizens who are insulting Turkishness. Hundreds of journalist, authors, critical intellectuals, politicians etc. has been dragged through the Turkish court rooms often without sentences than huge media discussions and personal persecutions. Often public references to public denying of the *historic murder of the Armenian people* has caused proceedings according to the paragragh. E.g. The Turkish- Armenian editor Hrant Dink has been banned of this reason with the risk to be exposed to the bullets of nationalistic radicals. The same has happened to the Nobel Prize author Orham Panuk.

In April 2008 the paragraph was changed by the Turkish Parliament. Now the banding refers to insulting to the *Turkish Nation.* From a cultural policy point of view the paragraph and its conceptual transformation raises serious questions regarding the domination definitions of nationality and identity.

- What are the differences between the two conceptualisations?
- Which paradigms of nationalism are lying beneath the old and new concept?

The Turkish Minister of Justice will in the future be allowed to approve the criminal cases to bee proceeded with reference to the paragraph 301. It is handed over to the Court of Laws to define what are the differences between to two formulations and the consequences for the law breakers.

- Which paradigm of nationalism do the Lords of justice or the Islamic Minister of Justice have in mind when they are convicting, interpretating and defining the concepts of *Turkishness*, *The Turkish Nation* etc.?

---

[4] Here comes also the canonical aspect of the European integration at stage. The European Union as an organization which is supranational has a history of the 'headmaster' of school. When Spain joined the Union it had a very feeble democratic tradition. When Portugal joined the Union, the same story. When Greece joined the Union, the colonels were still alive. The Union has often worked as a didactic schoolmaster teaching the new pupils in the class about the right forms of democracy. These elements are also to be seen in the EU-negotiations with Turkey. What are the reasons? Is it caused by the religious differences or by secularism vs. religion?

To day Turkey is like the chariot with the four horses of the Apocalypse. Just like in the Apocalypse the country are going in different directions. Is it possible in the spirit of the paradigm of constitutional patriotism to appeal the horses to drive in the same direction?

Cultural canons of the EC/EU?

How does the *European Union* (EU), formerly the *European Community* (EC) respond to this development? Which paradigms of nation and identity has explicit or implicit been put on the cultural policy agenda in the member states and in the EC/EU?

The culture canon in the EU before and after the Maastricht Treaty.

Since the Maastricht Treaty the question of the different paradigms of nationalism has played a crucial role within the process of expansion of the European Union and resolving the integration issues that comes with it. An increasingly important role is given to the cultural component. For too long it was thought that the necessity for the European Union was primarily determined by economical interests.

Up until the *Treaty of Maastricht (*1992), the Community had no real power in the field of culture. However, culture was latent represented in Community activities through ad hoc initiatives (Duelund 1989, 1994, 1995).

The cultural policy of the EU used to be characterized by either indifference or economical determinism before the Maastricht treaty (Duelund 1994: 165-206). At first, it was all about to hinder new steel- and coal struggles for power which had been a substantial cause to Europe's to world wars in the 20th century. The spiritual energy, culture and art had to wait for a while. It wasn't until the 1980th that on of the architects behind the Coal- and Steel union and the Treaty of Rome, Mr. Jean Monnet, stated that "if he could start all over with re-thinking the European Community, he would begin with the culture".

Before the Maastricht Treaty art and culture was reduced to instruments of economical growth, technological development and, first of all, to the construction of a supranational European identity and cultural policy. It was the European horse before the national cultural carriages inspired by by the paradigms of radical social constructivism.

E.g. the first EC action program for the cultural co-operation in Europe, the socalled "booster", was motivated by the following quote:

> When the Commission continues this action [on the cultural policy field, PD] it is because there is a political urgency and a socio-economical demand today - not only regarding the implementation of the inner market in 1992, but also on the progressively development of firstly the citizens Europe and secondly the European Union.

(Booster on the Cultural field in the European Common ship. Bulletin of the EC 4/87. Luxembourg 1987)

It was a European cultural unity thinking which was decided and carried into effect over the heads of the European countries. E.g. this top-down strategy of EU cultural policy came to light at a Danish cultural ministers' conference at Brandbjerg Folk High School in April 1989. One by one, the directors of the nation Danish cultural institutions went up on the rostrum and declared that they had been pointed out by the European Commission to represent Danish culture within the newly established cultural committees in theatre, music, art museums etc (Duelund 1989). The present Danish Ministry of Culture or any other actors in the Danish cultural field was informed on these latent strategy and ambitions of the EC (Duelund 1995: 316-317).

The secret reflected, but not public discussed, cultural policy aims of the EC pre- Maastricht was to develop a shared set of European cultural institutions and a common set of supporting the art with the overall purpose to construct a *identity as a cultural phenomenon*, a unified and monocultural European cultural public sphere and not *a shared political culture* as elaborated in the conceptualisation of constitutional patriotism. Taking the consequences of this ambitions was in fact to start an elite construction and power manipulating process in the spirit of Breuilly paradigm nationalism (Breuilly 1993), now displayed on a supranational European level.

With the cultural article 128 of the Maastricht Treaty art and culture was given a greater autonomy a a special dimension in the cooperation of the EU. And first of all the cultural article underlined the primacy of national cultural development as a basic of European cooperation. Thus the article stated:

The EU should promote the co-operation between the member states and extend the effort of the member countries on non commercial cultural exchanges ….

The article also stated that the national and regional cultural diversity was to be respected.

Finally, also a paragraph was added (article 92, paragraph 3d) to prevent that the other articles of the Maastricht Treaty on public economical support and national discriminations (Art. 92,93 and art. 7) was used against national public cultural support on national level.

To sum up:

The EU cultural policy pre Maastricht was marked by:

- Development of a supranational European single culture as a superior cultural policy aim.
- Economical and technical utilization of art and culture.
- Supranational top-down organization without principles on "arm-length" between politics and culture.

The post Maastricht was marked by:

- A pluralistic aim with emphasis on cultural diversity and national and initiation.
- Strengthening of artistically and cultural cooperation in Europe by self-organized networking,
- A shared effort in implementing universal regulations on cultural diversity efficiently.

At the moment, there are no signs of rhetorical shifts in the cultural policy division between the autonomy of the member states to define the national based cultural policy and the overall cultural aims in the EU. Only a few general amendments to the articles in the Maastricht Treaty have been amended since then. But contrary to the revitalisation of national identity in the EU member countries cultural policies the dimension of multiculturalism, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue has been underpinned in the different EU-Treaties post Maastricht

The multicultural dimension was added on behalf of Belgium in the *Amsterdam Treaty*. Belgium – the country with two main languages - wanted the *definition of culture to be changed from single to plural*. The principles of public service was underlined in a separate article as a core principle in the EU co-operation (rubric 32), with the amendment that it is up to each country itself to decide weather the principle is supposed to be performed in practice on a national level.

The importance of cultural openness is continued and underlined in the present text of the *Lisboan Treaty*.

In fact the EU –post Maastricht- has been an effective cultural political player in the global fight on authors rights vs. copyright (Duelund 1999). A proactive influence has also been the case in the preparation and ratification of the *UNESCO - Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (Duelund 2008b). A lot of those huge national and global cultural policy issues would have been very difficult for each country to have solved by themselves – not a least for the small countries in and outside Europe. The fight on the international rules within the film legislation is a good example. Here, the EU has shown to be an effective fighter on the interests of the copyright law and on behalf of improving independency in artistically expressions.

On the others hand it can be argued from a national point of view that this sort of common EU cultural policy objectives also can be used to obstacle the national freedom to construct and consolidate different forms of nationalism.

In 2006, Head of the European Commission, Barosso, gave a speech in which he stated that the future of Europe depends to a large extent on culture. "Identities become blurred, he said, and a sense of belonging needs new concepts of (multiple) citizenship and identity, which are not spelled out in terms of being *against* something." So for the near future, the question of cultural identities seems to be a key issue.

In aiming for a more coherent future for the Union, also many contradictory tendencies can be noticed: on the one hand the diversity of cultures is seen as a wealth of variety, on the other hand this same diversity blocks the way to a more efficient approach to improve multiculturalism and

cultural diversity in the reality of the member states as alternative to the growing nationalism. Other things being equal the link between culture and national politics has gained more momentum ever since the Netherlands and France both said NO to the European *Constitution Treaty.* The Irish NO to the *Lisboan Treaty* June 13, 2008 has confirmed the impact of the national dimension in politics in general and in cultural policies especially.

The present questions on cultural diversity, multiculturalism and the rights of the memberstates to improve the national dimension in cultural policy is one of the most sensitive, paradoxical and confusing dilemmas of the EU to day. Citizens hear their own politicians reassuringly talk about the Europe of cultural diversity. On the other hand about the sacredness of the right of every member state to shape and preserve its own culture and cultural identity.

Note, however, all the plurals: peoples, languages, cultures, traditions, identities. Nowhere is it made explicit what cultural pluralism means. Without a fundamental public European discussion on the paradigms of nationalism and multiculturalism it will be difficult to raise a common and valid public discussion on the challenges to cultural policy as long as in fact cultural policy basically is perceived as the total sum of national histories.

One Dutch *Rietveld chair* and one *Danish PH-lamp* do not form a start for a European design history. *Kierkegaard*, *Erasmus* and *Spinoza*, mentioned in the different context of the two respective national canons, do not offer a starting point for an understanding of Europe's cultural possibilities and challenges nationalism/multiculturalism to which Treaties post Maastricht refers.

The ambitions of constructing an over national European monoculture, dominating the cultural canons of the EC pre – Maastricht is abandoned. The new EU cultural canons is focusing unity through cultural diversity. [5]

However, everything seems not to be solved by the new EU canons on diversity or by the adoptions of the different cultural articles in the EU-Treaties since the Maastricht Treaty. Wee are still missing an answer to following crucial questions regarding cultural policies in the second European modernity:

---

[5] The *European Commission's Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World* (2007), the new *Culture Programme 2007-2013*, the Programme *Europe for Citizens* and the *Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008*) [Texts are Available from: ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/…].

- Which paradigms of nationalism are dominating in the cultural policies of the European national states and the EU

- Which paradigms of multiculturalism are displayed in the cultural policy of the member countries and the EU?

- Is the golden rhetoric on cultural diversity based on individual cultural rights of the citizens *or* on national monocultures and a consolidation of the European national states cultural sovereignty?

- Is it the construction of a *multicultural* Europe based on plurality and equal possibilities of individual and collective cultural patterns and artistically expressions *or* on subordination of minority cultures to national majority cultures?

- Will it be modern and constructivist paradigms on nationalism that will gain ground in the future cultural European landscapes or primordial and ethnosymbolic figures of a Europe build on *Danishness, Dutchness*, *Turkishness etc.?*

- Does Europe need something like a common European *cultural identity* or at least a strong common desire to share the same cultural values and traditions in everyday life *or* do wee only need a shared *political culture*, as argued in the paradigm of constitutional patriotism?

- Is it possible to subvert these scenarios and methods and draw up alternatives?

- What role do contemporary art, e.g. the new interventional art forms play in this process?

Postlude

In a limited perspective, cultural policies appear as tools for administration of the arts. In a broader sense cultural policy deals with class of interests and history of ideas, institutional struggles and economical and political power relations in the production and circulation of symbolic meanings in society (McGuigan 2004).

If we choose this broad definition of cultural policy the current discussion raises a number of general as well as specific scientific and political issues relating to identity, nationalism and cultural policies.

The transformations and challenges confronting the national states and regions in Europe indicate that the importance of the national dimension of cultural policy will hardly be reduced as a result of

an intensified process of European integration and globalisation. Quite the contrary, an intensified integration in the EU and a strengthening of global regulation in bodies like UN, WTO and UNESCO seems to stimulate a closer links between identity and nation.

It seems also to be the case in the debate on the UNESCO -Convention *Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,* which was ratified in 2006 and 2007 by a majority of the EU member countries. The convention and its binding demands to protect and further cultural diversity has given rise to a world wide discussion of whether the articles of the Convention should protect existing *national* cultures or should be basically be interpreted in terms of multiculturalism and cultural rights of the individual citizens in a global world without national or territorially frontiers (Duelund 2008b: chapter 4)?

Ministers of culture in dictatorships in Africa, but also in many democratic societies governed by law, support the first view. The Council of Europe preferred the second interpretation of the Convention. The EU is more hesitant in their attitude to the frontlines in international cultural policies. And so are most of the present European national states.

Who wins this war of interpretation will decide the frontlines in future battles on the cultural landscapes in Europe and the rest of the world. To sum up, the following general questions should receive attention in the years to come:

- *Which paradigms of identity, nation and nationalisms are to day displayed in cultural policy ideologies and practises in European countries and in the EU?*

- *What are cultural and political implications of preferring one paradigm to the others?*

- *Is it possible to work out alternative paradigms and cultural practises that subvert the present positions of nation, identity and democracy?*

References

Anderson, B., 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso

Baumann, S., 2000. *Liquid modernity*. London: Blackwell Publishers

Beck, U.,2000. The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (1),79-105.

Breuilly, J., 1993. *Nationalism and the Statet.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dahl, H. F. & Helseth, T., 2006. *To Knurrende Løver. Kulturpolitikkens historie 1814-2014,* Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Duelund. P. 2008a. Nordic cultural policies: A critical view. *International Journal of Cultural* Policy,14 (1), 7-25.

Duelund, P. 2008b. Danish Profile. *Compendium: Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*. Bonn. EricART [online]. Avaiblable from: www.culturalpolicies.net.[accessed June 2008]

Duelund, P. (ed.),2003. *The Nordic Cultural Model*. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute [Ordering of the book is available from:www.nordiskkulturinstitut.dk/English].

Duelund, P. and Dyekjær, T. M., 1996. *Spillet om ophavsretten* [*The Battle on Copyright*]. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute.

Duelund, P.,1995. *Den danske kulturmodel* [*The Danish Cultural Model*],. Copenhagen;Aarhus: Nordic Cultural Institute & Forlaget KLIM.

Duelund, P.,1994. *Kunstens vilkår. Om de kulturpolitiske tendenser i Danmark og Europa* [*Conditions of the Arts. Cultural Policy Tendencies in Denmark and Europe*] København: Akademisk forlag.

Duelund, P., 1989.*Det indre marked og kulturen* [*The Internal Marketand Culture*]. Copenhagen: The Danish Ministry of Culture.

EricART 2008. *Sharing Diversity. National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe.Study for the European Commission*. Report [online].Available from: www.erictarts.org [accessed March 2008]

European Commission 2007 - 2008. *European Commission's Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World* 2007 the new *Culture Programme 2007-2013*, the Programme *Europe for Citizens* and the *Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008*) [Texts are available from: ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/…].

Engberg, J.,2005. *Magten og Kulturen. Dansk Kulturpolitik 1750-1900*, I-III, [*Power and Culture.Danish Cultural Policy 1750- 1900*, vol.I-III], Gads Forlag, København.

Gellner, E., 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell

Gellner, E., 1987. *Culture, Identity and Politic*. Oxford: Basic Blackwell

Giddens, A., 1985. The nation-State and Violence. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grosby, S.1995. Territoriality: the transcendental, primordial feature of modern societies. *Nations and Nationalism* 1 (2).143-162.

Habermas, J., 1981. *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*, Bd. 1-2, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, J. 1987 [1981]. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Volume 2: The Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. 1989 [1962]. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Norwegion translation: Habermas, J. (1971) *Borgerlig Offentlighet*. Oslo: Norsk Gyldendal.

Habermas, J.,1992. *Faktizität und Geltung. Beitrage zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats*. Franfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, J., 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy.* Translated by William Regh. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Habermas, J., 1992. Further reflections on the public sphere. In *Habermas and the public sphere*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Cambridge/ London: MIT Press.

Habermas, J.,1994. Kampen för ömsesidigt erkännade i den demokratiska rättsstaten. In *Den mångkulturella samhälllet och erkännandets politik*, edited by Charles Taylor. Gothenburg: Daidalos AB.

Habermas, J.,1998. *Die Postnationale Konstellation*. Franfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, J., 1998. *The inclusion of the Other. Cambridge: MIT press*

Habermas, J., 2001. *Glauben und Wissen*. Franfurt a.M.: Suhskamp Verlag.

Habermas, J., and Ratzinger J. 2005a. *Dialektik der Säkulariseirung,* edited by F. Schuller. Freiburg: Verrlag Harder Freiburg. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Habermas, J., 2005b. *Zwischen Naturalismus und Religion*. Franfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag

Habermas, J., 2008. Religious tolerence – the pacemaker for cultural rights. *In*: L. Thomassen, eds. *The Derrida-Habermas Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 195-207.

Hagen, Lutz M. (ed.) 2004. Europäische Union und mediale Öffentlichkeit. Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Befunde zur Rolle der Medien im europäischen Einigungsprozess, Cologne: Halem.

Hedetoft, U.,(ed.)1993. Nation or Integration? Perspectives on Europe in the 90s, *Aalborg University Press.*

Hedetoft, U. 1995. Signs of Nations. Studies in the Political Semiotics of Self and Other in Contemporary European Nationalism*, Hants: Dartmouth.*

Hedetoft, U. 1997. *The Nation State Meets the World: National Identities in the Context of Transnationality and Cultural Globalisation*, Aalborg: Center for International Studies, School for Postgraduate Interdisciplinary Research on Interculturalism and Transnationality, Discussion Papers, No.2/97

Held, D.1995. *Democracy and the Global Order. From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hobsbawm, Eric & Ranger, Terence (red.) 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E., 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (2. edition er opdateret om udviklingen efter muren fald)

Hodne, B.,2002 [1994]). *Norsk nasjonalkultur. En kulturpolitisk oversik.* Oslo:Universitetsforlaget, 2. utgave.

Kedourie, E., 1994. *Nationalism*, 4th eds. Oxford: Blackwell (svensk oversættelse: *Nationalismen: En studie av nationalismen som ideologi.* Stockholm: SNS Förlag 1995).

Kirisci, K., 2007. *Religion as argument in the debate on Turkish EU membership*. Paper to the conference "Turkey in Europe". 18-20 January, 2007, Copenhagen: The Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).

Legene S., 2006. The Dutch Canon and Europe. *In*: A. Sonnen, eds. *The inspiration of a European Canon*. Amsterdam: SICA, Service centre for International Cultural Activities

Kücükcan T. 2008. Centre for Islamic Studies, Istanbul. Interview in Politikken, June 14. 2008.

McGuigan, J. 2004.*Rethinking Cultural Policy 2004*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Smith, A. D.,1991. *National Identity*. Harmondsworth:Penguin

Smith, A. D., 1995. *Nations and Nationalism in a global Era*. Cambridge: Polity

Smith, A. D., 2001. *Nationalism.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Stack, J.(ed.), 1986. *The primordial Challenge: Ethnicity in the Contempory World*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Taylor, C.,1994. *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.