THEORETISATIONS OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY
The case of Eastern European countries

European Union. European integration. Are just one of the words we daily hear in political, social discourse or even business discourse. If we watch TV, we go to the university, to the countryside everybody is speaking about European Union.

The issue of European integration arose in Central European countries after the collapse of the communism in early ninetees. In 1993, at Hague, the European Council decided the main criteria's for a country to join the European Union: a functional market economy, the capacity to deal with the competition within the Union, adopting of the acquis which means the capacity to change and adopt laws established by the Union, and political, economic and monetary integration. There was recognized the fact that there are differences between the candidate member states concerning the adoption of the general conditions and criteria because each of them was on a different scale of development. The integration took into account these differences. As we can easily see, the discussion about the European integration was always based on the practical realities. But, besides this, there are other things to take into account, things that cannot be touched, like: identity, citizenship, nations. European Union dose not mean only a gathering of states with commercial and workers exchanges or person moving freely. European Union is continuously constructing itself and is transcends the nation state.

The main purpose of my presentation is to see how the former communist countries will find their own place in this European project. In this respect, the paper will deal with the concept of European identity in relation to national identity and the question to be answer will be: how can we create an European identity in the CEE countries? If we talk about European identity in the former communist countries we need to take into consideration their common history in the past decades and the way they perceive they are or will be treated as members of the European Union, so I considered important to discuss the relationship between European identity and national identity of a state.

European Identity In Relation To National Identity

The idea of a European identity was created around 1970. Earlier nobody used the concept of a European identity. The keyword since the 1950s in the Cold War framework was **European integration**. Identity is a problematic concept. If we take it literally, it means equality, sameness, the quality of being identical. It is a concept used to construct community feelings of cohesion and to convey impression that all individuals are equal in an imagined community.

At the Copenhagen summit from December 1973, the identity idea was based on the principle of the unity of the Nine, on their responsibility towards the rest of the world, and on dynamic nature of the European construction. The meaning of the *"responsibility towards the rest of the world"* was expressed in a hierarchical way:

1. it meant responsibility towards the other nations of Europe with whom friendly relations and co-operations already existed
2. it meant responsibility towards countries of the Mediterranean, Africa and the Middle East;
3. it referred to the relations with the United States, based on the restricted foundations of equality and the spirit of friendship.
4. narrow cooperation and constructive dialogue with Japan and Canada;
5. relations with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe;
6. a reference was made to the importance of the struggle against undevelopment in general.

The idea of a European identity was an instrument to re-establish order and confidence within Europe and to give the European project back the feelings of having a place and a mission in the world order.

The debate about European Union can be situated within the two ideal types of social organization distinguished by Ferdinand Tonnies as Gemeinschaft versus Gesellschaft. The distinction between these two concepts is that the first one refers mainly to a certain sense of belonging based on shared loyalties, norms and values,

kinship or ethnic ties (community); it is conditioned by feelings. The second, on the other hand, relates to the idea that people remains independent from each other as individuals, but may decide in a "social contract", or a "convention", to group together for the conduct of profit-making transactions (society); it remains an artificial construct which will only continue as long as its citizens find the contractual arrangements of common value.

We can argue that all the EU Member States have built a European Gesellschaft (society) because the EU exists nowadays as a social contract, but that the EU lacks the life-and-blood characteristics of an internal living and organic entity; it is not for the moment a truly European Gemeinschaft (community).

Nation-states in many ways continue to cultivate their national heritage, have no longer a political relevance (as many scholars proclaimed after the collapse of the communism the end of the nation state) but this is still a legitimizing instrument of state authority and power. Frequently, we can encounter the argument that changes in technology, economic relations and social institutions have led to a contradictory process of simultaneous globalization and localization ("glocalization"). It is obvious that technology managed in the past year to unify time and space, creating images that are global and erode established categories of identity. As a result, people have started to imagine virtual "new communities" apart from the traditional nation-state. These new homes are developed based on cognitive regions, witch include understanding of culture, common identity and a commensurate sense of solidarity. Also, this means on another level that we need to find new ways and tools for making the people participating in the civic and political life.

In the same time we must not forget that nation-state is a social construct and European Union is an elite-driven project. The regular Eurobarometer opinion polls, conducted by the European Commission, invariably registered a steady and broad support among the European population for the European project in all its different aspects. Until the mid of 1980's European integration was perceived first and foremost as an economic project, not directly affecting core values of its constituent peoples.

Through the decades, Europe's collective identity has developed hand in hand with an institutionalized "culture of cooperation".

For the construction of a collective European identity I think that the concept of Zygmunt Bauman of **"palimpsest identity"** is crucial**.** It is the kind of identity in which forgetting rather than learning, memorizing is the condition of continuous fitness, in which every new things and people enter and exit without rhythm or reason. Only such a palimpsest identity may help Europe to accommodate generously to its many cultures and multivarious senses of „us". National identity is a social construct, determined by history. Constructing a European identity means, first of all, a new memory policy: to celebrate primarily those past events that brought together the nation states, not those that meant war and division. Or, I think we can construct a European identity by forgetting the common unpleasant events of the past.

Although the act of forgetting may seem somewhat artificial and not sincere method of advancing a European identity, it should be recalled the nation states have over the centuries practiced a complex policy of remembering and forgetting in their efforts to produce nationalism and the sense of belongings. Ernest Renan claims that forgetting has been a crucial element in the creation of nations, and that once a nation has been established; it very much depends for its continued existence upon a collective amnesia. National unity, according to Renan, has often been established through brutality and force, and the newly created "Frenchman", "German" or "Italian" had to actively forget his/her local, regional other non-national roots and past by adopting a hegemonic national identity. Although the EU is unlikely to enforce such a collective process of forgetting, it does ask for a shift in allegiance and solidarity that implies a weakened link between citizens and "their" nation state. But, as a group of researchers have shown in their research (Antonia M. Ruiz Jimenez, Jaroslaw Josef Gorniak, Ankica Kosic, Paszkal Kiss, Maren Kandulla, 2004) national and European identity are compatible because" *they are seen as identities of a different level, bearing different meanings. For advocates of more Europe, and for those politicians interested in forging a European identity to serve as one of legitimizing foundations of the EU, this finding could have both positive and negative implications. The good news is that the EU could*

swell the ranks of the citizens with dual identity by further strengthening the performance of the European institutions and the benefits they bring. (or rather the public perception of both)". The fact that Europeans continue to feel, primarily nationals of their home countries it is not a bad news. In fact, if this point of view will be made clear for the national governments it might facilitate the mergence of the type of European identity that is currently resisted by some member states, concerned that it might erode their sovereignty (and the loyalty of their citizens).

In this respect, I think of great importance the fact that professor Bronislaw Geremek, MEP has drawn the attention on the occasion of an exhibition in the European Parliament entitled "Jerzy Giedroyc - Voice Of European Liberty" „*Despite the changes over the years in Eastern Europe, the fall of the Iron Curtain and enlargement of the EU, the historical division of our continent is still present in our minds and consciousness. Europeans have no memory or consciousness of their collective history. There are no common heroes and references. How then can we talk about unity, about a common future? Figures such as Jerzy Giedroyc deserve to be widely known in Europe - not just in Poland, for the values he defended which have now become common European values. Giedroyc dedicated his life to the idea of reconciliation, which is one of the cornerstones of European integration".*

So, Europe can go beyond its limits and construct a common identity as a whole if it learns to remember the events of the past that trancended the nation state and have had a positive impact on every individual/state. I am not saying the nation state should forget its own history (which is important in constructing the identity of an individual as a member of a certain nation state) I am trying to argue that we cannot be ONE in Europe, even if we are different, unless there is something to bring us toghether (the good moments of the past).

National Identities In Central And Eastern Europe And Their Views About European Integration

The history and the nation-building process in the Central-European countries, make it rather unlikely to think that they would support the transformation of the

European Union into a political federation. There is a gap between the East European states wish to assert their sovereignty and their wish to become integrated in the EU. In the view of the Copenhagen school, national identities constitute foreign policy and vice versa. This means that identities of the East European nations can influence the ways in which they act into the EU, but their participation in the EU integration project will also influence their identities.

The dominant view among the countries from Central and Eastern Europe was that future enlarged EU must not take shape as a kind of "a fortress", keeping nations and peoples outside the boundaries at a distance.

Contrary to what the name "Central and Eastern Europe" implies, this regions' position in Europe has never been central. The region has rather been condemned, through the centuries, to constitute a periphery. In Mediaeval Europe the region was the Western Christian world's periphery which had to face the threat of the Muslims world. In the 17th century it came to occupy a peripheral position in the economic context, too from which it has never recovered. In the 18th century, Europe of Enlightment and later, Central and Eastern Europe was regarded at the periphery of European civilization, taking its impulses from the West. The Eastern Europeans received confirmation of their peripheral position, and hence marginal importance, at the end of World War II when at the Yalta Conference in 1945, the Western powers gave their tacit agreement that the region should fall into the Soviet Union's sphere of power. The elites in the region are fully aware of the area's peripheral situation and bitter about the fact that for centuries is has been treated as "the suburb of Europe". In the discourse on Europe in these countries one can trace an inferiority complex coupled with a need for self-assertion and, on the one hand an idealization of Europe, and on the other, a bitter criticism of it.

The stratification of Europe and including the Central European Countries in this periphery might have negative consequences to identity level by creating a negative feeling expressed by the shame of being a part of this place in Europe. Identity is formed in the interaction with the other. It does not have always the same form and it is changing and it needs positive reactions and this is the role of the elites of the society (political, economic or cultural elites of a society).

The promise of the EU enlargement gave to these countries the hope of changing in their situation as peripheral countries and become a fully valid and respected member in Europe. Membership to the EU can be seen as a "return to Europe", a Europe understood in terms of values and hence a "Europe of equals". This rethoric expresses an important emotional driving force behind the striving of the Central and Eastern Europeans towards integration-the will to confirm and strengthen their identity (as Europeans) and to increase their self respect. But the questions is: how realistic are these expectations? Probably for us there is no escape from a peripheral situation, because within a "Europe of equals" there is nonetheless a chance that the weaker, peripheral countries will be able to cooperate and thus to balance their interests against those of the larger countries.

Other researchers argued that in the early nineties, European identity in the CEE countries was closely related to breaking with the Communist past. The slogan "back to Europe" represented a diffuse and affective image of Europe as a desirable counter world to a dire state socialist with its communist ideology, soviet hegemony and Marxist-Leninist organization of state and society. The idea of a return to Europe also implied that the country had been a part of Europe throughout most of its history and its civilization and cultural orientation, but was artificially decoupled from Europe due to unfortunate historical incidences.

The studies made by a group of researchers from the accession countries (see Martin Brusis) discovered interesting things as:
A. *the notion of EU membership has given way, or been replaced by, an increasingly utilitarian notion of EU membership, with an elaborate time-dimensions:*
   - explanations given for joining the EU have shifted from general historic and geopolitical reasons to more concrete economic and security benefits;
   - supporters of EU membership place more emphasis on the significant economic and political benefits integration will entail for one's own country;
   - EU membership no longer represents an aim as such, but (increasingly)a means to attain economic modernization, political stability and to regain national sovereignty in the face of globalizing process;

So, EU membership is viewed as more detached from being European or having a European identity and drawbacks and costs of EU membership are more clearly seen and articulated.

B. *Debate was more about going into the EU than about being there. Political elites of the CEE countries, lacking a distinct public opinion or consensus on a member identity in the EU, appeared to have considerable degrees of freedom in defining whether their country adopts more integrationist or more intergovernmentalist dispositions concerning cooperation within the EU and the future of the EU.*

This political flexibility can be explained by several rationales. The political elites in Central and Eastern Europe seem to be far from their public opinion and general society than in democracies of Western Europe that have gone through decades of political-cultural consolidation and that have a long standing experience of European integration, materialized in entrenched cleavages and public expectations with regard to a country's member role in the EU. Furthermore, the domestic context in the accession countries was and is shaped by a historical tradition of adopting modernization from the West and by recent experience of fundamental constitutional change necessitated by the political transition. This legacy has generated a higher receptiveness for internationally spread institutional arrangements and "best practices".

C. *the discourses on Europe appeared to invoke and reinforce "European belongingness" as a legitimating resource the political elites of the region can rely on.* This affective affiliation with Europe has been moderated by the rationalization process described above. Political elites in the accession countries still appear to have a similar surplus of advance trust at their disposal that has eroded in EU member states in the course of the last decades.

What seems to be important for the national meaning of national identity is the center-periphery difference in nation-state building. The salience of the cleavage between modernization and traditionalism westernizes and guardians of an autonomous national culture is related to how European identity is constructed and claimed in national discourses. In Central and East European countries where this cleavage has strongly

developed and persisted in the configuration of the party system, European identity is placed more at the center of political controversy, and "Europeaness" constitutes a device used by Westernizers to argue against traditionalists. In countries with a less polar cleavage, European identity is constructed as self-evident, being part of the overarching national consensus and ephemeral to topical political debates.

This cleavage difference, however, can only partly explain why the functions attributed to the EU integration differ between the countries. The evidence presented in the Martin Brusis'book suggests that Estonia, Hungary and Slovenia are those countries where integration is primarily seen as a policy toolkit to overcome socio-economic backwardness. In Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and Slovakia, advocates of EU integration view it as a strategy to promote civic and modern identities. This emphasis can be related to the more partisan role of the European identity and EU integration in some of these countries. Compared to this weak correlation, the Communist past provides an easy explanation why in the Baltic States and Slovenia integration has been seen as a form of protection against hegemonic neighbor. While EU integration is usually seen as entailing a transfer of sovereignty rights from the national to supranational level, the opposite perspective also has plausibility: transferring decisions rights to the EU *could reinforce statehood, and integration could be strategic move to re-establish and enhance national sovereignty.* This function of EU integration is mentioned only in relation to Estonia.

In Eastern European countries, there are also euroscepticists. Social and economic groups and sectors which are, or perceive themselves as, negatively affected by integration articulate their concerns by resorting to three main lines of Eurosceptic reasoning. The most prominent form of Euroscepticism seems to be arguments according to which European Union jeopardizes the cultural distinctiveness of "our" nation, the regained national sovereignty and dignity. Political actors that agree to such traditional-conservative arguments belong to conservative clerical groups in Poland, Slovakia and Hungary.

A second form of euroscepticism is taking into consideration the fact that Brussels represents an "etatist-bureaucratic form" that harms dynamic and liberalism achieved and promoted in the transition countries.

The third form of Euroscepticism views economic integration with Western Europe as a sell out of national assets and hard-earned values, sacrifing the country to the forces of global capitalism.

All the variants of Euroscepticism are related to the cleavages structuring party systems and politics in the accession countries. Traditional-conservative Euroscepticism is a discourse strategy of traditionalist against Westernizers, reflecting the cleavage mentioned above. So, it is not incidental that in countries with a more pronounced modern-traditional cleavage in the party system-such as Poland with its opposition between Catholic-conservative groups versus laicist-liberals, traditional-conservative Euroscepticism was more strongly represented in the public debate.

How to create and support European national identities in the Eastern European Countries?

The European Commission has always tried to contribute to a wider understanding of what the EU represents so far that it launched a communication strategy in May 2000. The objectives of the strategy were to improve the public knowledge and understanding of the EU in the accession countries, to explain implications of accession for each country and to explain the link between the pace of preparations for membership and the progress of negotiations. (European Commission, Communication Strategy for Enlargement, 2000).

The implementation of this communication strategy was based on three principles, which were supposed to be the key to its success:

- Decentralization: the strategy was implemented in a decentralized manner in both the Member States and the Candidate countries (at that period of time), in order to ensure that it is geared to the specific needs and conditions of each individual country;

- Flexibility: in order to adapt to varying communication challenges arising from an essentially dynamic process;
- Synergy: essential to ensure that the efforts deployed by the Commission, the European Parliament and the member states, and other groups in the society complement and reinforce each other.

However, a communication strategy, notwithstanding its importance, is an insufficient response since it can not replace the rethinking of the political role of the EU in Central and Eastern Europe. What is needed may be described as a complex organizational learning, a learning process that goes beyond the change of polity outputs and extends to changing the organizational knowledge base and cognitive frame of policy making. These two elements form a part of the organizational identity of the EU and have shaped the routines of problem perception and policy formulation within the EU. It seems necessary to establish an intra-EU capacity that enables EU decision-makers and institutions to take into consideration how intra-EU debates affect Central and East European perceptions and become effective in the domestic debates about joining "Europe".

The process of the negotiations provided interesting examples of how national European identities in the accession countries were shaped by the EU and its member states without much consideration about the impact of their policies on the EU's image in the region. The Italian blockade of the European Agreement made the Slovenian public realize that: "*Europe was run by nation states and its interests which at some points challenged the roots of Slovene sovereignty and its identity*". The more the negotiations proceeded to political controversial issues such as the freedom of movement and the acquisition of real estate, the stronger was their impact on the public perception of the EU in the accession countries. In view of this indirect identity-shaping impact was not sufficient to explain the link between the pace of preparations for membership and the progress of negotiations. More important seemed to be ensuring the accession countries to perceive the accession as a fair treatment grounded in factual objectivity.

Beyond the accession-identity nexus, the most challenging issue for the EU was and is to clarify, the relationship between a state's European identity and a state's identity as a member of the EU.

The EU can base its attitude towards European states outside the EU on a synecdochial relationship of EU member and European identity i.e. EU membership is a part, representation and symbol of European identity but EU membership as such has a different meaning, and European identity is clearly more than an EU member identity. The advantage of relying on this relationship is that European states and their citizens can identify themselves as European without having or wanting to be members of the EU. The EU has less definional responsibility since its internal norms are not congruent (and do not have to be congruent) with the entire set of norms that have evolved and guide political behavior among and within states in Europe. The EU can construct itself as a club where the members have to fulfill certain entry conditions. This way of club thinking has been revealed by the French president Jacques Chirac, who stated: "*It is legitimate that old member states, who have contributed so much, have more votes than those who are new and bring problems".*

Alternatively, the EU can adopt a cognitive frame according to which there is a synonymous relationship of EU member and EU identity, i.e. that both notions have an equal meaning and are equivalents. This configuration of the relationship implies that EU membership is defined as the natural correlate of having a European identity. Since the norms structuring member states relations and cooperation in the EU are equivalent with European norms, the EU has the power to define these norms as constitutive to Europeaness, as core features and requirements of European identity. This endows the EU with a powerful policy instrument to create political stability across Europe: to the extent that European states and citizens outside the EU identify themselves as European and adopt the synonymy principle, they will accept all implications and requirements the EU links to membership –not as a conditionality imposed from outside but as a norm to be internalized. Europeans outside the EU will perceive their non-membership as a deviation from normality and try to achieve cognitive consistency between their diverging self-perception as Europeans and non-members of the EU. This

perception prevailed in Central and Eastern Europe in the early nineties and can still be found in declarations of politicians, as it was the case of the former Bulgarian Prime Minister Ivan Kostov: „*Our European identity was buried long after the Second World War and came back to life ten years ago as an aspiration to European Union membership*".

Hitherto European politicians have been able to manage enlargement by fusing the synonymous and the synecdochial relationship between EU member and EU identity. It also enabled political representatives of the applicants countries to legitimize unpopular measures by referring to the synonymy notion. Both notions are, however, increasingly difficult to reconcile since Turkey with its application for membership and also the membership ambitions of Ukraine and Russia will challenge the credibility of synonymy notion suggested by the EU. The core of the problem is not to find and draw the borders of Europe but to strike a balance between two concepts of European identity-synecdochial or synonymous- by taking into serious consideration the function and relevance of a European identity for the democratization process in Eastern Europe.

If the EU wants to foster the European national identities in the former accession countries, it should address the focus on involving them as equal partners, for this to perceive the problems of the EU as they are their own, to internalize them. This way of viewing the debate has reinforced the imposed character on the EU membership in the perception of the East European countries, which can be seen in Martin Brusis comments about Czech Republic: "*Czechs tend to feel that their identity within the EU has been somehow pre-arranged for them, prepared by somebody else.*" Such an attitude is likely to prejudge attitudes in, and political dispositions of, the future new member states towards the EU, relieving them of a responsibility to advocate communitarian concerns in their own right, not in an instrumental way.

The EU should try to complement the accession focus on the public debate by a membership guided perspective. An appropriate political strategy would open the debate on the final result of the EU and European integration, framing it as an open

constitutional process that extends to all European countries. It would encourage the Eastern European countries to reflect on their role as a member of the EU and to redefine their national interests.

The dynamic between identity and integration is similar to the dynamic between organic and institutional. The risks of the changes only to the formal level and not taking into account the substance were often encountered in the Romanian society. The Europeanization only to the political and legislative level, under the pressure of the economic factor, would lead to societies to transform the essence after institutional forms. It is believed that cultural integration will come out finally as a consequence of the unification introduced by mass communication. The circulation of economic goods means in the same time the circulation of symbolic goods that may lead to the standardization of behaviors. The new world culture is expressed by English and images. This type of integration has its negative consequences by producing cultural homologation and by excluding modern and traditional values, by unifying persons and devaluation of men.

Conclusions

Reorganizing Europe has to start by taking into consideration that it is a Europe of nations. Central and Eastern European countries that dealt with profound transformations in their recent history are more sensitive to the tensions of the economic reorganization. This is way under the pressure of adapting to the western way of life there are more inclined to nationalist views.

Taking into consideration all the facts presented in this paper, I find it useful not to talk about the dismantling of national states and national identities in Europe but about their redefinition in response to the challenges they confront with. That is, to see national identities as historical-geographical imaginations renegotiated in the interactions with the others. A very interesting research from this point of view was made by Anna Triandafyllidou who analysed how national identities are reconsidered and images of Self and Other are transformed in the emerging new Europe. She studied press discourse in Germany, Greece, Italy and the UK in order to explore how national

patterns of identification are reconsidered in the tree dimensions of the identity space discussed below: the transnational or European level, the national or member state sphere and the local-regional context, including minorities and immigrant communities.

With regard to identity formation, the European integration process has posed two main challenges. First, it has suggested that Europeaness should be integrated into in-group identity, with the fellow member states no longer being seen as external Others, but as a part of the in-group. Second, the European Union itself has grown into an inspiring or threatening, external Other for many European countries. Through contrasting with the internal threatening of the external Other, this suggest the nation strengthens its sense of belonging and thus can afford towards inspiring external Others, such as the European Union.Anna Triandafyllidou found response to these challenges in her study. In all the countries studied, the press discourse revealed dynamic interaction between, on the one hand, national tradition and established features of national identity and, on the other hand, the necessity to deal with new challenges and changing social, economic and political environment. Discourses of nationhood tended to re-invent, modify, transform and re-interpret formerly established national features, and to develop new understandings of nationhood and images of the nation. The new opening toward a European identity was accompanied by increasing hostility towards groups of immigrants. Through contrasting with the internal threatening of the external Other, this suggest the nation strengthens its sense of belonging and thus can afford towards inspiring external Others, such as the European Union.

Anna Triandafyllidou traced in her analisys a new form of nationhood, developing in interaction between former national identities and some form of Europeaness. National identities develop into more flexible forms of national belonging, witch allow for national traditions and feelings of "we-ness" to intersect with a wider transnational cultural and political space witch is partly included in the identity space. Because the new discourses of nationhood become more complex and the boundaries more blurred, she argues that they may in the long run render difficult the definitions of Others as people not belonging to the „in-group".

My opinion about the future of Europe, quoting one of my proffessors (Septimiu Chelcea) is: *"European unification will be possible by keeping cultural, ethnic and national identities. The failure of the melting pot theory (the apparition of a new identity by melting all the cultural, ethnic and national characteristics) should raise a big question mark to those politicians that nowadays are trying to sacrifice their national and cultural identity for economic reasons. We would say, paraphrasing a well known aphorism that Unified Europe will be democratic, multi-identity, will accept collective memories or it will not be at all".*

Bibliography:

Antonia M. Ruiz Jimenez, Jaroslaw Josef Gorniak, Ankica Kosic, Paszkal Kiss, Maren Kandulla (2004), "European and National Identities in EU's old and new member states: ethnic, civic, instrumental and symbolic components", European Integration Online Paper, Vol 8, No. 11

Anssi Passi (2001) "Europe as a social process and discourse", European Urban and Regional Studies, Sage Publications

Brusis, Martin (2000), "Conclusions: European national identities in the accesion countries-the role of the European Union"

Chelcea, Septimiu (1998) "Memorie socială şi identitate naţională", Editura INI, Bucureşti

European Commission "Communication Strategy for Enlargement"

Ferreol, Gilles (2000) "Identitatea, cetăţenia şi legăturile sociale", Editura Polirom, Iaşi

Ehrke, Michael (2005) "Noua Europă: economia, politica şi societatea în capitalismul postcomunist", Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, www.fes.ro

Kirsten Simonsen (2004) "Europe National identities and multiple others", Roskilde University, European Urban and Regional Studies, Sage Publications

Lemke, Christian (1998) "Citizenship and European integration", Washington

Morin, Edgar (2002) "Gândind Europa", Editura Trei, Bucureşti

Michael Bruter (2003) "Winning hearts and minds for Europe: the impact of news and symbols on civic and cultural European identity", Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 36, No.10, Sage Publications

Persson, Hans-Ake (2000) "Europe: a vision from within and from the outside",

Studentlitteratur, Malmo University Press

Peter van Ham (2001), "Europe's postmodern identity: a critical appraisal", International Politics 38, 229-252, June 2001

Sean Carey (2002), "Is national identity an Obstacle to European integration?" European Union Politics, Volume 3 (4), Sage Publications

Strath, Bo & Malmborg, Mikael (2000) "The meaning of Europe: variety and contention within and among nations", Berg Press, Oxford&New York