Review article
UDK 39(4)
316.722(4)

;

Ivana Gačanović*
Institute for Ethnology and Anthropology
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Belgrade

Ivan Kovačević**
Department of Ethnology and Anthropology
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Belgrade

FROM THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF EUROPE TO THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND BACK

Abstract: From its origin in the nineteenth century, through the entire twentieth, ethnology was present in most continental European countries as the national science of ethnological research on the given population and territory, past and present. Countries that held colonies, however, grounded their anthropological studies entirely differently, namely, in the research of 'primitive societies'. A process of merging Anglo-American anthropology and European ethnology began after the Second World War through theoretical innovations, such as Claude Levi-Strauss' structuralism, which integrated anthropology as a scientific discipline. This was also the beginning of the integration of Europe, that is, the creation of the European Economic Community. Science has traditionally regarded Europe as a 'mental representation' or the product of a complex political-ideological or cultural conceptualization. In anthropology as elsewhere, Europe was chiefly seen either through a regional comparative approach or through various kinds of analysis of interior or transcontinental spheres of political, economic, demographic, and cultural influences. This paper will take a closer look on the recent studies of Europe, and more specifically, of European Union, through the lens of anthropology.

Keywords: Europe, European Union, anthropology, research approaches.

* ivgacanovic@gmail.com
** ikovacev@f.bg.ac.rs

European anthropology, in past times more often referred to as ethnology, was grounded in the ideas of European Romanticism, and has from its very inception been directed at "local" research. From its origin in the nineteenth century, through the entire twentieth, ethnology was present in most continental European countries as the national science of ethnological research on the given population and territory, past and present. Countries that held colonies, however, grounded their anthropological studies entirely differently, namely, in the research of 'primitive societies'. Such anthropologies were connected only through theoretical systems, such as evolutionism or functionalism, from which emerged the academic discipline of sociocultural anthropology, primarily in Great Britain and the US. On the other hand, the weaving of 'national ethnologies' into a broader 'European ethnology' was either mechanical – textbook surveys under the heading "Ethnology of Europe" – or else as part of nineteenth-century diffusionist school, which persisted in rump form into the last quarter of the twentieth century. The highest aim and achievement of this school was the development of a European atlas of the various traditional cultural phenomena, predominantly of material nature.

A process of merging Anglo-American anthropology and European ethnology began after the Second World War through theoretical innovations, such as Claude Levi-Strauss' structuralism, which integrated anthropology as a scientific discipline. This was also the beginning of the integration of Europe, that is, the creation of the European Economic Community.

The basis of study of European societies in the second half of the twentieth century was anthropologized European ethnology. Sometime around 1980, it incorporated a hundred years of American and British anthropology, in particular when American anthropologists 'returned home' from Africa, South America or far-flung Polynesian islands, entering a previously exclusive domain of sociological study of one's own society. The early 1990s was also marked by their increased interest in the study of Europe.[1] As part of studying modern societies and research focus on 'local knowledge', detraditionalized global ethnology/anthropology unsurprisingly began to outgrow the study of local communities and show inclinations towards the study of more encompassing social and political phenomena, such as nation-states and transnational forms (Thomas 1997, 334). Indeed, the study of larger political entities began with the anthropological study of nation-states (Anderson 1998; Abélès 2001). Anthropology, and primarily political anthropology at that, included the study of all levels of territorial organization and association from the smallest village and provincial towns to megalopolises, and from local communities and larger residential units to regions, provinces, and states.

1 Cf. the issue of American Anthropologist from that time (Vol. 99, No. 4, 1997), entitled "Provocations of European Anthropology."

"Europe" as an Analytic Category and Object of Study

Science has traditionally not regarded Europe as a clearly delineated and homogenous geographic, sociocultural, and political unit. As an analytic category, it has always been a 'moving target' and most often perceived and experienced as a 'mental representation' or the product of a complex political-ideological or cultural conceptualization (cf. Delanty 1995; Chakrabarty 2000; Pagden 2002; Stacul et al. 2005). In anthropology as elsewhere, Europe was chiefly seen either through a regional comparative approach or through various kinds of analysis of interior or transcontinental spheres of political, economic, demographic, and cultural influences. Spatially and temporally most comprehensive anthropological studies and syntheses focused on specific 'parts' of Europe, like Western (Macdonald 1993; Delamont 1995), Eastern (Wolff 1994), or else post-socialist countries (Verdery 2005), the Balkans (Todorova 2006; Hayden 2013), the Mediterranean and European 'peripheries' (Herzfeld 1987; Giordano 2012), etc. when it comes to theoretical interpretations of socio-political and economic changes in contemporary Europe, they are taken as part of general global transformations, most often noted and interpreted as late capitalism (which replaced industrial society), globalization, anti-globalization, information and technological revolution, postcolonialism, migrations (global demographic mixing), multiculturalism, neoliberal capitalism, and the Anthropocene. The causes and processes of European integration, begun in the mid-twentieth century, are directly tied to all these phenomena, along with myriad others. Given the very specific discursive presence of the European Union in media and political discourses in the 1980s and '90s, at the turn of the century, the term 'Europe' begins to be increasingly used as synecdoche for the European Union, that is, as a reference to its administrative and political bodies, as well as to a relatively well-defined value system.

Yet, in its first two decades, the European Economic Community was consolidated rather quietly, without fanfare, flag-waving, or political speeches, as Zygmund Bauman noted. A significant reason for that lay in the fact that its inception was brought about with the help of the likes of Alcide de Gasperi, Robert Schuman, and Konrad Adenauer (rather than priests, kings, or philosophers, Bauman 1998, 2). In the 1950s, Schuman popularized a new term, 'supranationalism', which according to Cris Shore encapsulated the ethos of this integrative process (Shore 2001). Technically, it referred to a legal concept of unique competencies and autonomy of institutions of the Community, and ways in which it differed from 'inter-governmental' institutions (as well as from national and international law). According to Monnet and Schuman, supranational institutions were supposed to control the surpluses of national states, taking away their power in the domain of production of coal, steel, atomic energy – the main resources for waging war. They thus made war between Germany and France virtually impossible (Shore 2001). Moreover, it is

important to note that during the first decades of integration, it was equally, if not predominantly, based on economic need.

Jean Monnet, the visionary behind the project of the European integration, was significantly guided by 'neofunctionalist' arguments, popular at the time, about regional integration of political communities. According to the father of this theory, Ernst Haas (1958), Leon Lindberg (Lindberg and Cheingold 1970) and other integration theorists, prolonged mixing among national representatives and politicians within EU institutions will result in a stable transfer of loyalty from the national to the European level. The expression internally used for this was *engrenage* (something akin to transfer in mechanics; entwinement). They predicted that joint working habits would spill over into political psychology of the elites, resulting in a process of 'cognitive change', and ultimately a development of a new, 'European consciousness'. Note that this process was largely anticipated by Jean Monnet. Speaking of the particular nature of European civil service embodied in the high authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel of the 1950s, Monnet enthusiastically wrote about the Committee as a 'laboratory' which would create a new kind of 'European man' (Shore 2001). Still, as Bauman says, the execution of the integration process unfolded behind closed doors, and was conducted above all by businessmen (primarily talking about creating joint authority and control over the French and German coal and steel industries), the resulting 'community' based above all on an economic foundation. Jean Monnet did not consider this a good basis for creating unity among Europeans; rather, it should have been built primarily on 'culture', but this was an idealism that none of the 'builders' of Europe took seriously at the time. Ultimately, the result of these accords was the opening of European borders for the free flow of goods and capital.

The period of development of the European Community that intrigued anthropologists at first were the 1980s, when the Community faced a crisis of legitimacy:[2] there was a need for legitimation of the European Community as a political system and the growing awareness that a significant condition for legitimacy is the creation of a 'European demos'. Otherwise, the Community would continue to be perceived as a fundamentally undemocratic system (Shore and Abélès, 2004, 10). The introduction of a common monetary unit and the creation of the Eurozone through the 1992 European Treaty only further impressed the significance of the question of cultural legitimacy: "we should not be surprised if people in rich regions like Bavaria, Alsace or the Veneto question why they should pay more taxes to help out neighbours in countries like Greece, Spain or Eastern Europe, with they feel they have little cultural affinity" (Shore 2001). The process of European integration, until then conducted without including the public opinion of national states or public clashes of opinion, had

2 Legitimacy is a political term that refers to the idea that governance over a given group of people within a given political system ought to be conducted with the agreement of the given group (cf. definition in McLean and McMillan 2003, 305).

already been well underway; meaning that at the point when the first forms of protest and resistance appeared, there was already no return.

The absence of public consent and attachment to the Community was being resolved by European federalists digging up Monnet's claims about the significance of 'culture' for the creation of European unity, as well as reaching for a rhetoric of a 'European identity'. A Declaration on European identity was signed in Copenhagen as far back as 1973 by nine foreign ministers of EEC member countries, and the European Commission began to officially develop its 'cultural policy' in 1977 (officially recognized in 1985). Therefore, from the entire context of creation of the European Union, anthropologists focused their analysis on the role played by concepts of 'culture' and 'identity', thus contributing significantly to the scientific study of the discourse of 'new Europe'. Credit for this shift in perspective goes to the New Zealand anthropologist Cris Shore who significantly influenced and directed a number of local anthropologists in their dealing with the European Union.[3] Additionally, anthropologists infiltrated European institutions and bureaucratic structures to conduct ethnographic fieldwork on cultural engineering of a particular kind, or as it is usually called in the literature, the creation of 'identity politics' of the European Union. With ever-greater emphasis on the notions of culture and identity in public speeches, regulations and policies, the EU 'invited' anthropologists already 'armed' with theoretical and methodological approaches for this kind of analysis.

The Anthropological Approach to the Study of the European Union

Broadly, we can still agree with Borneman and Fowler that the anthropological study of the European Union can be classified into three approaches or groups of problems (2010, 49).[4] In a slightly modified order and description, we will here present three approaches as they have gelled over the course of our teaching subjects dedicated to the European Union.[5] The first approach is the so-called approach *from above*, encompassing discursive analysis of politicization of concepts of culture and identity in official documents, policies, and general public discourse of the EU representatives.[6] This approach seeks to uncover the logic of creation of the European identity or means used by European insti-

3 The first and so far only translations of Cris Shore into Serbian were done for the thematic issue "Anthropology of the European Union" [Antropologija Evropske unije] of the journal *Treći program* (145, I/ 2010, edited and translated by Ivana Gačanović).

4 Cf. Wilson (1998).

5 The authors have years of experience teaching the subject "Anthropology of the European Union" across various levels of study at the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.

6 For an example and explanation of this approach in Serbian, see Gačanović (2009).

tutions to reach the consciousness of members of European nations, ethnicities, classes, molding into them the belief that together they comprise the 'Europeans'. In this view, the European Union is a project that concerns all, belongs to all, and to which all belong. What we can emphasize within this approach is the narrative in which certain elements of this process are compared to elements present in process of creation of collective consciousness of belonging to modern nation-states.

The second approach we designate as approach *from within*. Attention is directed to ethnographic research of the centers of the Union and other European institutions as 'fashionable localities' or 'multicultural laboratories'. It seeks to study cultural and identity points of view and interactions of European civil servants, as well as the organizational culture emerging from this environment.

We call the third approach *from below*, and it comprises all those ethnographic and other research directed at ways in which the contemporary idea of 'Europeanness' has sifted through the complex populations of the European continent, and how it is 'reflected' through the prism of quotidian mutual interactions and interactions with local and national policies. This approach comprises all the research dealing with processes of Europeanization. Defined by Borneman and Fowler as the strategy of self-representation and an instrument of power, which above all reorganizes territory and nationality, the two forms of group identification that have shaped modern European order (2010, 38). The study of questions surrounding the migrant crisis and Islam in Europe also should not be overlooked, as these anthropological studies are particularly prominent in recent years (Pišev and Milenković 2013; Fadil 2019); however, these themes run through all levels of analysis here mentioned, given that they pervade all levels of 'European reality'.

The Approach *from above*

The 'studies of nationalisms' can be considered the first indirect research of the European Union. It is a field that has inspired many famous theorists of various humanities and social sciencies, such as Anthony D. Smith (1992), Eric Hobsbawm (1996), or the anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1983). But perhaps the greatest contribution to the field was made by Benedict Anderson with his term 'imagined community': with it, he created a new paradigm in the social sciences when it comes to understanding of nations as well as other forms of political organizations (Anderson 1998/1983). Anderson's viewpoint has also become widely accepted in the anthropological theoretical body of literature, and is the starting point of many analyses, including those of the European Union. In addition to studies of nationalism, anthropologists grounded their analysis of the EU on other theories or their facets, remnants of theoretical

and methodological work from anthropology and other social sciences of the second half of the twentieth century. We can mention certain aspects of political theories of power relations by Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci, and others; theories of ethnicity (Barth 1998/1969); theoretical discussions of culture following the interpretative 'turn' brought about by Clifford Geertz (Gorunović 2010), resulting in 'post-cultural' theory grounded in the critique of cultural 'essentialism', as well the theory of politicization of culture (Wright 1998; Hobart 2000; Milenković 2005; 2007); discourse theories and (feminist) social constructivism (Di Leonardo 1991); theory of multiculturalism (Milenković 2014). The same period also saw the development (under crucial influence of Shore) of so-called "anthropology of policy."[7] Still, the period of the last twenty or thirty years (the period here in question) was marked in anthropology (as well as other social sciences), across global media and news outlets, via political and cultural events – by a 'fascination with identity': "Social, cultural, religious, professional, national, supranational, ethnic, migratory, sexual, global and local, political identity – all emerge whether we wanted them to or not" (Bošković 2014: 109). Identity discourse was rediscovered and spread rapidly across Europe, nearly simultaneously found in conservative and liberal political projects (as the European Union is), and came to be followed several decades later by a global discourse on tangible and intagible 'cultural heritage'" (Ćuković 2019).

When it comes to the research into cultural policies developed by the European Community in the 1980s, Shore's, let us call it programmatic effort (Shore 2010/1993), allowed him to ascertain that the federalist logic of creation of consciousness of a European identity was to a great extent based on means similar to those used to create modern national states, and thus represents an exemplary way of manipulating symbols and inventing tradition. The standpoint quickly became a commonplace in anthropological and other analyses of cultural policies. The Declaration of European Identity was the touchstone of this process, from which future cultural policies only developed and adapted to contemporary context or responded to 'crises' that followed one another in Europe over the decades (cf. McDonald 1999). The Declaration contained articles about what was common to the signatories, and also the principles to which they had to adhere to be able to continue to build "a society which measures up to the needs of the individual" (Commission 1973, 119). The most important among which were the values of a legal, political, and moral order, and the commitment to define principles of representative democracy, the rule

---

7 Anthropology of policy and anthropology of multiculturalism are intellectual endeavors built on the premise that "instead of the outdated and vague terms 'culture', 'social life', acting in according with 'the law' and even the 'Constitution' itself (here also taken as a form of public policy), contemporary public policy, plans, programs, visions, and strategies attempt to regulate and control the entirety of life to a greater degree than they explicitly claim. Public policy becomes a culture of its own, thus also becoming an object of analysis" (Milenković 2008: 47).

of law, social justice (as the ultimate aim of economic progress), and respect of human rights. One of the first 'cultural' initiatives rolled out in the 1980s was a set of strategic measures by the European Commission (following the call of Jacques Delors), entitled "Europe without Borders" (*Europe sans frontières*). The measures were designed to promote social and cultural cohesion, and it included promotion of civil rights, education and cultural exchange, mutual recognition of qualifications and diplomas, and generally removal of all 'obsolete' obstacles to employment and residence. The set of measures Shore particularly underscores in his early work is the kind emerging from the Commission's department *People's Europe*, established with the explicit aim to create and foster "symbols of European identity" (quoted in Šor 2010, 24–25). One of the most famous "symbols of Europe" created this way was the blue flag with a circle of gold stars, which the Commission ordered be displayed wherever the Union financed public endeavors.[8] The program also introduced and standardized the European passport, coordinated driver's licenses and registration plates, sporting events financed by the Community, a postage stamp bearing the image of Jean Monnet, as well as the European anthem – Beethoven's Ode to Joy. The Commission recommended that this piece of music be played at "appropriate events and ceremonies" and "wherever the existence of the Community needs to be brought to public attention" (quoted in Šor 2010, 25).[9]

These analyses showed that the EU's political practice was strongly rooted in a feeling of territorial identity, even though in theory it represented a borderless, post-national or supra-national region (Abélès 2000). The EU invested in creating new common traditions ("invented traditions"), seeking to itself become a community (an "imagined community"), but this has still not led to the creation of a 'European nation'. Despite all information and propaganda, despite its symbols in form of flag, anthem, passport, monetary unit, a European education program (e.g. Erasmus), or else the fostering of civic activism through a right to petitioning and voting for a European Parliament, and despite introducing European civil rights through a European Constitution – the ideology of European 'nationalism' has not had success (Dijkstra et al. 2001, 68).

Just as according to Max Weber nationalism turned the French peasant into a Frenchman, the aim of this 'Europeist' cultural engineering was to turn Frenchmen, Greeks, Danes, or Bulgarians into Europeans. Anthropologists and other scientists, quickly followed by consultants to EU cultural policy creators, understood that this concept of 'European identity' oversimplified complex relations of European countries and their populations. There is a certain body of 'mistakes' that anthropologists and others compiled in regard to this type of identity strategy – above all an absence of common language and history, which were crucial elements for the consolidation of national states and creation of

8 The flag was raised for the first time in front of the building of the European Commission in Brussels, on May 29, 1986, and the design was taken from the logo of the European Council.

9 For more similar initiatives, see Šor 2010.

feelings of collective belonging. Also overlooked was the fact that national identities were often created over the course of centuries, not years, and often through use of force and conquest.

The problems of collective identities in Europe became particularly acute after the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. Integration of post-socialist countries into the European project and the circumstances that followed forced the European Union to amend what Shore called its 'Russian doll' theory of identity-formation. This understanding of identity is best seen in Article 128 of the Treaty of Maastricht (1992): "'European identity' can be developed alongside other identities (ethnic, regional, national) in a harmonious and neatly stratified hierarchy of nesting loyalties." This idea might have been somewhat sustainable when the process of European integration encompassed countries of Western Europe only, but it became 'dubious' when it spread to former socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Countries of the former Eastern bloc began to conduct their own cultural policy with the aim of reconstructing their identity bases, without which – it turned out – it was not viable to expect a stable and peaceful reproduction of political power in national political communities. Due to the need in the 1990s to follow the tempo set by the neoliberal capitalist race, Western European countries experienced a weakening of the welfare state and rise of the security state, resulting in increasing social inequalities and poverty, which in turn strengthened particular group identities (cf. Šor 2010, 13–15). Nevertheless, it is thought that one of the main problems these countries faced at this time, was the ethnocultural heterogeneity that became ever more conspicuous due to an increased migrant population. Problems of treatment of migrants brought multiculturalism into focus, in both intellectual debates, and in media and political discourses of European officials. Commenting on the media and political narrative of the so-called 'crisis of multiculturalism', which emerged in Europe in the first decade of the twenty-first century, Lentin and Titley reach the conclusion that European multiculturalism amounts to nothing more than initiative designs, rhetoric, and aspirations, and that it is rather no more than a media narrative in the service of politics, removed from reality (Lentin and Titley 2011). Multicultural debates (which indirectly also involved anthropologists, focusing in particular on analyzing the term 'culture' itself and deriving policy from it) obviously at least partially influenced the rethinking the cultural policy of the EU, forcing it to alter its discourse yet again. The creators of cultural policy understood that the public discourse of a culturally homogenous Europe was under the circumstances not viable.[10] And when the

10 One such (recent) attempt to develop a strong sense of federal European identity was New Narrative for Europe, initiated in 2013 by the then President of the European Commission José Manuel Barroso, who stated: "I think we need, in the beginning of the XXI century, namely for the new generation that is not so much identified with this narrative of Europe, to continue to tell the story of Europe. Like a book: it cannot only stay in the first pages, even if the first pages were extremely beautiful. We have to continue our narrative, continue to write the book of the present and of the future. This is why we need a new narrative for Europe" (Applebaum 2017).

nesting doll theory of the development of European identity or the theory of hierarchical identity belonging (cf. Gačanović 2009, 105) proved useless, the entire European cultural policy came to be encapsulated in the motto 'United in diversity', which then in 2000 became the motto of the Union.

The sundry analyses and reports submitted to the Council of Europe by the authorities entrusted with the cultural sectors of national states, the aim of which was the evaluation of 'cultural life' and 'cultural needs' of Member States, proved useless to the efficiency auditors of EU's cultural policies thus far; what they needed was a means to "... focus on determining objectives, defining programmes of action, and attempting to measure results" (Gordon 2001, 50). Until means that provide this information are found, the cultural policy of the European Union will continue to be reconsidered. Creators of European cultural policy have received strong support for these ends from associates and consultants in UNESCO. Namely, in its 1995 report, "Our Creative Diversity," the organization concludes that shifting culture 'from the margins' into the center of policy, in particular when it comes to development, is a necessity, and as such requires renewal of activity of cultural policy-making. Since then, European cultural policy has followed and availed itself of (and therefore overlapped with) solutions and aims reached by UNESCO, such as "integration of culture, development, and forms of political organization" (Gordon 2001, 1). In particular, in "developing, industrial and post-industrial economies alike the flourishing of culture is a determinant of social integration, political democracy and economic equity" (Gordon 2001, 2–3). For anthropologists, this emphasis on 'cultural diversity' – not only in Europe, but on a global political and economic level – as both the greatest problem and greatest solution, is a truly huge contemporary research challenge. When it comes to studying the European Union and analyzing its cultural and identity policies 'from above', anthropologists will still face many challenges, as the policies are continuously changing and adapting to socio-political, economic, and recently socio-medical challenges – the financial crisis (of 2008), the migrant crisis (since 2015), the Ukraine crisis (since 2013), Brexit (2020), terrorist attacks in European capitals (since 2014), or indeed the COVID-19 pandemic (2020). Anthropological conclusions about the nature of EU's identity policies thus far have been rather critical, finding that the approach to culture remains, despite the proclaimed subsidiarity principle, top down, directed and elitist; the only constant in these policies, throughout its shifts and changes, has been a very selective concept of 'Europeanness'.

The Approach 'from within'

What we mean by studying the European Union 'from within' are the ethnographic studies conducted by certain anthropologists of the European institutions themselves, such as the European Parliament, European

Commission, or Council of Europe. Mostly, the research was enabled by the EU institutions, as part of their various research programs.[11] Taking on such research, anthropologists start from the premise that European (or other international) institutions can be regarded as microcosms of how the multicultural ideas of the European Union manifest in 'tangible reality', that is, as an EU writ small or multicultural labs. Between 1989 and 1992, Marc Abélès conducted the first such ethnographic study in the European Parliament (Šor i Abeles 2010, 103). Immediately after, he conducted the same study a second time, this time on the European Commission, with Irène Bellier and Marion McDonald, looking at identity among European civil servants and the Union itself as a kind of multicultural political project (Abélès, Bellier and McDonald 1993). However, their study was not based on long-term observation and participation in quotidian practices of the Commission; rather they drew on multi-sited, short-term ethnographies of certain parts of the institution. The research focus of this and similar anthropological studies was to analyze some of the conceptual pillars the EU used to represent itself (such as 'community of diversity'), as well as ways they manifest in the organizational or 'managerial' culture of European institutions. The anthropologists also examined the role cultural background of Euro-bureaucrats played in the process of formulating European policies. A general conclusion that can be drawn from these analyses (which is in harmony with general conclusions of other levels of anthropological analyses) is precisely the one that most influenced Abélès: that the nature of European cultural policy is ambiguous and contradictory. This manifested in the lives of EU civil servants in a constant tension between loyalty to 'Europe' and loyalty to their national states. It turned out that EU bureaucrats constantly battled problems in communication, misunderstanding of cultural traditions, of pluralism, opacity in the notion of culture; all the while, they sought to reach 'the common good', which Abélès defined as a "floating signifier" (Abélès 2000). According to Bellier and Wilson, the conflicting nature of this project can be seen in the fact that because of the imposed imperative to identify with 'virtual Europe', the European elites never really stopped to think about the meaning and end goal of their path: "building Europe is a metaphor of construction in which the end product is in dispute, with the smaller feats of engineering required to get there also being contested because of a lack of agreement about the reasons, methods and functions of building itself" (Bellier and Wilson 2000, 17).

On several occasions and in different intervals, Cris Shore too did ethnographic field research on the European Commission, focusing on the civil servants and "organizational culture" (Šor i Abeles 2010, 102). Initial questions in these studies referred to 'testing' the practical application of the concept of European identity among the civil servants, which the EU promoted 'on paper': did the Commission bureaucrats, in the course of daily contact and cooperation,

11 This must be taken into account, given their relatively compromising position of presenting all too free or negative findings, due to potential political limitations.

really experience cognitive change towards themselves and increasingly feel 'European' (ibid.). Shore confirms his own assumptions, and that of other researchers of the kind, that in these circumstances, there is indeed a mixing of national traditions among the officials and the creation of a certain "culture of compromise" (Abélès, Bellier and McDonald 1993). Still, was this permanent cognitive change or only an ephemeral, corporate loyalty that is to be expected from any sufficiently-motivated employee? Shore's record shows that it is the former. Internally, EU institutions do indeed form a particular identity that transforms employees into a self-recognizing 'community' with a particular identity and ethos. Various factors contribute to this process: shared experience of social distance from the local population; the 'ghettoization' of employees by working and living together in the European quarter and residential blocks; the shared sense of a common mission of 'building Europe'; the ideology of European integration, which still offers a legitimizing framework for what the EU does; a common lifestyle, quasi-diplomatic status, high income, and free education for their children at prestigious European schools. A combination of all these factors creates an important feeling of 'distinction' and common spirit, transforming the European elites into a "bureaucratic castle" (Shore 2001). Still, Shore uses the analysis to criticize the efforts of the European Commission to create a 'European identity' on a supranational level, considering that subjective identification with EU can only exist among the political, administrative, and business elites of the European Union.

The values that tied together all these new 'Europeans', overcoming their national differences, were, in Shore's words, Euro-idealism, political connections, flexibility, entrepreneurialism, distance from national public, elitism, sense of élan etc. However, what also tied respondents together was involvement in what one Commission official called a "parallel system of administration" – a system based on "pragmatic codes," with little respect for duty (Šor i Abeles 2010, 102). Insights like this one almost entirely diverted Shore's research focus towards questioning and critiquing one of the most important principles of the EU, the principle of subsidiarity, as well as further study of the problem of corruption and lack of public accountability, which has the potential to become endemic in an administrative system developed throughout the EU.[12]

Shore was less constrained than other ethnographers of European institutions with potential political limitations potentially set by the fact that the EU funded their research and oversaw their findings.[13] Consequently, he

12 Following the 1999 Report by the Committee of Independent Experts on accusations of "fraud, mismanagement and nepotism" (during the Presidency of Jacques Santer), the entire College of Commissioners resigned, plunging the Commission into its most serious political crisis to date. Among else, the event brought to light critical insights into the complex relations of the European Commission and the Parliament, and the lack of organizational culture of both institutions.

13 Among other, Shore cooperated with the independent research institution, Bruges Group. He presented his findings on the Commission to them in 2001 (which can be

was more vehement in his criticism of the organizational culture and ways of functioning of the European elite, bureaucrats, and marketing experts in the course of creating EU policy. However, there has also been criticism of his claims to have identified something like a bureaucratic 'culture' of European institutions, built on the same principles as national states and reflected in its united and homogenous group of European elites; ultimately, it appears that this elite is really only unified in fraud, nepotism, and corruption. For example, Marc Verlot, who studied anthropology and held various positions within the EU, resisted Shore's view of administrators and creators of EU policy. Verlot underscores the complex nature of the individual comprising these institutions, as well as the circumstances of work and life, characterized by contradictory demands placed before them, anxiety, and fear of responsibility for making wrong decisions (Verlot 2001). Perceptions of the EU simply differ, not only from an anthropological, but any other perspective; nor can we expect to be able to grasp the institutions as a comprehensive whole with cultural and identity characteristics. While the EU is from the British perspective usually seen as a centralized bureaucratic monster, in Spain, or even the European Parliament, it is considered backward precisely due to being too decentralized, having poor and corrupt staff, particularly in the Commission (cf. Bellier and Wilson 2000, 5). Anthropological studies have shown that demands for clear explanations of European integrations are even among European leaders rather problematic, since from afar the leaders appear as a homogeneous group of dedicated idealists and Europhiles. Yet, for many of them, just as for many of us, the European Union remains a vague entity, a "an indistinct entity, a contradictory conglomeration of words and actions, of symbols and policies, of instructive and liberating values" (ibid.).

Anthropology of European institutions and identities does not in this sense differ from much other anthropological research of culture and power relations: from attempts to trace the various channels of increasing all kinds of capital, to local communities, via broader economic and political circumstances – much like countries and regions themselves. In their endeavors, anthropologists encounter various obstacles in (empirically) approaching powerful institutions and individuals, facing constant rejections and discouragements, but also an overabundance of information from the media, as well as other disciplines. In addition, they interact with an extremely well-informed respondents and public, all of whom already have elaborate models of identity and culture, and as such enter into a complex dialectic with methods and theories within the anthropological experiential field (Bellier and Wilson 2000, 6).

found at https://www.brugesgroup.com/media-centre/papers/8-papers/900-european-union-and-the-politics-of-culture). Inspired by a speech by Margaret Thatcher in this Belgian city in 1988, the Bruges Group was founded with the primary aim of promoting criticism of EU's centralized structure and seeking greater autonomy of Great Britain within the Union. (Thatcher's speech can be found at https://www.brugesgroup.com/about/the-bruges-group).

The Approach 'from below'

The approach 'from below' primarily refers to spheres of actual interaction taking place on the territory of the European Union. Borneman and Fowler categorize these myriad real interactions into five spheres: language, money, tourism, sex, and sport (Borneman and Fowler 2010).

Language

Language is taken from the perspective of political and linguistic anthropology, analyzing the circulation of communication of persons who speak different native languages. In the past, medieval Latin was the language of the educated and the elite, replaced by French in the nineteenth and early twentieth century for the purposes of international relations (so-called language of diplomacy). Intentionally creating a universal language, aside from being by nature artificial (e.g., Esperanto), is seen as Utopian or even, as Umberto Eco called it, foolish. But also, the forceful imposition of Russian as the language of communication across the countries of the Warsaw Pact is seen as violence of the stronger over the weaker, and has led to a rejection of its use. Based on personal observation, we can claim that many academics from countries of Eastern Europe outside of Russia, despite their considerable knowledge of the Russian language, refused to use it in communicating with Yugoslavs who spoke it. This is an important parallel with the language situation in the EU, where regardless of EU's language policy within its institutions, English acts as the international global language of communication, including among people of different native languages in the EU. Meaning that diglossia will become the dominant linguistic competence. The channels of influence for English are mostly non-political in character and there is no history of imposition. The expansion of the use of this language will continue regardless of Brexit, as it was not the result of some kind of dominant British influence in the EU, but the consequence of global linguistic trends.

Money

Money acts as much more than a means for paying bills or for large banking transactions. From the very introduction of the Euro, Borneman and Fowler pointed out the significance a joint monetary unit of a certain number of EU Member States would have for the political unity of Europe, as well as a feeling of belonging of EU citizens using the money. Regardless of the fact that the monetary unit and system in general are based on different countries' economies, once introduced, it is not easily broken (as we could see in the case of Greece). On the other hand, Brexit was far easier than it would have been

had Britain been part of the Eurozone. Leftist critiques of the introduction of the Euro, claiming that national governments would be less capable of protecting the "common good," are based in an arbitrary assessment that national governments are more likely to seek the common good than is the Union itself, and that they would relinquish the particularity guaranteed by each nation's own monetary unit. Without wading into the question of how much the protection of particularity is directed at the various European civilizational heritages, or indeed how threatened these heritages are with a single means of paying, we can say that the criticism of the Euro's introduction have not been justified, not even in cases of crisis such as the one of Greek debt. In fact, this crisis showed that, for all the "diversity of European civilizational heritages," there was no particularity to the habit of spending more than was being earned.

When looked at within the framework of the anthropology of EU, the global phenomenon of tourism can be considered a subject in anthropology 'from below', but can also shift into the field of policy creation. Thus, Borneman and Fowler place the definition of cultural tourism front and center, as a means to develop a European 'feeling', even if they themselves think that definitions and declarations are less effective in developing feelings than the practices of people who travel. Interestingly, the two elements of movement and travel (which is to say, tourism) have created a greater feeling of belonging to the EU than any list of 'European cultural monuments that ought to be seen'. This specifically refers to the widely recognized EU passports and the (ceremonial and actual) razing of border crossings, like the one conducted by President Vaclav Havel. In both the EU and in surrounding countries that are tourist destinations, passport control segregates holders of EU passports from others, differentiating a single mass of people into two groups, one of which is defined by its passport, the other remaining mere rabble. Up to the border crossing point, the differences between people are in the language they speak, less often in their style, although more overtly in Middle Eastern airports; on the other hand, standing in lines of various windows, the difference becomes one of passport.

Sex

Borneman and Fowler note that "increased interactions between nationals across class and status groups within and outside Europe are radically altering practices of sex" (Bornmen i Fauler 2010, 57). Sexual behavior transgresses legally prescribed values, with certain practices treated as sanctioned and supported. Absolute mobility within the European Union leads to encounters of diverse introjected patterns of sexual practices, which act either transformatively or conservatively. The challenge to anthropology, for example, is how the negotiations that model sexual mores take place, not only in encounters of different traditions, but within a single tradition in the face of global models (e.g., pornography).

Sport

Regardless of whether sport is entertainment for the masses or big business, it is a field of competition of national and local entities, drawing out emotional responses from the viewing public. At the same time, what plays out in the encounter of global and regional organizations that govern the sporting events, that is, between local and national entities, is a range of relations from negotiation to conflict. Perhaps the most prominent example is the case before the Court of Justice of the European Union between the European football organization (UEFA) and the European Union (Knežević-Predić 1999). The case was won by the EU, with the football organization having to adapt its rules. The consequences of the ruling were enormous, impacting the formation of supporters. The exclusive inter-nation nature of international football tournaments was reduced by half, such that the national belonging was replaced by local, resulting in the final match of the largest European football competition being played out by two teams from the same city (Kovačević and Žikić 2014, 795–796). The mass mobility of supporters, in particular across the borderless region, leads to contact (and conflict) of supporter groups, an in turn permanent relations of friendship or enmity, as well as exchange of experience among supporter groups that have their own particularities.

Not only football, but other sports as well produce stars and idols, role models to the masses, mostly the youth. A Spanish tennis player can be an object of adulation and emulation of young people in Lithuania, just as a French footballer was an idol to the supporters of a London football club. Compared to exclusively national idols from the mid-twentieth century, there has been significant change, regardless whether due to EU regulations or more general media globalization.

Conclusion

This review of approaches to the study of the European Union shows that the first is actually a transgression from anthropology into an analytical science of politics that deals with all forms of politics, including those public. The second approach is a return to anthropology, deploying this discipline's techniques in studying EU institutions, in the way that twentieth-century anthropologists studied the institutions of their subjects in Africa, Polynesia, or South America, such as tribal leaders, secret societies, systems of kinship, or clans. The third approach is a complete renewal of anthropology that had been contaminated or dislocated by active involvement in politics (militant, postmodern anthropology, NGO anthropology), or even substituting culture with public policy (post-cultural anthropology). By returning public policy into the sphere of politics, and thus making it only one focus (of many) of political

anthropology, there is a return to the basic direction of anthropological study of the European Union. It consists predominantly of the third approach, which focuses on continuous interactions of persons, groups, and institutions within the EU, what Borneman and Fowler call "practices of Europeanization." The processes unfolding in the encounter of various practices across aspects of human life can result in acculturation, conservation, or a combination of the two. The result, ultimately, is a broad field open to anthropological explanation, which requires painstaking intellectual work.

References

Abélès, Marc, Irène Bellier, and Maryon Mcdonald. 1993. *An Anthropological Approach To The European Commission*. Report to the European Commission.

Abélès, Marc. 2000. Virtual Europe. In Irène Bellier and Thomas M. Wilson (eds.) *An Anthropology of the European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*, pp. 31–52 . Oxford: Berg.

Abeles, Mark. 2001. *Antropologija države*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Anderson, Benedikt. 1998. *Nacija: zamišljena zajednica*. Beograd: Plato.

Applebaum, Anne. 2017. Novi evropski narativ. *Peščanik* 2.10.2017. Dostupno na adresi: https://pescanik.net/novi-evropski-narativ/

Asad, Talal. 2002. The Idea of Europe: Muslims and European Identity: Can Europe Represent Islam? In Anthony Pagden (ed.) *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union*, pp. 209–227. Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington, DC & Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1989. Intellectuals in East – Central Europe: Continuity and Chance . In George Schöpflin and Nancy Wood (eds.) *In Search of Central Europe*, pp. 70–90. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Europe of Strangers*. University of Oxford: Transnational Communities Programme.

Bellier, Irène, and Thomas M. Willson, eds. 2000. *An Anthropology of European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*. Oxford, New York: Berg.

Bornman, Džon i Nik Fauler. 2010. Evropeizacija. *Treći program* 145, I: 38–68.

Bošković, Aleksandar. 2014. *Antropološke perspektive*. Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press.

Chari, Sharad, and Katherine Verdery. 2009. Thinking between the Posts: Postcolonialism, Postsocialism, and Ethnography after the Cold War. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51 (1): 6–34.

Commission of the EC. 1973. Declaration on the European identity. *Bulletin of the European Community* 12 (Clause 2501): 118–27. Distupno na adresi: https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/02798dc9–9c69–4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf

Čapo, Jasna. 2014. Ethnology and Anthropology in Europe: Towards a Trans-National Discipline. *Cultural Analysis* 13: 51–76.

Ćuković, Jelena. 2019. *Nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe iz antropološke perspektive*. Beograd: Dosije.

Delamont, Sara 1995 *Appetites and Identities: An Introduction to the Social Anthropology of Western Europe*. London: Routledge.

Delanty, Gerard, and Chris Rumford. 2005. *Rethinking Europe Social theory and the implications of Europeanization*. New York: Routledge.

Delanty, Gerard. 1995. *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. London: Macmillan.

Di Leonardo, Micaela. 1991. *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. University of California Press.

Dijkstra, Steven, Karin Geuijen, and Arie de Ruijter. 2001. Multiculturalism and Social Integration in Europe. *International Political Science Review* 22 (1): 55–84.

Fadil, Nadia. 2019. The Anthropology of Islam in Europe: A Double Epistemological Impasse. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 48: 117–132.

Fredrik, Barth. 1998. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Waveland Press.

Gačanović, Ivana. 2009. *Problem evropskog identiteta: uvod u antropologiju Evropske unije*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar; Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.

Gačanović, Ivana. 2011. Evropa kao izvorište kulturnog identiteta i vrednosti kao normativnog okvira. U Bojan Žikić (ur) *Kulturni identiteti kao nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe*, 111–128. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism: New Perspectives on the Past*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gingrich, Andre. 2006. Neo-nationalism and the reconfiguration of Europe. *Social Anthropology* 14 (2): 195–2017.

Giordano, Christian. 2012. The Anthropology of Mediterranean Societies. In Nick Craith, M. and Frykman, J. (eds.) *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*, pp. 13–32. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gordon, Christopher. 2001. Some general and methodological reflections on the Council of Europe's programme of reviews in member states (1985–99), in C. Gordon and S. Mundy, *European Perspectives on Cultural Policy*, pp. 13–57, UNESCO Publishing.

Gorunović, Gordana. 2010. Književni zaokret i etnografsko pisanje u američkoj kulturnoj antropologij. *Antropologija* 10 (2), 65–96.

Haas, Ernst B. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.

Hayden, Robert M. 2013. *From Yugoslavia to the Western Balkans: Studies of a European Disunion, 1991–2011*. Leiden: Brill.

Herrero de Miñón, Miguel. 1996. 'Europe's Non-Existent Body Politic'. In M. Herrero de Miñón, and G. Leicester (eds.) *Europe: A Time For Pragmatism*, pp.1–5. London: European Policy Forum.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1987. *Anthropology Through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1993. *The Social Production of Indifference*. The University of Chicago Press.

Herzfeld, Michael. 2003. Reviewed Work: *An Anthropology of the European Union. Building, Imagining, and Experiencing the New Europe* by Irène Bellier, Thomas M. Wilson. *Anthropos* 98: 211–213.

Heydemann, Günther, and Karel Vodička. 2020. *From Eastern Bloc to European Union. Comparative Processes of Transformation since 1990*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Hobart, Mark. 2000. *After culture: anthropology as radical metaphysical critique.* Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Hobzbaum, Erik. 1996. *Nacije i nacionalizam od 1780: program, mit, stvranost.* Beograd: Filip Višnjić.

Isiksel, Turkuler. 2018. Square peg, round hole: Why the EU can't fix identity politics. *LEQS Discussion Paper* No. 128: 1–23.

Jansen, Thomas (ed.) 1999. Reflections on European Identity. European Commission: Firward Studies Unit.

Knežević Predić, Vesna, 1999. Union Royale Belge das Societes de Football Association (ASBL) and Others v, Jean-Marc Bosman, kraće Bosman Case, *Revija za evropsko pravo1(2–3)* 105–127.

Kovačević, Ivan i Žikić, Bojan. 2014. Antropologija fudbala. *Etnoantropološki problemi*. 9(3): 783–803.

Lentin, Alana, and Titley Gavan. 2011. *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London: Zed Books.

Lindberg, Leon N., and Stuart A. Scheingold. 1970. *Europe's would-be polity: patterns of change in the European community*. Prentice-Hall.

Macdonald, Sharon, ed. 1993. *Inside European Identities: Ethnography in Western Europe*. Oxford, England: Berg.

Malešević, Miroslava. 2006 Evropa: kriza identiteta . Prvi deo. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU LIV*: 69–86.

McDonald, Maryon. 1999. European Identity – an Anthropological Approach. In T. Jansen (ed.), *Reflections on European Identity*. European Commission.

McLean, Iain and McMillan Alistair (eds.) 2003. *Concise Dictionary of Politics*. Oxford University Press.

Milenković, Miloš. 2005. Postkulturna antropologija i multikulturne politike. U: Kovač, Senka (ur.). *Problemi kulturnog identiteta stanovništva savremene Srbije*. Beograd: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju, Filozofski fakultet: 61–74.

Milenković, Miloš. 2007. Paradoks postkulturne antropologije: postmoderna teorija etnografije kao teorija kulture. *Antropologija* 3: 121–143.

Milenković, Miloš. 2008. Problemi konstitucionalizacije multikulturalizma – pogled iz antropologije. *Etnoantropološki problemi* 3 (2): 45–57.

Milenković, Miloš. 2014. *Antropologija multikulturalizma: Od politike identiteta ka očuvanju kulturnog nasleđa*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar.

Modood, Tariq, and Pnina Werbner, eds. 1997. *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Pišev, Marko i Miloš Milenković. 2013. „Islam" u anti-multikulturnoj retorici političara i antropologa Zapadne Evrope: kongruencija ili koincidencija? *Etnološko-antropološke sveske*. 8 (4): 965–985.

Rot, Klaus. 2000. *Slike u glavama: ogledi o narodnoj kulturi u jugoistočnoj Evropi*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Sassatelli, Monica. 2002. Imagined Europe: The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 2002;5(4):435–451.

Sassatelli, Monica. 2007. The Arts, the State, and the EU: Cultural Policy in the Making of Europe. Social Analysis 51 (1): 28–41.

Shore, Cris and Marc Abélès 2004. Debating the European Union: An interview with Cris Shore and Marc Abélès. *Anthropology Today* 20, 2: 10–14.

Shore, Cris, Victoria A. Goddard, and Josep R. Liobera. 1996. *The Anthropology of Europe: Identities and Boundaries in Conflict (Explorations in Anthropology)*. Routledge.

Shore, Sris. 2001. *European Union and Poltics of Culture*. Pamphlet based on a talk given by Dr Shore to the Bruges Group in March 2001. Dostupno na adresi: https://www.brugesgroup.com/media-centre/papers/8-papers/900-european-union-and-the-politics-of-culture

Smith, Anthony D. 1992. National Identity and the Idea of European Unity. International Affairs 68 (1): 55–76.

Stacul, Jaro, Christina Moutsou, and Helen Kopnina. 2005. *Crossing European Boundaries. Beyond Conventional Geographical Categories*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn

Stolcke, verena. 1995. Talking Culture: New Bounderies, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe. *Current Anthropology* 36 (1): 1–24.

Šor, Kris i Mark Abeles. 2010. Intervju: Diskusija o Evropskoj uniji. *Treći program* 145, I: 101–114.

Šor, Kris. 2010. Strvaranje „Evrope građana“: Kritički pristupi „kulturnoj politici“ Evropske zajednice. *Treći program* 145, I: 11–37.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1997. Anthropological Epistemologies. *International Social Science Journal* 49 (153): 333–343.

Todorova, Maria. 2006. *Imaginarni Balkan*. Beogar: Bibilioteka XX vek.

Verderi, Ketrin. 2005. *Šta je bio socijalizam i šta dolazi posle njega?* Beograd: Fabrika knjiga.

Verlot, Marc. 2001. Are Politicians Human? Problems and Challenges of Institutional Anthropology. *Social Anthropology* 9 (3): 345–353.

Vidmar Horvat, Ksenija. 2012. Memory, Citizenship, and Consumer Culture in Post-socialist Europe. In Nick Craith, M. and Frykman, J. (eds.) *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*, pp. 145–163. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilken, Lisanne. 2012. Anthropological Studies of European Identity Construction. In Nick Craith, M. and Frykman, J. (eds.) A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe, pp. 125–145. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilson, T. M. 1998. An Anthropology of the European Union, From Above and Below. In S. Parman (ed.) Europe in the Anthropological Imagination, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wolff, Larry. 1994. Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment. Stanford University Pess.

Wright, Susan. 1998. The politicization of ‘culture’. Anthropology Today 14 (1): 7–15.