“ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI
THE CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DISERTATION PAPER

Graduate
IOANA-SABINA PRISACARIU

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER IN EUROPEAN STUDIES

Supervisor: PROF. DR. ALEXANDRU-FLORIN PLATON

FEBRUARY 2007

“ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI
THE CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

THE SYMBOLS ROLE IN THE CREATION OF A EUROPEAN IDENTITY

Graduate
IOANA-SABINA PRISACARIU

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER IN EUROPEAN STUDIES

Supervisor: PROF. DR. ALEXANDRU-FLORIN PLATON

FEBRUARY 2007

ABSTRACT

The present paper focuses on the symbolic aspects of the process of formation, sustainment, and change of identity in the European Union. We first establish the role of the symbolisms and symbols in forming links among European citizens and in shaping a European identity.

We present a number of initiatives, which have been taken, aimed at forming a collective identity related to the concerns expressed in the recent years over the democratic deficit of the European Union. We consider *Andonnino Reports* especially significant in this sense through the recommendation of adopting Community symbols. After presenting other activities organized with this aim, in education, culture, and youth fields, we argue that the symbols established by the Constitutional Treaty are the most readily identifiable symbols of integration process.

We consider important to have a theoretical presentation of the social and anthropological functions of the symbols. The role of the national symbols of any state is to provide an identity, having at the same time a unifying and a federating power. We show the political implication of the symbols at the level of European citizens. The citizens can be influenced by means of symbols and their symbolisms, to leave aside their differences and act in the common public good. We can conclude that the first important steps to emerging European Union as a new post-national political system (where the national interest coincides with the European interest) have been made. We emphasize how the European symbols such as the flag, the anthem, the motto, the currency, and the Europe Day help to make the European Union more legitimate in the eyes of its citizens by creating emotive images and rites.

At the end of the paper, we describe the 9 May Day as a performance of a ritual festivity. We have in mind especially the capacity of this moment to act as a sequence of events within a fixed space and time and to involve simultaneously all stimuli. Our aim is to show how particular aspects of the process of construction of a European identity work in practice, in relation to the symbolic context of ideologies, images, and worldviews.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	1
ABBREVIATIONS.....	2
I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
II. THE NECESSITY OF STRENGTHENING A EUROPEAN IDENTITY	9
1. Identity as a Processual and Dynamic Phenomenon	10
2. The Efforts to Foster a European Identity	13
a. Approaching Cultural Differences in the European Union.....	18
b. European identity in relation to national identities	25
c. European Integration and Public Opinion.....	31
3. European Citizenship Role in the Creation of a European Identity	35
III. THE SYMBOLS FUNCTION IN EXPRESSING CULTURAL ASPECTS AND COMMUNICATION.....	41
1. Defining the symbol concept	41
2. A Theoretical Distinction between Signs and Symbols	44
3. The Symbols Functions.....	47
IV. EU SYMBOLS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL TREATY	53
1. The European Union Flag.....	57
2. 9 May, Europe Day	64
3. European Union Anthem	70
4. The European Motto: “United in diversity”	75
5. European Union Currency as Symbol of Identity	78
6. Rituals, Identity and Social Change	86
V. CONCLUSION	95

REFERENCES.....	99
------------------------	-----------

APPENDIX.....	107
----------------------	------------

Appendix A	Documents related to the adoption of the European symbols ..	107
-------------------	---	------------

A.1	A people's Europe	107
A.2	Strengthening of the Community's image and identity	108
A.3	Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté	109
A.4	The Europe Prize.....	110
A.5	Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau (Bruxelles, 16 avril 1986).....	111
A.6	Memorandum from the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe on the European Flag (Strasbourg, 16 July 1951)	112

Appendix B	Documents attesting the creation of the European flag	118
-------------------	--	------------

B.1	Le drapeau de l'Europe et l'hymne européen – La genèse de deux symboles 118	
B.2	The European Flag.....	131
B.3	The European Flag – Memorandum presented to the Council of Europe by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-European Movement, Secretary General of the European Parliamentary Union (Gstaad, 27 July 1950)	133
B.4	Memorandum from the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe on the European Flag (Strasbourg, 16 July 1951)	135
B.5	Letter from Filippo Caracciolo to Representatives to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (Strasbourg, 7 December 1951)	139
B.6	Lettre d'Arsène Heitz à Filippo Caracciolo (Strasbourg, 5 janvier 1952)..	140
B.7	Letter from Filippo Caracciolo to Representatives to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (15 February 1952).....	142
B.8	Resolution 41(1) on the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (25 September 1953)	143
B.9	Recommendation 56(1) of the Consultative Assembly on the choice of an emblem for the Council of Europe (25 September 1953).....	144
B.10	Recommendation 88 (1955)1 of the Consultative Assembly on the emblem of the Council of Europe (25 October 1955)	144
B.11	Resolution (55) 32 adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (8 December 1955).....	145

Appendix C	May, the day of the Robert Schuman Declaration established as Europe Day	146
-------------------	---	------------

C.1	Declaration of 9 May 1950	146
-----	---------------------------------	-----

C.2	The 25th anniversary of the ‘Schuman Plan’	148
-----	--	-----

**Appendix D Official documents regarding the adoption of the European
anthem 151**

D.1	L'hymne européen.....	151
D.2	Report of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe on a European anthem (10 June 1971)	157
D.3	Resolution 492 (1971)1 of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe on a European anthem (8 July 1971).....	162
D.4	Decision (71) 187 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe: organization of Europe Day (12 January 1972).....	163
D.5	Mémoire à l'attention du Secrétaire Général du Conseil de l'Europe (2 mars 1972)	165

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. I.	The European Flag.....	167
Fig. II.	Emblems - Institutions and bodies.....	168
Fig. III.	European Day poster gallery.....	170
Fig. IV.	Euro Banknotes.....	171
Fig. V.	Euro Coins – common side.....	173
Fig. VI.	The Euro Sign	174
Fig. VII.	Euro Coins	174
Fig. VIII.	A logo for European Day in France.....	180

ABBREVIATIONS

CCE	Conseil des Communes d'Europe (Conseil des Communes et Régions d'Europe - CCRE), Council of European Municipalities and Regions - CEMR
CEC	Commission of the European Communities
CECA	Communauté Européenne du Charbon et de l'Acier, European Coal and Steel Community
CNRS	Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (National Center for Scientific Research) is a government-funded research organization, under the administrative authority of France's Ministry of Research.
EB	Eurobarometer
EC	European Community
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community; see also CECA
ECU	European Currency Unit
EICAR	Ecole Internationale de Creation Audiovisuelle et the Realisation
EEC	European Economic Community
EMI	European Monetary Institute
EMU	European Monetary Union
EU	European Union
EUI	European University Institute
EURATOM	European Atomic Energy Community
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
OCDE	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMPI	Organization Mondiale de la Propriété Intellectuelle, World Intellectual Property Organization - WIPO
TEU	Treaty of Maastricht
UGC	Union Générale Cinématographique
UEO	Union de l'Europe Occidentale, Western European Union

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we intend to throw some light on the process of the formation and transformation of identity and the role of symbols and symbolic culture in this process. By studying the European Union symbols, we present the way the new Europe is building its identity in the process of interaction, identification, and creation of symbolic images. Various aspects of this process: political, economical, cultural, national, territorial, were just dimensions of basically the same social phenomenon: social assuming of an European identity through meaningful action.

In the first chapter *The necessity of strengthening a European Identity* we present the social, structural and symbolic components which influence the process of identity formation. From the beginning we try to point out the importance of the symbols in creation and development of people identity. Symbolic actions and forms are used in the expression of identity, and at the same time, they constitute an indispensable and constructive element of mutual identification. Therefore, in order to understand the process of creation of identity, one must take into account its symbolic aspects.

In this context, the formation of identity is presented as a dynamic and creative process. Identity is formed in action, or rather in interaction, in the process of exchange of messages, which we send and receive. It appears as a dynamic characteristic of a group involved in the process of historical development. It implies changing relation to other groups, to the natural and social environment, and the symbolic construction of images of the group's own past and present. In building an European identity, the fact that the identity is a dynamic, processual and contextual phenomenon seems to be of a certain importance, regarding the Union efforts to engender, at the level of its citizens, a popular sense of being European.

But why the Union is trying to encourage the formation of a European identity? Lately there has been many debates over the democratic and legitimacy deficit of the Union. The Community itself is aware of the lack of public support. Consequently, the challenge of the democratic deficit has to do with how to create and secure democracy in a none-state entity. Thus, in the last three decades, a number of initiatives has been taken aimed at collective identity formation by including the people of Europe in the integration process and fostering a sense of belonging. As we can see the Community has linked the question of legitimacy to a lack of common identity, and has tried to promote the latter through different measures. The desire to bring "Europe close to its citizens" was officially expressed in the 1975 *Tindemans Report* – produced by the Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans" – which first marked the Community's interest in the European identity. These questions will mainly be situated, in the context of the three policy areas, central for identity construction in the EU: culture, education, and citizenship. These

areas, crucial for the consolidation of the nation state, were also given priority in the Maastricht Treaty as key areas for the creation of a cohesive European identity. We intend in this context to bring up some theoretical issues related to the politics of identity at the level of the European Union and, to display some concrete examples from EU policies on culture, education, and citizenship, hinting at the types of representation of Europe that the EU deems appropriate as sources of identification. We also try to situate the identity politics under study mainly in the context of the crisis of legitimacy facing the European Union today. In addition, this discussion will mainly focus on the work carried out by European Commission.

Since the mid-1980s, the efforts to foster a European identity have been assisted by the often directly linked campaigns to give EU a public personality. The *Andonnino Reports* (1985) are especially significant in that, as part of a "People's Europe" campaign intended to engender a popular sense of being "European", they recommended the bold move of adopting Community symbols. To this end, a number of pan-EU icons and symbols were introduced. In 1985, for example, the European Community adopted a standardized European passport. During the same period, "Ode to Joy" from Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony* assumed the role of unofficial anthem of the Community. Perhaps most significantly, in 1985, the Community adopted its official flag. Positioned all over the EU, the flag has now become one of the symbols most readily associated with the EU. Today, another significant symbols of unification, in the "Euro zone" (the area formed by the countries participating in the European Monetary Union) are the new notes of the Euro. The 1992 Maastricht Treaty formally enabled the EU to intervene in some aspects of policy-making in the fields of education, youth, and culture. Of particular importance are the Treaty's references to the necessity of developing the European dimension in education (Article 126) and of bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore in EU policy. Since this time, EU policy-makers have responded to this challenge by promoting awareness of European integration through its education and training programs, such as *Erasmus*, *Leonardo*, *Socrates*, and *Tempus*. By the mid-1990s, European hints become inscribed in the educational discourse.

Why so much energy has been dedicated to fostering this European supra-nationality? Overall, however, we can say that the principal driving force has been the need to strengthen the popular base of support for integration. Moreover, for answering at this question, we investigated the EU institutions attempts to articulate an alternative, less rigid and less exclusive Community identity, compared to those often-exclusive national identities. Since the early 1970s, there has been growing support within the main EU institution to give "Europe" a larger presence in the hearts and minds of the citizens of the member states. The European Commission, as the supranational driving force of integration, has taken a particular interest in this project. In a working paper on the issue of European identity produced by the Forward Studies Unit of the European Commission, one Commission official remarks that the Union's very ability to survive, grow, act and succeed in its endeavors rests with whether or not EU citizens actively espouse the spirit of the Union.

However, the concept of identity cannot be separated from the national differences and interest that is often taken to represent. Identity in ethnic groups has been so widely discussed by now that the very concept of identity becomes often used as synonym for ethnic identity. Ethnic identity is defined in terms of cultural unity and is based on a self-

definition on grounds of one's own group's cultural characteristics in contrast with those of others. Ethnicity is also a symbolic system, which may be activated by members of a group or its leaders as one of many strategic alternatives in the pursuit of individual or group goals. At a general level, ethnic identity transforms itself into a national identity, when a belief in common ancestry an origin and of homogeneity of a culture is combined with the desire to acquire a sovereign state to protect the integrity and free development of the group's culture. Moreover, nation-states and nationalism are relevant to European integration because they are seen as key obstacles to European Union and because the formation of European nation-states provides useful parallels, even a model, for understanding some of the processes involved in European political integration and state-formation. We will found out that similar elements, as cultural symbols, were used for developing the idea of a common national culture, at the level of the states. In the idea of building a European identity, are reconsidered and interpreted these kind of symbols. Therefore, we see that European Union makes use of similar means to achieve the citizen's support (European icons, emblems, flags, mass celebrations and rituals, European anthem, European common culture and history).

Moreover, this aspect of *national identity* is a serious concern for the effort to foster a European identity, as long as people do not understand that this supranational identity is not intended to replace the national one. For critics of the EU, and in particular of its efforts to forge a European identity, this project is portrayed as a threat to national cultures and identities. For the EU the need to establish strong lines of communication with EU citizens and to generate identification with the EU are becoming of grater importance to the progress of integration. Indeed, over the past thirty years, during which the architects of integration have become increasingly concerned with public attitudes to the Union, "Europe" has come to be used as shorthand for the EU. Each year, for example, *Eurobarometer*, the European Commission's statistical device for measuring public opinion in the EU, records the way is balanced being European against nationality. The results of these statistics show that identification with Europe among EU citizens lags considerably behind attachments to their respective national states. It seems unlikely that a European identity, with the EU as its political foundation, will generate the sorts of passions and loyalty that people feel towards their nations. If some Europeans are to come to identify with a limited vision of Europe, in the form of the EU, then this idea of Europe will need to be broad enough to accommodate a diverse range of cultural experiences. As we can see, beyond the official affirmation and the analyses stated on historical, sociological, and anthropological studies, we considered important to look over some surveys organized by *Eurobarometer*, in order to measure public support for the European integration. In this sense, we also include a *case study* of the Danish opposition to the European citizenship.

In addition, in spite of many predictions, ethnic identity has not disappeared in modern society. It may happen that in the future we would leave in a world of technological homogeneity but cultural pluralism in which particular groups will continue their traditional differences. However, this defense of one's identity is not the same as simple conservatism. People want to be different and original but also want to develop. Symbolic identity is not a resistance to change but an autonomous and independent development of a group's own unique culture within the civilized, advanced, and egalitarian world. The differences do not necessarily have to be transformed into a

conflict, although they are if at least one of the groups in a given social system perceives its situation as inferior and its interests as endangered.

Thus, identity, being a result of conceptual classification of the world, is also expressed symbolically. It seems that since identity is a conceptual and symbolic phenomenon, understanding of the process of formation and transformation of identity can only be achieved through reconstruction of a symbolic model of the world which generates actions and which is the conceptual basis of the inter-group relations. This implies that our attention must be drawn to the essential function of signs, which is *communication*. Whatever other functions sign and symbol may fulfill, it is clear that they make it possible for human individuals to send and receive messages, and therefore to establish relations between people and consequently make possible all kinds of human grouping and cultural constructions.

Starting from this point, in the second chapter, *The symbols function in expressing cultural aspects and communication*, we considered to be necessary a theoretical incursion in the significance and function of the symbols. Symbols should not be considered arbitrary signs, but important components of the traditions, ideas, and events, which they represent. A symbol is a very special category of sign intriguing, thought-provoking, stirring emotions, opaque, and ambiguous. It is also conventional in the sense that its meaning is rooted in traditions, agreed upon in numerous cultural text, and is interpreted according to culturally established meaning. Cultural tradition and social processes determine the meaning of symbols and often lead to differences in conventions between social groups belonging to the same cultural area.

The traditional roots of symbols and the fact that they are not merely signs but integral parts of correlates of what they symbolize does not mean that they do not change. There are not constant, they change, but not as the result of arbitrary decision but only as a part of the cultural process, which forms the whole cultural complex which involves a particular symbol. The consequence of the special status of the symbol as part of the symbolized is that a symbol represents something, which essentially cannot otherwise be represented. In complicated and subtle feelings and thoughts, which we experience when other high values are involved, for instance, those connected with group identity, moral issues, and the like, ideas and emotions cannot usually be fully described in non-symbolic discourse. Everyday language is not capable of expressing deep emotions and complicated feelings, associations and thoughts. They can be reached only through symbols, through metaphor and analogy. Signified ideas cannot be perceived or communicated directly, independently of symbols. Symbols are therefore indispensable and necessary for the most important aspects of cultural expression and communication.

Symbolic forms like rituals, ceremonies, myths, festivities, art, literature, represent the way in which a group, a community, a state, or, in our case, a reunion of states organizes the intellectual and emotional framework of its members' lives, confirming its value system, social norms, and goals, and legitimizing social order. In such a way, group identity is created, maintained, and transformed together with the identity of other groups with which one's own group has relations. In this way, the control over people is executed by organizing their experience, by attaching emotional, ideological, and moral values to their thoughts and actions, and by classifying and judging their behavior according to the group's normative system. Thus, symbolic actions are active factors of social change, contributing to transformation of society through reconstruction of

symbolic world views and through creating within spatial and temporal limits of ritual, the new world. Moreover, symbolic forms create identity and are active elements in social problems; they do not only express differences and power ration, but also shape relations through the emotional and ideological construction of images.

As we found out in the third chapter *EU symbols established by the Constitutional Treaty*, the purpose of the political symbols of the State (flag, emblem, motto, anthem, currency, national public holiday) is that of providing an identity, which is crystallized in order to become more tangible. Identity is in practice an invisible concept and therefore has to be symbolized if it is to be seen and acclaimed. Every political symbol is therefore a tangible sign of identity, which codifies the shared values represented by the symbol and which is generally detailed in a constitution. The purpose of the political symbols is to provide an identity for European Union and to determine its citizens to leave aside their differences and act in the common public good and, therefore, to perceive the Union as a second and larger home.

The political and cultural symbols, launched by the Constitutional Treaty (2004), as the flag, the anthem, the motto, the currency and Europe Day may therefore help, by creating emotive images and rites to make the European Union more legitimate in the eyes of its citizens and help them to accept the plan for a common destiny. By this way, there were established a number of symbols of the European Union that are important, since they enable Europeans to identify more with Europe. Among the Union's symbols mentioned in Article I-8 of the Constitutional Treaty, the flag with 12 golden stars on a blue background, the "Ode to Joy" from Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the Euro currency, the European motto "United in diversity" and 9 May as Europe Day are already part of the tradition of the Community and the Union. In the paper, we analyze each of these symbols, considering their origins, cultural and artistic meaning, their significance at the state and European Union level, their creation process, and the importance ascribed to them by the European citizens and Union institutions. Some official documents which reflect the elaboration process of these symbols, at the level of the decisional power, are listed in the *Appendix*. As long as this ideal of a European identity is expressed through the medium of some images, visible signs, we considered appropriate to present in our paper the artistic images of these symbols (see the *Figures* at the end of the thesis).

In the discussion on the symbolic aspects of European identity creation, we also consider the ritual issue (*Rituals, Identity, and Social Change*), which is the performance of the whole activities dedicated to the celebration of the European Day, moment that involves the participation of all others symbols, as the flag or anthem. If we concentrate on ritual as a social phenomenon, we understand that abstract ideas generated in the human mind must be given substance if they are to be grasped, communicated, and perceived. Only if they acquire a tangible form may they play a role in organizing collective thoughts and behavior. Symbols are such vehicles, which are capable of carrying the most abstracts ideas and emotions, and by converting ideas, products of the mind into material objects, it can receive relative permanence. Rituals become material, perceptible representation of ideas and emotions, which involve a variety of objects, human beings, sequences of time and space, sounds, and images. Such event as European Day, that is celebrated every year in each Member State, is intended to play an important role in forming a new identity around European Union.

“There are no ideals, however exalted in nature, which can afford to do without a symbol”. These are the opening words of a memorandum on the European flag drawn up by the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe in 1951. Interpreting these words we can say that symbols represent active factors in the affirmation of new ideas and values in a society, and by ascribing them emotions, the population adhesion is stimulated. Symbols seem to have a vital role in the legitimization and justifications of a new social or political order. Their importance consist in the capacity to convey norms and values which are presented in a ceremonial and sacred form, saturated with emotions, being thus imposed upon people in an aura of obviousness and inevitability.

II. THE NECESSITY OF STRENGTHENING A EUROPEAN IDENTITY

The process of creation, re-creation, maintenance, and change of identity involves both social, structural and symbolic components. In order to recognize and understand the nature of relations, strains, and conflicts between groups, one must take into account both their structural interdependence with balance of power, as a fundamental component of the relation, as well as the cultural image of the social world of a given group (or groups) in particular context. Every culture contains a cognitive model of the world, which defines ones own group and other groups in terms of values, ideologies, and stereotypes. This model is built of symbolic forms. Symbols organize people's experience and express relations between groups. They also play a fundamental role in the process of creating identity as the substance out of which a group builds cultural boundaries, protects itself, and organize relations with the outside world.

This paper deals with the problem of the formation, maintenance, and change of identity in European Union. It focuses on the symbolic aspect of this process, on the role of symbols and symbolic forms in relations between different people, and the protection and development of their identities. The formation of identity is presented as a dynamic, creative process witch has its symbolic dimension: symbolic actions and forms are used in the expression of identity, and at the same time, they constitute an indispensable and constructive element of mutual identification. Therefore, in order to understand the process of creation of identity, one must take into account its symbolic aspect. The aim in writing this thesis is to analyze the role of the symbolic forms in the process of formation of a European identity. Here the main emphasis is put on ritual as the symbolic form, which is particularly developed and relevant in political context. Symbolic aspects of European order and the role of symbols in its legitimization are particularly relevant to the process of identity formation and therefore deserve special attention in this context.¹

¹ Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. ix-xii.

1. Identity as a Processual and Dynamic Phenomenon

At the social level, identity is an answer to the question: Who are we in relation to other human groups? In this case, identity is formed in a force field of integration, adaptation, and conflict, and is of a subjective and symbolic character. It is, however, itself a product of an action and not a “natural” intrinsic quality of an object prior to relations with other objects. Identity is formed in action, or rather in interaction, in the process of exchange of messages, which we send, receive, and interpret until a general, relatively coherent images are achieved. Identity is thus a dynamic, processual, and contextual phenomenon. From the most general point of view, identity is a result of classification of the world.

By ascribing certain qualities to people or groups or by including them in well-defined categories, people organize their social world and classify it and, in such a way, a conceptual, symbolic model of the world is formed. Such a model describes relation between people, groups, states, objects, metaphysical beings, and natural phenomena and serves as the basis of thoughts and actions. People think and action in relation to the world according to this symbolic model and not in the accordance to the “objective” nature and characteristics of elements of the world. Thus, the model of the world is a dynamic entity created, changed, and developed in the historical process. The mental and symbolic organization of the world defines the reality of a given culture, determines the way in which its participants think and feel their attitude towards all the beings and phenomena, as well as their behavior, regardless of how adequate it is to the reality seen by an outside observant.²

The more complex is a social system, the more identities a person or a group has. One may talk about a professional identity, a class identity, a regional identity, an ethnic identity, or a national identity, and a desired supranational identity. Any person may have all of them encoded in his mental model of the world and in a given social situation, in contact with other people, one of them comes to the fore and this shapes an action undertaken by a person towards his partner or partners.

The social world was divided according to the national differences and national interests were defended. Identity in ethnic groups has been widely discussed by now in a very reach literature, both sociological and anthropological. These discussions were so wide spread that the very concept of identity becomes often used as synonym for ethnic identity. Like any other form of social identity, ethnic identity is essentially subjective, a sense of belonging, a definition of self and one’s group in relation with others. It consists of two mental processes: the search for the self and the construction of boundaries between one’s own group and that of the others. Ethnic identity is defined in terms of cultural unity and is based on a self-definition on grounds of one’s own group’s cultural characteristics in contrast with those of others. A certain degree of cultural homogenization, or at least the existence of an important cultural text with which all members of a group identify themselves, is indispensable for the formation of an ethnic group.

² *Ibid*, pp. 4-7.

For understanding people's behavior in a social situation, the subjective component is of particular importance, since in different context people may emphasize different aspects of their cultural identity. Ethnicity is a symbolic system, which may be activated by members of a group or its leaders as one of many strategic alternatives in the pursuit of individual or group goals. By using selected cultural forms as charters and banners, groups members may be extraordinary flexible in their choice of behavioral alternatives.

In spite of many predictions, ethnic identity has not disappeared in modern society. One might suppose that in a post-industrial social system occupational stratification and a corresponding sense of identity would be dominant. However, as it has turned out, the reality is different. Ethnic identity persists and is even increasing in all types of societies, in our world. Exchange of goods results in similarities in ways of living, which become more and more similar, so as the increasing number of people all over the world participate in the same patterns of homogeneous mass culture distributed by electronic media, and use the same technical inventions and facilities. However, at the same time people want to maintain and continue their cultural characteristics. Technical civilization is more and more similar but symbolic culture does not necessarily follow.

It may happen that in the future we would live in a world of technological homogeneity but cultural pluralism in which particular groups will continue their traditional differences. Cultural differences, being the basis of classification of the human world into groups and categories, serve here not only the need of preserving one's unique identity but also political interests. Ethnicity becomes a political phenomenon, especially nowadays, when is usually taken for granted that ethnic identity is used in a struggle for power with the others who are identified as culturally strange and foreign. At a very general level, ethnic identity transforms itself into a national identity, when a belief in common ancestry and origin and of homogeneity of a culture is combined with the desire to acquire a sovereign state to protect the integrity and free development of the group's culture.

Identity thus appears as a dynamic characteristic of a group involved in the process of historical development. It implies changing relation to other groups, to the natural and social environment, and the symbolic construction of images of the group's own past and present. The relation between social development and cultural pluralism is one of the most interesting problems of the contemporary civilization. It also involves moral and philosophical issues of great importance. On the one hand, democratic and egalitarian values, being the basis of European and American ways of thinking about society and the human individual, favor the principle that political and economic benefits and well-being should be equally available to all the people throughout the world. From this point of view all divisions, political, national, and others, appear artificial, old-fashioned, backward, and unjust. We should all live in egalitarian world society irrespective of race, religion, cultural background, or whatever. On the other hand, the same humanistic principles also assume that all people and human groups should enjoy freedom of choice and self-determination. People should be free to determine the way of life they want to develop even if for other people it seems strange, backward, or irrational. The long and reach history of dictatorship teach us how dangerous it is when any person or group claims to know better what is the proper way of life or direction of development of other people or groups. Enforced homogeneity of culture means that at

least some people are deprived of their own choice and their own rights and that they have to give up traditions they may want to continue.³

People in general seem to want to be different from other people, to have their own, unique identity. There are many reasons why people may elect to give up this claim temporally in order to achieve other goals, like economic well-being, security, or fulfillment of certain ideas. For these reasons, people may form various kinds of alliances and suspend tendencies towards separateness, or laying stress on cultural uniqueness and the right to their own specific development. Apart from perception of differences and protection of one's interests, pluralism also results from a creative attitude towards one's own life and fate. People do not want to be anonymous consumers of mass culture; they are not satisfied with a passive existence in a welfare society. They want to express and develop their personalities and are conscious of individual characteristics, which make them in this sense unique beings. At a group level, people want to cultivate and develop tradition and heritage, which make them different from other cultural units. Therefore, when basic needs are satisfied, when everybody is secure and has enough means not to concentrate only on mere survival, more and more people tend to look for an individualized way of life and unconventional ideas. They are also aware of the fact that people and human groups are not alike and there is no reason why they should be identical and share the same patterns of life. Generally speaking, people want to be different and want their differences to be recognized and safely maintained and developed.

Our world becomes more homogeneous and integrated in many aspects of our way of life, access of knowledge, and technical inventions. At the same time, the scope of our perception broadened. We perceive people and groups whom our ancestors could ignore even if they were aware of their existence. We must incorporate them into our model of the world because we interact with them in a shrinking world. Therefore, a reciprocal process of identification encompasses more and more groups and comparisons are made, but it does not follow that we are ready to loose our separate identity. On the contrary: we cooperate with others, exchange goods, services and messages, become more interdependent but wish to distinguish ourselves from the others by cultivating our symbolic identity, by emphasizing differences between ourselves and the others.⁴

Communities become increasingly subject to influences from across their boundaries. The interrelated processes of industrialization and organization, the dominance of the cash economy and mass production, the centralization of markets, the spread of the mass media and centrally disseminated information, and the growth of transportation infrastructure, and increased mobility all undermined the basis of community boundaries. Each is a multi-pronged assault on social encapsulation, and one, which results in an apparent homogenization of social forms. Within any country the language, family structures, political and educational institutions, economic processes, and religious and recreational practices of communities come to have a certain apparent resemblance to each other. However, this homogeneity may be merely superficial, a similarity only of surface, a veneer which masks real and significant differences at the deeper level. Indeed, the greater the pressure on communities to modify their structural forms to comply more with those elsewhere, the more are they inclined to reassert their

³ *Ibid*, pp. 9-18.

⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 18-19.

boundaries symbolically by imbuing these modified forms with meaning and significance which belies their appearance. In other words, as the structural bases of boundary become blurred, so the symbolic bases are strengthened.⁵

However, this defense of one's identity is not the same as simple conservatism. People want to be different and original but also want to develop. Symbolic identity is not a resistance to change but an autonomous and independent development of a group's own unique culture within the civilized, advanced, and egalitarian world. The differences do not necessarily have to be transformed into a conflict, although they are if at least one of the groups in a given social system perceives its situation as inferior and its interests as endangered. Thus, identity, being a result of conceptual classification of the world, is also expressed symbolically. A mental model of the world, which consists of images of one's group and the others, is formulated in terms of symbolic forms, which range from simple categories of sameness and differences to complicated ideologies. Boundaries which people build to separate themselves from other people are also mainly of symbolic nature, although they may have and often do have material components. Symbolic actions constitute communication between groups and give meaning to their mutual relations and through such actions identifications are carried out and models of identity are created and adjusted.

It seems that since identity is a conceptual and symbolic phenomenon, understanding of the process of formation and transformation of identity can only be achieved through reconstruction of a symbolic model of the world which generates actions and which is the conceptual basis of the inter-group relations. Therefore, apart from descriptions of objective characteristics of social phenomena and processes, it is necessary to assume a cognitive approach which through reconstruction of symbolic systems allows us to look deeper into the way people think of themselves and of each other and to understand their behavior. In addition, such an understanding is necessary for understanding the importance of using symbols at the Union level, in the context of building a European identity.⁶

2. The Efforts to Foster a European Identity

In recent years, there has been much debate over the democratic and legitimacy deficit of the European Union. However, the democratic and legitimacy deficit is precisely a problem because the policies of the European Union are agreed and implemented within a binding constitutional order. If the European Union were an ordinary intergovernmental organization, nobody would lift an eyebrow as to the secrecy of the Council of ministers, of the inferior role of the European Parliament. Provided that

⁵ Anthony P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, Tavistock, London, 1985 **apud** Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 19-20.

⁶ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

the Union is forming a binding constitutional order it is quite clear that this constitutional order in turn does not live up to the requirements of democracy and accountability as they are secured in liberal, democratic states. Therefore, the lack of democratic legitimacy is often considered as an institutional problem, where the solution envisaged is developing the Union towards some kind of federal system. However, it does not seem likely that a federal type system is the result envisaged by the governments of the member states at the present stage of integration. Consequently, the challenge of the democratic deficit has to do with how to create and secure democracy in a none-state entity, rather than addressing the question as if the Union was to become a state. Given that the democratic deficit is a serious problem of the Community in its own right, therefore, it seems as if the most fundamental problem is the legitimacy linked to it. Indeed, it has been argued that *legitimacy* rather than the democracy seems to be the critical condition for integration.

The Community itself is all too aware of the lack of public support. Thus, in the last three decades, a number of initiatives have been taken aimed at collective identity formation by including the people of Europe in the integration process and fostering a sense of belonging. This enterprise is taking under the heading of “a Citizen’s Europe”, “a People’s Europe”, and, finally, with the creation of “a European Citizenship”. That the Community has linked the question of legitimacy to a lack of common identity, and has tried to promote the latter through measures creating a “European citizenship”, is by no means a coincidence.

Since the early 1970s, there has been growing support within the main EU institution to give “Europe” a larger presence in the hearts and minds of the citizens of the member states. The European Commission⁷, as the supranational driving force of

⁷ The European Commission (EC) is essentially the European Union’s executive branch and has the sole right of legislative initiative. It is independent of national governments and represents the European (as opposed to individual Member State) perspective. The Commission is comprised of 25 appointed Commissioners—one from each EU country—each of whom is responsible for specific policy areas. The Commission ensures that the provisions of the EU treaties are applied correctly and represents the EU internationally, negotiating with non-EU countries in areas falling under the competence of the European Community (EC). The Commission also fulfills an administrative role. A new Commission is appointed every five years, within six months of the European Parliament elections. The process involves several steps with input from Member States and the European Parliament:

- Member State governments agree on a new Commission President-designate.
- Parliament approves the Commission President-designate.
- The Commission President-designate chooses the other Members of the Commission, in consultation with Member State governments.
- Parliament interviews each Member and issues its opinion on the whole team. Once approved, the new Commission can officially start work.

The present Commission’s term runs through October 31, 2009. The President of the European Commission is José Manuel Barroso of Portugal.

The Commission remains politically accountable to Parliament, which has the power to dismiss the entire Commission by adopting a motion of censure. Individual members of the Commission must resign if asked to do so by the President, provided the other commissioners approve. The Commission attends all the sessions of Parliament, where it must clarify and justify its policies, in addition to replying regularly to written and oral questions posed by MEPs. The seat of the Commission is in Brussels (Belgium), but it also has offices in Luxembourg, representations in all EU countries, and delegations in many capital cities around the world. The European Commission has four main roles:

1. Proposing legislation to Parliament and the Council. Proposed legislation must defend the interests of the Union and its citizens, not those of specific countries or industries. The Commission also seeks the

integration, has taken a particular interest in this project. Since the mid-1980s, the efforts to foster a European identity have been assisted by the often directly linked campaigns to give EU a public personality. The *Adonnino Reports*⁸ (1985) are especially significant in that, as part of a “People’s Europe”⁹ campaign intended to engender a popular sense of being “European”, they recommended the bold move of adopting Community symbols. To this end, a number of pan-EU icons and symbols were introduced. In 1985, for example, the European Community adopted a standardized European passport. During the same period, “Ode to Joy” from Beethoven’s *Ninth Symphony* assumed the role of unofficial anthem of the Community. Perhaps most significantly in 1985 the Community adopted its official flag. Positioned all over the EU, the flag has now become one of the symbols most readily associated with the EU.

Today, another significant symbols of unification, in the “Euro zone” (the area formed by the countries participating in the European Monetary Union) are the new notes of the euro. Launched in august 2001 (and becoming legal tender on 1 January 2002) these notes are the most pervasive symbols of the EU. And they are the most concrete manifestation of the desire to bring “Europe close to its citizens” as expressed in the 1975 *Tindemans Report*¹⁰ – produced by the Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans” – which

opinions of national parliaments and governments. To get the technical details right, the Commission consults experts through its various committees and groups.

2. Managing and implementing EU policies and the budget. The Commission is responsible for administering and supervising expenditures under the oversight of the Court of Auditors. National and local authorities do most of the actual spending.

3. Enforcing European law (jointly with the Court of Justice). The Commission acts as guardian of the Treaties and can take legal action and refer cases to the European Court of Justice against persons, companies, or Member States that violate EU rules.

4. Representing the European Union on the international stage. Negotiating agreements between the EU and other countries and providing official Commission presence in delegations throughout the world. (“European Union - A Guide for Americans”. In *European Union. Delegation of the European Commission to the USA*. Retrieved December 5, 2006 from:

<http://www.eurunion.org/infores/euguide/euguide.htm>)

⁸ Named after the Italian member of the EU Parliament who, in 1984, headed a working group for the European Council initiating wider proposals for a “People’s Europe”. (“Adonnino Committee”. In *EU ABC. A Dictionary on Words Related to UE*. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from:

<http://en.euabc.com/word/18>)

⁹ A proposal from the Adonnino group in the mid-eighties. It aimed to encourage Europeans to develop a common identity through common citizenship and the adoption of European symbols such as an EU flag, anthem, passport, car registration plates, symphony orchestra, sports events etc. The group was named after its chair, an Italian Christian Democrat MEP.

It also made proposals for wider European co-operation on education, health, drugs, terrorism and other popular “social” topics that went outside the primarily economic concerns of the traditional common “market”. These were thought likely to engage the interests of citizens more and encourage them to develop loyalty and affection towards the EU similar to how many feel towards their own nation states.

Most of the group’s proposals have now been implemented. (“Adonnino Committee”. In *EU ABC. A Dictionary on Words Related to UE*. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from:

<http://en.euabc.com/word/705>)

¹⁰ “European Union”. Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans, Prime Minister of Belgium, to the European Council. *Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 1/76*, 1975 (commonly called the Tindemans Report).

Also on-line: “European Union. Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans, Prime Minister of Belgium, to the European Council. Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 1/76”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 6, 2006 from:

<http://aei.pitt.edu/942/>

first marked the Community's interest in the European identity. As with the other EU symbols, the euro notes have been design to appeal to a pan-EU audience; each of the seven notes bears an image of a bridge intended to represent different European architectural styles. Great care has been taken to distance the images on the notes from actual European places; the designer took photographs of real bridges, such as the Rialto Bridge in Venice and the Neuilly Bridge outside Paris, and then proceeded to remove any features that might betray their original location.

These icons are perhaps the most readily identifiable symbols of the integration process and of the EU as a political identity; another reason for us to insist on their importance in this paper. The publicity campaigns that bring these symbols of the integration to our attention not only seek to communicate what they symbolize as "European" icons, they also generate a sense of "us" – those to whom the messages are directed – as an imagined European community. In the case of the euro, for example, the European Central Bank, the institution responsible for the management of the currency, had spent 800 million euro by the end of 2001 on advertising campaigns to increase public awareness of *The Euro, Our Money*, as the campaign's slogan declared. Similarly, when the euro was floated on the world's financial markets on 1 January 2000 the event was marked by elaborate public ceremonies across the euro zone. The public campaigns associated with these phenomena can therefore be viewed as helping to give form to the idea of what it means to be "European".

In this respect, these high-profile campaigns are buttressed by many other "Europeanization" policies. The 1992 Maastricht Treaty¹¹ formally enabled the EU to intervene in some aspects of policy-making in the fields of education, youth, and culture. Of particular importance are the Treaty's references to the necessity of developing the European dimension in education (Article 126) and of bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore in EU policy. Since this time, EU policy-makers have responded to this challenge by promoting awareness of European integration through its education and training programs, such as *Erasmus*, *Leonardo*, *Socrates*, and *Tempus*. By the mid-1990s, European hints become inscribed in the educational discourse.

Why has so much energy been dedicated to fostering this European supra-nationality? This issue generates considerable emotions in some quarters. One former British prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, in what has become known as her "Bruges Speech"¹² (The speech was delivered to the College of Europe, Bruges, 1988), famously spoke out against what she saw as the efforts of some to create "some sort of identikit European personality". Answers to this question can thus hinge on one's political persuasion on the issue of "Europe". Overall, however, we can say that the principal driving force has been the need to strengthen the popular base of support for integration. EU policy-makers recognize the importance of a European identity. In a working paper on the issue of European identity produced by the Forward Studies Unit of the European Commission, one Commission official remarks that the Union's very ability to survive,

¹¹ "The Maastricht Treaty. Provisions Amending the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community with a View to Establishing the European Community". In *Eurotreaties*. Retrieved December 6, 2006 from:

<http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>

¹² "Bruges Revisited". In *The Bruges Group*. Paper no. 34. Retrieved December 5, 2006 from:

<http://www.brugesgroup.com/mediacentre/index.live?article=92#britain>

grow, act and succeed in its endeavors rests with weather or not EU citizens actively espouse the spirit of the Union. In the case of EU, however, this problem is compounded by charges that decision-making in the EU is not accountable to EU citizens and that a democratic deficit exists between citizens and EU policy-makers. As more powers are transferred to the EU, so this notion of a democratic deficit has been subject to increasing debate.

For critics of the EU, and in particular of its efforts to forge a European identity, this project is portrayed as a threat to national cultures and identities. For the EU the need to establish strong lines of communication with EU citizens and to generate identification with the EU are becoming of grater importance to the progress of integration. Indeed, over the past thirty years, during which the architects of integration have become increasingly concerned with public attitudes to the Union, “Europe” has come to be used as shorthand for the EU. Each year, for example, *Eurobarometer*¹³, the European Commission’s statistical device for measuring public opinion in the EU, records the way is balanced being European against nationality. The results of these statistics show that identification with Europe among EU citizens lags considerably behind attachments to their respective national states. It seems unlikely that a European identity, with the EU as its political foundation, will generate the sorts of passions and loyalty that people feel towards their nations. The notion of “L’Europe des états”, a phrase first employed by Charles de Gaulle, a former president of France, arguably remains the preferred vision of Europe for most Europeans. If some Europeans are to come to identify with a limited vision of Europe, in the form of the EU, then this idea of Europe will need to be broad enough to accommodate a diverse range of cultural experiences.

Today, The Council of Europe and UE are both engaged in considering what the core elements of a shared European culture are. While there are still references to ethnically specific characteristics, such as Christianity, there are signs that the political leaders of the Council of Europe and UE are conscious of the danger of culturally specific definitions of Europe and European. While both speak of cultural heritage, they are both vague as to what this term means, preferring instead to proclaim universal concepts, such as tolerance, the rule of law and respect for human rights as the basis of modern European identity. As multinational and multicultural organizations, the Council of Europe and EU are understandably careful not to offend elements of their membership by creating a European identity that is not sufficiently all embracing. In the case of the EU, the substance of European identity has not been the major concern; the main concern has been to foster identification with the EU as a political entity. Anyway, while most European citizens may not feel they share a common European culture there is a possibility that as more people become aware of the significance of the EU policy the EU will become more of a focus for their concerns and aspirations.¹⁴

In constructivist terms, state identities and interests are to a large degree constructed by social structures. Then, as in all democratic systems, EU institutions

¹³ The EU Commission financed, opinion poll institute. It organizes periodic polls in the member countries and applicant states. It measures support for European integration and other issues. It issues two major reports on such surveys each year. (“Eurobarometer”. In *EU ABC. A Dictionary on Words Related to UE*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from: <http://en.euabc.com/word/365>)

¹⁴ David Dunkerley, Lesley Hodgson, Stanislaw Konopacki, *Changing Europe. Identities, nations and citizen*, Published by Routledge, London, and New York, 2002, pp. 116-125.

should act at EU level as identity producers. The EU institutions should help the Europeans to become aware of their belonging to a political common entity. At the same time, they should help the development of a feeling of belonging to a common identity and to a common destiny.

Many scholars refer to top-down strategies of state-building applied to the European integration process. Actually, a parallel can be made between the process of nation building, which occurred in the last century in many European states, and what is happening now at the EU level. States used enormous resources and symbols to install a sense of loyalty and identification with the national political community. After having learned the sense of belonging to the nation (process of nationalization) it is now necessary to teach the EU citizens to live with an own government (state) and a common (EU) government. The process of nation building is now affecting the supranational level. A process of Europeanization is therefore binding. In this context, Europeanism – considered as mobilization of symbolic values – has to be spread in support of European integration.

The mobilization of public opinion in favor of the integration process is often regarded as an essential element. Is a learning process, which instead of teaching a national mythology, ethnocentrism, and nationalism should be eradicated in the name of the political democracy, in order to give to an equal European citizenship, independent from the nation, ethnic group, and language. Newman also stresses the importance of top-down strategies. In what mean the transfer of the nation-building process to the regional level and in what refers to a process of region building: the existence of regions is preceded by the existence of region-builders, political actors who, as part of some political projects, imagine a certain spatial and chronological identity for a region, and discriminate this imagined identity to others.¹⁵

However, when arguing that the Union top-down strategies of state building, have a role to play in altering perceptions of the political space, to which individual Europeans belong, we do not mean that the Union should set out to replace national identities. However, the extension of the political space beyond the nation-state provides a shelter for multiple identities, being local, regional, or national.¹⁶

a. Approaching Cultural Differences in the European Union

Further, we will articulate more clearly, how the EU goes about creating an identity for itself. The intention is to investigate attempts from within EU institutions to articulate an alternative, less rigid and more exclusive Community identity, compared to those often-exclusive national identities we see being pursued within the member states. These questions will mainly be situated, as we could see before, in the context of the

¹⁵I. B Neumann, “A Region-building Approach to Northern Europe”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 20, 1994, pp. 53-74.

¹⁶ Stefania Panebianco, “European Citizenship and European Identity: from Treaty Provisions to Public Opinion Attitudes” (pp. 18-36), in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004, pp. 31-32.

three policy areas, central for identity construction in the EU: culture, education, and citizenship. These areas, crucial for the consolidation of the nation state, were also given priority in the Maastricht Treaty as key areas for the creation of a cohesive European identity. We intend to bring up some theoretical issues related to the politics of identity at the level of the European Union and, to display some concrete examples from EU policies on culture, education, and citizenship, hinting at the types of representation of Europe that the EU deems appropriate as sources of identification. We also try to situate the identity politics under study mainly in the context of the crisis of legitimacy facing the European Union today. And this discussion will mainly focus on the work carried out by European Commission.¹⁷

The work to establish greater popular cohesion across national borders, among citizens within the European Union, and not only among the member states themselves as political entities, has been part of the Community project since the outset. Indeed, for many so-called “Founding Fathers” and the subsequent Community engineers, federalists and visionaries, the long-term goal of European Community formation has been to dissolve the nation state as the primary unit of identification among people in the Community. However, it was not until 1973 that the Community put forth its first formal statement that explicitly addressed the issue of “European identity”. In the 1973 Declaration on the European Identity, the member countries agreed, “that the time has come to draw up a document on the European Identity”.¹⁸ The diversity of cultures within the framework of common European Civilization, the attachment to common values and principles, the increasing convergence of attitudes to life, the awareness of having specific interests in common and the determination to take part in the construction of a united Europe, all give the European identity its originality and its own dynamism. The European identity is supposed to evolve as a dynamic function of a united Europe construction.¹⁹

Nevertheless, it was not until the launching of the “People’s Europe” concept in the mid-1980s that explicit discussion of a “European identity” took shape on the EEC (European Economic Community) agenda. As we mention before, this concept was developed by the ad hoc Committee on a People’s Europe, chaired by Pietro Adonnino and set up by the European Council in 1984. The committee was asked to focus on future Community manoeuvres that would meet the expectation of the peoples of Europe by adopting measures to strengthen and promote its identity and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world.²⁰ From here on, the identity discussion become firmly embedded in European Union discourse, and initiatives to foster a strong

¹⁷ Peo Hansen, “The Cultural Short-cut: A Road to Exclusion? Notes on Identity Politics in the European Union”, in Jadish Gundara and Sidney Jacobs (eds.), *Intercultural Europe. Diversity and Social Policy*, Published by Ashgate, Aldershot, England, 2000, p. 94.

¹⁸ S., Tindemans, “Social Movements in Europe: Movement Society or Europeanization of Conflict?”, *EUI Working Papers*, No. 98/8, European University Institute, Florence, 1976, p. 12.

¹⁹ CEC (Commission of the European Communities), “Declaration on the European Identity”, *Bulletin European Community*, 12 (Clause 2501), 1973, pp. 119, 122.

²⁰ Idem, “A People’s Europe: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament”, COM (88) 331/final, *Bulletin of the EC*, Supplement No. 2, Luxembourg, 1988, p. 6. Also on-line: “A People’s Europe. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament. COM (88) 331 final, 7 July 1988”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 4, 2006 from: http://aei.pitt.edu/3831/01/000195_1.pdf

identification with what is now the EU have been numerous. We can call this the EEC's, and subsequently the EC's (European Community), and now the EU's (European Union) politics of identity.²¹

However, the idea of 'People's Europe' became an avowed political objective in the 1970s. In 1975, the Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans, following a request from the European Council, drew up a report on European Union. This emphasized that the construction of Europe is not just a form of collaboration between States. It is a rapprochement of people and that Europe needs to be closer to its citizens. And following this, the European Council meeting in Fontainebleau in June 1984 set up an *ad hoc* committee chaired by Pietro Adonnino (Adonnino Committee), which subsequently produced two further reports proposing a series of practical measures designed to promote greater freedom of movement and citizens' rights within the Community. Among these were measures to ease rules and practices, which cause irritation to Community citizens' including facilitating the crossing of intra-Community frontiers, intensifying efforts to promote mutual recognition of professional qualifications and rights of residence, improving information for tourists, and encouraging broadcasts of news, weather and tourists information in languages of other Community States.²²

The second report focused in particular on action geared toward strengthening of the Community's image and identity in order to enhance the sense of belonging and identifying with the Community through cultural exchanges and the creation of new symbols of "Europeanness".²³ These were, as one informant put it, the first steps toward "selling" the Community. Indeed, the marketing of Europe as a kind of "brand product" has come to characterize much of the way in which the Commission has sought to tackle its problem of image. These two reports also set the agenda for what might be described as the invention of the new European order. Publication of this reports in 1985 coincided with the appointment of a new Commission under Jacques Delors. That year also saw a significant name-change spearheaded by Carlo Ripa di Meana, the new Commissioner of DG 10 – the Directorate responsible for culture – to "Audio-visual, Information, Communication, and Culture". The inclusion of "Information" had important consequences for the development of the idea of a "People's Europe". In particular, it led to a tendency to link the citizen's Europe project rather narrowly to information campaigns rather than with environment, consumer affairs or competition policy and internal market - where responsibility for this area had previously been vested. This had little to do with any explicit strategy or theory about the centrality of information policy for the achievement of a citizens Europe.²⁴

After 1985, therefore, emphasis was placed on the cultural and symbolic dimensions of citizenship, including education, training and 'consciousness-raising'

²¹ Peo Hansen, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

²² P. Adonnino, "A People's Europe: Reports from the Ad Hoc Committee", *Bulletin of the EC*, Supplement No. 7, Luxembourg, 1985, p. 9. Also on-line: "A People's Europe. Reports from the ad hoc Committee. Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 7/85". In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 4, 2006 from: http://aei.pitt.edu/992/01/andonnino_report_peoples_europe.pdf

²³ Ibid, pp. 29-30.

²⁴ Cris Shore and Annabel Black, "Citizens' Europe and the Construction of European Identity", in Victoria A. Godard, Josep R. Llobera, Cris Shore (eds.), *The Anthropology of Europe. Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*, Berg, Oxford, Washington D. C., 1996, pp. 285-287.

campaigns involving the creation of a new repertoire of self-consciously constructed “Euro-symbols”. Among the various new symbols and initiatives that resulted from the Adonnino reports were the European passport and the standardized European driving license, a European anthem (taken from the prelude to ‘Ode to Joy’ from Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony), and a European flag (taken from the Council of Europe’s twelve-star logo). In addition, the Commission proposed a number of what it called ‘consciousness-raising’ measures reckoned to be of specifically symbolic value.²⁵ These included the ‘European Road Safety Year’, ‘European Fight Against Cancer Year’, ‘European Cinema Year’, ‘European Fight Against Cancer Year’, and ‘European Cinema Year’; the harmonization of car number-plates, and incorporation of the European logo; sponsorship of European Youth Orchestra and a ‘Europe of Tomorrow’ young scriptwriters competition; town-twinning; European sports events (The European Community Games, the European Cycle Race and European Yacht Race, to name but a few); and the European City of Culture project. The Adonnino Committee even drew up plans for Euro-lottery, the results of which would be “televised throughout the Community” and expressed eventually in ECU (European Currency Unit).²⁶ Reflecting on these and other initiatives, the Commission concluded in 1988 that a “sense of European identity has begun to take shape”²⁷ Yet another official report published in the following year observed that cultural measures are still needed to make people more aware of their European identity.²⁸

The aim stressed by European Commission is that the political union must not be seen simply as a legalistic exercise but rather as a humanistic enterprise; a union among peoples rather than just formal treaties between states.²⁹ Indeed, the European Community (EC) was founded with the explicit aim of forging an even closer union among the peoples of the Europe.³⁰ Since the 1970s the concepts of a ‘Citizen’s Europe’ and a ‘People’s Europe’ have gradually, if sometimes falteringly, emerged as a key to the whole vision of European Union. Central to these concepts is the belief in the need for a Europe close to its well-informed citizens, the latter acting as prime movers for change, actively demanding their rights and advancing the vision. The promotion of this belief has been the subject of countless fine words set down in reports, resolution, and directives introducing ambitious programmes aiming to raise consciousness and to promote awareness, movement, and freedom.³¹

Moreover, we can detect an emerging awareness, even uneasiness, from within the Community organization about the fact that economic integration in itself had not, so to speak, ‘blessed’ Community institution with enough legitimacy to make integration in other areas self-evident. The opening sentence of the Tindemans Report to the European

²⁵ CEC (Commission of the European Communities), “A People’s Europe...”, p. 5.

²⁶ P. Adonnino, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

²⁷ CEC, *op. cit.*, p.3

²⁸ Idem, *XXIIIrd General Report on the Activities of the European Communities*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1989, p. 139

²⁹ Idem, *Treaties Establishing the European Communities*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1983, p. 113. Also on-line: “Treaties”. In *Eur-Lex* Retrieved December 8, 2006 from:

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/index.htm>

³⁰ Ibid, p. 109.

³¹ Cris Shore and Annabel Black, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

Council in 1976, addressed a concerning question: “Why has the European concept lost a lot of its force and initial impetus?” In order to alter this precarious state of affairs the Report went on to argue for an expansion of Community competence and activity into areas closer to daily concerns of its citizens. “No one wants to see a technocratic Europe. The citizen in his daily life must experience European Union. It must make itself felt in education and culture, news and communications, it must be manifest in the youth of our countries, and leisure time activities.”³²

In some respects, the Tindemans Report, with its emphasis on a citizen’s Europe, can be said to have laid the discursive foundation for the new strategies that were set in motion in the mid-1980s in order to win more popular support and thereby legitimacy for the Community projects. As Newman notes: “For most of its history, the EU has not talked of ‘citizens’ but of ‘workers’. However, during the 1980s, the emphasis shifted from the category of ‘workers’ to the category of ‘citizen’.”³³ These new strategies thus assigned much greater importance to the policy areas of culture, education, and citizenship. Although these policy areas are some-times defined as being outside the immediate economic realm, they are nevertheless considered fundamental to it since these policies, if successfully implemented, would create the legitimacy which further economic integration needs to rest upon.

Stated differently, this reorientation in terms of strategy reflect a widespread conviction among Community policy makers that, in order to rally more people behind the Community project and to strengthen a sense of European identity, the stress on common market had partly to give way to a stress on common culture. As the Commission put it, it is necessary for Community action to look beyond economic issues to the major concerns of day-to-day life, since that will help heighten the sense of belonging to a European culture and thereby strengthen the European identity.³⁴ Indeed, the Commission feels that new impetus for Community measures in the cultural sector is also an economic necessity.³⁵ In this sense, development in the past years can be seen as conscious attempts by Community institutions to redefine the EU as primarily constituting a cultural community. As formulated by the European Parliament, Europe is not only an association of economic interests but also a cultural unit then the integration of Europe must be built on the common foundation of European culture.³⁶

With culture being installed as the future foundation upon which European Union integration is to be built, the discourse on the culture has consequently influenced not only cultural policy, but have also come to structure the articulation of several other EU

³² S. Tindemans, op. cit., p. 12.

³³ Newman, M., *Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union*, Hurst & Company, London, 1996, p. 152.

³⁴ CEC, “A People Europe: Commission Communication”..., pp. 7, 11

³⁵ Idem, “A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community”. COM (87) 603 final, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, Supplement 4/87, 14 December 1987, p. 1. Also on-line: “A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community. COM (87) 603 final, 14 December 1987. Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 4/87”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 3, 2006 from:

<http://aei.pitt.edu/6854/>

³⁶ Peo Hansen, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

policies that address the issue of collective identity.³⁷ Probing into how the discourse on culture manifests itself in EU cultural policy, we can see that Union identity “in the making” does not appeal to a cultural homogeneity that would break with recognized national and regional cultures. In this sense, reflecting the views of the Economic and Social Committee, there have been no attempts to create an all-embracing melting pot in the European Union. Instead, for the Commission “unity in diversity” is said to constitute the starting point for cultural policy in the Union.

In a document titled *The Community and Culture*, the Commission writes that European culture is marked by its diversity: diversity of climate, countryside, architecture, language, beliefs, taste, and artistic style. Moreover, it believes that such diversity must be protected, not diluted. Because it represents one of the chief sources of the wealth of our continent. However, underlying this variety affirms that there is an affinity, a family likeness, a common European identity. Down the ages, the tension between the continent’s cultural diversity and unity has helped to fuse ancient and modern, traditional and progressive.

Further, in the Commission guidelines of 1987, under the heading, *A fresh boost for culture in the European Community*, it is stated that the Commission will be at particular pains to integrate the cultural dimension, which the Community citizens see as being intimately linked to his feelings of identity and of belonging to the European Community. That the creation of a larger market establishes a European area based on common cultural roots. In addition, the unity of European culture as revealed by the history of regional and national cultural diversity is the keystone of the ambitious construction, which aims at European Union.³⁸

As these quotations clearly indicate, culture, in European Union discourse, is mainly understood as that which signifies a bounded entity’s shared beliefs, way of life, history, heritage, etc. It is an understanding of culture that emphasizes naturalness, rootedness, and what it deems to be its inherent essence, unproblematically inserted under the headings of European national and regional cultures.³⁹

Stated differently, EU citizenship does not replace national citizenship, but rather underlines its importance, since people residing in the Union cannot acquire EU citizenship without first having acquired its counterpart in a member state. Europe’s cultural heritage has evolved over time and displays certain common characteristics that transcend national or regional differences. This interplay of diversity and constancy perfectly illustrates the regional, national, and European roots of European’s citizens. Community action in the field of cultural heritage can thus help to forge a European citizenship, based on a better understanding of both national culture and the culture of the other Union states.⁴⁰

³⁷ CEC, *First Report on the Consideration of Cultural Aspects in European Community Action*, COM (96) 160 final, Brussels, 17.04. 1996. Also on-line: In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 9, 2006 from:

<http://aei.pitt.edu/1329/>

³⁸ Idem, *A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community...*, p. 3.

³⁹ Peo Hansen, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁴⁰ CEC, *European Community action in Support of Culture*, COM (95) 110 final, Brussels, 29.03.1995, p. 1. Also on-line: “European Community Action in Support of Culture. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage. RAPHAËL. COM

Drawing from EU documents that address the issue of European identity, one finds that difference, when referred to in the abstract, is often appropriated as something positive, as an asset said to belong inside the Union and which therefore should be preserved, included and negotiated, rather than reduced to one uniform level.

With reference to this, at a surface level, one could argue that this points to a potential future transformation of traditional understanding of European identity. In other words, it recognizes the danger of organizing a collective identity around particularistic and excluding notions of ethnicity, culture, and religion. Aside from the merely rhetorical, however, actual EU policy construes the issue of difference in much more limited terms, seeing a European identity comprising only what is said to be different national and regional cultural identities. Differences between recognized national and regional entities in the Union – a recognition that, over the years has been increasingly emphasized in a variety of contexts – are seen as positive instances of difference and, as such, they are included in the Maastricht Treaty. “The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.”⁴¹ Hence, this articulation can be said to dissociate itself from an identity formation through a process of leveling, and instead seeks to have difference and commonality constitute two sides of the same coin. “On the one side, we see a disparate family of nations embracing many different cultures; on the other hand, a desire to develop a common identity, to make Europe ‘European’ – but without succumbing to the colorless uniformity of ‘Europeanism’ or to the temptation of blindly imitating the past.”⁴²

Thus, difference is by no means always constructed as being of a dividing or mutually antagonistic nature. National and regional cultures, framed as bounded and essential entities but which still can be organized around the least common denominator of ‘Europe’ which provides the differentiated space with its unifying and ‘natural’ boundaries, are also differences destined to coexist in a pluralist harmony. A Union “we” then, is indeed said to encapsulate differences, and no identity mobilization conducted by the EU is allowed to overlook what are conceived of as distinct and homogenous national and regional cultures.⁴³

European Union policy considers the educational system to play an important role in fighting the negative stereotypes, assumed by each national group, about the ‘other’. Thus, intercultural education is considered the main means of achieving the goal summarized by the motto “Unity in diversity”. It is seen as capable of accomplishing harmonious coexistence and collaboration of member states, through respect and

(95) 110 final, 29.03.1995”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 9, 2006 from:

<http://aei.pitt.edu/4844/>

⁴¹ Council of European Communities, Commission of the European Communities, *Treaty on European Union*, Title IX, Article 128, Office for Official Publication of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1992.

⁴² CEC, *The European Community 1992 and Beyond*, Office for Official Publication of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1991, p. 5. Also on-line: “The European Community - 1992 and Beyond. Europe on the Move, March 1991”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from:

<http://aei.pitt.edu/1551/>

⁴³ Peo Hansen, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-99.

acceptance of national differences in culture and language. A great number of EU programmes finance common projects on education, and encourage teachers and students' mobility among countries. The target is to get to know the "other", learn their language, become familiar with their culture, and finally appreciate the wealth resulting from cultural contact and mutual influences.

Intercultural education is defined as the transmission of values and assumptions, through which differences are recognized and respected, rights are acknowledged, collaboration is learned and practiced, and new perspectives are thought. The European countries have had recently to face intercultural education as part of the transformation produced by the EU. Thus, the notion of monoculturalism is starting to lose its mythical quality. Many as a characteristic of modern societies and the practice of stereotyping view cultural diversity and prejudice is becoming part of a debate questioning its relation to the social and political dangers concealed in an intolerant society.⁴⁴

b. European identity in relation to national identities

Nation-states and nationalism are relevant to European integration for three reasons. First, because they are seen as key obstacles to European Union. Second, because both Europe and nation-state are 'imagined communities', and it is important to explore how, from an anthropological perspective, such imaginings are constructed and articulated. Third, because the formation of European nation-states provides useful parallels, perhaps even a model, for understanding some of the process involved in European political integration and state-formation.

The EU is widely held to suffer from a legitimacy deficit. Gerard Delanty notes "the search for new principles of European legitimacy is inextricably bound up with the attempt to create a space in which collective identities can be formed." One of the most important and contentious issues is whether such a European identity can at all be formed. The EU consists of Member States, all of which have well-established national identities. The question of a European demos and identity must therefore be seen in relation to entrenched national identities. Does a European identity have to supplant the national ones? Can it supplement or transform these? How much of a transformation is necessary? Will a European identity be a novel, *post-national* type of identity? These are complex issues, both in empirical and in normative terms.

Historically speaking, nation building has been marked by struggle, by people actively seeking recognition for their particular culture, history, language, and identity. Social movements or other organised action can forge 'from above' Nation building by elites or 'from below'. In both cases, nation building can be seen as a struggle for recognition, to ensure that a particular national community is recognised by the world around it and by those who see themselves as - or are made to see them as - part of it. Applied to Europe, such a process would draw on the uniqueness of the European

⁴⁴ Anna Frangoudaki and Thalia Dragonas, "Intercultural Education in the European Union from a 'Southern' Viewpoint", in Jadish Gundara and Sidney Jacobs (eds.), *Intercultural Europe. Diversity and Social Policy*, Published by Ashgate, Aldershot, England, 2000, pp. 167-169.

experience, in terms of history, culture and language to create a unique European identity and self-professed Europeans.

That there will be a process in Europe where a European (in the sense of nation-type) identity replaces a Member State national one is highly unlikely. As Habermas notes “It is neither possible nor desirable to level out the national identities of member nations, nor melt them down into a “Nation of Europe”.” In cultural and linguistic terms, Europe is marked more by its diversity than by its coherence. Attempts at fostering a unified European nation-type identity based on a common European cultural tradition are bound to encounter fierce national opposition - driven by the need to ensure continued preservation of nationally based difference. Opposition to integration will then be as driven by the need for recognition of nationally based difference as will be the integration process itself.

The prospect of supplanting a national with a European nation-type identity appears highly remote. What needs to be explored instead is whether national identities can be supplemented or transformed – even to the extent of becoming *post*-national. Such a consideration requires attention to the possibility that the contemporary context of identity formation may be quite different from that, which existed at the time when the *notion* of national identity first emerged and when the national identities of the European Member States were formed. This observation seems particularly opposite now, as cultures and societies are becoming increasingly tightly linked and interconnected, and as societies become increasingly multicultural. These developments bring forth a heightened concern with identity, regarding both recognition of uniqueness, as well as recognition of *equality* and of *equal value*. Nations, regions, groups (intra and trans-national) and individuals seek recognition of their unique identity. Struggles for recognition of uniqueness are labelled *politics of difference*. The efforts by groups and collectives to protect and promote their difference and uniqueness must contend with the efforts by individuals, groups, and collectives to ensure the recognition of equal rights and equal dignity of every individual being.

The EU is a complex entity with supranational, transnational and intergovernmental traits, which suggests that it may be conducive to a wide range of identities and forms of belonging. The present resurgence of identity politics reminds us that there is not necessarily a struggle between a national and a European identity. People have always had multiple identities and the European integration process may make it easier to simultaneously embrace a national and a European identity. This is not merely a vertical matter of levels. It is also a horizontal matter; in the sense that territorially as well as non-territorially based identities compete with the national ones as well as the (emerging) European one. The international resurgence of identity politics brings with it other forms of identity, which may profoundly affect the forming of a European identity and the ensuing reshaping of national ones.

National identity is privileged in the very structure and workings of the so-called Westphalian state system. There is an important distinction between state and nation. The state is a political institution and an organisational form, whereas the nation is a cultural community and an idea. Moreover, the nation is an *imagined community*, “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” As a community, the nation is based on a form of solidarity. It is also

always in some sense a construction, in that it is a (re)invented community. Some symbols are highlighted and some aspect of a community's past are highlighted at the behest of other: "Only the symbolic construction of "a people" makes the modern state into a nation-state."

There are indications of a major identities transformation in Europe. National identities are becoming more inclusive and there are signs of an emerging inclusive conception of European identity. The latter is far more akin to a post-national than a national type identity. From what we have seen here both historical and contemporary aspects of the EU give it this post-national thrust. The Member State still retains the most important traditional mechanisms for socialising its citizens (school systems, a national vernacular etc.) The EU has not undermined these but the context of European co-operation appears to make them more inclusive.⁴⁵

A significant observation is that nation states are not permanent features of European history. We know that it was not always this way. Indeed, most of the states of the former URSS had not previously existed as nation-states prior to the 1990s, while many others states in Europe did not exist as fully democratic nation-states – where people held full citizenship rights – until the late twentieth century. Therefore, even when we speak of the universality of nation-state, we should remember that this is a recent phenomenon. Therefore, we can conclude that there is no inherent reason why people should always wish to identify themselves as belonging to nation-states.

A second observation is that patterns of change make it increasingly difficult to speak of a single, national culture anyway. In reality, there never was such a thing, but politicians and others chose to speak as if "our" culture was a timeless entity, handed down from one generation to the next. National politicians and some of the primary national institutions display awareness that the nation is not an unchanging entity. The movement of people, ideas, images, and commodities brings new cultural experiences that, in turn, mean that it is less likely that the nation imagined by the mass of the population will remain in the way it once was. It is difficult to measure the impact of these cultural changes on a people's sense of national identity, but given what we know about how national consciousness was generated it is fair to argue that as the key cultural and political processes change, so will our attachment to the nation.⁴⁶ We should understand this phenomenon of nationalism to understand better the way it functions and how was embodied, by now, in the people consciousness. We will find out that similar elements, as cultural symbols, were used for developing the idea of a common national culture, at the level of the states. In the idea of building a European identity, are reconsidered and interpreted this kind of symbols. Therefore, we see that European Union makes use of similar means to achieve the citizens' support.

We found out that in the history of modern Europe, the nation would be among the leading players. Since the late eighteenth century, the idea of the nation has developed as arguably the principal source of political legitimacy for European states. During this period, nationalism, as an ideology and a movement, has been among the chief political

⁴⁵ Jon Erik Fossum, "Identity-politics in the European Union", *Journal of European Integration - Revue d'Intégration Européenne*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 2001, pp. 373-406, http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp01_17.htm

⁴⁶ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.

forces reshaping the political map of Europe. The changing fortunes of empires and states, and the lives of those inhabiting these territories, have in large part unfolded in the shadow cast by these phenomena. Therefore, some of the most profound political changes of the past two centuries implicated nations and nationalism.

Nations do not just exist in people's imaginations, even if nations exist if people feel they belong to one. The nation, or, more accurately, a vision of the nation, is embodied in many social institutions, from education systems to government, as well as across the spectrum of high and popular culture. We will see how the nation is representing at the level of popular culture. Since the nineteenth century of national identity and nationhood have implied all manner of cultural practices, including art, architecture, classical music, film, literature, and theatre. We already have seen that these kinds of ways are followed by the Union, too, in its attempts to gain the sustainability of the civil people. In the case of classical music the list of the composer who, especially at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, embraced nationalism, and sought to find some expression of the nation and their sense of attachment to it through their music is considerable. Some pieces of classical music were adopted by nationalist movements or have come to be associated with nationalistic occasions, such as Verdi's *Chorus of the Hebrew Slaves* (which became an anthem of Italian nationalism in the mid-nineteenth century) and Edward Elgar's *Pomp and Circumstances March No. 1*, perhaps better known as *Land of Hope and Glory* (which first became popular in the UK during the First World War). In addition, a number of composers during this period drew on folk songs as inspiration for their compositions, such as Russian composers Rimsky-Korsakoff and Tchaikovsky.

In the twentieth century, film has been a key arena in which ideas of nation and nationhood have been played out to European audiences. The importance of film is that it has the capacity to reach an audience beyond the scope of many other cultural practices and because it has the power to make history, rather than simply recording it. Thus a movie such as *Breaveheart*, the 1995 film starring Mel Gibson as William Wallace, who had waged war against the English King Edward I in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, has arguable created an awareness of issues of nationhood among domestic audience. Jerzy Hoffman's 1999 historical epic, *Ogniem I mieczem* (*With Fire and Sword*, for example, which portrays civil warfare in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the seventeenth century, met with critical and popular success in his native Poland.⁴⁷ We found out that there is nevertheless a step that necessarily precedes people's support for nationalist movements: people must perceive themselves as belonging to nations. As this attachment is not natural, people need to learn to think of themselves as belonging to nations. National emblems, icons and figures, too, act as visible declaration that nations exist in the real word, rather than simply in our own imagination.

Many of these phenomena also encourage identification with the nation. Nationalist historiography will always involve a narrative that helpfully identifies our glories, while simultaneously pointing to the deeds of enemies. National icons and emblems are nevertheless also part of the mass rituals and celebrations in which the people come together as a nation. If these phenomena foster attachments to our culture and history, others forge identification with homelands. National anthems, many of which

⁴⁷ Idem, pp. 44-45.

do not date beyond the mid-nineteenth century, often make direct reference to the relationship between land and identity. In addition, for centuries flags have been used as markers of identity, especially in battle, and of territory. States increasingly began to use flags in the medieval period. Today, national flags are present at all public national ceremonies, such as sporting events and national holidays, although they also fly permanently from many public buildings across Europe. They are, in short, part of the performance of nationalism. Although there is a fair degree of originality with regard to the colors and the visual design on flags, there are some common patterns (such as the “Scandinavian cross” found on the flags of Finland, Norway, and Sweden, and the tricolor, the earliest example is the French flag). Moreover, some commonality regarding the various colors symbolized (black usually symbolizes the wealth of the soil, while yellow or gold will often represent the wealth of the country). The esteem in which the national flag is held is evident in the fact that numerous countries have laws relating to the design and use of the flag. All this marks involved at the level of the national states are used now, with the same scope, by European Union, mostly because of their proved efficiency at the level of the citizens.

We should understand that nations are not natural forms of human organization. Studies have shown that there was a time when people did not think of themselves as belonging to nations. Indeed, it is only since the late nineteenth century that national identity has become a mass phenomenon. In addition, we know that circumstances have conspired to encourage this identification with the nation. In this sense, A. D. Smiths in his works⁴⁸ arguments that there have been two main routes to nationhood in Europe: bureaucratic incorporation and vernacular mobilization. The former is characterized by those countries, such as England, France, and Spain, where the state has developed over a number of centuries, during which the mass of the population is gradually assimilated into the culture of the dominant ethnic group. The latter process, characteristic of central-eastern Europe, is marked by the transition that occurs when elite groups (intelligentsia) from the pre-existing ethnic culture mobilizes the ethnic group. We can nevertheless speculate that, in general, a combination of factors generated and have sustained popular national consciousness in Europe since the nineteenth century, from war and international animosity to the impact of national public cultures and, more recently, nationalizing popular cultures.

Nations and nationalism, then, look set to remain key players in European society for some time to come. That we know that there was a time when neither existed does not make it easier to imagine a time when, again, they will no longer have an impact on the European stage. To be sure, many European societies – from east to west – are contemplating what national identity means today, a development that has been prompted by considerations of immigration as well as the position of minorities, but many Europeans would find it difficult to contemplate life without nations.⁴⁹

In the absence of a European consciousness, it is possible for community builders to construct it? Neumann⁵⁰ argues that the existence of regions comes after the

⁴⁸ A. D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Blackwell, Oxford, 1986 and *Nationalism and Modernism*. Routledge, London, 1998.

⁴⁹ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-63.

⁵⁰ Neumann, I., “A Region Building Approach to Northern Europe”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 20, 1994.

emergence of region builders, political actors who “imagine certain spatial and chronological identity for a region, and disseminate this imagined identity to others”. An important approach to political integration is one defined as the process whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations, and political activities towards a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over pre-existing national states. This is the more ambitious approach, one that moves the emphasis from a political union, understood in terms of a set of institutional arrangements towards the people of the Europe themselves. According to this theory, union will come about through a gradual change in the behavior, perception, and outlook of the peoples of Europe as they come to identify increasingly with the new central authority.

The formation of nation-state in Europe provides an interesting model for comparison. An essential ingredient in this process was the creation of a new class of leaders and intellectuals; a vanguard inspired by an ideology of nationalism which enabled them to transcend parochial loyalties and rivalries. The rise of an elite cadre – equipped with a new and distinctly national self-consciousness and with a vested interests in promoting the idea of nationhood which enabled them to perceive themselves as ‘Frenchmen’ rather than Parisians, or Germans rather than Bavarians and Prussians – thus becoming pivotal to the process of nation-state formation.⁵¹

The policies that flowed after the Adonnino Committee (1985) were an attempt to gradually change people’s consciousness of political realities, and the political domain to which they belong. This is a deliberate attempt to manufacture and legitimize a European identity from the top-down. In addition, just as nation states are imagined communities, official policy in the Union is to construct Europe as an imagined community. This seems to receive validation from the fact that the notion of citizenship is no longer cut off at national boundaries. People will never know most of their fellow Europeans yet they are expected in their minds to create the image of their communion – imagining the extended boundaries. It is not clear that as of yet they have any real desire to do so as to date, the Eurobarometer surveys have shown national identity leading European identity. The Eurobarometer data indicate that national identity has not given ground to a sense of European identity. In this case, the best that can be expected is that European identity may develop as a weaker form of identity in a hierarchy or circle of identities. European citizenship is described as a new kind of citizenship that is neither national nor cosmopolitan but is multiple in enabling the various identities that we all possess to be expressed, and our rights and duties exercised through a complex configuration of common institutions.⁵²

There is a broad consensus among social scientists today about the theoretical status of ethnic, cultural, and national categories. Indeed, one is even inclined to say that canon has developed around these concepts. A canon that now fairly dominates the discussion, the gist of which can be summarized as follows: there is no such thing as an ethnic, cultural, or national essence. Formation, which appears as ethnic groups, as cultures, or as nations, should no longer be considered as supra-subjective wholes that generate and determine human action. Instead, they should be interpreted as the products

⁵¹ Cris Shore and Annabel Black, *op. cit.*, pp. 279-280.

⁵² Dolores Taaffe, “Who governs the Europeans?” in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004, pp. 83-84.

of history, therefore as resulting from concrete acts that are motivated by people's interests. Such formations are constructions naturalized by social actors in the interests of their own social standing; only then are they equipped with a coherent history and homogenous, territorial character.

The development of the European Union constitutes the second current that is causing fundamental changes in the social and political landscape of the old continent. Although primarily concerned with economic objectives, the EU is nevertheless causing significant changes in fields unrelated to the economy. It is becoming apparent that the political and economic integration of Europe will be accompanied by a process of identity-building that, no matter how fragile and convoluted at the present time, will ultimately weaken national identities. The very determination of the various groups fighting to maintain a national identity or the conflicts building up around the issue of yet-to-be negotiated Euro-meanings indicates that the new Euro-identity construction is already more deeply rooted than is commonly assumed. It takes a major conflict between the EU and other economic powers to reveal just how far the EU has come in building new identities; indeed, nothing moves people to embrace a collective identity, even on temporary basis, more than an attack from without.

Regardless of the outcome of EU Project, the days of national independence are over for Europe because international commitments and global interdependence alone are sufficient to rule out such autonomy nowadays. Yet the weakening of national-state sovereignty does not mean that nationalism will disappear altogether - in Europe no more than elsewhere. The truth is that the nationalism can be put to very different uses and that the label nationalism often conceals other realities.⁵³

c. European Integration and Public Opinion

Beyond the official affirmation and the analyses stated on historical, sociological, and anthropological studies, more accurate, and closer to reality would be to look over the results of a public survey. In order to measure public support for the EC/EU, specific EB (Eurobarometer) surveys have been systematically conducted since the early 1980s. What emerges over the past twenty years is, on average within the member countries, a general pattern of public support for Europe. It was characterized by a continuous rise of basic approval of EC/EU membership until early 1991 (when average public stood at 72 per cent compared to about 50 per cent in 1980), and a downturn thereafter, followed by a consolidation at lower levels of support. In 1997, half of the interviewed considered EU membership a good thing, and three out of ten "neither good nor bad", while only 14 per cent judged it a "bad thing".⁵⁴

⁵³ Hans-Rudolf Wicker, "Introduction: Theorizing Ethnicity and Nationalism", in Hans-Rudolf Wicker (ed.), *Rethinking Nationalism & Ethnicity. The Struggle for Meaning and Order in Europe*, Oxford, New York, 1997, pp. 1, 35-36.

⁵⁴ "Eurobarometer", no. 48, Autumn 1997. In *European Commission. Public Opinion Analysis*. Retrieved December 7, 2006 from:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb48/eb48_en.htm

To better understand this trend, it is now necessary to recall some concepts which are often used in public opinion analysis and which give account for the European integration process. *Utilitarian support* for supranational institutions is a support for integration that steams from recognition of common interests and positive, mutual benefits that will result. *Affective support* is emotional support, which may exist between peoples, and which may comprise a sense of common identity. When defining *permissive consensus*, means more a declaredly negative attitude towards European integration rather than supportive, as it “allows for integration by political, economic, military and cultural elites, as long as those segments of these elites that are opposed to integration (or to more integration) do not succeed in mobilizing significant support. If and when they do, they slow down the speed of integration, stop it or even reverse its directions”. As the trend of the last two decades demonstrates, public support of Europe is more permissive, acceptive and benevolent, than demanding, challenging or pushing.

European integration is not merely a process run by political elites, but depends also on fluctuations in public sentiments as well. European support for European integration is influenced by contingent events. If international migration flows, environmental disasters, economic crises and unemployment, constitute a threat to Europeans interests and lives; they might negatively influence the attitudes towards European integration. Unless the EU will be able to find a solution in the direction of tangible economic benefits and higher standards of living, European nationals as an attractive alternative could consider nationalism or local separatism. Europeans are clearly not ready to sacrifice themselves for Europe. Due to the adoption of the TEU (Treaty of Maastricht), a large public debate has arisen on European integration, and the referenda highlighted the distance existing between citizens and EU. It was then clear that a good deal of the population fears that the EU would threaten their national interests acting in fields previously regulated by national governments.

However, when explaining the reason why the respondents are hostile to the treaty, they describe a Community that is basically organized according to the treaty itself. The European fear that the EU as described in the TEU would threaten national identity and cultural diversity, that their governments would be forced to carry out decisions they do not want. They do not like a too centralized European decision-making process guided by bureaucracy in Brussels. To sum up, they are against a community that it is distant from the citizens. They want different cultures and identities to be respected, their governments to play an important role in the decision-making process and sovereignty not to be transferred completely to the common institutions. They do not know, then, that they are in favor of the system established in the TEU, where the principle of the subsidiary, disciplines the level of the intervention.⁵⁵

Moving from the EU severs public judgment, mainly stemming from economic considerations and dissatisfactions, to a sociological level, the EB surveys offer a different picture of European public opinion: half of the EU peoples feel to some extent European. The “feeling European” survey indicates that in spring 1997 the majority of the Europeans declared having a European identity. This majority is divided in three categories of identity: “national and European” (40 per cent); “European and national” (6 per cent); “only European” (5 per cent). Forty-five per cent of the respondents declared having only a national identity. The variables influencing the “feeling European” are first

⁵⁵ Stefania Panebianco, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27.

of all age, sex and political ideas. In general young people, men, and leftists are more pro-European than elderly people, women, and rightists. Maybe there is somehow true the affirmation that the hope for true integration lies with the young. Fact that could be the result of the programmes developed by EU, which operate at the level of the exchange of culture and ideas, particularly in the field of youth education. Can be indicated that a high level of education implies a full comprehension of the compatibility between national and European identity. Moreover, to a large extent respondents relay upon EU to protect cultural diversities.

However, if citizens are asked to choose between having a European identity and a national identity, they consider national ties stronger than the European ones. The attachment to one's nationality emerges from an EB survey about the rights and freedom to be respected "under all circumstances"; then, 80 per cent of respondents refer to the right to one's own language and culture.⁵⁶ Although in the latter data, the national identity prevails, and the importance of the general coexistence of two identities, national and European is to be stressed. In fact, the "feeling European" question is based on the assumption that one does not need to give up one's national identification in order to adopt a European one. The EU clearly does not aim at substituting national and regional identities with a European one.

Undeniably, in Europe there are common historical origins and common cultural heritage. However, at the same time the EU is characterized by a plurality of cultures, languages, and ethnic groups. In addition, in view of any further enlargement, Europe is destined to be a continent of plural belonging. It is difficult to imagine a cultural "unification", and in any case, this is not to the ultimate goal of the EU. Talking about a common identity cannot imply a uniformity of European cultural identities. The deepening of the common European values does not necessarily mean the removal of cultural specificity of the European peoples. This would be in contrast with the TEU articles giving way to a certain regional decentralization and establishing the right to respect local and regional identities (Art. 126-8)

A comparison can be made between the coexistence of different levels of sovereignty and powers, and of identities. In fact, Europeans are at the same time citizens of their town, their region, their nation, and of the EU. The EU does not aim at substituting the member state nations, and the principle of subsidiarity is the weapon aimed at protecting the different levels, and consequently, different identities. The point of departure here is the evolution towards a post-étatique entity of the EU made of different levels: local, national, and supranational. It is clearly point out that the complexity of the EU political system is strictly linked with the definition of European identity. And the emerging complexity of various co-existing layers of identity forces us to rethink what kinds of identity might be possible to function here. In a post-sovereign space like Europe, identity cannot be connected to the idea of primacy, of the one real identity.

The emergence of European identity does not imply the substitution of others identities. Dealing with identity sociological terms of reference are much more explanatory. As they are used to adapting to different social roles in their lives,

⁵⁶ "Eurobarometer", no. 47, Spring 1997. In *European Commission. Public Opinion Analysis*. Retrieved December 7, 2006 from:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb47/eb47_en.htm

Europeans should get used to different belonging. Each human being often shares highly contradictory identities and social roles as a member of his family, of his region, of his nation and possibly, by the virtue of transnational links, of the world. It is a question of multiple allegiances. Sociologically, human beings can move between their multiple identities according to context and situation. Such identities may be concentric rather than conflictual and there is plenty of historical evidence for the coexistence of concentric circles of allegiances. The relationship between national and European identity should be described in terms of compatibility considering the fact that however dominant the nation and its national identification, human beings retain a multiplicity of allegiances in the contemporary world.⁵⁷

Rejecting a label – a study of the Danish opposition to the European citizenship.

It has been maintained that the initiatives on European citizenship can be viewed as a strategy for strengthening the legitimacy of the Union. However, European citizenship was still rejected by the Danish population. Moreover, the citizenship is being rejected because of the symbolism inherent in the concept. When it comes to evaluate the symbolism a groundless fears is obvious in the population attitude, whereas the opponents view citizenship as a symbol of a Union aiming at the creation of a new European state.

In an article arguing that, the Danish rejection of Maastricht in 1992 has to be found in the specific way the Danish state was built historically and the culture surrounding it today, Tim Knudsen⁵⁸ links these features to the concept of state-culture. This is understood not only as the political and administrative institutions, but also as the relationship of political-administrative institutions and the culture of a country. In this understanding, the state-culture for each country influences the approach, which the country takes toward European integration.

Danes in general evaluated the EU according to two parameters – the political and the economical aspects of European cooperation – where the former as a general trend was regarded negatively and the latter positively. The decisive factor in how people voted was the priority between the parameters. Together, these two trends seem to suggest that the Danes consciously do not want to become “Europeans”, which they understand as identifying themselves as Europeans. Moreover, they certainly do not want to have European symbols imposed on them. A number of the political actors support this view. Elisabeth Arnold (the Social Liberal Party) affirms that she is an opponent of a community feeling that is being imposed on people. She is adding that this has been on the agenda from the early years where an anthem, and a European sports-team and other forms of “catchpenny” were supposed to encourage a community feeling. The politician believes that it will have the opposite result, because people become irritated when a community-feelings is being forced upon them, regarded as a propaganda. In addition, especially the Danes do not like this kind of symbolism.

Drude Dahlerup (the June Movement) that regards the policy of symbolism as EU-nationalism takes a more forceful view. For him, a European identity is constructed with an immense commercial means. In addition, the goal is to make people think

⁵⁷Stefania Panebianco, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-31.

⁵⁸ T. Knudsen, “A Portrait of Danish State-culture: Why Denmark Needs Two National Anthems”, in M. Keistrup (ed.), *European Integration and Denmark's Participation*, Political Studies Press, University of Copenhagen, 1992, pp. 262-296.

European by using enormous means of propaganda. The public opinion towards the symbols of the Union are very much regarded, as something being imposed from above against the people will.

That a sense of identity is an indispensable factor in achieving and maintaining European unity was recognized by Jean Monnet when he said that if he had to begin again he would start with culture. The Community has also recognized this. Since the early 1970s, the Community has launched a number of projects, proposal, and policies aimed at stimulating a collectivity identity among the peoples of Europe, most notably through the introduction of a European citizenship in the Maastricht Treaty of 1992.

The European Community cannot do without legitimacy for one fundamental reason. It is made up of democracies, and the basic rule of democracy is that the people rule. This can be arranged in various ways, most often through some form of representation. Unless the people regard the arrangement of representation as legitimate, there is no democracy. Today, the Community takes a vast number of decisions that have a profound effect on people's lives. The fundamental problem is that the Community lacks a decisive element: a European demos. This is not merely an institutional question that can be solved through, say, granting more legislative power to the European Parliament. On a more fundamental level it has to do with the fact that the peoples of Europe do not regard themselves to be a united people. This is not only a Danish problem – a number of the European national populations do not feel European – they consider themselves German, Dutch, Irish, or British. It should be obvious how this is likely to pose severe problems in the future, when increased majority voting will ensure more cases of a national people being outvoted by a majority that is not considered part of their own community. This is why Europe needs a demo with a collective identity.

Again, there can be no doubt, that what Europe needs is a sense of Community among Europeans. However, it does not seem as if the present top-down construction of the European Community and the initiatives trying to promote a collective identity has lead to the desired outcome. Europe needs to involve its people in the process. If the peoples of Europe would gain a more important role in the debate on the construction of the Union, a sense of common civic identity might develop in the course of the next generations, as public involvement and public demands would be mutually enhancing.⁵⁹

3. European Citizenship Role in the Creation of a European Identity

Talking about European identity imply a necessary incursion in the European citizenship matter, regarding the symbolic power of such a concept, at the level of the member states (as being strongly linked to the national identity). Nevertheless, we will

⁵⁹ Camilla Hersom, "European Citizenship and the Search for Legitimacy: The Paradox of the Danish Case" in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004, pp. 59-61, 67-71.

not accord an important space in our approach because is already widely analyzed by many others authors. In addition, we think that the accent is settled on the political side (gaining new rights) and not on the cultural one as in the case of the flag, anthem, euro, and European Day. Moreover, citizenship could be seen more as an achievement than a means. That is why we decided to pass superficially over this topic.

In 1986, the Single European Act (art. 8A) clearly referred to the right of free circulation of people by granting European citizens some substantial rights. But a big step forwards was made with the inclusion in the TEU(Maastricht Treaty) (1992) of a chapter on “Citizenship of the Union”, adding political rights to economic and social rights, then shifting from EC workers to EU citizens. If in 1980s European citizenship had developed mainly in the economic field creating a “welfare citizenship”, in the early 1990s the TEU focused on political rights, constitutionalizing some rights, which were already part of the *acquis communautaire*, and establishing some new rights. By formalizing the European citizenship, the TEU gave clear visibility to a step-by-step process that had already started two decades earlier.

In order to answer the question whether the establishment of European citizenship helped to develop a European identity, both treaty provisions concerning the European citizenship and public opinion attitudes towards European identity have to be taken into account. The distinction between the formal meaning of citizenship as established in the Treaty of Maastricht on the European Union (TEU) and recalled by the Treaty of Amsterdam, and the attitudes of the Europeans is useful as it results from the *Eurobarometer* (EB) data on whether European public opinion is aware of the attempts to bring the European Union (EU) closer to the citizens. As we show in the chapter above, empirical results indicate that the majority of Europeans declare having both a national and European identity, demonstrating that they consider them compatible. However, when asked to make a choice, the national attachment prevails. In reality, in the treaty provisions the citizens are not asked to choose to have either a national identity or a European one. Identity cannot be analyzed in terms of zero-sum games; instead, it is better understood through sociological lenses.

The European citizenship and European identity are strictly interrelated, it appears extremely important to foster actions that strengthen the sense of belonging to the EU. It is not sufficient to entitle the Europeans to EU rights without instilling the same time the Europeaness. The concept of citizenship is based on the two focal points of belonging to a political community and of the status of enjoying distinctive rights. The entitlement of the new rights alone does not necessarily imply an increased allegiance to the EU. The identity formation is an instituted process based on the boundaries existing between EU and non-EU citizens.⁶⁰

The concept of European citizenship is intimately linked to the idea of the European Union as political union. Forming part of the political agenda directed towards Political Union, citizenship addressed the question of what constitutes a polity and who it is to be included in the creation of a constitutional system in a non-state entity. Arguably, the most important step concerning Union Citizenship was bringing together the already existing freedoms and the new rights in a new separate part of the Treaty, thereby creating a coherent concept labeled “European Citizenship”. The new elements in “European citizenship” count the right to vote and stand as a candidate at municipal

⁶⁰ Stefania Panebianco, *op .cit*, pp. 18-20, 33-34.

elections and in elections to the European Parliament, establishment of an ombudsman institutions, and the entitlement to diplomatic protection of any member state in a third country in which the national's own country is not represented. With respect to the substance of the provision, the creation of political rights – hitherto unprecedented in international organizations – was undoubtedly most significant. There is no doubt that the Community itself assigns huge symbolic importance to the new concept of European citizenship. This is apparent in the preamble, which explicit states that the member states will “establish a citizenship common to the nationals of their countries”. Likewise, the importance shines through in the rhetoric of the Commission, which in its initial report on Citizenship of the Union states that it “welcomes this opportunity to set out its conception of these new provisions, the importance of which cannot be sufficiently stressed.”⁶¹

The concept of the European citizenship has, as its clearly stated goal, the increasing of legitimacy of the Union through the notion of citizenship and an explicit policy of stimulating a European identity or not obviously depends on whether Union citizenship is conceived as making a difference in its own respect. There are still concerning whether a genuine new citizenship with a corresponding identity is emerging, being neither national nor cosmopolitan in character or, whether European citizenship is without a significant substance. In this case, we have to note that European citizenship is evaluated as a process, a systematic formation of expectations, perceptions and behavior, which in their turn stimulate a European identity. The determining factor in evaluating the prospects for a European identity is the importance ascribe to the homogeneity of a community. If homogeneity is regarded as the crucial factor for collective identity formation, a collective European identity formation base on the co-operation in the community would have poor prospects. However, if homogeneity is not considered an indispensable building block of a given community, the conclusion reached about the prospects of a European identity is different. There can be no doubt that collective identity formation in Europe must overcome the challenge inherent in a heterogeneous, multicultural community. In this thinking, a European identity must be constructed along civil and political lines. However, is this development a manifestation of the will of the European peoples? The answers to this question would certainly have great implications for the use of Union citizenship in the search for legitimacy.⁶²

Most people possess a variety of identities according to gender, professional occupation, personal relationship, political observance, special interests, and nationality. It is the later that is of interest in the present context. The feeling of identity that people have towards their nation generates a community feeling which in the modern state provides the legitimate basis of representative democracy, and leads people to be willing to make great economic as well as personal sacrifices. This is the most powerfully manifest in the fact that people are willing to pay taxes and go to war for their nation. National identity can, to an extent, be viewed as the glue that knits society together.

⁶¹ Commission of the European Communities, *Report on the Citizenship of the Union*, COM (93)702 final, Brussels, December 21, 1993, p. 1. Also on-line: “Report from the Commission on the Citizenship of the Union. COM (93) 702 final, 21 December 1993”. In *AEI University Library System. University of Pittsburgh*. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from: <http://aei.pitt.edu/5025/>

⁶² Camilla Hersom, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-43.

National identification has become the cultural and political norm, transcending other loyalties in scope and power.

In most cases, the feeling of national identity is linked to the citizenship of a particular state. At present, the European Community is neither a state, nor an ordinary international organization. By definition, a problem necessarily arises in the context of the European Union: the conception of citizenship – as characterized in the traditional nation state – cannot be transferred to the Community level, when it comes to the identity-feeling that people have towards their state and nationhood. On a European level, the notion of citizenship must necessarily include a variety of political and cultural identities, and common features must be nested in something different from the cultural homogeneity, which is the foundation of national identity.

A quotation drawn from an information booklet on the European Union affirm that: “Every one nowadays recognizes the sky-blue banner with 12 gold stars symbolizing European unification, which we see more and more often flying alongside national flags in front of public buildings. Is there anyone who can fail to be moved on hearing the Ode to Joy....? What Community national does not enjoy following the European Community sign in the airport arrival halls, and passing through simply by showing the uniform passport adopted in 1985?”⁶³ However, it would be wrong to assume that it is an eloquent characterization of most peoples’ feelings towards the EU. There is a stronger case for arguing that if the European Project is to succeed, a development of such feelings is both desirable and necessary. Another way the Community has tried to address the problem has been through the development of a notion of European Citizenship. The underlying idea is that by granting the peoples of Europe political and social rights in relation to the Union, the Community apparently suffers. Ideally, it would indeed make people feel European, fostering the group-identity that could glue the Community together, because it would work the same way as the national identity in the nation state.⁶⁴

Dealing with European identity implies referring on the one hand to a convergence of cultural values among European citizens, on the other to a capacity of tolerating cultural diversity. Considering the growing danger of international instability, the EU and its institutions constitute a precious intermediate instrument between the local, regional, national and global level. However, at the same time, there is an urgent need to build a European consciousness, to create a sense of community that can safeguard and nourish the basic elements of the European culture.

The analysis of the EB public opinion surveys indicates that the establishment of the European citizenship apparently has not stimulated a stronger European identity. Due to the difficult economic situation Europe has been faced with in the last few years, Europeans judge European integration in highly utilitarian terms (their main interest is to find a job). It is worth then to spread the idea of Europe in such a context? The answer will be yes. Defending and protecting diversities seem to be the only way for the EU to face, on the one hand, the challenges of the global world economy, on the other, the moves towards fragmentation and regionalization that might risk becoming separation

⁶³ P. Fontaine, *A Citizen's Europe*, Office of Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1991.

⁶⁴ Camilla Hersom, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-39.

and secession. The reason why public opinion is not aware of these constraints might be that we are experiencing the first phase of the Europeanization process.

A new kind of citizenship seems to emerge. That is neither national, nor cosmopolitan but is multiple in enabling the various identities that we all possess to be expressed, and our rights to be exercised. That, through an increasingly complex configuration of common institutions, states, national and transnational interest groups and voluntary associations, local or provincial authorities, regions, and alliances of regions. A multiple identity allows different identities to be expressed and different rights and duties to be exercised.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Stefania Panebianco, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.

III. THE SYMBOLS FUNCTION IN EXPRESSING CULTURAL ASPECTS AND COMMUNICATION

1. Defining the symbol concept

It has become commonplace that human beings are *homines symbolicae*. That we think and express our feelings and thoughts through symbols⁶⁶, and that culture is a symbolic construction. Yet the concept of symbol is not clearly defined and is understood in many different ways. Ernst Cassirer and Susanne Langer argued that men live in a symbolic world created by them, which mediates between nature and human mind. Symbolic thinking is the fundamental function of human consciousness and constitutes the basis of language, mythology, religion, art, and science. Then, people do not relate to nature directly, but do so through symbolic interpretations where symbols represent and stand for nature or any object of perception. Thus, the main issue seems to be the relation between symbols and that which is symbolized, what symbols stand for and how this relation is established. Many authors use the term symbol for specific form of representation, talking about signs as the basic unit of the cultural world. What condition must fulfill in order to become a cultural representation? It seems that first it must be an empirically perceived phenomenon, which does not necessarily mean that it has to be a material object. It may also be a sound, or a gesture, and so on. On the other hand, *significatum* (that is what signs stand for) can, but does not have to, be perceived. Signs can also represent thoughts, images, ideas, the real, potential or imaginary objects, beings and facts, as well as abstract concepts.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Communication element intended to simply represent or stand for a complex of person, object, group, or idea. Symbols may be presented graphically, as in the cross for Christianity, the red cross or crescent for the life-preserving agencies of Christian and Islamic countries; representationally, as in the human figures Marianne, John Bull, and Uncle Sam standing for France, England, and the United States respectively; they may involve letters, as in K for the chemical element potassium; or they may be assigned arbitrarily, as in the mathematical symbol ∞ for infinity or the symbol \$ for dollar.

("Symbol". In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from:

<http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9070715>)

⁶⁷ Ernst Cassirer, *An Essay of Man*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1994 and Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*, Mentor Book: The New American Library, New York, 1956 (1942), *apud* Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, p. 22.

Moreover, Mircea Eliade consider that symbolic thinking is consubstantial with human existence; it comes before language and discursive reason. The symbol reveals certain aspects of reality – the deepest aspects – which defy any others means of knowledge. Images, symbols, and myths are not irresponsible creation of the psyche; they respond to a need and fulfill a function, that of bringing to light the most hidden modalities of being. Consequently, the study of them enables us to reach a better understanding of man – of man as he is, before he has come to the terms with the conditions of history. In this context, it seems that history does not radically modify the structure of an immanent symbolism. History continually adds new meanings to it, but this not destroys the structure of the symbol. As an example, we take the symbol of the tree. Christianity has utilized, interpreted, and amplified this symbol. The symbol of the tree is the continuation into Christianity of an old and universal myth. However, the church is careful to draw attention to the innovations made by Christianity.⁶⁸

Various meanings of a symbol (particular versions that represent local histories) are linked together, interconnected in a system. For signs, in general it is clear that the basis of this link is always a certain agreement as to their meaning, among people who use the signs, that is, a consensus about what they represent. Thus, signs are essentially conventional even if there are some natural grounds for choosing a particular sound or object for representation of a particular idea or another object. The contradictions one can discover between the various particular versions are in most cases only apparent; they are resolved as soon as we consider the symbolism as a whole and discern its structure. Each new valorization of an archetypal image crowns and consummates the earlier ones: the salvation revealed by the Cross does not annul the pre Christian values of the Tree of the World, that pre-eminent symbol of the total renovation; on the contrary, the Cross comes to complete all its earlier valences and meanings. Let us observe, once more, that this new valorization, brought about by the identification of the Cosmic Tree with the Cross, took place in history and through a historical event – the Passion of Christ.⁶⁹

However, images, archetypes, and symbols are variously lived and valued; and the product of this multiple realizations of them is largely constitutive of the different “cultural styles” of life. Although, regarded as historical formations, these cultures are no longer interchangeable, being already fixed in their own styles, they are still comparable upon the plane of imagery and symbolism. It is just this perennial and universal quality of the archetypes that saves cultures in the last resort, and renders possible a philosophy of culture that is more than a morphology or history of styles. All culture is a fall into history, and is, for the same reason, limited. Let no one be misleading by the incomparable beauty, nobility, and perfection of Greek culture; even this does not make it universally valid as a historical phenomenon. Try, for instance, to reveal the Greek culture to an African or to an Indonesian; the admirable Greek style it is not what they will understand; it is the Images that the African or Indonesian will rediscover in classical statuary or literature. What is, for an Occidental, beautiful and true in the historic manifestation of antique culture has no value for an Oceanian; for any culture, is limited by its manifestation in the structures and styles conditioned by history. Nevertheless, the images, which precede and inform cultures, remain eternally alive and universally

⁶⁸Mircea Eliade, *Images and Symbols. Studies in Religious Symbolism*. Translated by Philip Mairet, A Search Book: Sheed and Ward, New York, 1969, p. 10-13.

⁶⁹ Ibid, p.161-164.

accessible. In case we do not manage to grasp the simple matter of fact, there is no hope of entering into any useful dialogue with a non-European. In what concern the Europeans, there are not only the common symbols and images that help them to open a useful dialog but also a common way to explain and understand spiritual and cultural matters, given by an interchangeable history and even religion.

After all, it is the presence of the images and symbols that keeps the cultures “open”: starting from no matter what culture, the Australian no less than the Athenian, the “limit-situation” of man are fully revealed, owing to the symbols that sustain those cultures. If we neglect this unique spiritual foundation of the various cultural styles, the philosophy of culture will be condemned to remain no more than morphological and historical study, without any validity for the human condition as such. If the images were not at the same time, an “opening-out” into the transcendent, one would ultimately become suffocated in any culture, however great and admirable one might believe it to be. The symbol will play in the European case the linking role between different cultures. For the common symbols and images, Europe found out largely accessible interpretation, so all the European could understand and believe in.

The images provide openings into a trans-historical world. That is by no means their least value: thanks to them, the different histories can intercommunicate. Much has been said about the unification of Europe by Christianity: and is never better attested than when we see how Christianity coordinated the popular religious traditions. It was by means of Christian hagiography that the local cults – from Thrace to Scandinavia – were brought under a common dominator. By the fact of the Christianization, the Gods and the sacred places of the whole Europe not only received common names but also rediscovered, in a sense, their own archetypes, and therefore their universal valences. From having been regional and provincial, the popular mythology became ecumenical. It is, above all, through the creation of a new mythological language common to all the populations who remained attached to their soil – and therefore in the greater danger of becoming insulated in their own ancestral traditions – that the civilizing mission of Christianity has been so remarkable. For, by Christianising the ancient European religious heritage, it not only purified the latter, but also took up, into the new spiritual dispensation of humankind, all that deserved to be saved of the old practices, beliefs, and hopes of pre-Christian man. The Christianization of the peasant level of the Europe was effected thanks above all to the images: everywhere they were rediscovered, and had only to be revalorized, reintegrated, and given new names. The same role should have the European Images, to reveal common valences that should help Europeans to accept the unity in the name of peace and prosperity. We can see thus the importance of symbols for a united Europe, and what function it has in justifying, at the level of the common people, a natural communication between opened societies.

The symbolism adds a new value to an object or an activity without any prejudice whatever to its own immediate value. In application to objects or actions, symbolism renders them “open”; symbolic thinking “breaks open” the immediate reality without any minimizing or undervaluing of it: in such a perspective this is not a closed Universe, no object exists for itself in isolation; everything is held together by a compact system of correspondences and likenesses. The man becomes conscious of himself in an open world that is rich in meaning. Thus, our attention must be drawn to the essential function of signs, which is communication. Whatever other functions sign and symbol may fulfill, it

is clear that they make it possible for human individuals to send and receive messages, and therefore to establish relations between people and consequently make possible all kinds of human groupings and cultural constructions.⁷⁰

A similar meaning of the symbols notion is that represented by C. G. Jung. For him the most fundamental level of human psychological structure consists of archetypes, the basic principles that are shared by all humankind, unconscious, but shaping human perception, and thoughts. In such a view, symbols are natural, because they are universal and common to all people, and represent objectives ideas, the basis of human mentality.

2. A Theoretical Distinction between Signs and Symbols

A distinction between a sign and a symbol we think it is necessary to be made, in order to understand better the function of the symbols in the construction of a European identity. A signal is a sign where there is an intrinsic prior relationship between two elements – a representing, and a represented – because they belong to the same cultural context. For example, given the context of European political traditions in which the principal item of the ruling monarch's regalia was a crown, a crown is a sign for sovereignty. This relationship can be described as “a part which stands for a whole”. In this example, a crown is a part of the whole system of objects, concepts, and ideas of traditional political system of monarchy. Within this system of conceptual relation and associations, a part evokes, refers to, and expresses the whole (the idea of sovereignty, but also a particular system of political and social organization).

In turn, a signum is a symbol when there is no intrinsic prior relationship between the two elements; that is to say, they belong to different cultural context. For example, where a crown is used as a trademark for a brand of beer it is a symbol and not a sign. There is no prior intrinsic relationship. Crowns and beer come from different contexts. Such a relation is a type of metaphor and one element resemble the other, while belonging to a different context or it is interpreted as similar or parallel to it. So the two can be seen as corresponding and homologous to one to another within their respective contexts (as a crown indicates the superior position of a monarch within the system of social relation, so the beer with a crown on its label stands in a superior position to all others beers).⁷¹

Symbolic representation consists in a relation between three elements: concept in mind, sense image, and object or event in the external world. The relationship between the concept and the image is intrinsic. However, the relation between the image and the object in the external world is always arbitrary, at least at some extent. A symbolizing element, an object, or event in the external world brings to mind a corresponding sense image, which in turn is linked with a concept in mind. Cultural convention and

⁷⁰Ibid, p. 173-178.

⁷¹ Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 24-26.

experience in symbolic communication develop the automatic relationship between these elements, but these relations are not identical. An object, or an event in the external world is connected with a sense image by cultural convention, and this relation is always arbitrary and metaphoric. If we hear a sound we can recognize it, that is, interpret it according to a particular cultural convention, and linked it to the image of an object or idea, which we use to associate with this sound. Nevertheless, to what extent do social conventions determine the meaning of symbols and how far does the meaning depend on the intrinsic characteristics of something, which represent something else? There is little doubt that there are some objects, sound, or gestures, which are somehow predisposed by their nature to represent particular ideas or feelings. If it is true, it also means that such symbols, if we agree that they exist, should come from those aspects of human experience that are both important and universal. In this case, the same object (a universal one), symbolize different ideas and emotions, and the particular meaning depends on the context within which the symbol is used. However, it also seems that the very fact of the ambiguity of natural symbols determines their usefulness for expression and communication. Even if certain objects are predisposed to play a particular role in the symbolic world, it is cultural convention, which in the last instance determines their meaning. It also draws our attention to the issue of contextually of symbols.

The basic differences between a sign and a symbol consist in the fact that in a sign both elements of signifying relation (the signifying and the signified) belong to the same context, are parts of the same conceptual system. While in a symbol, they belong to a different context and therefore the act of representation and interpretation requires metaphoric transformation of one context into another. However, we must take into account the features, which we traditionally associate with symbolic representation as a particular kind of signifying.⁷²

We also must consider that interpretation and use of symbols involves emotion. Most every day cultural communication based on signs and conventional meanings is relatively emotionally neutral. We exchange signs without emotional involvement. This applies to most of communication in natural language, written messages, numerous sounds, words, pictures and gesture, which organize our everyday life. However, when it comes to artistic or religious experience this neutrality seems out of place. One of the main differences between interpretation of a newspaper and a poem is that the latter requires readiness for emotional involvement. Art is supposed to stir our feelings and that is what we need it. However, emotion is only one part of the complex result of perception of the artistic and religious message. In religion, as in art, and perhaps in other cultural subsystems as well, symbols inspire our thoughts.

This means that symbolic communication and the interpretation of symbols do not consist only in translating them according to cultural convention. Such a translation is sufficient in most cultural communication when we just refer a perceived sign to a particular cultural language, to a system of conventional relations between signifying and signified elements; and when a particular entry in dictionary is found, the message is understood and this part of communication ends. The whole problem in interpretation lies in finding out what this particular sign means in this context, and therefore cultural

⁷² Edmund R. Leach, *Culture and Communication*, Cambridge University Press, 1976, *apud* Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 26-27.

training teaches numerous vocabularies and grammars according to which messages are interpreted. In art and religion, however, it is not enough. The sense of artistic and religious communication reaches far beyond mere translation. We are not satisfied with ascertaining that such and such object in a temple signifies a particular idea. That is, we may be satisfied with as long as we are mere observers and do not participate in the religious ceremony. Nevertheless, if we participate, if we are ourselves believers, then a fixed conventional cultural meaning of a particular object, icon, sound, or gesture is not the final point but just the beginning of our perception and interpretation.

A symbol, then, is a very special category of sign intriguing, thought-provoking, stirring emotions, opaque, and ambiguous. It is conventional in the sense that its meaning is rooted in tradition, agreed upon in numerous cultural texts, and is interpreted according to culturally established meaning. However, the rules of interpretations of symbols are different from those, which regulate our use of signs. Even if it is possible to construct dictionaries of symbols, and many such sets exist, the relation between signifying and signified are very ambiguous and sometimes contradictory, unclear, and unequivocal. It is so, because of their special function of inspiring thoughts and feelings. Artistic and religious experiences are very individual, subtle, and difficult to describe, even if they are undoubtedly culturally determined and conventionally shaped.

Symbols are not only arbitrary signs, but also components of the traditions, ideas, and events, which they represent. Take as examples the crown and the cross. It is not only the result of arbitrary decision that the crown is now regarded as the symbol of superiority; it just happened that the rulers of our culture used to decorate their heads with crowns as a sign of their position. Metaphorically, and by analogy, the same object is now used as a symbol of superiority of any kind. It is inconceivable that people nowadays could decide to change this symbol and declare that from now onwards a crown will symbolize something else. No one would accept such a decision, because a crown is associated in our tradition with a particular meaning. Therefore, in the case of symbols, cultural convention does not mean an arbitrary choice as in the case of many others signs used in our every day life, but rather the recognition of tradition and a choice from a set of objects which that contains.

Cultural tradition and social processes determine the meaning of symbols and often lead to differences in conventions between social groups belonging to the same cultural area. For example, in Britain a crown is a symbol of sovereignty and not a symbol of it because it belongs to the same context as the political system, actually decorating the head of the present monarch. A crown may, however, be a symbol of political principles, as it is in Poland where there is no monarchy and no political system of which a crown could be a part, but a strong ideology of political sovereignty symbolized by a crown. A crown, in Poland, being a part of the Polish national emblem used in the context of political opposition, in contradiction to the crownless official emblem, symbolizes the idea of independence and sovereignty. The appearance of a crown in a political context is supposed to convey the message that the crownless emblem symbolizes dependency and the lack of sovereignty, while the crown on the emblem changes it into a symbol of an independent state; exactly as in past centuries, it changed the person who wore it into the sovereign ruler.⁷³

⁷³ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, 1993, pp. 28-32.

The traditional roots of symbols and the fact that they are not merely signs but integral parts of correlates of what they symbolize does not mean that they do not change. They are not constant but they change, not as the result of arbitrary decision but only as a part of the cultural process, which forms the whole cultural complex which involves a particular symbol. Let us take the example of the cross. It is a symbol of Christianity, of complex ideas and emotions and its meaning is rooted in the fact that Jesus Christ died on the cross. It is inconceivable that anybody, even the highest religious authority, would declare that from now on the cross would not be the symbol of Christianity, but would be replaced by, say, a square. Jesus Christ died on a cross and not on a square, and this fact cannot be changed by anybody's decision. However, as we know, various periods of development of Christianity have used as their symbols different shapes of the cross and, even now, crosses throughout Christianity are not the same. The symbol changed together with the religion with it symbolizes and, although conventional, has a life of its own, is born, lives, and dies but is not entirely dependent on arbitrary decision.

The consequence of the special status of the symbol as part of the symbolized is that a symbol represents something, which essentially cannot otherwise be represented. In complicated and subtle aesthetic and religious experience, as well as in feelings and thoughts, which we experience when other high values are involved, for instance, those connected with love, family, group identity, moral issues, and the like, ideas and emotions cannot usually be fully described in non-symbolic discourse. Everyday language is not capable of expressing deep emotions and complicated feelings, associations and thoughts. They can be reached only through symbols, through metaphor and analogy. Signified ideas cannot be perceived or communicated directly, independently of symbols. Symbols are therefore indispensable and necessary for the most important aspects of cultural expression and communication.

3. The Symbols Functions

What are the functions of symbols, which make them such an indispensable and essential component of culture? Raymond Firth⁷⁴ mentions four of them: expression, communication, knowledge, and control.

Symbols as expression. This function of symbols is above all a domain of art, but it also plays an important role in religion and politics. In all contexts where emotions are aroused, stimulated, and directed, whether negative or positive, individual or collective,

⁷⁴ Raymond Firth, *Tikopia, Ritual, and Belief*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1967, *apud* Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 34-35.

there are symbols, which are used to express them. Victor Turner⁷⁵ argues that symbols have two poles, two aspects: ideological and emotional. The former represents and evokes ideas and appeals to consciousness, while the latter stirs emotions and therefore saturates the other, ideological aspect with feelings. On the other hand, the ideological role of symbol provides emotions with content and values. This is why symbolic texts are rarely emotionally neutral. They cannot be perceived and interpreted objectively, that is, without involvement. Emotions are their intrinsic part and this is why symbols are so useful for all kinds of ideological communication.

Symbols as communication. The part in which we are the most interested in what concern the role of the European symbols. This is the major and most obvious function of symbols. As I have mentioned before, they are necessary because the ideas and emotions which, they represent cannot be represented, perceived and communicated in a different, nonsymbolic way. Complex ideas, abstract values, subtle emotional associations when communicated in a nonsymbolic common language which require very long, complicated and difficult verbalization, would be incomprehensible for at least most of the people to whom the message is addressed. Symbols, on the contrary, communicate them in a synthetic, short way, appealing directly to the emotions and semiconscious associations, and avoid intellectual elaboration. Symbols are therefore a very quick and efficient means of communication. They have also another quality that facilitates communication enormously, namely, they often contain high aesthetic value. Symbols are ceremonial, attractive, and appeal to the sense of beauty. A message transmitted in such a festive and aesthetically pleasant way is readily received and accepted, because not only it is sent in an attractive form, but also since its ceremonial character gives the impression that its content is of a special importance and value.⁷⁶

Symbolic communication, apart from conveying meanings, confirming values and ideas and enriching them with emotions, has also another, very practical function, namely, it stimulates action. By stirring emotions and directing them round certain ideas and values, a symbolic message can push and direct people to action in pursuit of particular goals or, as often in the political context, against other people. This is why symbols are always present in politics. Abner Cohen⁷⁷, who is particularly concerned with the symbolism of power, not surprisingly included this aspect in this definition of symbol: he writes that symbols are objects, acts, concepts, or linguistic formations that stand ambiguously for a multiplicity of disparate meanings, evoke sentiments and emotions and impel men to action. In such a view, symbols are not only means of communication for ideas but also important factors in social action. Therefore, symbols are not merely symbolic, in the sense of being the opposite of real life. They are real life and they may become vital aspects of social process.

Symbols in knowledge: Symbols in this function help to organize concept and ideas in a concrete form, to perceive more clearly, what is difficult to grasp. Symbols reveal certain aspects of reality, the deepest aspects that defy any other means of knowledge. A conceptual, symbolically expressed model of the world serves as the

⁷⁵ Victor Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1967, *apud* Zdzisław Mach, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 34-35.

⁷⁶ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-35.

⁷⁷ Abner Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

general framework in which people organize their perception of the natural and social environment and which determines their action. Such a general pattern, which involves complex ideas and emotions related to particular objects of perceptions, social groups, metaphysical beings, and ideas, concepts of identity and the like, can be constructed only with symbols due to the particular capacity of symbols to represent what cannot be represented in nonsymbolic discourse.

Symbols in social control: This is another crucial function of symbols – that refers to power structure and social order. This function makes symbols present in political events whenever social conflict is expressed or solved and whenever social identity is confirmed. What is of primary importance here is the role of symbols as vehicles, which convey values. Cultural values, although a fundamental component of the cultural system, do not exist in any material form outside symbolic texts. They can be conceived and communicated only through symbols. Therefore, the moral and ideological fundaments of social life depend on the symbolic communication. Symbols express moral principles, religious beliefs, justify social order, as may be used for reference and support when conduct is called into question. Invoking a symbol for justification such as Bible, the Koran, the memory of a dead parent, can be a powerful means of affecting someone else's behavior. However, there is also the other type of control: when a symbol is under the direct authority of, or capable of being manipulated by, the person wishing to affect the behavior of others. This is the case in the political context in particular, when select and combine symbols to achieve a desired state of people's minds; to appeal to values, to refer to ideas, to stir emotions and stimulate action.

Symbolic forms like rituals, ceremonies, myths, festivities, art, literature, are the way in which a group, a community, a state, or, in our case, a reunion of states organizes the intellectual and emotional framework of its members' lives, confirming its value-system, social norms, and goals, and legitimizing social order. In such a way, group identity is created, maintained, and transformed together with the identity of other groups with which one's own group has relations. In this way also, control of the people is executed by organizing their experience, by attaching emotional, ideological, and moral values to their thoughts and actions, and by classifying and judging their behavior according to the group's normative system. Social order, the way the society is organized in a structure, is expressed and above all justified symbolically by reference to supreme values, like acts of God, the will of the people, the vote of the majority, an objective historical law, and so forth. Since these concepts and, most importantly, the idea of their superior value as a principle in which society is, or should be, organized are of a very abstract nature, symbols are necessary as a means through which they can be expressed and communicated.⁷⁸

Most anthropological monographs describe the vital role played by various symbolic forms in justification and legitimization of the existing social structure, kinship relations, economic interdependence, and balance of power. Symbols convey norms and values and present them in a ceremonial and sacred form, saturate them with emotions and thus impose them upon people in an aura of obviousness and inevitability. The status quo is described symbolically as a natural state of affairs, the result of God's will or the objective laws of history, as something sacred, to change which is so much beyond human ability that it cannot even be considered. As Cohen has pointed out, there can be

⁷⁸ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, p.36- 38.

no social order without the mystification of symbolism. In the socialist societies, these ways were of a large use. Emblems, slogans, banners, mass parades, titles, patriotic music and sounds and, inevitably, the “world view” of dialectic materialism – these and a host of other symbols of all sorts play their part in the maintenance of the political order.

Within a system of unequal balances of power between social groups, the process of mutual symbolic identification assumes a character of maintaining and legitimizing the status quo through the creation of identity of all participants of a social context. Therefore, through symbolic identification the legitimization of the social order can be achieved and maintained. However, the balance of power between groups within a system changes and so do the identities. In this process, symbolic forms play a double function. On the one hand, they justify, express, and communicate change, and on the other, they are active factors in it. Symbolic structures have a reputation of being conservative factors. Indeed, there are many instances when they do not change immediately hand in hand with changes in other aspects of social life, and persist unchanged despite the transformation of political or economic systems. The very concept of tradition, which is the essence of customs, rituals, or religion, implies continuity rather than radical change. However, when change is in process within a system, a party which advocates and implements changes uses symbolic forms in order to justify the introduction of new norms and values and the transformation of the balance of power.

Although a regime may come to office and maintain itself for some time purely by force, its stability and continuity are achieved mainly through the symbolism of authority which it manipulates. This is the case with European Union; the development and continuity of its principles, politics and activities depends merely on the population sustainability, which is very sensible when is about its identity and cultural continuity. The stability and continuity of the regime are made possible through the complex system of symbolism, which gives it legitimacy by representing it ultimately as a natural part of the celestial order. Through the mystification, which it creates symbolism, makes it possible for the social order to survive the disruptive processes created within it by the inevitable areas of conflicting values and principles.

The word mystification means that the worldview is the product of the symbolic interpretation and communication of reality, the interpretation of which is constructed, imposed, and accepted and has become reality itself as far as human perception and subsequent action go. Here again we see that a symbolic model of the world replaces for human beings the real world of objective facts and events, and that people react according to their perception and understanding of the relations between groups and not on the basis of the objective balance between them. A group interested in changing the symbolic model of the world held by other participants of a social system uses symbolic forms to create a reality consistent with the desired state of affairs. Symbols present new ideas and values and combine them within new contexts, fill them with emotions and produce the symbolic reality, their interpretation of the world which, when accepted, becomes part of the world and thus the basis of perception and action. In such a way, symbols become active factors in social change (in our case is about changing the perception of the national identity as the only identity that every citizen should have).⁷⁹

Every political group must have symbols, which serve to identify it and members and represent values, which it pursues. When a political group gains power, its symbols

⁷⁹ Ibid, pp. 48-51.

join the symbolic structure of the state. In contemporary nation states, there usually exists a standard set of national symbols⁸⁰ (emblem, flag, and national anthem) which are officially recognized, unambiguously defined, and protected by law. A change of the political system or of political leadership usually brings with it a change of these symbols. Not only have nearly all communist countries adopted new symbols, but also the same happened in France after the Revolution and in Italy and Germany after the World War II. When democratic systems were introduced in the majority of European countries, the old symbols that had come from the ancestral signs of the monarchs were discarded. In the European Union case, it is not about a changing of the old symbols, because the states national characteristics remain untouched. However, as a political organization, it also needs to gain the sustainability of the population, and here the role of the symbols is irreplaceable. Thus, such symbols are created, in addition to the national ones, in respect to the states culture and values.

Radical change in a political system, like revolution, generally brings changes in the symbolic system of a state, which consist in the removal of symbols of the old establishment and the introduction of those, which represent the new ideology and the new political group, which took over. At the same time, new political elites usually claim some continuation of what they regard as good, just, and progressive elements of the nations past and refer to them in the construction of the new symbolic structure of the state. Old symbols are often revived in new contexts and meanings. The idea behind such symbolic manipulation is to identify the new state with the nation and or, at least, with

⁸⁰ National symbols are symbols of any entity considering itself and manifesting itself to the world as a national community – namely sovereign states, but also nations and countries in a state of colonial or other dependence, (con)federal integration, or even an ethno cultural community considered a 'nationality' despite the absence of political autonomy. National symbols intend to unite people by creating visual, verbal, or iconic representations of the national people, values, goals, or history. These symbols are often rallied around as part of celebrations of patriotism or aspiring nationalism (such as independence, autonomy, or separation movements) and are designed to be inclusive and representative of all the peoples of the national community.

The common official national symbols are: the flag of a nation-state; the coat of arms; seal (device) and stamp of the land and/or ruling dynasty, the associated device and/or motto can also be use separately. The national colors often derived from the above; emblematic animals and plants/flowers, whether related to the above or not, either the above or more abstract symbols, especially crosses, national anthems, royal and imperial hymns. Alongside such official hymn(s) custom may also recognize the national symbol value of very popular songs, such as, the office of the Head of State, and in case of a monarchy (often to some extent even after its political elimination) certain of its regalia, such as crown jewels, the Father of the Nation and other founding fathers, the Mother of the Nation and other founding mothers. The colors of the European Union flag are classified as supranational colors, near other Organization as African Union, and United Nations.

Common unofficial national symbols are: national myths about the country's history or founding, national epics, national dishes, national dress - this can have a more official character in the case of court dress or military uniforms, national holiday – 9 May for the European Union, national instrument, nationalism (music), national pastimes, folk dances, folk hero, folk instrument, folk music, culture hero, tricksters, monuments and clichés associated with tourism, national personifications, various other national emblems, including special plants, animals and objects associated with the nation, in a nation largely stamped by a particular religion, some of its most revered symbols may be adopted as national symbols (occasionally even officially), e.g. the patron saint or equivalent deity, a major pilgrimage site, church or temple.

(“National Symbols”. In *Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*, Retrieved November 10, 2006, from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_symbols)

those segments and social forces of the nation whose support is sufficiently important to the new ruling elite. Unification of national and political identity is vital for the legitimization of any power elite and all efforts are made to achieve that, as well as promoting loyalty to the state and recognition of it as the representative and protector of the nation, its tradition, and identity. Those who have power in order to secure and maintain their leading position construct nationalism as symbolic worldview and ideological interpretation of social reality. This seems to be a wide spread, one may even say a universal phenomenon characteristic of all cultures and social systems. Very characteristic of this is the process of seizure of traditional rituals like rite of passage, or cyclical calendars events. All societies observe traditional festive days and holydays, which are rooted in religion and folk customs, and the identity of communities at local, regional, and national level, is expressed and defined partly through these rituals. Suppression of them, or the creation of new ones on different days, results in emphasizing differences between the old and the new social order, which is sometimes one or the objectives of the new political elite. However, these steps would also express discontinuity of the tradition and cast doubts on the new establishment's link with the community of nation; this would have very negative consequences for the legitimization of the power elite.⁸¹

We intended to throw some light on the process of the formation and transformation of identity and the role of symbols and symbolic culture in this process. We have tried to show the relation between the symbolic construction of identity and the structure of power, which is the fundamental component of the social structure. By studying the European Union symbols, in this paper we intend to show how the new Europe is building its identity in the process of interaction, identification, and creation of symbolic images. Various aspects of this process: political, economical, cultural, national, territorial, were just dimensions of basically the same social phenomenon: social assuming of an European identity through meaningful action.

Owing to their symbolic complexity and dynamic character, rituals are particularly suitable for expressing identity and inter-states relations. Thus, symbolic actions are active factors of social change, contributing to transformation of society through reconstruction of symbolic world views and through creating within spatial and temporal limits of ritual, the new world.

Ethnic and national identity does not disappear in the course of development of contemporary civilization. The mutual interdependence of groups all over the world, equality of knowledge, education, and access to technology and scientific invention increase, while simultaneously the tendency towards preservation, protection and autonomous development of group's unique identity also increase and leads to new-nationalism and new-ethnicity. Moreover, symbolic forms create identity and are active elements in social problems; they do not only express differences and power ration, but also shape relations through the emotional and ideological construction of images.

⁸¹Ibid, pp. 105-107.

IV. EU SYMBOLS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL TREATY

Every social group and every organised political society assigns itself the symbols (or signs) that it needs to identify, distinguish, and represent it. The term 'symbol' comes from the Greek 'συμβάλλω' (to bring together, to cause to coincide) which gives 'σύμβολον', made up of 'σύν' (together) and 'βάλλω' (throw). Literally, it is the token of recognition formed by the severed part of a broken wooden, ceramic, or metal object, which fits the remainder perfectly. A symbol, therefore, acts as a means of identification or sign of recognition between people or between the members of a social group.

Nowadays, a symbol is usually taken to be a sign which, when perceived, reflects something else, to which it is linked by an ontological or merely conventional relationship, and may in some ways make it intuitive or stand in for it. In other words, when an image, or a set of letters (acronym), a word, or a phrase, a sound, or a musical melody has an evocative meaning, it is a symbol. The meaning of whatever the symbol portrays therefore has to be recognized in order to be able to evoke something intangible in the mind of the person looking at, hearing, or using the symbol. A symbol generally portrays, therefore, a sign, an image, or a subject, which embodies another with which it is connected.

The purpose of the political symbols of the State (flag, emblem, motto, anthem, currency, national public holiday) is obviously to provide an identity. The national identity is crystallized by making it tangible; in other words, it is codified the subjective nature of the nation. The nation is in practice an invisible concept and therefore has to be symbolized if it is to be seen and acclaimed, if it is to be loved. It is precisely in this way that the symbol provides identity: it shows citizens what is theirs and encourages them to be loyal to the sign representing the nation. The use of symbols consequently has a unifying and federating power. When they sing the same anthem, honor the same flag, use the same currency, or celebrate the same public holiday, citizens are all sharing a common sentiment. Every political symbol is therefore a tangible sign of identity, which codifies the shared values represented by the symbol and which is generally detailed in a constitution.

The purpose of political symbols is to provide an identity for the European Union as well as for its Member States. They are the external signs of that constitutional patriotism through which European citizens, aware of their belonging, can be influenced to leave aside their differences and act in the common public good and, therefore, to perceive the European Union as their home. Understood in this way, symbols may help to consolidate the fledgling European demos. EU treaty drafter Valéry Giscard d'Estaing

made no secret of giving the new constitution a symbolic element to engage Europe's often distantly regarded institutions with citizens.⁸²

They should undoubtedly not do so in opposition to the national demois but as a synthesis of the specific and shared values of a highly integrated area such as the European Union. The Community methods and participative democracy launched by the Constitutional Treaty could help the European Union to emerge as a new post-national political system based precisely on shared values where the national interest coincides with the European interest. The political symbols such as the flag, the anthem, the motto, the currency and Europe Day may therefore help, by creating emotive images and rites, even subliminally, to make the European Union more legitimate in the eyes of its citizens and help them to identify with the plan for a common destiny. In other words, they help to construct a political identity, where a set of values which identify us as belonging to the same community are felt to be binding.

"There are no ideals, however exalted in nature, which can afford to do without a symbol". These are the opening words of a memorandum on the European flag drawn up by the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe in 1951. (Appendix A.6) Since the end of the First World War, private individuals and movements advocating the political organization of Europe began to acquire emblems, as was the case for the Pan European Union founded by Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi and for the European Movement.

When the Council of Europe — the first European organization with a political agenda — was established in 1949, the question of acquiring an official emblem soon arose. In 1984, at the European Council of Fontainebleau (see Appendix A.1), an ad-hoc Committee was set up to address issues relating to the people's Europe. Then the Adonnino Committee published two reports concerning the enlargement of economic rights and the establishment of new rights to bring Europe closer to the citizens. The Committee put forward proposal on rights on citizens, culture, youth exchange, and health, and social security, free movement of people, town twinning, and symbols of EC identity. So the European passport, the European flag, the European anthem, which are elements of the citizenship traditionally linked to nation-states, were adopted in order to increase the awareness of the EC (European Community) as a new political actor and foster the feeling of belonging to the Community among European citizens.⁸³ Moreover, the development of communications between Europeans can be helpful in developing a mutual understanding. In this view mobility programs such as Erasmus, Comett, Lingua and Petra, now Socrates and Leonardo, have financed the mobility of a great number of students and workers since 1987 and proved to be successful in increasing public opinion awareness of movement rights.⁸⁴

These symbols, adopted by the organization that represented "Greater Europe", also became those of "Small Europe". It was at the Milan European Council held in June 1985 (see Appendix A.2) that the Heads of State or Government of the Ten approved the adoption of these symbols as the official emblems of the European Communities. They also agreed to establish Europe Day. The adoption of a motto and a common currency came later.

⁸² "Symbols Clash". In *European Politics and Policy*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from: <http://www.eupolitix.com/EN/News/200311/5c34d425-65f2-45c4-bc29-735573dc2d8d.htm>

⁸³ Stefania Panebianco, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁸⁴ Neumann, I. B., *op. cit.*, p. 40.

However, the founding treaties of the European Communities and the European Union do not contain any provisions on the flag, the motto, the anthem, or Europe Day. As the treaties are silent, the institutions have had to use their powers of self-organization to adopt those measures needed to ensure the functioning of the Communities and the Union and pursue the objectives that the treaties have assigned to the institutions. If a body is to pursue its objectives it may well need to be provided with symbols able to identify it as an organization with autonomy, capacity and legal personality.

Only in 2004, the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe recognized all of these as official symbols of the European Union. By this way, there were established a number of symbols of the European Union that are important, since they enable Europeans to identify more with Europe. Among the Union's symbols mentioned in Article I-8 of the Constitutional Treaty⁸⁵, the flag with 12 golden stars on a blue background, the Ode to Joy from Beethoven's Ninth Symphony (symbols that the Community took over from the Council of Europe), and 9 May as Europe Day are already part of the tradition of the Community and the Union. But have never been set out in provisions of primary law; the euro is the common currency of those Member States taking part, without derogations, in the third phase of European Economic and Monetary Union. Over and above their constitutionalisation, the motto therefore seems to be the only new symbol introduced by the Constitutional Treaty.

Article I-8 of the Constitutional Treaty, headed *The symbols of the Union*, provides the symbols with a sound basis. Their inclusion in the Constitution obviously makes the provisions on them inflexible. If it were wished, for instance, to change the design of the flag or the music of the anthem or the date of Europe Day, the revision procedure set out in this Treaty would have to be used. It should nevertheless be borne in mind that Article I-8, like similar provisions in some national constitutions, in no way makes the symbols, and the flag in particular, into constitutionally protected legal property. In the Union's legal order, as in domestic laws, the symbols will have to be protected by implementing provisions to be adopted by the Union and enforced by the Member States. Even if the Union did not act, the Member States would nevertheless have to provide for effective protection of the symbols, especially the flag, in their own areas of jurisdiction. In addition, that should be done under the duty of constitutional cooperation set out in Article I-5 of the Constitutional Treaty, and already incumbent upon them under Article 10 (formerly 5) of the EC Treaty, which sanctions the general principle of loyal cooperation between the Member States and the European Community. Under this principle, the Member States must in practice comply with measures decided by the Community institutions when exercising their power of self-organization and, in particular, allow the European flag to be flown from their buildings.

⁸⁵ "Article I-8

The symbols of the Union

The flag of the Union shall be a circle of twelve golden stars on a blue background.

The anthem of the Union shall be based on the 'Ode to Joy' from the Ninth Symphony by Ludwig van Beethoven.

The motto of the Union shall be: 'United in diversity'.

The currency of the Union shall be the euro.

Europe day shall be celebrated on 9 May throughout the Union."

("A Constitution for Europe". In *Europa*. Retrieved October 29, 2006, from:
http://europa.eu/constitution/en/1stoc1_en.htm)

Beyond a simple enumeration, we can add that the European flag is the symbol not only of the European Union but also of Europe's unity and identity in a wider sense. The circle of gold stars represents solidarity and harmony between the peoples of Europe. The number of stars has nothing to do with the number of Member States. There are twelve stars because the number twelve is traditionally the symbol of perfection, completeness, and unity. The flag will therefore remain unchanged regardless of future EU enlargements.

The European anthem comes from the Ninth Symphony composed in 1823 by Ludwig van Beethoven. For the final movement of this symphony, Beethoven set to music the "Ode to Joy" written in 1785 by Friedrich von Schiller. This poem expresses Schiller's idealistic vision of humanity in which all men are brothers – a vision Beethoven shared.

The European motto: "United in diversity" was chosen through a competition organized by a group of European citizens. Some 80 000 young Europeans aged between 10 and 20 submitted suggestions.

A number of countries have chosen to replace their national currency with a single European currency, the euro. So far, the countries which have done so are Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain.

On 9 May 1950, the French Foreign Affairs Minister, Robert Schuman, presented his proposal for the creation of an organized Europe based on the pooling of coal and steel production, chiefly in order to avoid the belligerent countries of Europe from ever going to war with each other again. This proposal, known as the *Schuman Declaration*, is considered to be the beginning of the creation of what is now the European Union. The 9th of May is now known as "Europe Day". It is the occasion for activities and festivities that bring Europe closer to its citizens and the peoples of the Union closer to one another.⁸⁶

The role of the symbols in forging awareness and an identity of the European Union as a political community is therefore crucial. It is in practice true that most of the basic categories and concepts relating to European integration and, in particular, those breathing life into the notion of belonging, are represented by symbols which make the very notion of citizenship tangible, real and comprehensive. Leaving aside the symbols listed in the Constitution, there are many other symbols not discussed here like, that maybe would be further considered: Europe's buildings, the European passport, vehicle number plates, cities of culture, etc.

The symbols therefore, far from playing a 'cosmetic' function, secondary in importance to the function of the four freedoms or of Community policies, express the deep-seated values of the European Union. They are also able to mobilize the sentiments of European public opinion. They do not just breathe life into the notion of belonging, but help actively to support it, thereby helping the fledgling European demos to settle.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ "A Constitution for Europe". In *Europa*. Retrieved November 4, 2006, from: http://europa.eu/constitution/download/brochure_160904_en.pdf

⁸⁷ Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union." Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

1. The European Union Flag

Flags and their symbolic meaning can be first found at the level of the national states. Considering that European Flag follows in scope and significance this model, we should start with a description of the states flags, in order to understand better what role have such a symbol in fostering a European identity.

The colors and designs of national flags are usually not arbitrarily selected but rather stem from the history, culture, or religion of the particular country. Many flags can be traced to a common origin, and such “flag families” are often linked both by common traditions and by geography. The oldest European flags still in use are those that display the Christian cross, which was first extensively used in the Crusades. In addition to the British flag, the Union Jack (*q.v.*), flags with crosses are used by Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Greece, and Switzerland. Following the introduction of heraldry into Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries, European royalty adopted coats of arms that soon became the basis of their flags. These heraldic devices have largely disappeared from modern national flags, but the colors used in the coats of arms are still the colors of the flags of Poland, Belgium, Germany, Spain, Hungary, Luxembourg, and Monaco. The flags of Austria and the tiny states of San Marino and Liechtenstein still display the heraldic devices themselves.

Among the better known of Europe's striped flags was the red-white-blue flag of the Netherlands. Because of its use in that country's long war for independence from Spain, the flag and its colors became associated with the concepts of liberty and a republican form of government. This association was greatly reinforced by France's adoption of the same colors, but with vertical instead of horizontal stripes, following the French Revolution of 1789. The newly independent United States' choice of these colors for the Stars and Stripes (*q.v.*), however, was based on its former affiliation with Britain and the colors of the Union Jack. Other nations in Europe and in South and Central America selected tricolors of their own to express their adherence to the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity as embodied in the French flag. The flag of the former Soviet Union was red with a yellow hammer and sickle, the traditional symbol of revolution for communists. China also adopted a red flag based on that color's communist associations.

Since World War II, interest in flags has expanded beyond their creation and use. Political scientists, historians, sociologists, and others recognize them as artifacts expressive of the cultures of certain times and places. The scholarly study of the history, symbolism, etiquette, design, manufacture, and other aspects of flags is known as vexillology (from the Latin *vexillum*, “banner”). Such studies are fostered by many publications as well as by the International Federation of Vexillological Associations and its members.⁸⁸

However, we should found out, which was the reasons, and the means that lead to the creation of the European flag (see Appendix B.1)? When some people grouped

⁸⁸ “Flag”. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-2345>

themselves to form a unit of action or life, they wanted to mark this will by visible signs, to place their action or their adherence under symbols. It is why the flags, to the multiple colors and to the innumerable symbols, always accompanied the history of the men, their religious as well as war activities. Moreover, an ideal can be expressed only through the intermediation of an image. It is therefore natural to see to appear, with the first initiatives of a political unification of Europe, the propositions of a flag, an emblem, a hymn, signs of rallying and auto identification. Since its foundation in 1949, the Council of Europe has been aware of the need to give Europe a symbol with which its inhabitants can identify (see Appendix B.2, B.4, B.5). On 25 October 1955, the Parliamentary Assembly made the unanimous decision to adopt a circle of gold stars on a blue background as an emblem. On 8 December 1955, the Committee of Ministers adopted this as the European flag. The Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly repeatedly expressed the desire that other European institutions should adopt the same symbol in order to strengthen the idea of solidarity between the different organizations in a united and democratic Europe. It was the European Parliament, which took the initiative for a flag to be adopted for the European Community. In 1979, a draft resolution was presented, shortly after the first European elections held by universal suffrage. In a resolution adopted in April 1983, the Parliament decreed that the Community's flag should be that adopted by the Council of Europe in 1955.

The European Council, meeting at Fontainebleau (France) in June 1984 (see Appendix A.1), stressed the importance of promoting the European image and identity in the eyes of its citizens and the world. Then, in Milan (Italy) in June 1985 (see Appendix A.2), it gave its approval to the proposal of the Committee on a People's Europe (Adonnino Committee) that the Community should adopt a flag. The Council of Europe agreed (see Appendix A.3) to the use by the Community of the European flag that it had adopted in 1955 and Community institutions have been using it since the beginning of 1986.

Thus, the European flag and emblem represent both the Council of Europe and the European Community (and the European Union, since the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty). It has now become the symbol par excellence of united Europe and European identity. The Council of Europe and the institutions of the European Union have expressed satisfaction with the growing awareness of the European flag and emblem among European citizens. The European Commission and the Council of Europe are responsible for ensuring that all uses of this symbol respect the dignity of the European flag and emblem, and for taking whatever measures are necessary to prevent misuse. All European institutions have been using it since the beginning of 1986. The European flag is the only emblem of the European Commission - the EU's executive arm. Other EU institutions and bodies use an emblem of their own⁸⁹ (Fig. II) in addition to the European flag.⁹⁰

A selection of Council of Europe documents online shows that the matter of choosing a flag to represent the European ideal had been under serious consideration since 1949 (see Appendix B.6-9). The personalities to the fore in these deliberations are

⁸⁹ "Emblems". In *Europa. Interinstitutional Style Guide*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from: <http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-5000200.htm>

⁹⁰ David Crowe, *European Union. Flag of the European Union*. Retrieved November 6, 1998 from: <http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu-eun.html>

all identified, including in particular Paul Levy, the Council's Director of Information, who co-ordinated proceedings, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi (see Appendix B.3), who particularly favoured employing a cross in the design, Salvador Madariaga⁹¹ (the founder of the Bruges-based College of Europe), a Spanish diplomat, and the aforementioned Arsène Heitz, an employee in the Council's mail room and a talented draughtsman who produced sketches of his own and others' ideas. By the early 1950s objections from the Islamic Turks had effectively ruled out the incorporation of a cross. In January 1952 Madariaga proposed gold stars on a blue background, and while these were dispersed to represent European capitals, this basic design began to find favor. By September 1953 a design had crystallized composed of a circle of fifteen gold stars on a blue background, representing each of the states then members of the Council of Europe. In the light of the failure to agree on a flag design, it was obviously considered that expert advice was needed, so an 'ad hoc' vexillological committee was established in September 1954, comprising three Council of Europe representatives, and three heraldic experts nominated by Ireland, Italy, and the Netherlands. And by March 1955 two versions were under particular consideration: one was a circle of twelve gold stars on a blue background, credited to Arsène Heitz, the second was Salvador Madariaga's dispersed stars again on a blue background (see Appendix B.10). On eight or 9 December 1955 (see Appendix B.11) (there is an unresolved conflict over the date) the Committee of Ministers decided to adopt Heitz's design as the emblem of the Council of Europe.⁹²

The flag with a circle of 12 golden stars on a blue background, adopted by the Council of Europe on December 1955 and taken up by the Community in 1986 (see Appendix A.5), is obviously a symbol of identity par excellence. The European flag (Fig. I) is the symbol not only of the European Union but also of Europe's unity and identity in a wider sense. The circle of gold stars represents solidarity and harmony between the peoples of Europe. Any interpretation of the symbolism of the flag has to start from its symbolic and heraldic description. Its symbolic description states, "Against the background of blue sky, twelve golden stars form a circle representing the union of the peoples of Europe; the number of stars is fixed, twelve being the symbol of perfection and unity." The heraldic description states: "on an azure field, a circle of twelve golden mullets, their points not touching."

The symbolic components to be considered are therefore: the circle; the stars, including their number and shape; the colors. The circle first of all has no beginning or end, no direction or orientation and is homogeneous, perfect, and indivisible. A circle leads back to itself and is therefore a symbol of unity, of the absolute and of perfection. In a circle, all the points of the circumference are equidistant from the centre. For this

⁹¹ Madariaga, Salvador de (Salvador de Madariaga y Rojo), 1886–1978, Spanish author, and diplomat. In 1922 Madariaga became head of the disarmament section of the League of Nations. After teaching at Oxford (1928–31), he served as Spanish ambassador to the United States and France. His literary work, written in Spanish, French, and English, is voluminous; it includes history, international relations, literary criticism, and social psychology. Madariaga's point of view is liberal and humanist, his style classical. ("Madriaga, Salvador de". In *Infoplease*. Retrieved December 2, 2006 from: <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/people/A0831054.html>)

⁹² Sean Murphy, *Memorandum on the Role of Irish Chief Herald Slevin in the Design of the European Flag*. Centre for Irish Genealogical and Historical Studies, 9 December 2005, revised 25 January 2006. Retrieved December 3, 2006 from: <http://homepage.eircom.net/%7Eseanjmurphy/chiefs/euroflagmemo.html>

reason, it is a good illustration for the union of the Europe peoples, to which the official symbolic description refers. However, it is just good as an illustration of the parity of the Member States.

Second, the stars are the "presence of the divinity", hope, and the eyes of the night. It is also a symbol of constancy.⁹³ They light the night sky and orbit around the polar star and are therefore perceived as symbols of the cosmic order. In flags, the star illustrates independence, unity, liberty, renewal, and hope. It is not by chance that the flags of many former colonies contain stars together, in many Islamic countries, with the crescent. When there is more than one star, they generally represent a unit of measurement, i.e. the number of the federal states (United States), provinces (Costa Rica, Venezuela), geographical areas (Philippines), parishes (Grenada), islands (Comoros, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe) and peoples (Burundi, Burma). One of the features of the stars of the European flag is that they have five points, which do not touch one another, also known as a pentagram or pentacle. Since five-points stars can be drawn with a single, interwoven closed line, the Pythagoreans gave them a mystical meaning of perfection. In the European flag, the pentagram fits in well with the circle, which is also a symbol of perfection. The five-point star is also the symbol of man as individual possessing five-fingers and toes, five senses and five limbs. If the points of the star do not touch, this means that the circle is open. Symbolically, therefore, the European Union is not a closed society; it is not, as is often said with a negative connotation, a fortress. In contrast, the European Union is above all open to the accession of the States of Europe and is an active member of the international community, is open to the outside world, and plays its part in the life of international relations.

The number of stars is fixed and was set at 12 in 1955. The number of stars has nothing to do with the number of Member States. There are twelve stars because the number twelve is traditionally the symbol of perfection, completeness and unity. The flag therefore remains unchanged regardless of EU enlargements. Twelve is considered an ideal number. It provided the foundation of the Babylonian numerical system (called duodecimal for that reason). There are 12 signs of the zodiac, which therefore represent the universe. There are 12 months of the year, 12 hours of the day and 12 hours of the night, 12 Egyptian gods, 12 Olympian deities which formed the Greek pantheon from the 5th century BC, 12 laps in the chariot races of ancient Greece, 12 labors of Hercules in Greek mythology, 12 tables making up the first codification of Roman law, 12 knights of King Arthur's Round Table in Celtic tradition and 12 gates of Paradise in Scandinavia.

Twelve is also a number in Judeo-Christian symbolism. The tree of life has 12 fruits; there are 12 sons of Jacob, 12 patriarchs, 12 tribes of Israel and 12 gates of the New Jerusalem. Moses sent 12 explorers to the lands of Canaan, the bread multiplied by Jesus was placed in 12 baskets and Jesus talks of 12 legions of angels after the kiss of Judas; lastly, there are 12 apostles. The number 12 is also the product of multiplying three, always a divine number (the trinity), by four, the number of the earth with its four cardinal points; 12 is therefore the symbol 'of the union between the divine and the terrestrial world' which, as we know, embodies the central mystery of Christianity. Twelve together with stars, the crown of stars, reflects, as has been said, the vision of the

⁹³ "Dictionary of Symbolism". In *Fantasy and Science Fiction Web Site*. University of Michigan College of Engineering. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from: <http://www.umich.edu/~umfandsf/symbolismproject/symbolism.html/>

Virgin Mary of the Revelation (12, 1) and is the symbol par excellence of popular Marian iconography.

Finally, the colors have their own expressive and symbolic value. The rectangle of the flag is blue, the color of the sky and the universe. Blue is the color most often associated with issues of the spirit and intellect. Its link to the sky also connotes eternity and immensity, time and space. Blue may be truth (no clouds to hide it) and transparency; it is linked to loyalty, fidelity, constancy, and chastity.⁹⁴ Blue is also traditionally the color of the European continent. Many parliamentarians referred to this symbolism when the Council of Europe was preparing to adopt the flag. Blue is lastly the color of the Virgin. Mary's stone, the blue sapphire which, again in the Revelation (21, 19), adorns the foundation of the walls of the New Jerusalem; blue is the color of Mary's mantle.⁹⁵

Concerning the number of the stars and the meanings of the components symbols of the flag, many debates have arisen. In 1953, the Council of Europe had 15 members and its flag should have had one star for each member. The number of stars was not to alter if the number of members changed.⁹⁶ The number of stars had to be symbolic rather than linked to members because the issue quickly became subject to the inevitable euro-wrangles – even 50 years ago. France wanted 15 stars for the Council of Europe's 15 member states in 1955. Germany objected because that would recognize the sovereignty of Saarland, and argued for 14. France objected because 14 would acknowledge the absorption of Saarland into Germany, and so on. Thirteen was ruled out for superstitious reasons. The flag was included as EU symbol in the European constitution at a time when the issue of religion was a hot one. Europe's Christian Democrats pushed hard, and failed, to get God a name check in the constitution's declaration of values. The flag has long provided fuel to anti-Vatican conspiracy theorists after being designed by the German Roman Catholic Arsene Heitz. That claimed inspiration from the Bible's Book of Revelation and a description of the Virgin Mary wearing a crown of 12 stars.⁹⁷

The religious interpretation was the subject that raised the most intricate discussions. While Count Coudenhove-Kalergi in a personal statement mentioned that three leading Catholics within the Council had subconsciously chosen the twelve stars on the model of Apocalypse 12:1, Paul M.G. Lévy, Press Officer of the Council from 1949 to 1966, explained in 1989 that there was no religious intention whatsoever associated with the choice of the circle of twelve stars. This is important because from time to time all kinds of myths are being launched to "prove" that the European emblem was designed to glorify the Virgin Mary who, erroneously again, is traditionally being associated with Apocalypse 12:1.⁹⁸

⁹⁴Ibid.

⁹⁵ Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag" Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*, Retrieved December 3, 2006 from:
<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

⁹⁶David Prothero, *European Union. Number of stars on the flag of the European Union*, 12 December 1996,
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu-eun.html>

⁹⁷ "The European Flag. The Symbols of the EU". In *Europa*. Retrieved 4 December, 2006 from:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/emblem/index_en.htm

⁹⁸ Peter Diem, "The myth of the "Marian seal" on the European Union flag". In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 11 June 2002. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>

The catholic connotation of the flag symbolism is another and indeed much more controversial matter deserving to be mentioned. Among the roots of British wariness of the European Union, was suspicion that it was all a “Catholic conspiracy, orchestrated from the Vatican”. Many prominent Britons, including Margaret Thatcher, held that prejudice. It is true that many of the moving spirits of post-war European integration—Konrad Adenauer, Jacques Delors, Alcide de Gasperi and Robert Schuman—were devout Catholics. Their faith gave them a strong sense of the cultural and religious ties between Europeans that transcend national boundaries.⁹⁹

In this context, some years, fundamentalist Protestant critics in particular have alleged that the design of the European flag was derived from the familiar halo of twelve stars, which surrounds the head of the Virgin Mary as portrayed in Roman Catholic iconography. A quote from the *Apocalypse*, Chapter 12:1, is cited to explain the symbolism: 'A great sign appeared in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars'. Moreover, Arsène Heitz, the accredited designer of the flag, has been reported as admitting, or rather proudly declaring that the flag was indeed intended to symbolise Mary.

On the 8 December 1955, the European Ministers' delegates officially adopted the European flag designed by Arsene Heitz. The decision was taken following the 1950 European Council's (one of the predecessors of European Union) convocation of a competition to design the flag of the newborn European Community. Among many other artists, Heitz presented several designs, and one was chosen: 12 stars on a blue background. After that, Heitz revealed to a French magazine the reason for his inspiration. At that time, he was reading the history of the Blessed Virgin's apparitions in Paris' Rue du Bac, known today as the Virgin of the Miraculous Medal. According to the artist, he thought of the 12 stars in a circle on a blue background, exactly the way it is represented in traditional iconography of this image of the Immaculate Conception. In the beginning, Heitz saw it as a flight of fancy, among the many that run through an artist's imagination; but the idea caught his attention, to the point that it became the subject of his meditation.

According to Javier Paredes, Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Alcala in Spain, in statements sent to *Zenit*, "Heitz listens to God in his interior; in other words, he prays with his heart and his head. He says he is profoundly religious and devoted to the Virgin, to whom he never misses praying a daily Rosary, together with his wife. Because of this, he believes the inspiration not only from his artistic talents, but from the silent voices that Heaven always speaks to men of good will, among whom Heitz can undoubtedly be numbered. He is an artist who, virtually at the end of his life and at the zenith of his career, can proclaim with the guarantee of authenticity that he recalls that moment, that he is interested in very few but very important things, that he regards himself as a man who loves the whole world, but especially the Blessed Virgin, who is our Mother." Professor Paredes admits that "neither the stars nor the blue of the flag are particularly religious symbols, thus respecting the conscience of all Europeans, regardless of their beliefs." Indeed, he recalls that "when Paul M.G. Levy, first Director of the Press and Information Service of the European Council had to explain to the

⁹⁹ “Real politics, at least?”. In *The Economist Newspaper and the Economist Group*, Oct 28, 2004.

Retrieved December 4, 2006 from:

http://www.economist.com/printedition/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID=3332056

Members of the Economic Community the meaning of the design, he interpreted the number of 12 stars as a 'figure of plenitude', given that in the 1950s there were not 12 members in that Council, nor in the European Community.“ However, in Heitz's soul the words of the Apocalypse were very present: 'A great sign appeared in the Heavens: a Woman clothed with the sun and with the moon at her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars.' And, perhaps without realizing it, the delegates of the European Ministers officially adopted the design proposed by Heitz on the feast of Our Lady: December 8, 1955," explained Prof. Paredes. "That's a lot of coincidences, so henceforth it should not be difficult for us to discover in the folds of the Europeans' flag the smile and affection of Our Mother, the Queen of Europe, ready to lend a hand in that great challenge that St. Peter's successor has proposed to us: to re-Christianize the Old Continent with the example of our lives and the testimony of our words." ¹⁰⁰

Even more disturbingly, there is in the online archives of the Council of Europe a transcript of an interview in French with Paul Levy conducted on February 1998¹⁰¹, in which he claims that he contrived with Léon Marchal, then Secretary-General of the Council of Europe, to have the European flag adopted on 8 December 1955, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. Levy commented as well that the above quotation from the *Apocalypse* forms the Introit to the Mass for this feast day. It is not impossible that old men reminiscing may have allowed piety to color their recall of events to a certain extent. The upshot of all this is that for at least some individuals the European flag has particular Roman Catholic connotations which make it an unsuitable emblem for those not of that denomination.¹⁰²

Another illustration of the myth: the *Times* (London) runs a regular daily feature entitled *Questions Answered*, which invites readers to submit questions on different topics, and then invites other readers to answer them. The 11 May 2004 edition carries the question “Will the EU flag change to reflect the number of newcomers?” Three replies were received. This is the third response to the question:

“The number 12 is a symbol of cosmic order and salvation. It is the number of the signs of the zodiac, the hours on a clock face, the months of the year, the Christian apostles, the Knights of the Round Table, and the lictors of Rome. Five-pointed stars represent aspiration and education. Gold is the color of the sun, and symbolizes glory and enlightenment. Blue is the color of the sky, and symbolizes the Virgin Mary, truth, and the intellect. Arranged in a circlet, a dozen stars represent the constellation of Corona, and are seen as a crown in paintings of the Virgin Mary as Stella Maris, to signify royalty and thus the structures of government (as in a Round Table). In short, the symbols of the flag are purely metaphorical.” (Paul Murdin, Royal Astronomical Society London).¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Ivan Sache, based on comments by Jean-Michel Lévy, Paul M.G. Lévy's son, “An Illustration of the Myth”. In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 15 January 2003. Retrieved November 7, 2006 from: <http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>

¹⁰¹ Transcript of interview with Paul Levy, 26 February 1998. Retrieved November 7, 2006 from: http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/flag/levy_1998.pdf

¹⁰² Sean Murphy, *op. cit.*

¹⁰³ Ron Lahav, “Another Illustration of the Myth”. In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 11 May 2004. Retrieved November 8, 2006 from: <http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>

However, a catholic connotation can be just a barrier in gathering a larger support for the European construction, if we consider the religious diversity of the European population. In addition, the role of the European symbols in general is to unite the large diversity that defines the European citizens' cultures and not to tear them apart on the spiritual matters. In this case, the respect for the religious adherence of the Europeans, as for the general cultural particularities represents the base of the Union conception.

For the past 20 years, the European flag has been all around us. It often flies alongside national, regional, and even local flags. It can be seen in universities, schools and chambers of commerce and agriculture, and so many other places. The flag has kept its unchangeable character – 12 stars whatever the number of member countries. A strong symbol that brings together the citizens of Europe. The decision by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to adopt the emblem of twelve gold stars on a blue background as an official flag provided Europeans with a powerful symbol, which succeeded in capturing people hopes and expectations.

The European flag satisfies all the requirements of an ideal emblem: it has good symbolism, which is simple and easy to interpret, and is easily recognizable, harmonious, original, and simple to produce. It is therefore a perfect flag from a geometric, symbolic, and political point of view. It becomes part of the life of all Europeans. Visible everywhere, present on all conceivable supports, it constitutes a symbol of European organizations that is familiar to all the people, and that, in their mind, simply means Europe. Even beyond European borders, the flag is the sign recognized of the unit of the European Continent. In this sense, we think that the flag is a real success.

2. 9 May, Europe Day

9 May is to be celebrated in all the Member States as Europe Day. As we know, with the advent of monarchies, feast days of a civil or dynastic nature began to be celebrated, although many included a religious element (coronations, sovereign's weddings, birth of the heir to the throne, etc.). These feast days were generally accompanied by tournaments, jousts, cavalcades and hunting parties. After the French revolution, however, civil feast days of a popular and national type began to become important with a view to celebrating the achievement of liberty from domestic privilege (France) or from subjection to foreign rule (in the case of the Americas). In the Member States, one day is set aside for national celebrations. Civil holidays are a significant way of preserving memory, and help periodically to naturalize an eclectic heritage, to keep awareness of the past alive and to unify relational networks. The national public holiday is often the day on which the State became independent, and in some cases, it celebrates the patron saint or another event that is particularly meaningful for the nation.

The Constitutional Treaty sets 9 May as Europe Day in memory of the Declaration of 9 May 1950 by the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, which is conventionally seen as the date on which Europe began to be built. The celebration of 9 May is not just the celebration of the founding document of the process of European

integration. It also provides an opportunity to reflect on the current and real situation, which changes daily. The reality of life in European Union is based on the principles of the rule of law, possessing a democratic order based on popular sovereignty and on values, which are now accepted and shared by the vast majority of European people. The meaning of the celebration lies in its commemoration of the path that had to be taken to consolidate these principles and values, without taking for granted the victories won.

Europe Day on 9 May offers a yearly opportunity to bring Europe closer to its citizens. It is a day of information, guidance, and discussion of European Union themes, especially, but not just, in schools and universities, with events of a particular cultural and educational content. Europe Day must also be an opportunity to forge closer ties between the citizens of Europe and overcome the sense of distance, indifference, and even disaffection that they feel for the European institutions. It is a moment at which the symbolist role of others Union's symbols can be emphases. Lastly, 9 May should be a day of public holiday where men and women from different cities, regions, and countries of our Europe can meet.¹⁰⁴

Further, we will see how the idea of a European Day come to the fore. The Committee of Ministers raised the question of a "Europe Day" as a means of spreading the European idea; in Resolution (54) 7, on multilateral co-operation in the cultural field, the Committee of Ministers recommended that member States should organize such a day in their respective countries. In January 1955, a motion for a recommendation calling for the institution of a day of European fellowship was submitted by Mrs. Von Finckenstein. In the same year a proposal by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-Europa Union, was referred to the Committee of Ministers. It recommended the institution of a Europe Day for the purpose of strengthening the feelings of fellowship among Europeans.

Before taking a decision, the Committee of Ministers submitted a request for an opinion to the Assembly. Opinion No. 15, prepared by the Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions and adopted by the Consultative Assembly on 7 July 1955, concluded: "It is not appropriate at present to organize a special 'Europe Day' on 21 March of each year." One of the considerations mentioned in Opinion No. 15 was that "public opinion in the various member countries [did] not appear to support everywhere, to the same degree, the celebration of a 'Europe Day'".

The debate was not resumed until January 1960, when the European Conference of Local Authorities adopted a resolution on the celebration of a "Europe Day". The intention of the members of the Conference was to take immediate, practical action on an "Education for Europe", program initiated by the representatives of municipal authorities, in particular the International Union of Local Authorities. In the resolution the Conference decided, "to give its support to the proclamation of the first Wednesday in March as 'Europe Day' ...".

The Conference resolutions were referred to the Committee on Local Authorities, which in 1961 presented a report on the celebration of a "Europe Day". In this, the Committee recalled the adoption of Opinion No. 15 (1955), stressed the need to re-

¹⁰⁴Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union. The European Day". Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

examine the question in the light of the progress that had been made towards European unity, and set out the arguments in favor of a "Europe Day". The objectives of which were "primarily of a psychological and educational nature". The Rapporteur continued: "The psychological and educational effectiveness of 'Europe Day', however, will essentially depend on the assistance of the local authorities ..." In his opinion "town councils and the like [were] easily in the best position to awaken that mass movement which [was] one of the aims of 'Europe Day'".

Conscious of the need, first and foremost, to obtain the support of local authorities, the Rapporteur of the Committee, Mr. Muller, presented a report on the celebration of Europe Day to the 4th session of the European Conference on Local Authorities in March 1962. Before the session opened, the Standing Committee of the Conference had appointed a working party to establish a program of action for the local celebration of Europe Day. The Conference again advocated the institution of a Europe Day in its Resolution 34 (1962), recalling that it had been celebrated in many towns and villages as early as 1961.

It recommended "that the Consultative Assembly and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe should officially proclaim a fixed date for the celebration of Europe Day in all member countries" and "that, until a final decision [was] taken ... Europe Day should be celebrated at a provisional date ...". In its opinion, given in Recommendation 328 (1962), the Consultative Assembly fully agreed "that the date chosen must have 'a symbolic and historical significance'", stressed "the significance, in this connection, of the European flag" and suggested "that governments and local authorities might use the same colors in public decorations for Europe Day".

The Assembly invited the Committee of Ministers "to make every effort to reach an affirmative decision as soon as possible". And to take into consideration the suggestions made by the Working Party which had met under the auspices of the Standing Committee of the European Conference of Local Authorities to the effect that "the date chosen should be 1 May or any other day in the first week of that month".

In October 1964 the Committee of Ministers, "considering that the celebration of a Europe Day by all European countries [was] likely to unite those countries even more closely", resolved to institute a "Europe Day". And recommended that governments of member countries should "arrange for Europe Day to be celebrated, if possible, on 5 May", should celebrate it "with appropriate functions" and should "decorate public buildings on that day with the colors of the European flag". Following the official institution of Europe Day, the Secretary General took a number of steps to ensure that the resolution would be implemented: he sent a letter to the Foreign Ministers of member States, requesting them to give their support to all those wishing to be associated with this celebration. A memorandum enclosed with the letter gave practical suggestions on the way in which Europe Day might be celebrated.

A further letter was sent to the Secretary General of the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations, suggesting that Europa stamps should be circulated at a date close to 5 May rather than in September, which was the normal date for such issues. The President of the European Conference of Local Authorities requested the members of the Conference and of national associations of local authorities to celebrate Europe Day and arrange for its celebration by others. The permanent Working Party on relations with national parliaments requested presidents of national

legislative assemblies to mark the occasion of Europe Day with speeches. At the same time, brochures were distributed widely by the Secretariat: there was a brochure on the European flag, a brochure specially intended for municipalities and a general brochure about Europe Day.

A report published in 1965 by the Directorate of Information stated that, although relatively little time had elapsed between the decision of the Committee of Ministers and the date of 5 May, member States had succeeded in celebrating Europe Day quite effectively. However, each year since 1965 renewed efforts have been made to have it established for the last time; these efforts have taken the form of circular letters and messages from the President of the European Conference of Local Authorities and the President of the Consultative Assembly. In 1970 a European Committee for Europe Day was set up under the chairmanship of Mr. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, in his capacity as former President of the European Conference of European Authorities and Mayor of Bordeaux; the Committee consisted of the directors of the major European local, governmental and private organizations.

In 1970 and 1971, this Committee sent out an "urgent appeal to the national, regional, and local authorities to do all they can to organize in the week of 5 May great demonstrations of popular support for the European cause". In his message on the occasion of Europe Day 1971, Mr. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, as Chairman of the European Committee, told the people of Europe that the significance of Europe Day lay in the opportunity it gave them to stop for a moment "to think of their common heritage, of their joint interests, their shared hopes and destiny". At its meeting on 7 May 1971 in Strasbourg, the Committee of Ministers adopted a solemn declaration on Europe Day, reiterating its resolve "to pursue its efforts so that the celebration of Europe Day [became] a major event in the lives of the peoples of Europe".¹⁰⁵

We could see that the Council of Europe has celebrated its founding on 5 May 1949 as "Europe Day" since 1964. However, the decision to celebrate European Day on 9 May have been taken at the Milan summit in 1985, in order to celebrate that Robert Schuman proposal on the creation of an organized Europe, indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. This proposal, known as the *Schuman declaration* (see Appendix C.1), is considered, by many, to be the beginning of the creation of what is now the European Union.

9 May is now the date recognized by everyone as being the celebration day of Europe, even so, some Europeans still prefer 5 May, since the Council of Europe was designed to defend human rights, parliamentary democracy and the rule of law, while the Schuman speech was simply proposing a sharing of French and German coal and steel. Incidentally, May 9 is also celebrated in many former Soviet Union countries as Victory Day, the end of World War II, which is celebrated on 8 May in most Western European countries.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971, *apud* "European anthem". In Council of Europe, *Documents. Library and Archives*. Retrieved November 3, 2006, from:

<http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

¹⁰⁶ "National Day. European Symbols". In *Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 4, 2006 from:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_symbols#Anthem

However, we certainly should reconsider that opinion by recalling that historical moment (see Appendix C. 2). In spring, 1950 Europe was on the edge of the abyss. With the onset of the Cold War, the threat of conflict between its eastern and western halves loomed over the continent. Five years after the end of World War II, the old enemies were still a long way from reconciliation. What could be done to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past and to create the right conditions for a lasting peace between such recent enemies? The nub of the problem was the relationship between France and Germany. A link had to be forged between the two, and all the free countries in Europe had to be united around them so that they could work together on building a community with a shared destiny. It was Jean Monnet, with his unique wealth of experience as a negotiator and man of peace, who suggested to the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, and the German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, that a community of interest be established between their countries, in the shape of a jointly managed market in coal and steel under the control of an independent authority. The proposal was officially tabled by France on 9 May 1950, and was warmly received by Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.¹⁰⁷

We can see now that the ideas behind what is now the European Union were first put forward in Paris on 9 May 1950, against the background of the instability and the need to rebuild a shattered Europe. The French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman read to the international press a declaration calling on France, Germany and other European countries to pool together their coal and steel production: "World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it. . . . By pooling basic production and by instituting a new High Authority, whose decisions will bind France, Germany and other member countries; this proposal will lead to the realization of the first concrete foundation of a European federation indispensable to the preservation of peace."

What he proposed was the creation of a supranational European Institution, charged with the management of the coal and steel industry, the basis of all military power. The countries, which he called upon, had almost destroyed each other in a dreadful conflict, and Schuman's proposal to remove coal and steel production from national controls would make sure such a war could never happen again. This led to the 1951 creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), first of the European Communities and predecessor of the European Union. The resulting ECSC introduced a common free steel and coal market, with freely set market prices, and without import/export duties or subsidies. However, a transition period allowed the different economies to reach this situation over about one year. In particular, the declaration specifies the creation of a higher authority independent of the national governments. It also mentions the prospect of a European federation: "Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ "European Union: Europe Day". In *Representation of the European Commission to Turkey*. Retrieved November 5, 2006 from:

<http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/english/e-day3.html>

¹⁰⁸ "Schuman Declaration". In *Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 5, 2006 from:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schuman_declaration

Today's ambition is completely different: to build a Europe which respects freedom and the identity of all of the people who live on this continent. However, this ambition is only possible because of the foundations laid by Schuman's declaration. That is why during the Milan Summit of EU leaders in 1985 (see Appendix A. 2) it was decided that 9 May should be celebrated as "Europe Day". Therefore, 9 May is an annual opportunity to celebrate the EU's achievements and to reflect on its aims: peace, freedom, prosperity, and working together.

Europe Day is an opportunity for sharing European identity. National, regional and local authorities, universities and schools, clubs and associations, all could use the 9th May to bring people together. Direct contacts are always the most efficient way to allow people of different countries to understand each other and learn from their differences. That is why Europe Day is a day for popular festivities, which bring the citizens and cultures of different countries and regions in personal contact with each other: exchange visits, twin city events, correspondence of all kinds, cultural and festive events illustrating the ties among European peoples, etc. It is also an occasion for using the European symbols: The European Union has its blue flag with 12 golden stars and its own European Anthem (the prelude to "Ode to Joy" of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony).

Every country, which democratically chooses to accede to the European Union, endorses its fundamental values of peace and solidarity. These values find expression through economic and social development embracing environmental and regional dimensions, which are the guarantees of a decent standard of living for all citizens. While Europe as such has existed for centuries, the elements, which united it, in the absence of rules and institutions, have in the past been insufficient to prevent the most appalling tragedies.

The integration of Europe will not come about in one day or even in a few decades. Deficiencies are still numerous and there are evident imperfections. The project, which was begun just after the Second World War is still very new. In the past, efforts at European Union were based on domination of one group over another. These attempts could not last, because those conquered had only one aspiration: to regain their freedom. The European Union wants the people to know that it is at service of its citizens. While keeping their own specific values, customs and language, European citizens should feel at ease in the 'European home'. Europe Day represents the very best of what it means to be European.¹⁰⁹

Today, the 9th of May has become a European symbol (Europe Day) which, along with the flag, the anthem, the motto and the single currency (the euro), identifies the political entity of the European Union. Europe Day is the occasion for activities and festivities that bring Europe closer to its citizens and peoples of the Union closer to one another.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ "Europe Day, European Flag and Anthem". In *European Union. Delegation of European Commission to Japan*. Retrieved November 5, 2006 from:

http://jpn.cec.eu.int/union/showpage_en_union.day.php

¹¹⁰ "Europe Day". In *Europe*. Retrieved November 5, 2006 from:

http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/index_en.htm

3. European Union Anthem

An anthem is a hymn or song expressing patriotic sentiment and either governmentally authorized as an official national hymn or holding that position in popular feeling. The oldest national anthem is Great Britain's "God Save the Queen," which was described as a national anthem in 1825, although it had been popular as a patriotic song and used on occasions of royal ceremonial since the mid-18th century. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, most European countries followed Britain's example, some national anthems being written especially for the purpose, others being adapted from existing tunes. The sentiments of national anthems vary, from prayers for the monarch to allusions to nationally important battles or uprisings ("The Star-Spangled Banner," United States; "La Marseillaise," France) to expressions of patriotic feeling ("O Canada").¹¹¹

At this crucial hour in Europe's search for her identity, the time has perhaps come to provide her with what she still lacks in the trilogy of symbols by which our States identify themselves: like them, she needs her Flag, her Day, and her Anthem. These will give her the new impetus she needs in order to advance on the road to unity, and she will find there, a resounding expression of her driving force and of her faith. It is clear that, the hymn had to be the third link of the "trilogy" of the European symbols. In addition, should form an efficient support for the celebration of the European Day and finally to the backing of a European conscience.

An article by the French writer Daniel Rops, included the following passage relative to the power of the symbols in strengthen the union between European people: "A flag is only a symbol: agreed. It is only the expression of a myth. However, even before Georges Sorel it was constantly being borne out that, it is the great myths that lead the world and that symbols have a profound effect on men. The day that a European Hymn salutes the European flag, as today the national Hymn salutes the national flag in various countries, a great step will have been made along the road towards this essential union."¹¹²

After the adoption of the European emblem, some more urgent promptings came from municipal organizations regarding the adoption of an anthem. The origins of the European hymn are less complex and its birth knew a relatively right evolution (see Appendix D.1). There were also the first propositions that came from the European people since the first months of existence of the Council of Europe. Besides, a number impressive of propositions of texts and melodies for a European hymn flowed toward the young institution of Strasbourg. Here again, the organization of demonstrations with European character and notably those organized between twinning cities and townships and of the Day of Europe (5 May) had made feel the need of a hymn that should be either symbol and expression of the European fraternity. Some local responsible even passed to

¹¹¹"National anthem". In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9054948>

¹¹² Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971, *apud* Coucil of Europe, "European anthem". In *Documents. Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 12, 2006 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

the action improvising a "hymn for Europe" while hoping that it would find other adepts and either maybe some officials. Was this a premonitory gesture? Still it is that with the occasion of the celebration of the 10th birthday of the Council of Europe, April 20, 1959, the chorus of St Guillaume of Strasbourg had interpreted the ode to Beethoven's Joy.

In corollary with the relative discussions one Day of Europe, the idea of a European hymn had been many times evoked in the discussions, notably by the Commission of the Local and Regional Authorities of the Consultative Assembly, but also during the first meetings of the Conference of the Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe. However, the most powerful argument in favor of the introduction of a European hymn probably came from the institution of the "Price of Europe" (see Appendix A.4) by the Consultative assembly (since 1955) and the assignment of "Honor Flags" to the particularly active townships in the propagation of the European idea. The ceremonies of discount of such distinctions organized with big pomp by the townships arisen the desire to enclose such a ceremony by the execution of a European hymn.¹¹³

Moreover, in 1963 the Secretary General of the Belgian section of the Council of European Municipalities wrote to the Secretariat of the Committee on Local Authorities saying that in 1962 it had published a score and a record of a "European song" based on Beethoven's music, adding that "the numerous pairing ceremonies ... the large-scale participation of Belgian municipalities in Europe Day, European Schools Day and the campaign for use of the European flag [had] shown the need for a European anthem which could be performed together with the various national anthems". He continued: "The choice of Beethoven's setting of the Ode to Joy has enabled us to avoid the pitfalls of a competition, in which it would no doubt have been very difficult to agree unanimously on the winner. Moreover, the tune is one which was taught in schools long before the Council of Europe was ever thought of".

A number of people prominent in French cultural life who were interested in the institution of a European anthem reported spontaneous moves on the part of local authorities to have some musical work or other (usually Beethoven's setting of the Ode to Joy) performed as a European anthem for giving greater solemnity to functions of a European nature. Such action reveals, without any possible doubt, that a profound need was felt by an increasing number of Europeans to give musical expression to their feeling of belonging to a single community sharing the same destiny.

The Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities at its meeting in Paris on 22 April 1971 discussed the Round Table's appeal at length. The unanimous conclusion of the debate in which most members took part was that the time had come to initiate a move, at least in the Consultative Assembly, in favor of the progressive introduction of a genuine European anthem. At the level of the Commission (see Appendix D.2)(Commission President, René Radius, was named rapporteur), the discussions turned more and more around the alternative that was better to look over the European musical heritage, to find a composer already well anchor in the memory and in the sensitivity of the Europeans, than organizing a public concurs. A Beethoven,

¹¹³ Commission des Communautés européennes - Direction générale X. Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau, Objet: Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté. VDE/JSB X/B/1. Bruxelles: 16.04.1986, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Anthem". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved December 10, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

Carpenter, Mozart, Tchaïkowsky was taken in consideration.¹¹⁴ All members were against the idea of a competition for the purpose of "producing" an anthem; on the other hand, it was agreed unanimously that Beethoven's music was representative of the European genius and was capable of uniting the hearts and minds of all Europeans, including the younger generation. Also, bearing in mind that the tune of the Ode to Joy, from the last movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, had frequently been performed as a European anthem by local communities in particular, the Committee considered it preferable to give official approval to this incipient tradition and to propose the prelude to the Ode to Joy. In 1962, the Director of Information, replying to a question by a member of the Assembly, said that in his opinion a well-known existing work should be taken to avoid having to choose between the anthems proposed.

However, Beethoven was, especially, considered a true European: born in Bonn, of a Dutch progeny and arrived to the summits of a musical genius in Vienna. There was Beethoven's "anniversary" year exactly in 1970 and the numerous "precedents" of European ceremonies already surrounded by his melody, and text, of the Ode to Joy of the ninth Symphony. All of this designated the favorable circumstances to be these songs choose like a European hymn.¹¹⁵

If we are to understand Beethoven's art, we need to know something about the moment of history in which he was writing. While this is true of any artist, it is of crucial importance in Beethoven's case because he straddled the end of one period of history and the beginning of another. Music and its conception also reflect changing ways of thinking and living. Politically, therefore, the French revolution, Napoleonic expansion and the Restoration marked the period in which Beethoven was writing. Socially, the bourgeoisie grew in importance and, spiritually, the substantial growth of German philosophy and literature and the initial and most original aspects of romanticism were a major influence. Beethoven was not just a musician like Mozart and especially Haydn, but was also a deep thinker who was concerned about social problems and new ideas; the French revolution left a major and powerful mark in his thinking. For him, music did not just exist per se, but was pregnant with meaning and almost always embodied an idea. Most of his compositions, especially those written in his later years and his final compositions are not just the expression of an amorphous sentiment, but genuine musical poems, which reflect the various currents of thought and their stages, and often give life to a theme. While this was in some ways in keeping with the spirit of the times, Beethoven's music is strongly imbued with his character and his genius. Beethoven is a musician of the internal world, the realm of the mind, and freed music from any formal constraints, the idea being all-important. Beethoven's tendency to free himself from the material became ever more accentuated when his deafness distanced him from the external world and isolated him. It was then that Beethoven entered a plane of absolute and intangible contemplation, in which the sentiment of ultimate reconciliation sweetened the severity of his physical condition. Seriousness is the predominant feature of Beethoven, but this very seriousness may, even fleetingly, be transformed into joy, as in the Ninth Symphony.

The melody of the Ode to Joy is simple, almost elementary, and of an approachable and clear musicality to which it is easy to listen. Beethoven's main concern was to strike a perfect balance between unity (and exact repetition) and variety, in a form

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *op. cit.*

which was readily memorable. In the verses singing of the values of truth, liberty, universal fraternity, and human happiness, man emerges victorious over all his physical and moral oppressions. Throughout his life, and even in its happier periods, Beethoven was beset by the torments of his deafness, financial straits, unhappiness in love, and the agonies of life. The Kantian ideals of the enlightenment culture of the time, which provided a focus for Beethoven's knowledge and internal life, are brought to life and sublimated through the interweaving of music and poetry. It is precisely this exhortation to fraternity and friendship, to love and to peace, of which the Ode is a highly figurative symbol. That explains why the Council of Europe and then the European Communities decided to take as their official anthem a hymn to fraternity going beyond the confines of nations and beyond the differences between peoples in order to bring about something more sublime and exceptional in European society.¹¹⁶

But Schiller's words,¹¹⁷ from the ode, *An die Freude* (German for Ode To Joy) written in 1785, were adapted indeed to the sensitivity of our time? Were they capable to awaken a European conscience? In this concern, some doubt was felt, mainly with regard to the words of the Ode to Joy, which were in the nature of a universal expression of faith rather than a specifically European one. Members also wondered whether any words acknowledged as "European" could ever be translated into another language and accepted as such by the other linguistic groups of the European family. The Committee therefore preferred, for the time being, to propose only the tune for a European anthem, without words, and to allow some time to pass. Maybe, one day will appear a genius of the European poetry proposing a text, written in the main European languages and respondent to the different sensitivities of the nations that compose our old Europe.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union. The Anthem". Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

¹¹⁷ English translation: Oh friends, not these tones! / Rather let us sing more / *Cheerful and more joyful ones.* / Joy! Joy! / Joy, thou glorious spark of heaven, / Daughter of Elysium, / We approach fire-drunk, / Heavenly One, your shrine. / Your magic reunites / What custom's sword separates; / Beggars become princes' brothers / Where your gentle wing alights. / Whoever succeeds in the great attempt / To be a friend of a friend, / Whoever has won a lovely woman, / Let him add his jubilation! / Yes, whoever calls even one soul / His own on the earth's globe! / And who never has, let him steal, / Weeping, away from this group. / All creatures drink joy / At the breasts of nature; / All the good, all the evil / Follow her roses' trail. / Kisses gave she us, and wine, / A friend, proven unto death; / Pleasure was to the worm granted, / And the cherub stands before God. / Glad, as his suns fly / Through the Heavens' glorious plan, / Run, brothers, your race, / Joyful, as a hero to victory. / Be embraced, you millions! / This kiss for the whole world! / Brothers, beyond the star-canopy / Must a loving Father dwell. / Do you bow down, you millions? / Do you sense the Creator, world? / Seek Him beyond the star-canopy! / Beyond the stars must He dwell. / *Finale repeats the words:* / Be embraced, ye millions! / This kiss for the whole world! / Brothers, beyond the star-canopy / Must a loving Father dwell. / Be embraced, / This kiss for the whole world! / Joy, beautiful spark of the gods, / Daughter of Elysium, / Joy, beautiful spark of the gods"

"To Joy" (*An die Freude* in German, in English often familiarly called the *Ode to Joy* rather than *To Joy*) is an ode written in 1785 by the German poet and historian Friedrich Schiller, known especially for its musical setting by Beethoven in the fourth and final movement of his Ninth Symphony, for four solo voices, chorus, and orchestra. (Wikipedia. *The Free Encyclopedia. Ode to Joy*. Retrieved October 22, 2006 from:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ode_To_Joy)

¹¹⁸ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *op. cit.*

The discussions among the members of the Parliamentary Commission arrived very quickly to the conclusion that it was better - at least at the present - to give up the idea of a text for the anthem in order not to compromise a large acceptance of the European hymn. Unanimity has been crystallized during the successive meetings of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities on April and May 1971. The result was the proposition of a resolution (see Appendix D.3) which promoted use, in the member's countries, as European Hymn, the part of the 9th Symphony constituted by the 20 first measures of the 4th movement (Prelude to the ode to Joy)."

In the same way, the Secretary-General has been put in charge of entering in contact with Herbert von Karajan (see Appendix D.5) in view of the preparation of a musical arrangement of the hymn, with its orchestration and its official execution under his direction. Herbert Von Karajan was asked to write three instrumental arrangements - for solo piano, for wind instruments and for symphony orchestra. He wrote his decisions on the score, notably those concerning the tempo. Karajan decided on crotchet = 120 whereas Beethoven had written minim = 80. This orchestration has been executed by the philharmonic orchestra of Berlin under the direction of H. von Karajan and has been recorded and distributed as disk by the "Deutsche Grammophon." The arrangement of the partition, made by H. von Karajan, has been confided to the Schott's Söhne in Mainz Publishing Hause. In fact, three versions have been proposed: one for symphonic orchestra, one for wind instruments and one for only piano.

The preparation of European Day on 1972 (see Appendix D.4) was the opportunity of vast information relative to the European hymn. In a message of the "Round Table for European Day" distributed to the medias, to the local collectivities and to the non governmental Organizations, one expressed the hope "That the hymn of Europe, next 5 May, will sounded in the biggest number possible of townships and schools of our continent. That the 1972 European Day will be a real opportunity for Europe to make acquaintance with its hymn."¹¹⁹

As a conclusion we will systematizes the information above, in order to offer a more concise and illegible image over the European anthem. In 1971, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe decided to propose the adopting of the prelude to the *Ode To Joy* from Beethoven's 9th Symphony as the European anthem. The Council of European Ministers officially announced the European Anthem on January 19, 1972 at Strasbourg. The anthem was launched via a major information campaign on Europe Day in 1972. In 1985, it was adopted by EU heads of State and government as the official anthem of the European Community - since 1993 the European Union. It is not intended to replace the national anthems of the Member States but rather to celebrate the values they all share: their unity in diversity, and expresses the ideals of a united Europe: freedom, peace, and solidarity. Both the Council of Europe and the European Union play it on official occasions. Due to the large number of languages used in the European Union, the anthem is purely instrumental and the German lyrics have no official status. For the German lyrics, the Austrian composer Peter Roland has written a suggestion for Latin lyrics to the anthem, but the lyrics has not been accorded official status, and is not used by the EU.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Commission des Communautés européennes - Direction générale X, *op. cit.*

¹²⁰ "Anthem. European Symbols". In *Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 23, 2006 from:

4. The European Motto: “United in diversity”

The motto of the Union is ‘united in diversity’. Like the other symbols, the motto clearly highlights the sense of European identity, which is the birthright of every citizen of the Union, over and above the actual European Union. The preamble to the Treaty, in which the term ‘united in diversity’ is used in the fifth recital, goes some way towards interpreting the meaning of the motto set out in Article I-8 of the Constitutional Treaty. The two terms used in the European Union’s motto have to be examined: ‘united’ and ‘diversity’.

The term united in diversity is related to Europe, its values and its cultural, religious and humanist heritage. Values, which place two protagonists at the centre of social life: on the one hand, man and his rights and, on the other hand, the respect of law. For the purposes of interpreting the motto, the most illuminating passage of the preamble is to be found in the fourth recital which states that the peoples of Europe, while remaining proud of their own national identities and history, are determined to transcend their former divisions and, united ever more closely, to forge a common destiny.

This phrase clearly explains both the notion of unity and the notion of diversity. The concepts, which express unity, are not new. They recall, and appropriately take up, the formula of ‘ever closer union’ included in the preamble to the Treaty on European Union. The path towards ever-closer ties is gradual and proceeds — as heralded right from the Schuman Declaration of 9 May 1950 — from concrete achievements, which create actual solidarity. However, ‘unity’ is not an end in itself but has a specific goal: forging a ‘common destiny’. The notion of ‘diversity’ is nevertheless also explained. It lies in the strong call for peoples to be proud of their national identities and history and for the respect of everyone’s rights.

The stress has to be placed on the values common to the Member States and, therefore, the founding values of the European Union for a full understanding of what the motto actually means. Article I-2 of the Constitutional Treaty lists six values: human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights. These values are shared in a European society, which is in turn based on pluralism, tolerance, justice, solidarity, and non-discrimination. Further elements helping to explain the motto can be drawn from Article I-2. The reference to both ‘unity’ (Union, community, society) and ‘diversity’ (pluralism, tolerance) stands out.

Striking a balance between unity and diversity is crucial. Too much unity would run the risk of standardization and therefore of the destruction of national identities. Too much diversity could easily prevent intentions from converging and, in the long term, undermine the construction of a re-united Europe. Jack Lang understood this very well when he said that ‘diversity is not division (...), difference is not indifference, union is not uniformity.’ It therefore seems crucial to seek unity in basic values and the combined presence of unity and difference. At the end of the 1920s, Ortega y Gasset coined a metaphor in this respect, which has become rightly famous: ‘Europe is a swarm: many bees and a single flight’. The risks of implosion may nevertheless also be within the system. Valéry Giscard d’Estaing has pointed out in this respect that the dominant culture

within the institutions in Brussels systematically underestimates diversity, viewing it as an obstacle to the further standardization of Europe. Standardization is, moreover, one of the objectives that this culture has set itself the task of achieving in practice by trying to impose it from above through standardizing rules and pressures on mechanisms of identity. In Giscard d'Estaing's view, however, diversity is the genetic heritage of our continent in which unifying factors such as a single language, a common religion or a central power able to impose a uniform European model are lacking. As he points out, 50 years of integration have not managed to standardize Europeans' way of life. As it is not possible to rely on the assimilation brought about by a common language (as in the United States, which is nevertheless becoming a multilingual country along the lines of Europe) or a dominant people (as in China, where 80 % of the population is from the Han ethnic group), Europe has to be organized from its diversity and not against its diversity. A reasonable balance therefore has to be struck between the needs of diversity and the need to form a coherent whole.¹²¹

EU constitutional draughtsman decided to think "symbolically" when pulling together a declaration of EU values. The phrase "united in diversity" is singled out in the text by double quotes. And the move was deliberate, revealed the constitution's architect, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. "We thought yes it might be a good motto for Europe," he said. The dictum has its origin in the 1996 South African constitution, which states, "[this country] belongs to all who live in it, united in our diversity". The South African motto was officially adopted in 2000: *"!ke e: /xarra //ke"* in /Xam, an extinct Khoisan language. *"Bhinneka Tunggal Ika"*, translated as "Unity in Diversity", is also the national motto of Indonesia. The motto of Indonesia is *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* which is Old Javanese and is often loosely translated as 'Unity in Diversity' but literally it means '(Although) in pieces, yet One'.

This is a quotation from an Old Javanese poem kakawin Sutasoma, written by Mpu Tantular during the reign of the Majapahit Empire somewhere in the 14th century. Kakawin or Kawiya, are epic poems written in Indian metres. This poem is notable as it promotes tolerance between Hindus (Shivaites) and Buddhists. This quotation comes from canto 139, stanza 5. The full stanza reads as follows:

“Rwânêka dhātu winuwus Buddha Wiswa,
Bhinnêki rakwa ring apan kena parwanosen,
Mangka ng Jinatwa kalawan Siwatatwa tunggal,
Bhinnêka tunggal ika tan hana dharma mangrwa.”

Translation: It is said that the well known Buddha and Shiva are two different substances. / They are indeed different, yet how is it possible to recognize their difference in a glance, / Since the truth of Jina (Buddha) and the truth of Shiva is one. / They are indeed different, but they are of the same kind, as there is no duality in Truth.¹²² It is also similar to *"E pluribus unum"* (Latin for "out of many, one"), one of the mottos of the

¹²¹ Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union. The European Day". Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

¹²² "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" In *Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhinneka_Tunggal_Ika

United States of America (1776) which imply that unity involves leaving diversity behind. Unity in diversity is the present official motto of Papua New Guinea.¹²³

“United in diversity”, as an exhortation to get on with one another despite disagreements and differences, the phrase may well be apt for the EU. It is perhaps fitting that a slogan for a multi-lateral institution contrasts with earlier ringing constitutional declarations at the birth of nations.¹²⁴ Unity in diversity is a socio-ecological philosophy that describes a sense of oneness despite physical or psychological barriers. The phrase is widely used to describe India, which is home to a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, and multi-religious society. The subcontinent's long and diverse history has given it a unique eclectic culture that is often associated with spirituality. India's diversity forces it, to either evolve strong foundations of tolerance and survive, or face break-up. Such a situation has forced Indian society to foster a sense of *unity in diversity*.¹²⁵ In the European case, the motto means that, via the EU, Europeans are united in working together for peace and prosperity, and that the many different cultures, traditions and languages in Europe are a positive asset for the continent.¹²⁶

The European motto "Unity in diversity" (In varietate concordia) was officially proclaimed on the 4th May 2000 in the European Parliament. Since this date, the European Constitution proposes the motto "United in diversity".¹²⁷ It was first established through an unofficial process in 2000. The President of the European Parliament, Nicole Fontaine, selected it from entries proposed by school pupils submitted to the website www.devise-europe.org, and then accepted. The motto is soon likely to be replaced by the slightly modified "United in diversity", which has been written into the draft Constitution for Europe and now appears on official EU websites.¹²⁸

Europe had a flag, a hymn, and therefore it should have a motto: "Unit in the diversity ". The European jury chose it, in Brussels, and was announced with solemnity by Nicole Fontaine, chairwoman of the European Parliament. It was a beautiful adventure that embarked 80 000 young of 10 to 19 years, descended of the fifteen countries of the European Union. At the initiative of west-France and the Memorial of Caen, these school suggested more 2 000 propositions of motto for Europe, collected on the Internet site of France Telecom. Forty big European medias brought their active support in this unpublished enterprise in Europe. Some national juries operated a first choice. Then, to the term of a European selection organized to the Memorial of Caen, remained in lists seven mottos. The ultimate deliberation took place in Brussels.

¹²³ “Motto. European Symbols”. In Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_symbols#Anthem

¹²⁴ “Europe gets a ‘motto’”. In *The Parliament. European Politics and Policy*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:

<http://www.eupolitix.com/EN/News/200306/259ca7ae-3c2a-4ba8-bc87-54952016f1ae.htm>

¹²⁵ “Unity in diversity”. In Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unity_in_diversity

¹²⁶ “Unity in diversity”. In *Europa*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:

http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/motto/index_en.htm

¹²⁷ “European Motto 'In Varietate Concordia'”. In *Portal of European Stateless Nations and minorities*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from:

<http://www.eurominority.org/version/eng/languages-motto.asp>

¹²⁸ “Motto. European Symbols”. In Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_symbols#Anthem

A jury of fifteen European personalities had the task to decide among the seven propositions. Without knowing the origin of the mottos in competition: it was not about keeping the proposition of a country, but to make speak the European youth over the borders.

Representing classes of the fifteen countries, 500 youngsters were invited to this feast, that was first theirs. While their eldest deliberated, Irishman in uniform, Italian late, Greeks in sneakers, French come from Orne and all others visited the European capital with their professors.

After 13 h, the jurors had made their choice. A choice kept secret until the official ceremony, organized in enclosed, even for the Parliament, under the presidency of Nicole Fontaine.

Astonishing, and bracing spectacle, with a hemicycle filled of all youngsters people, seated on the places usually designate to the deputies.

The reading of the parliamentary reports took place on music, the one of "The angel of the Peace" of Chostakovitch, interpreted by the young musicians' virtuosos of Musica Mundi directed by Léonid Kerbel.

Every member of jury expresses himself two minutes, in his language. With heat, each expressed its gratitude to the young that found the words to express the tomorrow Europe.

The promoters increased suspense. Fifteen young of the union that, by turns, deposit a piece of a big puzzle, progressively unveil the motto. One reads, to the final, on an immense blue bottom: "Unit in the diversity".

Unit, diversity, two words that reflected the values to which the young Europeans have the most often referred: peace, union, solidarity, but also tolerance and respect of the differences.

With a flag of his country at the hand, a young of each of the Fifteen of the Union comes to proclaim the motto in his language. To the foot of the tribune, the young violinists of Musica Mundi played the Beethoven hymn "Ode to Joy" All the hemicycle, standing, applauds for a long time. Even so often heard, the European hymn, it was never so young and fresh. That was the way the Europe motto was establish with the young Europeans help, that 4 May at Brussels.¹²⁹

5. European Union Currency as Symbol of Identity

As we know, money has always been a powerful means of communication as it is able to transmit messages, and whose area of reception is practically unlimited. Money talks and its message is federating, as it is the lowest common denominator of the group using it. This makes it a highly effective and important instrument of identity which has become so customary, through its continuous use for 2 400 years, that its role has been

¹²⁹“Devise pour l'Europe”. In *Ouest-France Multimédia*, 05 mai 2000. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from: <http://www.ouestfrance-ecole.com>

more or less forgotten. This explains — from the oldest currencies to the most recent banknotes — why images of the sovereign or of republican symbols are portrayed as a sign of political identity or belonging. Figurative signs, which, as we will see, are not lacking in the euro. Money is also a strong symbol of social ties. It carries with it faith, solidarity and expectations of guarantees; every currency reflects the trust of citizens in the role of the state as a guarantor of national cohesion, of the protection of citizens and of the improvement of their standard of living.

The iconography on the banknotes includes, on the reverse, arches, vaults, pillars and columns, doors and windows. The door and the bridge. These two images take us back to Simmel's famous metaphor: money is a door and a bridge. It is a bridge because it helps trade to be interdependent, and a door because it is completely impersonal and abstract. Every institution is both a door and a bridge, everything created by man, as a social being, tends to become crystallized, to become an institution. The euro is here to stay: it is therefore an institution. It is perhaps the institution closest to citizens, as it is in our pockets and in our thoughts. It is a door and a bridge. It is a door because it opens out to an unknown world, an uncertain future, which causes anxiety. It is a bridge, however, since by fully respecting the typical vocation of monetary circulation, it unites Europeans and helps to make them aware that they belong to the same economic and monetary area and is a clear point of reference for Europe in its quest for an identity. Seen in this way, the euro acts for European citizens as a 'factor of reconciliation of their identity' both by strengthening their sense of belonging and acting as a border between the peoples of Europe and the rest of the world.

Choosing the theme of monuments of different architectural styles also pays tribute to the capacity of human labor to create great works and to improve them over time and is a visual image of the stability of the currency. In order to highlight 'the very potential of design' any direct portrayal of existing works is avoided. If it can be rightly deduced from this that the message that these banknotes pass on to European citizens is an exhortation to design, and achieve because any object, through technical and creative innovation, may be redesigned and recreated, to take up a semiotic interpretation. Further progress with the major project of the European Union is closely linked to the ability to design and redesign things and events.

It has also been rightly stressed, moreover, that the iconography of the banknotes undoubtedly returns to the allegorical motifs of the currency of the 19th century, but interpreted differently. From this point of view, the portrayal of monumental works arising from man's labor expresses the desire to construct a solid and lasting whole, of stone and iron, which is not dependent on economic and political contingencies and reflects the eternity linked to the motifs of classical culture. Moreover, the absence of people and geographical references is in keeping with monetarist theories whose rules are based on universality and intertemporality.¹³⁰

There is also a political and a psychological consequences of switching from the national to a single European currency. It is argued that money is more than a tradable commodity. Money is an integral part of each country's national and state identity. Once

¹³⁰Carlo Curti Gialdino. "The symbols of the European Union. The European Day". Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

introduced, the single currency has the potential of developing into a central symbol of a new European citizenship and identity.

We will try to find out also the conditions under which the European currency could become a focal point for a common European identity. The term identity is in itself ambiguous, open to constant constructions, deconstructions, and reconstruction. Identity, much like the terms of culture, nation, or state on which is based, never stand by itself, but it is used within the context of a particular political discourse. It is constructed of numerous symbols that give meaning to abstract and intangible political processes, such as common historic experiences or shared values. Currencies serve as one such symbol. Based on the name, history, appearance and public acceptance of the national currency, each country has developed its own monetary symbolism or pecuniary identity. In this chapter, arguments will be put forward to show why currencies can be powerful images of national or state identity.

Four different but interrelated themes are put forward which support the argument that currencies are symbols of identity and convey particular images. The first two of these themes are closely related to the state, while the other two return to the broader concept of national identity.

In his book entitled *Theories of Nationalism*, Anthony D. Smith¹³¹ distinguishes between the notion of state identity (reflected in the state's symbols of authority and the demarcation of territorial borders) and national identity (as expressed in a common cultural, linguistic, religious, or historical heritage of people). As national conflicts all too clearly demonstrate, these two forms of identity seldom coincide.

With his reference to the "Janus-face-nature" of money, Kenneth Dyson¹³² makes a similar distinction. He stresses that a currency not only fulfills the above-mentioned economic functions necessary for running a modern economy but also serves as a symbol of political and cultural identity. The two terms politics and culture are synonyms for state and nation. A currency is closely associated with a state's political and legal authority. Moreover, it also reflects and is indeed a result of the common economic history and shared values of society. As life is determined by economic activity, money becomes an inseparable element of the people's historical heritage. In addition, the state's sole authority over monetary affairs is reaffirmed by the symbols and inscriptions used on the notes and coins.

Moreover, the parallel negotiation on EMU and political union at Maastricht demonstrated that for many participants monetary union is not a means in itself but can serve as a motor for further integration. Based on its function as a unit of account and a medium of payment, money can be described as a means of social interaction or a form of communication. The proposed concept of currencies as a means of social interaction ties into the transactionalist explanation of nation-building and European integration. It is the communication between people facilitated by the single currency, which shape their identity. The regular interaction of people promotes the development of common ideas, values, and shared historical experiences. The economic functions of many do thereby actually reinforce the currency importance as a symbol of identity. Closely linked to the issue of communication is the final point that has to be raised in the context of currencies

¹³¹ A. D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, Duckworth, London, 1971.

¹³² Kenneth Dyson, *Exclusive Union. The Process of Economic and Monetary Union in Europe*, Longmans, London, 1994.

as symbols of identity. It has already been established that a shared national heritage need not only be based on linguistic, religion and culture but that it can similarly derive from a predominant collective interpretation of history and shared values or beliefs.

A currency is closely associated with the past economic experiences of a nation. It similarly reflects the level of underlying consensus within a society for specific economic objectives, such as price stability, growth, or unemployment. As such, the currency is a product of socialization process within a country. This also finds its reflections in the formal and informal institutional arrangements of the state.¹³³

The European currency (*euro*) is used in 12 countries of the European Union (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain) since 1 January 1999 (1 January 2001 in Greece), although coins and notes were released only on 1 January 2002. At the beginning of 2002, the euro became the currency of a union of states and peoples and unequivocally took on an institutional function. In spite of not being members of European Union, Andorra, the Holy See, Monaco and San Marino also use the euro as their currency.¹³⁴

The Euro symbol (€) was created by the European Commission as part of its communications work for the single currency. The design had to satisfy three simple criteria: to be a highly recognizable symbol of Europe, to be easy to write by hand, and to have an aesthetically pleasing design.

It was inspired by the Greek letter epsilon (ε), harking back to Classical times and the cradle of European civilization. The symbol also refers to the first letter of the word "Europe". The two parallel lines represent the stability of the euro.(Fig. VI)

The two parallel lines indicate the stability of the euro. The official abbreviation for the euro is EUR and this has been registered with the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).¹³⁵

In February 1996, the Council of the European Monetary Institute (EMI), the forerunner of the ECB, launched a competition to design the euro banknotes. National central banks nominated designers to sketch a series of seven banknotes, using one or both of two nominated themes: "Ages and styles of Europe" and an abstract modern theme. Later that year, a panel of renowned experts in marketing, design and art history drew up a shortlist of the five best designs in the two categories. A public opinion survey on the short listed designs was conducted across Europe. The winning designs were by Robert Kalina of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank, inspired by the theme "Ages and styles of Europe", and were selected in December 1996 at the Dublin European Council. His theme depicts designs from seven important architectural periods in Europe's cultural history.

On 1 January 2002, seven banknotes were introduced in 12 Member States of the European Union. On the front of the banknotes, windows and gateways symbolize the European spirit of openness and co-operation. The 12 stars of the European Union

¹³³Nickolas Reinhardt, "Pecuniary Identity and European Integration" in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004, pp. 112-119.

¹³⁴"The Euro as European Currency". In *European Union: Flags on Euro coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from:

[http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu\\$euro.html](http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu$euro.html)

¹³⁵"From Design to Distribution. Euro Symbol Design". In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from:

<http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro/euro.html>

represent the dynamism and harmony between European nations. To complement these designs, the reverse of each banknote features a bridge. The bridges symbolize the close co-operation and communication between Europe and the rest of the world.

On 1 January 2002 the euro banknotes were put into circulation. There are seven new banknotes, they have the same design throughout Europe, each banknote has a different color and different size, and the EUR 5 is the smallest banknote and the EUR 500 the biggest. The banknotes circulate in denominations of EUR 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 200 and 500. The euro banknotes have pictures of windows, arches, gateways, and bridges on them as well as a map of Europe and the European flag. The banknotes – inspired by the architectural styles of seven periods in Europe's cultural history – are of an identical design throughout all member countries of the Euro area. The architectural period for €5 is The Classical period, for €10, Romanesque, for €20, Gothic, for €50, Renaissance, for €100 Baroque and Rococo, for €200, Iron and Glass architecture and, for €500, Modern 20th Century architecture. (Fig. IV)¹³⁶

There are eight euro coins. Each euro coin has one side that is common to all 12 Member States. This design shows variations of the map of Europe. The designs for the European side were selected following a competition organized by the European Commission and were approved by the Ministers of the Member States.

The European side of the coins (Fig. V) was designed by Luc Luyckx of the Royal Belgian Mint and depicts a map of the European Union against a background of parallel lines linking the 12 stars of the European Union flag. The 1, 2 and 5 cent coins show Europe's place in the world and the 10, 20 and 50 cent coins depict Europe as a group of individual nations. A united Europe without frontiers is represented on the EUR 1 and EUR 2 coins.¹³⁷ Euro coins can be used anywhere in the euro area, regardless of their national sides. Milled edges have been introduced to make it easier - especially for those with impaired sight - to recognize different values. Sophisticated bi-metal technology has been incorporated into the EUR 1 and EUR 2 coins which, together with lettering around the edge of the EUR 2 coin, prevents counterfeiting.¹³⁸

While the side of the Euro coins depicting the different maps of Europe is common to all 12 countries, the country-specific reverse side features designs, which reflect each member country's national identity.

Belgium – The Belgian coins show King Albert II¹³⁹ and his monogram – a capital “A” underneath a crown – set among the 12 stars of the European Union.(Fig. VII.1)

Germany – The €1 and €2 coins feature the federal eagle, a traditional symbol of German sovereignty, set amid the stars of European Union. The Brandenburg Gate¹⁴⁰,

¹³⁶“Euro Banknotes”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from: <http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/testnotes.html>

¹³⁷“From Design to Distribution. Euro Symbol Design”...

¹³⁸“Euro Coins”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from: <http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro0.html>

¹³⁹ Albert II, King of the Belgians (Albert Félix Humbert Théodore Chrétien Eugène Marie), (born June 6, 1934), is the current King of the Belgians and a constitutional monarch. He is a member of the former ducal house of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. He is the younger son of King Léopold III (1901-1983) and his first wife, Princess Astrid of Sweden (1905-1935). (“Albert II of Belgium”, in *Wikipedia. The free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_Albert_II)

which symbolizes the division and subsequently unification of Germany, appears on the 10, 20, and 50-cent coins. An oak twig, reminiscent of the design on the old German pfennig coins, is depicted on the 1, 2, and 5-cent coins. (Fig. V 5.)

Greece – The €2 coin depicts a scene from a Spartan mosaic featuring Europe, the Greek mythical figure from whom our continent its name. The €1 coin shows an owl motif taken from an ancient Athenian 4 drachma coin. The 10, 20 and 50 cent coins portray leading Greek figures from the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries, while an Athenian trireme, a corvette and a seagoing tanker are featured on the 1, 2, and 5 cent coins respectively. (Fig. V.6)

Spain – The effigy of King Juan Carlos I de Borbón y Borbón is reproduced on the €1 and €2 coins. Miguel de Cervantes, the father of the Spanish literature, is shown on the 10, 20, and 50-cent coins, reflecting the universality of the man and his work. The Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela¹⁴¹, one of the most famous pilgrimage destinations in the world, is depicted on the 1, 2 and 5 cent coins. (Fig. V.14)

France – Over 1,200 designs were considered for the national side of the French coins. A panel chaired by the Minister for Economic Affairs and Finance chose three designs, each for certain specific denominations. The panel consisted of experts in numismatics, artists, a former Member of the European Commission (Christine Scrivener), Members of Parliament, the French Mint Director Emmanuel Constans, the General Engraver Pierre Rodier and the actress Irène Jacob, along with members of professional bodies. €1 and €2 coins: A tree, drawn by the artist Joaquim Jiminez, appears on these coins, symbolising life, continuity and growth. It is contained in a hexagon and is surrounded by the motto of the Republic "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité". Edge lettering of the 2 euro coin: 2 * *, repeated six times, alternately upright and inverted.

10, 20 and 50 cent coins: The theme of the sower is a constant in the history of the French franc. Designed by Laurent Jorlo, "this modern, timeless graphic represents France, which stays true to itself, whilst integrating into Europe".¹⁴² French euro coins of 10, 20, and 50 cents bear a hatched, striped background on the country-specific side. The left stripe is horizontally hatched, the central stripe bears no hatching, the right stripe is vertically hatched, clearly (not to the uninitiated!) showing the French flag (or at least its colors, blue-white-red) by means of a Petra Sancta hatching.¹⁴³ (Fig. V. 4.)

¹⁴⁰ The Brandenburg Gate (German: *Brandenburger Tor*) is a former city gate and the symbol of Berlin, Germany. It is located on the Pariser Platz and is the only remaining gate of a series through which one formerly entered Berlin. One block to its north lies the Reichstag. It constitutes the monumental termination of Unter den Linden, the renowned boulevard of linden trees which led directly to the royal residence. It was commissioned by Friedrich Wilhelm II, as a sign of peace and built by Carl Gotthard Langhans from 1788 to 1791. ("Brandenburg Gate", in *Wikipedia. The free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brandenburg_Gate)

¹⁴¹ Santiago de Compostela Cathedral is situated in Santiago de Compostela in Galicia, Spain. The cathedral is the reputed burial-place of Saint James the Great, one of the apostles of Jesus Christ. It is the destination of the Way of St. James, a major historical pilgrimage route since the Middle Ages. ("Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela", in *Wikipedia. The free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cathedral_of_Santiago_de_Compostela)

¹⁴²"Euro Coins". In *Euro banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from: <http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro0/specific.FR.html>

¹⁴³"The Euro as European Currency"....

Ireland – All the Irish coins have the same national side showing a Celtic harp, a traditional symbol of Ireland. The word “Ireland” is shown in Irish (Éire). (Fig. VII.7)

Italy – The €2 coin features a portrait of Dante Alighieri by Raphael. The €1 coin shows Leonardo da Vinci’s drawing illustrating the ideal proportions of the human body. The 10, 20, and 50-cent coins depict “The Birth of Venus” by Botticelli, a sculpture by Umberto Boccioni and the statue of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus respectively. The others coins feature the Castel del Monte (1 cent), the Mole Antonelliana (2 cent), and the Colosseum (5 cent). (Fig. VII.8)

Luxembourg – The coins show the effigy of the Royal Highness the Grand Duke Henri. The word “Luxembourg” is written in Luxembourgish (Lëtzebuerg). (Fig. VII. 9.)

The Netherlands – Two different designs – both of Queen Beatrix in profile – are used. On the €1 and €2 coins, the words “Beatrix, Queen of the Netherlands” in Dutch appear to the right of the profile. On the 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, and 50-cent coins, the same wording encircles the profile. The 12 stars of the European Union also feature in both designs. (Fig. VII.11)

Austria – Austria chose to produce a series of coins illustrating flowers, architecture, and famous people from its history. The designs were chosen by a national panel and public opinion poll. Austrian artist Josef Kaiser created the designs.¹⁴⁴ Austrian euro coins (all denominations) show a tiny Austrian flag on the country-specific side. On smaller denominations (1, 2, and 5 cents) the flag is curved upwards so as to fit in the scarce space. Once more, colors are represented by hatching (three horizontal stripes hatched vertical-plain-vertical standing for red-white-red).¹⁴⁵ The €2 coin shows a portrait of the radical pacifist Bertha von Suttner¹⁴⁶. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, the famous Austrian composer, is depicted on the €1 coin. Some of the Vienna’s most famous buildings adorn the 10-cent (St. Stephen’s Cathedral), 20-cent (Belvedere Palace) and 50-cent (Secession Building) coins. The 1, 2, and 5-cent coins show a gentian flower, an edelweiss and Alpine primrose respectively. (Fig. VII. 2.)

Portugal – the €1 and €2 coins feature some of the country’s castles and coats of arms, set amid the 12 stars of the European Union. The royal seal of 1144 is shown in the centre. The seal depicted on the 10, 20, and 50 cent coins dates back to 1142. The central area of the 1, 2, and 5-cent coins contains Portugal first royal seal of 1134 and the name of the country. (Fig. VII.12)

Finland – Cloudberry and cloudberry flowers appear on the €2 coin, while the motif of two flying swans features on the €1 coin. The heraldic lion is depicted on the 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, and 50-cent coins. (Fig. VII.3)

Monaco – The €2 coin depicts HSH (Her Serene Highness) Prince Rainier III, surrounded by the 12 stars of the European Union. The €1 coin shows a double portrait of HSH Prince Rainer III and HSH Hereditary Prince Albert in profile, also encircled by the

¹⁴⁴“Euro Coins”....

¹⁴⁵“National Flag on Austria Euro Coins”. In *European Union: Flags on Euro coins*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from:

http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/at_euro.html

¹⁴⁶Bertha Sophie Felicitas Freifrau von Suttner (Baroness Bertha von Suttner), (9 June 1843 in Prague, [then in Austrian Empire] - 21 June 1914 in Vienna, (then in Austria-Hungary), born as Gräfin (Countess) Kinsky von Wchinitz und Tettau, was an Austrian novelist, radical pacifist, and was the first woman to win the Nobel Peace Prize. (“Bertha von Suttner”, in *Wikipedia. The free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertha_von_Suttner)

12 stars. The 10, 20, and 50-cent coins depict the Prince's seal. The 1, 2, and 5-cent coins show the coat of arms of the Sovereign Princes of Monaco. (Fig. VII.10)

San Marino – The Government building (Palazzo Pubblico) is depicted on the €2 coin, while the €1 coin shows the Republic's official coat of arms. The three towers, Guaita, Cesta, and Montale, appear on the 50-cent coin. The 20-cent coin features the Saint Marino, based on a canvas of the Guercino School, while the 10-cent coin depicts the Basilico of San Marino. The 1, 2, and 5-cent coins show the third tower, the Statue of Liberty and the first tower respectively. (Fig. VII.13)

Vatican City – All coins show the effigy of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, Sovereign of the State of Vatican City, in profile facing to the left. The words "Città del Vaticano" also feature, together with the 12 stars of the European Union and the initials of the designer and engraver (GV and UP respectively).¹⁴⁷ (Fig. VII.15)

What remains to be asked is whether a single currency will also promote a common citizenship and identity in the European Union once a monetary union has been introduced. The significance of the single currency as a symbol for a European citizenship and identity and as manifestation of European unity had always been recognized. Based on the concept of "network externalities" the common currency has the potential of becoming a far more concrete symbol of identity than the flag, anthem, or others European emblems. As a medium of communication it will become an inseparable part of each European citizen's life, although its significance in this respect might somewhat decline as electronic means of payment become more widespread.

The role of money as a symbol of identity will also be facilitated by the design of the bank notes and coins. The features selected share a common meaning in all EU members states; representing the different historical epochs of Europe. Nevertheless, the governments could not agree on a homogenous appearance of the currency that would help to foster a common identity. They decided to retain a designated space on the bank notes and coin for national symbols; in itself an indication how hard it is for countries to part with their own pecuniary identities. The likelihood that European pecuniary identity will emerge depends first and foremost on the internal and external stability of the new currency. Only if the currency earns public trust and fulfils its central economic function as a means of storing wealth, can it potentially emerge into a symbol of European identity. While the single currency can be a powerful manifestation of a European identity, it cannot in itself create such an identity. It can only assist such a process where common political institutions already provide the basis for a European citizenship and identity. In this case, national and state images are transferred onto the European currency.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ European Central Bank, *The Euro Banknotes and Coins leaflet*, September 2002. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from:

<http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/euroleafletn.pdf>

¹⁴⁸ "The Euro as European Currency"....

6. Rituals, Identity and Social Change

In the discussion of symbolic aspects of European relation, it was also necessary to devote an important space to the issue of ritual, which is the performance of the whole activities dedicated to the celebration of the European Day, accompanied by the all other symbols like flag, and anthem.

Ritualization of behavior seems to be a particularly common strategy in contacts between countries, especially if there are fundamental contradictions and conflicts involved in their inter-state relation. Therefore, a deeper understanding of the structure and functions of ritual proves very useful in the analysis of relations between European states within a system of unequal and conflictual power relation. Here, the aim was to show how particular aspects of the process of construction of a European identity work in practice, in relation to the power structure and other components of the European order as well as in the symbolic context of ideologies, images, and worldviews.¹⁴⁹

The role of ritual as an active factor in social process, even outside the religious and magical domain, it is extremely important feature and explains why ritual is always present in social life. In the ritual case there are two different functions fulfilled by the symbolic behavior: namely, that it communicate messages, and does things. Another essential characteristic of ritual is that is repetitive. Indeed this feature seems to be present in every definition of ritual and distinguishes it from other forms of symbolic actions. Even in common language, the term “ritual” or “ritualistic” or “ritualization”, refers to behavior, which is repeated regularly without any apparent rational reason. However, repetitiveness is not sufficient for behavior to become ritual. It must also to be rigidly and formally structured. Ritual behavior must always be performed according to a fix pattern; otherwise, it is not valid and will not work.

If we concentrate on ritual as a social phenomenon, we understand that abstract ideas generated in the human mind must be given substance if they are to be grasped, communicated, and perceived. Only if they acquire a tangible form may they be transmitted as elements of culture and play a role in organizing collective thoughts and behavior. Symbols are such vehicles, which are capable of carrying the most abstracts ideas and emotions. By converting ideas, products of the mind into material objects, it can receive relative permanence. Rituals become material, perceptible representation of ideas and emotions, sequences of actions, which involve a variety of objects, human beings, sequences of time and space, sounds, images, and so forth. Ritual is undoubtedly the most complex and elaborate of all symbolic forms since it involves all sensory channels simultaneously and acts as an orderly sequence of events within a fixed space and time. Words, sounds, gestures, images, objects, human bodies – all become condensed into one single fact of experience. All components of ritual are structured in a sequence, a symbolic syntax, governed by very strict and formal rules. Everything in a ritual is prescribed and prearranged. Rigid formal structure organizes the symbolic action into a pattern where every development of events is predetermined.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 66-69.

In spite of all the controversies around the definition of the concept there seems to be an agreement as to many characteristics of ritual behavior. Ritual is undoubtedly a social activity performed by a group, or in the name of the group, and addressed to a community or a segment of the community. The performer and audience are often the same group, and then the group acts for itself, being both the sender and the receiver of the message. Ritual is the sequence of behavior organized in a strictly limited time and space, which creates the boundary between the ritual context and the world outside. Such a boundary is necessary in order to indicate that everything included should be interpreted according to the code of symbolic meanings in the ritual pattern, while the outside world is governed by the rational technological world. Within this time and space, the limitation of which themselves have meaning, a ritual sequence of objects and events have a symbolic character. Everything that belongs to ritual is symbolic and should be interpreted as such. These sequences of symbols are always very rigidly structured and formalized according to the fixed pattern. This results in the total control which rituals maintain over all its components, there are no unpredictable events in it. For this reason, ritual is always repeated in the same way; at least as far people's awareness is concerned. Repetitiveness is a feature of ritual (is repeated on the same day of the year), which makes it particularly suitable for carrying tradition and, in fact, the predictable and repetitive structure of ritual conveys the meaning of continuity and permanence regardless of its symbolic content. Whatever this content is, and the actual occasion, on which ritual is performed, it always conveys meaning which is essential for the existence and continuity of the group. Rituals are not performed on trivial occasions; they always communicate important matters and make it possible for people to do things, which have to be done if the group is to continue to exist.

If ritual fulfills the important function of creating the image of social order, it is because not only it is formal and repetitive but also because its structure is very elaborate and, most importantly, it is social action itself. Unlike art or myth, ritual not only describes and expresses social order, but also acts it out, makes the image of it, creates the fact of experience in which people participate and thus, within the limits of ritual, they can live out the order which ritual postulates. Owing to this, ritual creates images of social order in people's mental models of the world. As a living experience, it is superior to belief, since belief requires speculation while ritual draws people into the reality of ideas through participation.

There is, however, at least one other kind of structured symbolic behavior, which is directly connected with social order, that is ceremony. For the sake of conceptual clarity, it should be distinguished from ritual. Ceremony can be defined as any complex organization of human activity, which is not specifically technical or recreational and which are expressive of social relationship. All such models of behavior, conventional and stylized are ceremonial. By stressing the expression of social relationship, implies that ceremony reflects social order rather than creates it. Ceremony seems to be a kind of ritual in which the emphasis is more upon symbolic acknowledgement and a demonstration of social situation than upon the efficacy of procedures in modifying the situation. Whereas other ritual procedure are believed to have a validity of their own, ceremonial procedures, while formal in character, are not believed in themselves to sustain the situation or effect a change in it. Here the difference between ritual and ceremony is functional rather than structural. Ritual in this view does things, creates

social order, acts out the symbolic world, and transforms it, while ceremony merely represents the social relationships and does not itself constitute them. That is why we choose to see European Day in the light of a ritual performance.¹⁵¹

Hypothesis that rituals are active agents in social life and make things happen, while ceremonies are merely representation and acknowledgements of social situation, seems to be useful in our case in which such events as European Day is intended to play an important role in forming a new identity around European Union. In Firth's definition, many kinds of secular behavior of a formal and symbolic character would be classified as rituals, if there were active agents in social life. For instance, rituals of passage, graduation, May Day parades, openings of parliament, would be rituals since they are necessary for social events to happen. In contrast, a formal dinner, official meeting, or behavior governed by etiquette are ceremonial because, although they express and confirm the social order, it is not this very act which constitutes the social relation and makes the event or change in society happen.

An important role of ritual is that of saturating the presented image with emotions in such a way that ritual is an active factor in both maintaining and undermining the structural form of society. It is the factor which makes things happen, not in the same sense as in traditional communities but in the sense of shaping social relation and impelling people to change their social life by showing them the image of an alternative solution. A secular ceremony shows by acting in terms of them the existence of social relationship (the government, the party, etc.), ideas, or values, which are inherently invisible most of the time. It objectifies them and reifies them. It display symbols of their existence and by implicit reference postulates and enacts their reality.

If two sides of a social conflict show different realities then ritual actions may result in social change where one of the symbolic images of reality proves to be more influential; gain support, and become dominant over the other, which was previously dominant. Rituals may result in a new ideology coming to the fore and consequently being put into practice by the group, which advocates it and whose position in the balance of power it would be strengthen. Ritual is concerned with the process of either binding people's feelings into the existing organization of society or with aiding them to become critical and independent of it.

Ritual provides ideological justifications of power structure and reinforces it through symbolic interpretation. Its usefulness in political life comes from the fact that ritual creates a reality of power, acts it out, and provides it with an aura of sacredness and traditional values. Ritual combines the balance of power with the model of identity of the community. Since for every community to maintain pressure and defend its identity is a major goal, which in case of danger can mobilize human activity, it is ideal from the point of view of a power elite to create an image of reality which presents the political status quo as the integral element of the community's identity.¹⁵²

Ritual is a sort of tow way transformer shaping consciousness in conformity with culture but at the same time shaping culture in conformity with the immediate social-action and social-structural determinants of consciousness in everyday life. These relations between social structure, symbolic models of the world, and symbolic forms are

¹⁵¹ Ibid, pp. 72-75.

¹⁵² Ibid, pp. 76, 78, 83.

certainly dynamic processes and must be analyzed over the course of time. This process is the essence of social and cultural change, in which ritual is a significant factor.

Social life must be seen as a process, as the transformation of one stage of social structure into another. In this case, some rituals, as the rituals of passage, known from traditional communities, but present in all social systems, fulfill a double function. They declare the change in social status of a person or a group, and at the same time make this change happen. Rites of passage are the form of symbolic action in which a group makes change within the structure of positions and rules, although the structure itself remains unchanged. Nevertheless, from the point of view of the people involved, the change in their status would not happen if it were not for the ritual. In this sense, ritual is an active force in social life.

What is particularly interesting in the rite of passage is the existence of the middle phase of liminality or marginality. In this phase a person involved, no longer occupies a fixed, defined position to which the ritual is supposed to bring him. A person or a group (European citizens), when in this liminal phase, is from the point of view of the social structure, nonexistent, hidden symbolically, made invisible, absent from social life. The normative structure does not apply to him. The liminal stage is the phase of anti-structure where the change happens and from which the new order emerges. Innovation and inventions are created outside social structure in special anti-structural enclaves since normal social order requires conformism, while innovations are possible only where there is some kind of deviation from normality.

These marginal spheres of time and space contain art and science, play and theatre, carnival and ritual. In them social and cultural experiments are carried out, new ideas are invented and safely tried out beyond the main stream of social life where experiment cannot be risked. In due course, these new conceptual models are transformed into reality and introduced into social structure, thus making social change. In a contemporary complex society the new social order, normative, and value system is presented by ritual and theatre. These two forms of symbolic activity are in many respects similar. Their function in social drama consists in creating the model of the world into which new elements are introduced thus shaping ideas and action. Ritual and theatre are matrices of the social world, presenting images of reality, and letting the participants experience the new proposed order.¹⁵³

A ritual for European Union is the celebration of the European Day, on 9 May. The essence of such ritual is to strengthen and promote European identity and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world. The choice to describe the celebration of the European day in France, in 2006, is due to the important role played by the French states men in the creation and development of a united Europe, and because of the importance accorded to this Day by the French people and officials.

Each 9 May, Europe Day is celebrated in every Member State of the European Union. On 9 May 1950, Robert Schuman, French Foreign Affairs Minister, made a declaration in the Salon de l'Horloge at Quai d'Orsay that marked the beginning of European construction. In 2006, the twentieth Europe Day have been celebrated, after being established by the heads of state and government during the European Council in Milan in June 1985 and celebrated for the first time in 1986. Advantage has been taken of

¹⁵³ Ibid, pp. 86-89

this anniversary to give more meaning and impact to this day. The goal was to turn 9 May into a genuine holiday and an occasion for meetings and debates.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, embassies of European countries and the representation of European institutions in Paris opened their doors to the public. To make this day an occasion for meetings and discoveries of special places, the *Salon de l'Horloge* (the Clock room) of the *Quai d'Orsay* was opened to the public, as well as the embassies doors of European countries and the representation of the European Commission and European Parliament in Paris. All day long, the ambiance was set by classical and jazz concerts. In addition, the Republican Guard Orchestra and the French Army Choir gave two concerts in the gardens (the European anthem was also played). Films were screened and photos and drawings were on exhibit in the various salons.

Two big free concerts of the Republican guard took place in the gardens of the *Quai d'Orsay* between 13h and to 18h.

All colleges and French high schools received an educational kit on Europe, drawn in 40 000 copies. The European Movement and the Ministry of the National Education, of Higher Education, and Research, had achieved it jointly, so that the teachers could speak of Europe to their classes on 9 May.

The children of less than 12 years could participate in a concurs of drawing led in partnership with the West-France Newspaper on the theme of the European motto "United in the diversity." The best drawings were rewarded on 9 May at the *Quai d'Orsay*.

A big evening party was organized for the Erasmus students in the City of the Sciences and of the Industry with the launching of an artistic concurs by the Minister of Culture and the Communication. The European students who benefited from the Erasmus program or the one who are still beneficiating met in Paris Thursday evening, to go to dance. They celebrated the Feast of Europe, Tuesday 9 May, in the evening, to the City of the Sciences and the Techniques of La Villette. On this occasion and under the patronage of Renaud Donnedieu of Vabres, minister of the Culture and of the Communication, thrown the "Young Price of the European Culture." This prize rewarded the student amateurs in stay to Paris in the setting of the Erasmus program in four domains: musical activity (all instruments, songs), plastic expression, photos works, and poetic activity.

On the public buildings were reflected the colors of Europe, on the whole territory and one thousand European flags will be offered to the small townships that do not have one yet.

The Paris Transport Authority printed a blue subway ticket "Celebrates Europe."

The Post office published a philatelic souvenir "Celebrates Europe."

A *Eurostar*, in the colors of the Europe Feast leaved from the North Station (decorated in "Station of Europe") on 9 May, in the morning. That train circulated 15 days.

The hotel of the Currencies welcomed an exhibition "Euro / culture" with the support of the Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance and Industry. The euro being today the currency of 12 from 25 member States of the European Union. The exhibition "Euro / culture" presented at the hotel of the Currencies, the illustrations symbolism of the European currency. The photos with the national faces of the pieces, as well as European faces of the tickets and pieces were exposed. Some simple and educational texts illustrate and explain the symbols for every value of the pieces, their artistic,

cultural, historic or political mean, and that the motives of the tickets representing symbols of European architecture.

An exhibition "100 photos for Europe" was presented at the Representation of the European Commission in Paris. The ambition of that exhibition was to understand better the vision that we have about the today Europe through the prism of the big moments of our History. The first part was dedicated to the famous Austrian photographer Erich Lessing that offered a unique look on history. The second part was dedicated to 25 young talented photographers, original of each of the member States that knew how to seize on film, a look, a smile, a landscape, an atmosphere, a testimony of their country. That mosaic of works was intended to reveal our recent Europe, in its diversity.

An equestrian race took place in the evening of 9 May in Vincennes. The "Price of the European Day" was the subject of a Tiercé / Quinté+ and was broadcasted on *Canal Plus*, *Equidia* and *TF1*.

The UGC¹⁵⁴ cinemas of the forum of the Halles à Paris and Strasbourg diffused 25 movies issue by the 25 member States of the European Union in the evening of 9 May. On the European Day, UGC give to the Europeans the chance to discover the movies of the 25 countries of the European Union in its movies halls. 25 movies illustrating the cultural diversity of the 25 countries was simultaneous projected in the UGC CINE CITE movie halls implanted in five big symbolic European cities: Paris, Strasbourg, seat of the European Parliament, Brussels, Madrid, and Rome. UGC wished to make new spectators share wealth and the originality of the film production of the European countries, while presenting some movies in original version and in avant-première. The UGC group already organized in 2004 and 2005 in Brussels a big evening of Europe with the support of the Media Program, under the aegis of *Viviane Reding*, member of the European Commission. Let us recall that UGC is a group of cinemas present in France, Belgium, Spain and Italy; it is also a major actor of the production and distribution of the European films.

The traditional Parisian "roller parade" on Friday evening raised on 12 May the colors of the Europe Feast, in partnership with Suez.

The minister delegate awarded the Louise Weiss Prize for European journalism.

Air France offered supplementary discount coupons on the European destinations for the young tickets.

The Tower Eiffel was illuminated in blue, color of Europe, on 9 May from 0h00 and until midnight. Others monuments was also The Triumph Bow, the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs, the National Assembly and the Senate.

Many partners associate for the organization of this exceptional day: the National assembly and the Senate, many ministries and townships, the Town hall of Paris, big public corporations or private, the medias (*France Televisions*, *Arte*, *TV5 World*, *Euronews*, *Radio France*, the radio networks of highway, *The Parisian*, *West-France*,

¹⁵⁴ UGC is the largest cinema operator in Europe with, as of August 2005, 49 sites and 553 screens across four countries: France: 37 cinemas, 357 screens; Spain: 5 cinemas, 88 screens; Belgium: 4 cinemas, 56 screens; Italy: 3 cinemas, 52 screens

The Gazette, the Townships, etc.), which is a clear sign of the sustainability of the entire French population, official or not, for such a event, symbol of the European construction.

A communication campaign for the European Day:

- A logo (Fig. VIII)
- A campaign of TV spotlights on *France 2* and *TV5 Monde* as well as in the networks of television, with partners like Airports of Paris, *Air France*, and *Métrobus*.
- A campaign of radio spots on Radio France and on the radios network of the highway.
- A campaign of display: in the Parisian subway, but also on the whole of France (a poster sent to every township).
- A brochure drawn to 700 000 copies, distributed notably in the offices of station on the whole of the territory.
- An Internet site counting all events of 9 May, everywhere in France: www.feteleurope.fr¹⁵⁵

On that day, not only the embassies of European countries opened their doors to the public, but also the representative offices of the European Commission and the European Parliament in Paris. Some examples of what you could discover at the embassies on 9 May 2006.

- the embassy of Germany will propose one day on the theme of the European scientific cooperation. In partnership with the CNRS and the Discovery Palace, you could discover the laser Terramobil of detection of the atmospheric pollution, fruit of French-German cooperation.

- the embassy of Estonia will put the accent on the fashion with an exhibition of two young creators Estonians Jaanus Orgusaar, designer of fashion, and Tarvo Hanno Varres, photographer of fashion.

- the embassy of Spain will concentrate on the picture, proposing projections of movies on the Spanish regions, and the short subject films of famous Spanish producers Pedro Almodóvar and Luis Buñuel;

- the embassy of Ireland will present the Irish culture through an exhibition on life and the work of Samuel Beckett, folk music concerts.

Some interviews with Minister Delegate for European Affairs, Catherine Colonna, we think it will be relevant in emphasizing the importance of such a celebration. One of the interviews was given for a Parisian Newspaper, *Le Parisien* (Paris, 8 May 2006):

"It's a moment of celebration but also of reflection, to appraise what Europe has brought us in more than 50 years: not only peace and democracy on a continent long ravaged by wars and still cut in two 15 years ago, but also economic development with a market of 450 million inhabitants and more opportunity to take advantage of globalization. The day is also an invitation to mobilize to improve Europe, which isn't an abstract concept, but has a concrete existence, is a fact of daily life and depends on us all."

Others earlier remarks of Catherine Colonna were presented to the press, while describing the operation *Fête l'Europe* (Paris, April 20, 2006):

¹⁵⁵ "Dossier de Press". In *Fête l'Europe*. 9 May. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from: http://www.feteleurope.fr/images/dossier_presse2.pdf

"There's one moment when we need to think clearly. Know what we want. Remember where we have come from: I am referring here to the European continent before the European enterprise, ravaged century after century by wars and destruction. We need to realize that Europe is our common asset, quite simply, that it will be what we make of it collectively, that it doesn't come from the sky and that we all share responsibility, whether we are satisfied or dissatisfied. Frankly, if we take time to think back, I believe that we must pay tribute to it, hail what has already been done, and struggle to make it better still. That is why we wanted to give the twentieth anniversary of Europe Day a quite special meaning this year and make it a day for celebration, meetings, debates, and reflexion."

It followed another interview given by Ms Catherine Colonna to radio stations *Europe 1* and *RFI* (Paris, April 20, 2006):

"It's the twentieth time that 9 May, a day which exists in all the EU countries, is being marked. So what is 9 May? It is the anniversary of the Schuman declaration, which launched the building of Europe in 1950. This year it is being marked for the twentieth time and I would like it to be an opportunity for people to take a positive look at Europe, realize that it depends on us, that it can be improved, but that it is we who will improve it, if we want to. Our fate is in our hands. It is a moment of celebration, but also one of reflection and debate."¹⁵⁶

Such affirmations seem to be real arguments for the European success, and a kind of invitations for the European people to believe and sustain the development of the European construction.

Another interview was given by Catherine Colonna to the television channel of the International Film School of Paris (EICAR – Ecole Internationale de Creation Audiovisuelle et the Realisation)

Q. – What would you say to young Europeans, and particularly the French, to reassure them in the face of their Euro-scepticism?

The Minister – I am going to say two very simple things: firstly, Europe is a good thing. It has helped us in the past, it helps us every day, and it is going to go on helping us. Secondly, who is Europe? It is we, all of us. It is not heaven-sent, it is not here by chance, it exists because there were people who had enough vision and enough courage to say, "let's group together, let's act together, we'll do better all together". In addition, it is worked. Therefore, we are building Europe, generation after generation. Today, we are not doing it only for ourselves; we are not doing it for all the governments. We are doing it for young people and children. I believe we have to get this through to them. Their future depends on it. It is for them to build it, for us all to do it collectively. We are responsible for our destiny, and Europe offers us this opportunity to take responsibility for our destiny. This does not often happen, as you know. Therefore it is an opportunity, let us seize it.¹⁵⁷

We can see how important is the media role in promoting of such an event. The role of television seems to be paramount. Not only does it allow the general public to participate in events which previously involved only a small group of people, it also

¹⁵⁶ "Fête l'Europe". In *France Diplomatie*, 9 May 2006, Paris. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from: http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/european-union_157/fete-europe-paris-may-9-2006_4421.html

¹⁵⁷ "Foreign Policy Statements". In *France Diplomatie*. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from: <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/bulletin.gb.asp?liste=20060518.gb.html#Chapitre2>

changes to a large extent the character of the performance and the commentary provides a ready explanation of the events and interpretation of their meanings. On the other hand, and even more importantly, television commentators shape people's perception of the ritual by concentrating on particular details and omitting others, by interpreting and explaining symbols, by showing, before the actual event, during and after it, other places, people, pictures, reminding people of past events and providing the whole symbolic and ideological framework of the ritual.

The solemn music plays a vital part in creating an emotional atmosphere. The performance of the European anthem, the presence of the flag, others symbols which bring their contribution in emphasizing the importance of such an event. The meaning of this ritual is clearly to present the unified nation expressing their common identity and confirming their attachment to the supreme values rooted in the European tradition. The fact that all the member states take part in such a ritual, prove their acceptance and their sustainability for the values and realization of the United Europe. Every European country participates in this ceremony, by which European identity is defined, represented now by its symbols, the flag, the anthem, and the Euro.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸ Zdzisław Mach, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-120.

V. CONCLUSION

The development of the European Union constitutes the second current that is causing fundamental changes in the social and political landscape of the old continent. Although primarily concerned with economic objectives, the EU is nevertheless causing significant changes in fields unrelated to the economy. It is becoming apparent that the political and economic integration of Europe will be accompanied by a process of identity-building that, no matter how fragile and convoluted at the present time, will ultimately weaken national identities. The very determination of the various groups fighting to maintain a national identity or the conflicts building up around the issue of yet-to-be negotiated Euro-meanings indicates that the new Euro-identity construction is already more deeply rooted than is commonly assumed. Yet the weakening of national-state sovereignty does not mean that nationalism will disappear altogether - in Europe no more than elsewhere. The truth is that the nationalism can be put to very different uses and that the label nationalism often conceals other realities.

Besides, there are indications of a major identities transformation in Europe. National identities are becoming more inclusive and there are signs of an emerging inclusive conception of European identity. The latter is far more akin to a post-national than a national type identity. From what we have seen here both historical and contemporary aspects of the EU give it this post-national thrust. The Member State still retains the most important traditional mechanisms for socializing its citizens (school systems, a national vernacular etc.) and the EU has not undermined these, but the context of European cooperation appears to make them more inclusive.

That there will be a process in Europe where a European (in the sense of national type) identity replace a Member State national one is highly unlikely. And it is neither possible nor desirable to level out the national identities of member nations, nor melt them down into a "Nation of Europe". In cultural and linguistic terms, Europe is marked more by its diversity than by its coherence. Attempts at fostering a unified European nation-type identity based on a common European cultural traditions are bound to encounter fierce national opposition – driven by the need to ensure continued preservation of nationally based difference.

Undeniably, in Europe there are common historical origins and common cultural heritage. However, at the same time the EU is characterized by a plurality of cultures, languages, and ethnic groups. In addition, in view of any further enlargement, Europe is destined to be a continent of plural belonging. It is difficult to imagine a cultural "unification", and in any case, this is not to the ultimate goal of the EU. Talking about a common identity cannot imply a uniformity of European cultural identities. The deepening of the common European values does not necessarily mean the removal of cultural specificity of the European peoples. This would be in contrast with the TEU

articles giving way to a certain regional decentralization and establishing the right to respect local and regional identities.

The prospect of supplanting a national with a European nation-type identity appears highly remote. The Eurobarometer data indicate that national identity has not given by now a ground to a sense of European identity. What needs to be explored instead is whether national identities can be supplemented or transformed – even to the extent of becoming post-national. Such a consideration requires attention to the possibility that the contemporary context of identity formation may be quite different from that, which existed at the time when the notion of national identity first emerged and when the national identities of the European Member States were formed. This observation seems particularly adequate now, as cultures and societies are becoming increasingly tightly linked and interconnected, and as societies become increasingly multicultural. These developments bring forth a heightened concern with identity, regarding both recognition of uniqueness, as well as recognition of equality and of equal value. Nations, regions, groups (intra and trans-national) and individuals seek recognition of their unique identity.

Indeed, the greater the pressure on communities to modify their structural forms to comply more with those elsewhere, the more are they inclined to reassert their boundaries symbolically by imbuing these modified forms with meaning and significance which belies their appearance. In other words, as structural bases of boundary become blurred, so the symbolic bases are strengthened. Ethnic and national identity does not disappear in the course of development of contemporary civilization. The mutual interdependence of groups all over the world, equality of knowledge, education, and access to technology and scientific invention increase, while simultaneously the tendency towards preservation, protection and autonomous development of group's unique identity also increase and leads to new-nationalism and new-ethnicity. Moreover, symbolic forms create identity and are active elements in social problems; they do not only express differences and power ration, but also shape relations through the emotional and ideological construction of images. However, the efforts by groups and collectives to protect and promote their difference and uniqueness must contend with the efforts by individuals, groups, and collectives to ensure the recognition of equal rights and equal dignity of every individual being.

The EU is a complex entity with supranational, transnational and intergovernmental traits, which suggests that it may be conducive to a wide range of identities and forms of belonging. In this case, we can expect that European identity may develop as a weaker form of identity in a hierarchy or circle of identities. European citizenship is described as a new kind of citizenship that is neither national nor cosmopolitan but is multiple in enabling the various identities that we all possess to be expressed, and our rights and duties exercised through a complex configuration of common institutions. The present resurgence of identity politics reminds us that there is not necessarily a struggle between a national and a European identity. People have always had multiple identities and the European integration process may make it easier to simultaneously embrace a national and a European identity. Stated differently, an European identity is not intended to replace the national one. Europe's cultural heritage has evolved over time and displays certain common characteristics that transcend national or regional differences. This interplay of diversity and constancy perfectly illustrates the regional, national, and European roots of European's citizens. Community action in the field of cultural heritage

can thus help to forge a European citizenship, based on a better understanding of both national culture and the culture of the other Union states.

Drawing from EU documents that address the issue of European identity, one finds that difference, when referred to in the abstract, is often appropriated as something positive, as an asset said to belong inside the Union and which therefore should be preserved, included and negotiated, rather than reduced to one uniform level. With reference to this, at a surface level, one could argue that this points to a potential future transformation of traditional understanding of European identity. In other words, it recognizes the danger of organizing a collective identity around particularistic and excluding notions of ethnicity, culture, and religion. Differences between recognized national and regional entities in the Union – a recognition that, over the years has been increasingly emphasized in a variety of contexts – are seen as positive instances of difference and, as such, they are included in the Maastricht Treaty. “The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.” Hence, this articulation can be said to dissociate itself from an identity formation through a process of leveling, and instead seeks to have difference and commonality constitute two sides of the same coin. “On the one side, we see a disparate family of nations embracing many different cultures; on the other hand, a desire to develop a common identity, to make Europe ‘European’ – but without succumbing to the colorless uniformity of ‘Europeanism’ or to the temptation of blindly imitating the past.”

Thus, difference is by no means always constructed as being of a dividing or mutually antagonistic nature. National and regional cultures, framed as bounded and essential entities, but which still can be organized around the least common denominator of ‘Europe’ which provides the differentiated space with its unifying and ‘natural’ boundaries, are also differences destined to coexist in a pluralist harmony. A Union “we” then, is indeed said to encapsulate differences, and no identity mobilization conducted by the EU is allowed to overlook what are conceived of as distinct and homogenous national and regional cultures.

REFERENCES

I. BOOKS

- CASSIRER, ERNST, *An Essay of Man*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1994 and Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*, Mentor Book: The New American Library, New York, 1956 (1942).
- COHEN, ANTHONY P., *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, Tavistock, London, 1985.
- DUNKERLEY, DAVID, Lesley Hodgson, Stanislaw Konopacki, *Changing Europe. Identities, nations and citizen*. Published by Routledge, London, and New York, 2002.
- DYSON, KENNETH, *Exclusive Union. The Process of Economic and Monetary Union in Europe*, Longmans, London, 1994.
- ELIADE, MIRCEA, *Images and Symbols. Studies in Religios Symbolism*. Translated by Philip Mairet, A Search Book: Sheed and Ward, New York, 1969.
- FIRTH, RAYMOND, *Tikopia, Ritual, and Belief*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1967.
- FONTAINE, P, *A Citizen's Europe*, Office of Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1991.
- FRANGOUDAKI, ANNA and Dragonas, Thalia, "Intercultural Education in the European Union from a 'Southern' Viewpoint", in Jadish Gundara and Sidney Jacobs (eds.), *Intercultural Europe. Diversity and Social Policy*, Published by Ashgate, Aldershot, England, 2000.
- HANSEN, PEO, "The Cultural Short-cut: A Road to Exclusion? Notes on Identity Politics in the European Union", in Jadish Gundara and Sidney Jacobs (eds.), *Intercultural Europe. Diversity and Social Policy*. Published by Ashgate, Aldershot, England, 2000.
- HERSOM, CAMILLA, "European Citizenship and the Search for Legitimacy: The Paradox of the Danish Case" in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004.
- KNUDSEN, T., "A Portrait of Danish State-culture: Why Denmark Needs Two National Anthems", in M. Keistrup (ed.), *European Integration and Denmark's Participation*, Political Studies Press, University of Copenhagen, 1992.
- LEACH, EDMUND R., *Culture and Communication*, Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- MACH, ZDZISŁAW, *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, State University of New York Press, 1993.
- NEWMAN, M., *Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union*, Hurst & Company, London, 1996.

- PANEBIANCO, STEFANIA, "European Citizenship and European Identity: from Treaty Provisions to Public Opinion Attitudes" (pp. 18-36), in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004.
- REINHARDT, NICKOLAS, "Pecuniary Identity and European Integration" in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004.
- SHORE, CRIS and Black, Annabel, "Citizens' Europe and the Construction of European Identity", in Victoria A. Godard, Josep R. Llobera, Cris Shore (eds.), *The Anthropology of Europe. Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*, Berg, Oxford, Washington D. C., 1996.
- SMITH, A. D., *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Blackwell, Oxford, 1986.
- _____, *Nationalism and Modernism*. Routledge, London, 1998.
- _____, *Theories of Nationalism*, Duckworth, London, 1971.
- TAAFFE, DOLORES, "Who governs the Europeans?" in Edward Moxon-Browne (ed.), *Who are the Europeans now?*, Published by Ashgate, England, 2004.
- TURNER, VICTOR, *The Forest of Symbols*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1967.
- WICKER, HANS-RUDOLF, "Introduction: Theorizing Ethnicity and Nationalism", in Hans-Rudolf Wicker (ed.), *Rethinking Nationalism & Ethnicity. The Struggle for Meaning and Order in Europe*, Oxford, New York, 1997.

II. ARTICLES FROM MAGAZINES, JOURNALS, OR NEWSPAPERS

- COHEN, ABNER, "Political Anthropology: The Analysis of the Symbolism of Power Relation", *Man*, vol. IV, 1969, pp. 215-235.
- FOSSUM, JON ERIK, "Identity-politics in the European Union", *Journal of European Integration - Revue d'Intégration Européenne*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 2001.
- NEUMANN, I. B., "A Region-building Approach to Northern Europe", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 20, 1994, pp. 53-74.
- URI, PIERRE, "L'aube de l'Europe: Le vingt-cinquième anniversaire du Plan Schuman", in *Le Monde*. No 9 427, 09.05.1975.

III. OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

- “A Constitution for Europe”. In *Europa*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/constitution/en/lstoc1_en.htm
- ADONNINO, P., “A People’s Europe: Reports from the Ad Hoc Committee”, *Bulletin of the EC*, Supplement No. 7, Luxembourg, 1985.
- LARCHER, ALOÏS, *Le drapeau de l'Europe et l'hymne européen, La genèse de deux symboles*. Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg, septembre 1995.
- “Bruges Revisited”. In *The Bruges Group*. Paper no. 34. On-line at:
<http://www.brugesgroup.com/mediacentre/index.live?article=92#britain>
- CEC (Commission of the European Communities), “A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community”. COM (87) 603 final, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, Supplement 4/87, 14 December 1987.
- _____, “A People’s Europe: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament”, COM (88) 331/final, *Bulletin of the EC*, Supplement No. 2, Luxembourg, 1988.
- _____, “Declaration on the European Identity”, *Bulletin European Community*, 12 (Clause 2501), 1973.
- _____, (Commission des Communautés européennes - Direction générale X.) *Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau, Objet: Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté*. VDE/JSB X/B/1. Bruxelles: 16.04.1986.
- _____, *European Community action in Support of Culture*, COM (95) 110 final, Brussels, 29.03.1995.
- _____, *First Report on the Consideration of Cultural Aspects in European Community Action*, COM (96) 160 final, Brussels, 17.04. 1996.
- _____, *XXIIIrd General Report on the Activities of the European Communities*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1989.
- _____, *Report on the Citizenship of the Union*, COM (93)702 final, Brussels, December 21, 1993.
- _____, *The European Community 1992 and Beyond*, Office for Official Publication of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1991.
- _____, *Treaties Establishing the European Communities*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1983.
- Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, "XXIII. Organisation of Europe Day ". In *Conclusions of the 206th meeting of the Deputies*. Doc. CM (71) 187.
- _____, "Resolution (55) 32 - (Adopted by the Ministers' Deputies): Emblem of the Council of Europe", 9th December, 1955. In *Documents of the Committee of Ministers 1955 - II*, July - December, 1955; *Documents du Comité des Ministres 1955 II*, Juillet - Décembre 1955.
- Conseil de l'Europe. *Mémoire à l'attention du Secrétaire Général, Objet: Hymne européen*. MdB/js. Maud de Boer, 2 mars 1972.
- Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, *Recommendation 56 on the choice of an emblem for the Council of Europe*. Strasbourg. On-line at:
<http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta53/EREC56.htm>
- _____, *Recommendation 88 on the emblem of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg , 1955. On-line at:

- <http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta55/EREC88.htm>
- _____, *Resolution 41 on the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe*. Res (53) 41, Strasbourg, mise à jour 26.01.2006[30.05.2005]. On-line at:
<http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta53/ERES41.htm>
- Council of Europe. Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, *Resolution 492 on a European anthem*, Strasbourg, 1971.
- Council of Europe, "European flag - Drapeau européen". In *Library and Archives*, On-line at:
<http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/flag/default.asp>
- "Conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, No. 6, June 1984.
- "Conclusions of the Milan European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, No 6, Milan, June 1985.
- COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, R., "The European Flag", Memorandum presented to the Council of Europe by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-European Movement, Secretary General of the European Parliamentary Union. Gstaad, 27 July 1950. In "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191", *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, Commission of the European Communities, *Treaty on European Union*, Title IX, Article 128, Office for Official Publication of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1992.
- "Declaration on 9 May 1950". In *Europa. Europe Day, 9 May*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/decl_en.htm
- "Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté". In *Bulletin des Communautés européennes*, No. 4, 1986.
- "European Union". Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans, Prime Minister of Belgium, to the European Council. *Bulletin of the European Communities*, Supplement 1/76, 1975.
- "Eurobarometer", no. 47, Spring 1997. In *European Commission. Public Opinion Analysis*. On-line at:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb47/eb47_en.htm
- _____, no. 48, Autumn 1997. In *European Commission. Public Opinion Analysis*. On-line at:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb48/eb48_en.htm
- RADIUS, MR. (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971.
- "Report submitted to the Milan European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, Supplement 7/85, No. 6, Milan, 28-29 June 1985.
- "The Maastricht Treaty. Provisions Amending the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community with a View to Establishing the European Community". In *Eurotreaties*. On-line at: <http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>

TINDEMANS, S., "Social Movements in Europe: Movement Society or Europeanization of Conflict?", *EUI Working Papers*, No. 98/8, European University Institute, Florence, 1976.

IV. DICTIONARIES AND ENCICLOPEDIES

DINAN, DESMOND, *Encyclopedia of the European Union*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2000.

Encyclopædia Britannica. On-line at: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9070715>

EU ABC. A Dictionary on Words Related to UE. On-line at: <http://en.euabc.com/>

European Union Database Directory: 1999: A Guide to EU On-line Information Services, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1998.

LEACH, RODNEY, *Europe: a concise encyclopedia of the European Union from Aachen to Zollverein*, Profile Books, London, 2004.

Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia, On-line at:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/>

V. ARTICLES PUBLISHED ON LINE

CROWE, DAVID, *European Union. Flag of the European Union*. On-line at:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu-eun.html>

"Deviser pour l'Europe". In *Ouest-France Multimédia*, 05 mai 2000. On-line at:
<http://www.ouestfrance-ecole.com>

DIEM, PETER, "The myth of the "Marian seal" on the European Union flag". In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 11 June 2002. On-line at:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>

GIALDINO, CARLO CURTI, "The symbols of the European Union.". Translated by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe. In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. On-line at:
<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

LAHAV, RON, "Another Illustration of the Myth". In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 11 May 2004. On-line at:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>

- MURPHY, SEAN, *Memorandum on the Role of Irish Chief Herald Slevin in the Design of the European Flag*. Centre for Irish Genealogical and Historical Studies, 9 December 2005, revised 25 January 2006. On-line at:
<http://homepage.eircom.net/%7Eseanjmurphy/chiefs/euroflagmemo.html>
- PROTHERO, DAVID, *European Union. Number of stars on the flag of the European Union*, 12 December 1996. On-line at:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu-eun.html>
- “Real politics, at least?”. In *The Economist Newspaper and the Economist Group*, Oct 28, 2004. On-line at:
http://www.economist.com/printedition/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID=3332056
- SACHE, IVAN, based on comments by Jean-Michel Lévy, Paul M.G. Lévy's son, “An Illustration of the Myth”. In *European Union: Myths on the flag*, 15 January 2003. On-line at:
<http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu!myt.html>
- Transcript of interview with Paul Levy, 26 February 1998. On-line at:
http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/flag/levy_1998.pdf

VI. ON-LINE RESOURCES

- “Dictionary of Symbolism”. In *Fantasy and Science Fiction Web Site*. University of Michigan College of Engineering. On-line at:
<http://www.umich.edu/~umfandsf/symbolismproject/symbolism.html/>
- “Dossier de Press”. In *Fête l'Europe. 9 May*. On-line at:
http://www.feteleurope.fr/images/dossier_presse2.pdf
- “Emblems”. In *Europa. Interinstitutional Style Guide*. On-line at:
<http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-5000200.htm>
- “Euro Banknotes”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. On-line at:
<http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/testnotes.html>
- “Euro Coins”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. On-line at:
<http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro0.html>
- “Euro Coins. Common Side”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. On-line at:
<http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro0/coins.html>
- “Europe Day”. In *Europe*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/index_en.htm
- “Europe Day, European Flag and Anthem”. In *European Union. Delegation of European Commission to Japan*. On-line at:
http://jpn.cec.eu.int/union/showpage_en_union.day.php
- “Europe gets a ‘motto’”. In *The Parliament. European Politics and Policy*. On-line at:
<http://www.eupolitix.com/EN/News/200306/259ca7ae-3c2a-4ba8-bc87-54952016f1ae.htm>

- European Central Bank, *The Euro Banknotes and Coins leaflet*, September 2002. On-line at:
http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/euroleaflet_en.pdf
- “European Motto ‘In Varietate Concordia’”. In *Portal of European Stateless Nations and minorities*. On-line at:
<http://www.eurominority.org/version/eng/languages-motto.asp>
- “European Union - A Guide for Americans”. In *European Union. Delegation of the European Commission to the USA*. Retrieved December 5, 2006 from:
<http://www.eurunion.org/infores/euguide/euguide.htm>
- “European Union: Europe Day”. In *Representation of the European Commission to Turkey*. On-line at:
<http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/english/e-day3.html>
- “Foreign Policy Statements”. In *France Diplomatie*. On-line at:
<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/bulletin.gb.asp?liste=20060518.gb.html#Chapitre2>
- “From Design to Distribution. Euro Symbol Design”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. On-line at:
<http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro/euro.html>
- “Graphical Manual. The European Flag. The Symbols of the EU”. In *Europa*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/emblem/graphics1_en.htm
- “Madriaga, Salvador de”. In *Infoplease*. On-line at:
<http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/people/A0831054.html>
- “National Flag on Austria Euro Coins”. In *European Union: Flags on Euro coins*. On-line at:
http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/at_euro.html
- “Poster Gallery”. In *Europa. Europe Day, 9 May*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/gallery_en.htm
- “Symbols Clash”. In *European Politics and Policy*. On-line at:
<http://www.eupolitix.com/EN/News/200311/5c34d425-65f2-45c4-bc29-735573dc2d8d.htm>
- “The Euro as European Currency”. In *European Union: Flags on Euro coins*. On-line at:
[http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu\\$euro.html](http://www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/eu$euro.html)
- “The European Flag. The Symbols of the EU”. In *Europa*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/emblem/index_en.htm
- “Unity in diversity”. In *Europa*. On-line at:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/motto/index_en.htm

APPENDIX

Appendix A Documents related to the adoption of the European symbols

A.1 A people's Europe

The European Council considers it essential that the Community should respond to the expectations of the people of Europe by adopting measures to strengthen and promote its identity and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world.

An ad hoc committee will be set up to prepare and coordinate this action. It will be composed of representatives of the Heads of State or Government of the Member States.

The European Council approves the agreement reached on the principle of creating a European passport and asks the Council to take the necessary decisions to ensure that this passport is actually available to Member States' nationals by 1 January 1985 at the latest.

It asks the Council and the Member States to put in hand without delay a study of the measures which could be taken to bring about in the near future, and in any case before the middle of 1985:

- (i) a single document for the movement of goods;
- (ii) the abolition of all police and customs formalities for people crossing intra-Community frontiers;
- (iii) a general system for ensuring the equivalence of university diplomas, in order to bring about the effective freedom of establishment within the Community.

The Committee will examine inter alia the following suggestions:

- (i) symbols of the Community's existence, such as a flag and an anthem;
- (ii) formation of European sports teams;
- (iii) streamlining procedures at frontier posts;
- (iv) minting of a European coinage, namely the ECU.

It would also like Member States to take steps to encourage young people to participate in projects organized by the Community beyond its frontiers, and in particular to support the creation of national committees of European volunteers for development,

bringing together young Europeans who wish to work on development projects in the Third World.

The ad hoc committee will also examine the following suggestions:

- (i) measures to combat drug abuse;
- (ii) the twinning of children's classes.

The Commission will contribute to the proceedings of the committee within the limits of its powers.¹⁵⁹

A.2 Strengthening of the Community's image and identity

The Committee, taking account of the reference to initiatives of symbolic value in the conclusions of the European Council at Fontainebleau, proposes the following:

There is clearly a need, for both practical and symbolic reasons, for a flag and an emblem to be used at national and international events, exhibitions and other occasions where the existence of the Community needs to be brought to public attention. A decision on this matter is required in order to avoid misunderstanding and confusion.

The Committee agrees with the European Parliament's idea that a design, which could be used for both a Community emblem and a flag, should be basically that chosen by the Council of Europe.

However, bearing in mind the independence and the different nature of the two organizations, the Committee proposes to the European Council that the European Community emblem and flag should be a blue rectangle with, in the centre, a circle of 12 five-pointed gold stars which do not touch, surrounding a gold letter E, of the design already used by the Commission.

The European Council should express the hope that the emblem and flag will be used at appropriate places and on suitable occasions, without of course affecting the use of national flags, and asks the institutions to agree to regulate the use of flag and emblem.

The music of the 'Ode to Joy' from the fourth movement of Beethoven's ninth symphony is in fact used at European events. The Council of Europe as being representative of the European idea has also recognized this anthem.

The Committee recommends to the European Council that this anthem be played at appropriate events and ceremonies.

Stamps are very widely used both inside and outside each individual country and thus, if suitably designed, can be appropriate vehicles for drawing attention to ideas and events in the Community.

The Committee proposes to the European Council that the postal organizations should be invited to consider national issues of certain stamps in the individual countries

¹⁵⁹"Conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, June 1984, No. 6, pp. 11-12, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator*. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe. Retrieved December 6, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

bearing identical designs of subjects which highlight the Community or its underlying values, or which commemorate particularly important events in Community history, such as the accession of Spain and Portugal, as was done to mark the first direct elections to the European Parliament. The European Council should invite the competent postal authorities and the Commission to instigate early action on these lines.

The Committee furthermore proposes to the European Council that it request all postal administrations to study the possibility of extending the internal tariff for postcards and standard letters to destinations in all other Member States.

Even now, neither at the external frontiers nor at internal borders is there any visible sign that the traveler is entering the Community or moving within it. On the contrary, several of the features of border posts are increasingly becoming anachronisms, for instance the sign 'customs' at internal borders, in that they ignore the existence of the common market and thus undermine the credibility of the Community.

The European Council should therefore invite the Member States to remedy the present unsatisfactory and uninspiring state of affairs at the borders, through a concerted effort in the framework of the Community. It cannot indeed be beyond the imagination of a Community which strives for a 'Europe sans frontières' and which should now endow itself with a common emblem — without of course prejudice to the use of national flags — to abolish inadequate and obsolete signs at internal borders and devise border signs of a common design correctly reflecting the progress made towards a genuine single market and the unity of the European Community.¹⁶⁰

The Milan European Council of 28 and 29 June 1985 approves the proposals set out in the second report of the Ad hoc Committee on a People's Europe, known as the Adonnino Committee, including those concerning the adoption of the flag and anthem of the European Community and the establishment of 'Europe Day'.¹⁶¹

A.3 Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté

2.1.81. Le Conseil «affaires étrangères», réuni les 21 et 22 avril, a pris acte d'une déclaration de son président selon laquelle le Conseil utilisera le drapeau et l'emblème de la Communauté, comme cela avait été demandé dans le rapport final du comité ad hoc sur l'Europe des citoyens (1).

¹⁶⁰ "Report submitted to the Milan European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, Supplement 7/85, No. 6, Milan, 28-29 June 1985, pp. 18-30 **apud** "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*, Retrieved December 7, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

¹⁶¹ "Conclusions of the Milan European Council". In *Bulletin of the European Communities*, No 6, Milan, June 1985, pp. 13-16, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*, Retrieved December 7, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

Les autres institutions de la Communauté (Parlement, Commission et Cour de justice) ont arrêté la même position.

Ce drapeau est de forme rectangulaire, de couleur bleue, avec au centre douze étoiles dorées à cinq branches, représentant les États membres. Il flottera devant les institutions communautaires, à côté des drapeaux des États membres.

De même, la musique de l'«Hymne à la joie», tirée du quatrième mouvement de la neuvième symphonie de Beethoven, sera utilisée lors de manifestations européennes.

M. Carlo Ripa di Meana, membre de la Commission responsable de l'Europe des citoyens, a fait, à l'issue du Conseil, la déclaration suivante:

‘(...) Ce drapeau, qui a déjà connu une forte sympathie populaire comme drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe, témoigne de la volonté de la Communauté de devenir le centre et le moteur d'une construction européenne à grande portée qui rassemble tous les pays d'Europe occidentale unis par une histoire, une tradition et un héritage communs. Presque 30 ans après la signature du traité de Rome, la Communauté a finalement trouvé le courage de se faire connaître et reconnaître par tous. Une cérémonie solennelle de levée du drapeau aura lieu à Bruxelles devant le siège de la Commission le 29 mai, le prélude de l'«Hymne à la joie» de Beethoven, nouvel hymne européen, sera interprété (...)’.¹⁶²

A.4 The Europe Prize

The Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions also considered the matter of the propagation of the European idea, and in December 1951 submitted a report concerning the institution of a "Council of Europe Prize" to be awarded "for the best, and most inspired, literary work and film of the year, outstanding in form and furthering the idea of European unity".

In Recommendation 20 the Consultative Assembly submitted this proposal to the Committee of Ministers, which considered it as "premature" and took no further action.

The project was, however, taken up again in 1953 in a different form by the Special Committee on Municipal and Regional Affairs set up in 1952. In September 1953, on a proposal by that Committee, the Assembly adopted Recommendation 53 "on the best means whereby the national or international bodies connected with local government and the local authorities themselves may help in the propagation of the European idea".

Besides giving encouragement to "pairings", the Assembly recommended "the annual award of a European Prize to the municipality which [had] done most to propagate the ideal of European unity".

¹⁶² "Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté". In *Bulletin des Communautés européennes*, No. 4, 1986, p. 51, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*, Retrieved December 7, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

(It should be noted that the report of the Special Committee had stressed the wide variety of possibilities which local authorities possessed for the propagation of the European idea and which should therefore be used to further this ideal.)

Thanks to the tenacity of the Assembly, the objections of the Committee of Ministers, which continued to regard the idea of the Prize as "premature", were finally removed in 1955 and the institution of the Prize was hailed as an important step forward by the Assembly in the propagation of the European idea.¹⁶³

A.5 Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau (Bruxelles, 16 avril 1986)¹⁶⁴

Objet: Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté

Le Secrétaire général du Parlement européen, le représentant du Secrétaire général du Conseil et le Secrétaire général de la Commission se sont réunis le 20 mars 1986 à Bruxelles. Ils ont mis au point les modalités d'utilisation du drapeau, de l'emblème et de l'hymne de la Communauté.

1. Drapeau

Les trois Secrétaires généraux sont tombés d'accord sur le drapeau de couleur bleu avec au centre un cercle de douze étoiles dorées, sans la lettre "E", dans le graphisme déjà utilisé par la Commission. La Communauté et ses institutions sont représentés par le seul drapeau communautaire. Ce drapeau est conforme aux descriptions et au modèle ci-joint (Annexe), identique, soulignons-le, au drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe.

2. Emblème

L'emblème actuel de la Commission (un "E" en or sur un fond bleu foncé) reste valable et son utilisation peut être poursuivie.

Cependant, un emblème communautaire, reprenant le dessin utilisé dans le drapeau, peut également être employé.

3. Hymne

Dans le rapport du comité ad hoc "Europe des Citoyens", soumis au Conseil européen lors de sa réunion des 28/29 juin 1985 à Milan, il a été proposé que le prélude à

¹⁶³ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971, *apud* Council of Europe, "European anthem". In *Documents. Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 7, 2006 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

¹⁶⁴ Commission des Communautés européennes - Direction générale X. *Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau, Objet: Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté*. VDE/JSB X/B/1. Bruxelles, 16.04.1986. In "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191", *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg, *apud* "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*, Retrieved December 7, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

l'Ode à la Joie du 4ème mouvement de la 9ème Symphonie de Ludwig van Beethoven, constitue l'hymne européen.

Cet hymne fait, par ailleurs, déjà l'objet d'une large utilisation par les institutions communautaires et peut être utilisé comme hymne européen.

[signature]
Marco Piccarolo
Directeur

A.6 Memorandum from the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe on the European Flag (Strasbourg, 16 July 1951)

Confidential

1. The purpose of an Emblem

There are no ideals, however exalted in nature, which can afford to do without a symbol.

Symbols play a vital part in the ideological struggles of today. Ever since there first arose the question of European organisation, a large number of suggestions have more particularly been produced in its connection, some of which, despite their shortcomings, have for want of anything better been employed by various organisations and private individuals. A number of writers have pointed out how urgent and important it is that a symbol should be adopted, and the Secretariat-General has repeatedly been asked to provide a description of the official emblem of the Council of Europe and has been forced to admit that no such emblem exists.

Realising the importance of the matter, a number of French Members of Parliament (1) have proposed in the National Assembly that the symbol of the European Movement be flown together with the national flag on public buildings. Private movements such as the Volunteers of Europe have also been agitating for the flying of the European Movement colours on the occasion of certain French national celebrations.

In Belgium the emblem of the European Movement was used during the "European Seminar of 1950" by a number of individuals, private organisations and even public institutions. Certain newspapers criticised the use of this emblem and expressed their regret that the Council of Europe had adopted it which is untrue.

At Strasbourg the "E" flag has been widely used during Sessions, but to the surprise of the public, although it has been hoisted on private houses it has never been flown from French official buildings or buildings of the Council of Europe. On the other hand, a considerable amount of rivalry has manifested itself at the Seat of the Council inasmuch as the blue flag with the golden sun and red cross of the European Parliamentary Union has also made an appearance there.

This latter emblem, created by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi in 1923, is still used by him. The green "E" emblem dates from the early days of the European Movement. Both, however, are private emblems which do not affect the problem of a Council of Europe flag and its official use.

In August 1950, the Assembly examined the Report drawn up by the Secretariat-General at the request of the Committee on General Affairs on practical measures designed to make the peoples of Europe more directly aware of their unity. The Assembly referred the various chapters of this Report to the Committees qualified to deal with them. One of the measures advocated was the adoption of a flag. This proposal is a matter for the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges to decide (AS/AG (50) 85).

2. Design of the emblem of the Council of Europe and its use

The Assembly must reach a decision as to the principle of adopting an emblem, as to its design and the use to which it is to be put. This last point will briefly be dealt with here, partly on the basis of procedure and regulations established by the United Nations in a similar connection.

The text to be submitted to the Assembly for later recommendation to the Committee of Ministers might read as follows:

"The Consultative Assembly recommends to the Committee of Ministers:

Article 1

: That the emblem of the Council of Europe shall be (description).

Article 2

: That the Governments of Member States shall use the emblem of the Council of Europe conjointly with the national flag on all official buildings and on all occasions when flags are officially required to be flown, including the 5th May of each year, the anniversary date of the signing of the Statute of the Council of Europe.

In cases where it is flown together with a national flag, that of the Council of Europe shall be placed to the right of the national flag.

Article 3

: The emblem of the Council of Europe shall be flown:

(a) On all buildings of the Council of Europe;

(b) On the official residence of the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretaries-General;

(c) On all vehicles used by the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, the President and Vice-Presidents of the Consultative Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretaries-General, whenever these personages are riding in the vehicles.

Article 4

: The specialised authorities established within the Council of Europe and the non-governmental organisations recognised by the latter shall be entitled to use the Council flag subject to conditions to be laid down by order of the Secretary-General.

Article 5

: The flag of the Council of Europe may be used by individuals of the Member States provided it is at all times treated with respect.

Article 6

: The Secretary-General shall be responsible for the carrying out of these provisions."

3. Design of the Emblem

It would seem wiser not to adopt any flag already existing. Some are already employed by certain organisations, which should continue to use them. A completely new flag must be designed; on the other hand, any proposals submitted to this effect should fulfil the following requirements:

(a) Sufficient symbolical significance;

(b) Simplicity;

(c) Legibility;

(d) Harmony;

(e) Pleasing appearance;

(f) Orthodox heraldic design.

A. Symbols proposed

A very large number of symbols have been suggested. Those most frequently mentioned may be classified as follows:

- A cross - symbol of Christian civilisation, of Europe's crossroads (North - South, East - West), of command; reminiscent of the Crusades; the only symbol common to half the flags of Member States (Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Norway, Saar, Sweden, United Kingdom). Sometimes, as a variant, the Cross of St. Andrew, symbol of the Grand Duke of Burgundy, which appears historically the most appropriate.

- An "E" - Used by the European Movement, sometimes improved by being detached from the border of the flag, but criticized by experts in heraldry as being "more of a signpost than a flag".

- A white star in a circle - used in 1944-45 by the armies of liberation.

- Multiple stars - equivalent to the number of Member States in the Council of Europe and appearing either in the form of green stars on a white ground, white stars on a red ground, or silver stars for the Associate Members and golden stars for full Members.

- The coat-of-arms of the Town of Strasbourg - Argent, a bend gules, symbolising the official Seat of the Council of Europe.

- A sun - representing dawning hope.

- A triangle - representing culture.

B. Colours proposed

Some have suggested a combination of all the colours already used for the various flags of Europe. One of the earliest proposals sent in by a Strasbourg citizen was even accompanied by a statistical study of the colours employed, and was designed in blue, green, yellow, black, white and red in proportion to the extent these colours occur in the national flags. Green and white, the colours of the European Movement, are more often suggested; it should perhaps be pointed out in this respect that the original motive indulging the choice of green by Mr. Duncan Sandys was the use of the complementary colour to red; this has, however, been generally overlooked and green is advocated rather as symbolising youth and hope. On the other hand, some people have held that the true heraldic colour for Europe is blue (just as black is the colour for Africa, yellow for Asia and green for Australia); it has not been possible to trace the origin of this theory.

C.

While it is true that an orthodox heraldic device and adequate symbolic significance are of some importance, good visual recognition, attraction to the eye, and facility of reproduction are even more essential. When first examining the proposals received, it therefore appeared wiser straight away to reject:

(a) All intricate designs bearing symbols difficult to draw or particularly complicated to reproduce;

(b) Clashing colour combinations, however ingenious.

(c) Multicoloured emblems on the diagonal - such as the Cross of Burgundy - too reminiscent of the house flags of shipping companies.

The reasons militating against the use of emblems of existing Movements (European Parliamentary Union and European Movement) have already been given above.

D. Main proposals advanced

All proposals have been submitted to the members of the Committee. It is, however, in practice impossible to describe them all. Below will be found those proposals which appeared most worthy of the Committee's attention:

(a) The Manné proposal: This is the above-mentioned Strasbourg proposal based on the statistical distribution of the various colours on the European flags. Its design is in the form of four horizontal stripes - blue, green, yellow and black (secondary colours) - a triangle in red and white, the dominant colours, being placed adjacent to the pole. These colours (red and white) are not only those most frequently found on European flags, but also constitute the colours of the Town of Strasbourg. Every European will find in this composite flag the colours with which he himself is familiar.

(b) The Martin-Levy proposal: Designed by one of the curators of the Strasbourg Museum and a member of the Secretariat-General. White silk ground with a green cross bearing in the centre the coat-of-arms of the Town of Strasbourg. This flag resembles the colours of the European Movement and thus pays tribute to the founders of the Council of Europe; the cross, symbol of Christianity, is also the symbol of Europe's highways (North, South, East and West) at the converging point of which stands Strasbourg (the city of crossroads). This design is easily copied and is particularly harmonious to the eye, especially if the cross is shifted slightly towards the pole in the manner of Scandinavian flags.

This design met with considerable approval, but also with some criticism for the following reasons:

(i) White is easily soiled. It is therefore better not to have a flag with a white ground;

(ii) No federal flag has so far borne the coat-of-arms of the capital as its central motif.

(iii) Exception can be taken to the cross.

(c) The Coudenhove proposal: Count Coudenhove-Kalergi favours the white flag bearing a red cross whose four branches extend to the edges of the flag - i.e. the flag of St. George.

(d) The Prince de Schwarzenberg proposal: The latter proposes that the "first European symbol" - the labarum of Constantine - be adopted; that is, a red flag with a yellow cross.

(e) The Lucien Philippe proposal: Fifteen green stars in three rows on a white ground.

(f) The Wirion proposals: Monsieur Wirion, the Luxembourg expert in heraldry, considers that green and white should in all events be retained. He proposes various combinations (a star with eight forked points, the Burgundy Cross, a white sun on a field of green, etc.) but prefers a design based on the Martin-Levy proposal, reversing the colours (field of green and white cross) and doing away with the Strasbourg coat-of-arms. M. Wirion, however, at the beginning of March 1950, said he agreed that the white ground should be left, even though it is easily soiled. He was willing to accept the white ground with a green cross provided the Strasbourg coat-of-arms at the centre was only used for the pennants of Council personages and flags flown on Council buildings. In all other cases the coat-of-arms should be omitted.

(g) The Sommier proposal: Monsieur Sommier of Neuilly suggests that the aesthetic shortcomings of the "E" of the European Movement be remedied by detaching it from the edges of the flag and creating a neat geometrical design; this design he has studied in detail.

(h) Mondon proposals: Monsieur Mondon, a cartographer of Bad Godesberg, has proposed a white triangle, symbol of culture, on various fields.

(i) Muller proposal: Monsieur Muller of Wiesbaden proposes a red flag bearing the word "Europa" in gold lettering, with a golden sun and a white hand making the sign of the oath.

(j) Harmignies proposal: Suggests the creation of a new heraldic device - a Cross of Europe on similar lines to the Cross of Lorraine, Toulouse, Malta, Jerusalem, etc. The Cross of Europe would consist of four "E"s backed on to a square. This proposal was accompanied by a series of designs demonstrating its effect on coats-of-arms, flags, pennants, medals, etc.

(k) Poucher proposal: As far back as 1939, Monsieur Poucher proposed a federal banner which was virtually the reverse of the flag of the United States of America, with blue bands and a red quarter in one corner.

(1) H. C. proposal: A European flag decorated with the international code sign of the letter "E". This flag would be divided horizontally into two halves, the upper blue and the lower red. These two colours also correspond to those generally adopted by the right and left wing parties respectively. The flag would be distinguishable from the flag of the City of Paris, which is also blue and red, by being divided horizontally.

It will be for the Committee to choose between these various proposals and to prepare a Report explaining its choice to the Assembly.

(1) Proposal submitted by M. Bichet and colleagues.

Appendix B Documents attesting the creation of the European flag

B.1 Le drapeau de l'Europe et l'hymne européen – La genèse de deux symboles

Lorsque des hommes se sont groupés pour former une unité d'action ou de vie, ils ont voulu marquer cette volonté par des signes visibles, placer leur action ou leur appartenance communes sous des symboles. C'est pourquoi les drapeaux, aux couleurs multiples et aux symboles innombrables, ont toujours accompagné l'histoire des hommes, leurs activités religieuses aussi bien que guerrières. Il est donc naturel de voir apparaître, avec les premières initiatives d'une unification politique de l'Europe, des propositions d'un drapeau, d'un emblème, d'un hymne, signe de ralliement et d'auto identification. A l'occasion du 40e Anniversaire du Drapeau de l'Europe et sur demande du Service des Relations publiques, Aloïs Larcher, ancien membre du Greffe de l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe, a rédigé cette brochure. Dans ses parties subjectives, elle reflète l'opinion de l'auteur et pas nécessairement celle du Conseil de l'Europe.

Le drapeau de l'Europe

Le mouvement paneuropéen du comte Coudenhove-Kalergi avait son drapeau bleu au disque du soleil portant une croix rouge depuis 1923. Le Mouvement Européen, issu du congrès de la Haye de 1948 avait opté pour un grand "E" vert sur fond blanc et d'autres grandes organisations internationales apolitiques, à vocation technique, avaient adoptés des emblèmes. Avec la création de la première organisation européenne à vocation politique - le Conseil de l'Europe - le débat autour d'un emblème ou drapeau fût aussitôt inscrit à l'ordre du jour de son Assemblée parlementaire.

Les premières propositions relatives à un drapeau européen venaient d'ailleurs de l'extérieur et c'est par dizaines que de telles propositions affluèrent vers le Conseil de l'Europe dès les premiers mois de son existence. Aussi, le Secrétaire Général décida de soumettre la question à l'attention du Bureau de l'Assemblée en automne 1949. Tout en confirmant l'importance de la question, le Bureau se déclara incompétent. C'est alors que la Commission des Affaires générales, qui s'est saisie du problème dans le cadre d'un rapport sur les mesures concrètes, susceptible de rendre directement sensible à l'opinion publique la réalité de l'union européenne, demanda au Secrétaire Général une étude préalable. Le rapport de la Commission des Affaires générales a été soumis à l'Assemblée en août 1950. Il comporte, entre autre, la proposition d'adoption d'un emblème pour le Conseil de l'Europe. Après débat, cette proposition est renvoyée à la Commission du Règlement pour examen et aux autres commissions pour avis. Une demande d'inscription à l'ordre du jour de l'Assemblée fût déposée le 18 septembre 1953, "considérant qu'il y a intérêt à choisir un emblème susceptible d'être retenu par les quinze États membres du Conseil de l'Europe, aussi bien que par les communautés plus restreintes ...".

L'Assemblée approuvait cette proposition et chargeait la Commission du Règlement et des Prérogatives de lui présenter un rapport "sur le choix d'un emblème de l'Assemblée Consultative du Conseil de l'Europe". Le débat en assemblée plénière a été fixé au 25 septembre de la même année. En présentant son rapport devant l'Assemblée, Robert Bichet, parlementaire français, faisait état de l'utilisation de divers emblèmes de l'Europe unie, voire de fêtes nationales et il en tirait la conclusion que le succès de telles manifestations prouvait la nécessité d'un tel symbole : "un idéal doit nécessairement s'exprimer dans une image (et) l'absence d'un symbole du Conseil de l'Europe a été cruellement ressentie".

Face aux emblèmes de mouvements privés, il était important de créer un emblème pour la première des institutions politiques européenne officielles. Une telle décision était d'autant plus urgente qu'il fallait éviter "des particularismes regrettables", entraînant l'apparition de symboles concurrents à la suite de la création d'autres institutions européennes (les "Six" notamment). Le rapporteur faisait savoir que devant la centaine de projets mis à sa disposition, il était nécessaire de faire une sélection de dix à douze modèles qui seraient à soumettre à l'Assemblée pour avis. Ce sondage a été effectué avec un résultat quelque peu contradictoire: presque la moitié des voix se portait sur l'emblème du mouvement paneuropéen du comte Coudenhove-Kalergi, un choix énergiquement repoussé par les membres turcs de l'Assemblée à cause de la présence de la croix dans l'emblème, et pour des raisons diverses par d'autres membres. En reprenant, sur une base modifiée, la proposition du Centre Européen de la Culture d'un emblème d'étoiles sur fond d'azur, le Secrétariat soumit la proposition d'un cercle d'étoiles sur fond bleu.

Un emblème pour qui ?

La lecture des premiers textes fait apparaître une certaine confusion, voire contradiction, quant au titulaire d'un tel emblème. En effet, les premières propositions soumises aux diverses instances de l'Assemblée visaient bien l'institution du Conseil de l'Europe comme porteuse d'un emblème européen. Cependant, le premier rapport soumis à l'Assemblée en 1953 portait comme titre : "Sur le choix d'un emblème de l'Assemblée Consultative du Conseil de l'Europe" et la résolution adoptée à l'issue du débat avait le même objectif. Pourtant, une recommandation, votée par la même occasion, invitait le Comité des Ministres "à adopter le même emblème comme symbole du Conseil de l'Europe ...".

En outre, le rapporteur, tout comme plusieurs orateurs, avait souligné que ce nouvel emblème devait être commun à toutes les organisations européennes officielles présentes ou à venir, il devait être le signe de ralliement de toutes les institutions qui avaient pour mission d'achever l'œuvre de l'unification de l'Europe. Et c'est dans cet esprit que la même recommandation de 1953, adressée au Comité des Ministres demanda à celui-ci "de charger le Secrétaire Général d'entrer en négociation avec les autres institutions européennes en vue d'obtenir que les emblèmes qu'elles adopteront, soient apparentés à celui du Conseil de l'Europe. Le rapporteur avait d'ailleurs suggéré que le symbole commun (le cercle d'étoiles) porte en son centre les sigles ou symboles distinctifs des diverses institutions européennes.

La diversité apparente des propositions quant au titulaire du futur emblème européen répondait en fait à une simple stratégie: l'Assemblée voulait tout d'abord créer un fait accompli en décidant pour elle-même par sa Résolution 41 de 1953 "de prendre pour emblème le drapeau d'azur à quinze étoiles d'or ..." et obliger, par cette décision et au moyen de la Recommandation 56, le Comité des Ministres à prendre une décision analogue pour l'ensemble du Conseil de l'Europe, et de prendre ensuite les initiatives nécessaires pour s'assurer que cet emblème soit accepté comme emblème commun à toutes les institutions européennes.

Combien d'étoiles pour le drapeau de l'Europe?

Face aux multiples propositions quant à la forme du symbole à donner au futur emblème européen (croix, soleil, lune ?), la Commission du Règlement s'est finalement prononcée pour le symbole des étoiles. Mais, combien d'étoiles? Salvador de Madariaga avait proposé une étoile à l'endroit de la capitale de chacun des pays européens et une étoile plus importante à l'endroit de Strasbourg, ce qui supposait aussi les contours azurés du continent européen comme toile de fond d'un tel drapeau. Mais un tel projet paraissait manquer de signification particulière et c'est pour sortir des hésitations du rapporteur et de sa commission que le Secrétariat soumit la proposition d'un cercle d'étoiles d'or comme le symbole d'union des peuples européens tandis que les étoiles brillants sur fond bleu devaient symboliser l'espoir des nations européennes. Ce cercle d'étoiles aurait l'avantage supplémentaire d'offrir en son milieu l'espace nécessaire pour y inscrire le signe ou symbole distinctif et propre à chacune des institutions européennes qui aurait décidé d'adopter cet emblème. A ce propos, le rapporteur pensait que l'Assemblée pourrait choisir pour son emblème les armes de la ville de Strasbourg au centre du cercle

d'étoiles. Oui, mais combien d'étoiles ? Le rapport de R. Bichet plaidait pour la souplesse : à chacune des institutions de fixer le nombre d'étoiles en fonction du nombre de membres.

En ce qui concerne l'Assemblée du Conseil de l'Europe, et en tenant compte du nombre des délégations parlementaires et des pays présents au sein du Conseil de l'Europe, le projet de résolution soumis au vote de l'Assemblée suggéra "d'adopter pour son emblème le drapeau bleu au cercle de quinze étoiles d'or". Cette proposition, logique à première vue, banale même, déclenchait aussitôt un grand débat animé à caractère politique qui tournait autour de ce qu'on a pris l'habitude d'appeler "l'arithmétique européenne". C'était la délégation allemande qui fit le calcul suivant: "Nous sommes en présence de six membres de la Communauté (les Six) et de huit autres, qui forment ensemble le Conseil de l'Europe. Or, six et huit ne font que quatorze. Il y a donc un problème avec la quinzième étoile ...". En clair, il s'agissait du problème de la présence de la Sarre comme membre du Conseil de l'Europe, une entité politique dont le statut resterait encore à régler selon les termes du traité de la CECA mais surtout selon les vues du gouvernement allemand. En arguant que "pour le moment" quinze drapeaux nationaux étaient hissés devant la Maison de l'Europe et que, par ailleurs, le Comité des Ministres pouvait décider autrement, au nom justement du principe de la variabilité du nombre des étoiles, le rapporteur eut gain de cause et le vote donna la majorité qualifiée en faveur de l'emblème à quinze étoiles. Il y avait cependant un nombre appréciable de "non" (17) et d'abstentions (7) sur quelque 75 votants.

C'est dans ces conditions que la Résolution 41 et la Recommandation 56 furent adoptées le 25 septembre 1953. Le débat en assemblée et le vote ont démontré qu'il y avait approbation unanime de l'idée d'un emblème européen commun à toutes les institutions européennes, qui serait un cercle d'étoiles d'or sur fond d'azur. Mais, tout en admettant que le principe du nombre d'étoiles variable, le nombre de quinze étoiles proposé pour l'emblème de l'Assemblée était déjà contesté par une forte minorité (la délégation allemande), ceci en raison de la présence de la Sarre dont le statut international n'était pas encore réglé.

L'attitude du Comité des Ministres

La Recommandation 56 de septembre 1953, transmise au Comité des Ministres était libellée comme suit :

"L'Assemblée,

Ayant adopté pour emblème le drapeau bleu portant un cercle de quinze étoiles d'or.

Recommande au Comité des Ministres :

a) d'adopter le même emblème comme symbole du Conseil de l'Europe dans son ensemble.

b) de charger le Secrétaire Général d'entrer en négociation avec les autres institutions européennes en vue d'obtenir que les emblèmes qu'elles adopteront soient apparentés à celui du Conseil de l'Europe."

Ce texte comportait donc un élément politique explosif: au nombre d'étoiles était lié la question de la Sarre. Aussi, dès le mois de décembre, le gouvernement allemand fit savoir au Secrétaire Général que l'adoption d'un emblème pour le Conseil de l'Europe

relevait "de la compétence exclusive" du Comité des Ministres. Toutefois, la décision a été prise de soumettre la question au Comité mixte, réunissant une délégation du Comité des Ministres et des Représentants de l'Assemblée. Cette réunion, présidée par le Chancelier Konrad Adenauer, Président en exercice du Comité des Ministres, a eu lieu le 19 mai 1954. L'échange de vues a abouti aux trois conclusions suivantes :

- l'Assemblée ajournera sa résolution de mise en exécution immédiate de l'utilisation de l'emblème/drapeau pour elle-même;
- la nécessité d'arriver rapidement à l'adoption d'un emblème pour le Conseil de l'Europe dans son ensemble est confirmée par tous les participants à la réunion ;
- l'Assemblée sera associée aux travaux y relatifs, entrepris cependant par le Comité des Ministres.

En application de cet accord, un Comité ad hoc a été désigné (septembre 1954), composé de trois membres de l'Assemblée (R. Bichet (F). Fritz Erler (D). Karl Wistrand (S), ainsi que de trois experts héraldiques désignés par l'Irlande, l'Italie et les Pays-Bas. Le Comité ad hoc se réunit le 12 novembre 1954 et porte son choix sur un drapeau bleu portant un cercle de huit anneaux d'or entrelacés, un projet soumis par le Secrétariat. Mais les Délégués des Ministres décidèrent en avril 1955 de revenir sur le projet des étoiles et de proposer deux modèles au choix :

- a) un cercle de douze étoiles d'or sur champ d'azur,
- b) un semi d'étoiles sur champ d'azur, assorti toutefois du commentaire: "une majorité a marqué sa préférence pour le premier de ces deux modèles".

Par décision du Comité des Ministres, les deux modèles sont soumis à l'Assemblée pour un choix définitif. C'est la Commission du Règlement et des Prerogatives qui fût chargée d'effectuer ce choix et elle se rallia à l'unanimité au projet des douze étoiles d'or. Le cercle d'or avait l'avantage de permettre l'insertion éventuelle de symboles spécifiques d'organisations européennes, souhaitant à leur tour adopter le drapeau bleu. Par contre, le chiffre de douze étoiles devait rester invariable et sans relation avec le nombre d'États adhérents. Ce chiffre de douze représente l'ensemble des peuples européens et leur union est représentée par le cercle.

Un nouveau rapport a été soumis à l'Assemblée le 25 octobre 1955. Au terme d'un débat approfondi la Recommandation 88 a été votée à l'unanimité. Par ce texte, l'Assemblée rappelle qu'elle a été saisie par le Comité des Ministres d'une demande de nouvelles délibérations sur le choix d'un emblème. En réponse à cette demande, elle recommande au Comité des Ministres :

- a) "d'adopter comme emblème du Conseil de l'Europe le drapeau d'azur à douze étoiles d'or disposées en cercle,
- b) de charger le Secrétaire Général d'entrer en négociations avec les autres institutions européennes en vue d'obtenir que les emblèmes qu'elles adopteront soient apparentés à celui du Conseil de l'Europe".

On remarquera que l'Assemblée maintient sa position, déjà adoptée en 1953 selon laquelle l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe devrait être le modèle pour les emblèmes de toutes les institutions européennes. Les délégués n'avaient plus aucune difficulté à suivre la recommandation de l'Assemblée et décidèrent de donner une certaine forme solennelle à son adoption définitive. C'est au cours de leur réunion du 7 au 9 décembre que la Résolution (55) 32 relative au choix de l'emblème a été adoptée. La présentation officielle

a été effectuée par le Président du Comité des Ministres à l'issue d'une session tenue le 13 décembre 1955 au Château de la Muette à Paris.

Avec l'adoption de la Résolution (55) 321, la description héraldique: "D'azur à un cercle composé de douze étoiles d'or à cinq rais dont les pointes ne se touchent pas", et la description symbolique: "Sur le fond bleu du ciel d'Occident, les étoiles figurant les peuples d'Europe forment le cercle en signe d'union. Elles sont au nombre invariable de douze, symbole de la perfection et de la plénitude." ont été fournies d'une manière officielle et authentique.

La mise en œuvre

Le Secrétaire Général a été chargé par les Délégués des Ministres d'adresser une lettre aux secrétaires généraux de l'OCDE (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), de l'UEO (Union de l'Europe Occidentale, Western European Union) et au Président de la Haute Autorité de la CECA (Communauté Européenne du Charbon et de l'Acier; European Coal and Steel Community), pour faire connaître à ces organisations européennes l'adoption de l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe, en indiquant que son Assemblée parlementaire avait exprimé le vœu que "si d'autres institutions européennes venaient à adopter des emblèmes, ceux-ci soient apparentés à l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe ...". Une description et un modèle leur fût transmis en annexe à cette communication officielle.

Au sein de l'Assemblée la satisfaction était grande et maintenant ce fût à la Commission des Questions Culturelles et Scientifiques de prendre le dossier en main. Sur la base de deux rapports, soumis à l'Assemblée en avril 1956, elle a fait adopter par celle-ci deux textes relatifs à l'utilisation de l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe: par sa Résolution 93, l'Assemblée préconise les mesures pratiques suivantes:

a) l'emblème sera visible à l'intérieur aussi bien qu'à l'extérieur des locaux où siègent l'Assemblée Consultative et ses commissions;

b) les Représentants à l'Assemblée seront autorisés à apposer sur leur voiture une plaque portant l'emblème;

c) il est souhaitable que les parlements des États membres arborent l'emblème lorsque des questions d'intérêt européen sont en discussion.

Concernant ce sujet, le Bundestag allemand avait déjà donné l'exemple le 23 mars 1956 en adoptant à l'unanimité une motion invitant le gouvernement fédéral à faire en sorte que le drapeau européen, institué par le Conseil de l'Europe, "soit arboré à côté des drapeaux de la République fédérale et ceux des Länder à toutes les occasions et manifestations appropriées afin de propager l'idée de l'unité européenne". Dans sa Recommandation 94 adoptée à la même occasion, l'Assemblée invite le Comité des Ministres de charger le Secrétaire Général de la demande aux autres organisations européennes de se conformer aux dispositions de la Recommandation 88 (relative à l'utilisation de l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe) et de proposer aux gouvernements membres que les postes frontières où flotte le drapeau national, arborent en même temps l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe. Depuis cette décision historique du 8 décembre 1955 et sa proclamation solennelle par le Président du Comité des Ministres le 13 décembre à Paris, le drapeau bleu a été hissé aussi bien devant la Maison de l'Europe à Strasbourg

que devant les bâtiments où des réunions de quelque importance ont été organisées par le Conseil de l'Europe ou bien par des mouvements européens.

La première grande occasion en dehors de Strasbourg a été fournie par un débat sur les affaires européennes au Bundestag allemand le 23 mars 1956, qui a vu flotter le drapeau bleu dans le ciel de Bonn. Peu après, il a fait son apparition devant le Parlement de Vienne à l'occasion de l'entrée de l'Autriche au Conseil de l'Europe et d'une importante conférence parlementaire européenne à Vienne. Mais c'était surtout l'Exposition universelle de Bruxelles en 1958 qui a permis de faire connaître au monde et aux visiteurs de l'exposition le drapeau bleu aux douze étoiles, arboré non seulement devant de nombreux bâtiments publics de la capitale belge, mais surtout devant la section de la Coopération Mondiale où se trouvait notamment le pavillon du Conseil de l'Europe et de l'OCDE.

Très rapidement aussi des mouvements et organisations non gouvernementales à vocation européenne, telles que les "Nouvelles Équipes Internationales", "L'Union des Résistants pour l'Europe Unie", la "Journée Européenne des Écoles" ou "Le Conseil des Communes d'Europe" ont adopté l'emblème pour leur usage propre après y avoir intégré leurs sigles/symboles individuels dans le cercle des douze étoiles. À l'initiative du Conseil des Communes d'Europe (CCE), certaines communes, françaises notamment, ont pris la décision de faire pavoiser les édifices publics aux couleurs de l'Europe à l'occasion des grandes manifestations de la vie communale, ce qui a provoqué en mai 1963 une mise au point du ministère de l'Intérieur français précisant "que de telles décisions ne soulèvent aucune objection de principe dès lors qu'elles concernent effectivement le drapeau adopté en 1955 par le Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe". La même note apportait toutefois une restriction: le drapeau tricolore resterait le seul emblème pour la célébration des fêtes nationales.

C'est surtout après l'adoption du drapeau européen par les Communautés européennes en 1986, et de la manière dont elles en firent usage, que la nécessité de "personnaliser" les institutions et "leur" drapeau a été ressentie avec plus d'acuité surtout dans les milieux parlementaires du Conseil de l'Europe. Alors que certains suggéraient déjà l'abandon pur et simple par le Conseil de l'Europe de l'emblème aux douze étoiles, d'autres se souvenaient du "signe distinctif" qui avait été déposé auprès de l'OMPI (Organisation Mondiale de la Propriété Intellectuelle, World Intellectual Property Organization -WIPO) pour assurer sa protection juridique au profit du Conseil de l'Europe et ils préconisaient maintenant son usage systématique pour "personnaliser" ainsi l'institution du Conseil de l'Europe.

À une question parlementaire relative à ce problème, le Président en exercice du Comité des Ministres répondit en mai 1990 en ces termes: "En ce qui concerne l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe, le Comité des Ministres est parfaitement conscient de la confusion qui peut exister actuellement et de la nécessité d'améliorer l'identité visuelle du Conseil de l'Europe. Il y a lieu toutefois de distinguer d'un éventuel logo, l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe de douze étoiles d'or sur fond d'azur, emblème européen par excellence, qui reste évidemment à part entière celui du Conseil de l'Europe. Par contre, jusqu'à présent, le Conseil de l'Europe n'avait pas de logo particulier permettant de l'identifier. C'est pourquoi le Secrétaire Général a entrepris une consultation de professionnels pour améliorer l'image visuelle de notre Organisation. Cette amélioration passera peut-être par l'adoption du logo." (On notera dans cette réponse ministérielle le

passage identifiant "emblème du Conseil de l'Europe" avec "emblème européen par excellence".)

Le drapeau de l'Europe et les Communautés/L'Union européenne

L'histoire des relations entre les douze étoiles et l'Union européenne a connu plusieurs étapes :

Comme cela a été indiqué précédemment, la Haute Autorité de la CECA avait été informée en décembre 1955 que le Comité des Ministres avait adopté "pour emblème du Conseil de l'Europe un drapeau d'azur à un cercle composé de douze étoiles d'or ..." La lettre a également indiqué que "l'Assemblée Consultative a exprimé le vœu que, si d'autres institutions européennes venaient à adopter des emblèmes, ceux-ci soient apparentés à l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe". Cette formule traduit le fait que le Comité des Ministres, qui avait arrêté les termes de cette lettre, ne se sentit pas autorisé à faire une telle recommandation aux autres institutions, attitude qui sera sévèrement critiquée par la suite par l'Assemblée Consultative. Des lettres analogues ont d'ailleurs été adressées en juin 1959 à Walter Hallstein, Président de la CEE, et à Etienne Hirsch, Président d'EURATOM.

Dans un premier temps du moins, personne au niveau des Communautés naissantes ne semble avoir pris note du vœu de l'Assemblée du Conseil de l'Europe. Toutefois, le symbolisme des étoiles a inspiré les différents artisans d'emblèmes ou drapeaux communautaires qui étaient déjà à l'œuvre. C'est ainsi qu'apparaissait à l'Exposition Universelle de Bruxelles un emblème de la CECA portant 6 étoiles d'or sur fond mi-noir, mi-bleu (charbon et acier). Mais déjà à la même époque un autre projet d'emblème pour la CECA était en discussion: quatre bandes verticales (vert, rouge, bleu, jaune) avec cercle de six étoiles blanches au centre. La Commission d'EURATOM avait préparé à son tour un drapeau bleu clair portant six étoiles argentées, si bien que le gouvernement belge s'est décidé en été 1959 à mettre des plaques automobiles portant six étoiles argentées à la disposition des fonctionnaires des Communautés européennes.³

Par ce biais, la question de l'emblème a été portée à l'attention de l'Assemblée parlementaire des "Six" en 1959/60. Étant informé du projet de rapport, le Secrétaire Général du Conseil de l'Europe a adressé une note au Président de l'Assemblée des "Six" le 27 novembre 1959, exposant la philosophie de l'emblème des douze étoiles. Le Secrétaire Général soulignait dans cette note la possibilité, prévue par les auteurs mêmes de cet emblème, d'inscrire des signes ou des symboles spécifiques à l'intérieur du cercle, individualisant ainsi les diverses institutions européennes. Enfin, la note attira l'attention du Président sur le danger d'opter aujourd'hui sur un nombre d'étoiles (six), qui sera relié inévitablement au nombre des six pays membres de la Communauté. Mais quel sera le choix le jour où il y aura des nouvelles adhésions ? Et enfin, quelle attitude adoptera l'opinion publique devant deux drapeaux, l'un à douze étoiles, l'autre à six ?

Le mémorandum termine avec la bonne solution : "En revanche, l'adoption d'un symbole européen commun, d'emploi absolument général et pouvant servir au pavoisement par les particuliers et par les administrations publiques, non liées à l'une ou à l'autre institution (européenne), sera d'un appoint important pour la prise de conscience de l'Europe unie." La solution ainsi proposée comportait donc trois niveaux :

- a) l'emblème de l'Europe (d'un emploi libre pour tous),

b) les symboles des institutions, nettement caractérisées mais associées de façon harmonieuse à l'emblème de l'Europe et nettement réservés à chacune des institutions,

c) le pavillon des institutions, dont l'emploi doit être réglementé et protégé, comportant des effets légaux, associant l'emblème général de l'Europe au symbole d'une institution et réservé à l'usage exclusif de celle-ci.

Le rapport de Jonkheer M. van der Goes van Naters vient en discussion devant l'Assemblée des "Six" un an plus tard, le 19 novembre 1960. Le rapporteur plaide pour un emblème "bleu clair à couronne à six étoiles d'or ... afin d'établir une filiation entre ce pavillon et l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe". Mais d'autres propositions sont faites au cours du débat, conduisant à une impasse. Pour en sortir, l'Assemblée décide d'organiser un concours avant de faire son choix définitif. Au fil des années suivantes, la plaque automobile aux six étoiles sur fond bleu est sporadiquement utilisée, tout comme la couronne de feuilles de laurier avec le sigle EP/PE en son milieu, utilisé par le Parlement européen.

C'est finalement le nouveau Parlement européen, issu du suffrage universel qui lance une nouvelle initiative. Des membres de son groupe démocrate-chrétien (PPE) déposent le 31 octobre 1979 une proposition de résolution "sur l'adoption d'un drapeau européen pour la Communauté européenne". La proposition brève et lapidaire est formulée comme suit : "Le Parlement européen - conscient d'être la représentation démocratiquement légitimée par les élections au suffrage universel direct du 10 Juin 1979, des peuples de la Communauté européenne;

- résolu à donner à la Communauté européenne un symbole avec lequel les peuples européens puissent s'identifier;

- décide d'adopter un drapeau européen qui sera azur à douze étoiles d'or disposées en cercle."

Il est à remarquer que la description héraldique donnée est identique avec celle adoptée par le Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe le 8 décembre 1955 pour l'emblème de cette organisation, et il est d'autant plus surprenant qu'aucune référence à cette décision ministérielle, voire gouvernementale n'ait été faite dans ce texte de proposition. Il convient également de se rappeler que quelques mois seulement avant cette initiative au Parlement européen, le Conseil de l'Europe avait relancé la question de la protection juridique de son emblème. Deux mesures avaient été adoptées à ce sujet: une communication à l'OMPI en vue de la protection internationale du "signe distinctif et de l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe". Cette protection sous l'article 6/ter du Traité de l'OMPI a été confirmée par une lettre circulaire aux États membres en date du 4 octobre 1979.

Sur le plan interne, le Comité des Ministres a adopté une Recommandation R (79)18 le 18 septembre de la même année demandant aux gouvernements des États membres de prendre les dispositions législatives nécessaires pour accorder à l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe la même protection juridique que celle accordée à leurs drapeaux nationaux. Dans ce contexte, il n'est pas étonnant que cette initiative du Parlement européen ait soulevé quelque émotion dans les milieux du Conseil de l'Europe et surtout dans son Assemblée parlementaire où certains voyaient dans cette démarche une tentative de "vol du drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe". Aussi le rapporteur nommé par le Parlement européen, Kai Uwe von Hassel, a pris soin d'entrer en contact avec les instances du Conseil de l'Europe (Secrétaire Général et Président de l'Assemblée et certains membres

de celle-ci) pour "négocier" les conditions d'une "reprise" du drapeau par les Communautés européennes.

Finalement, un rapport a été présenté au Parlement européen en avril 1983, qui expose fidèlement l'historique et la genèse de l'emblème qui aurait dû être, selon les vœux de l'Assemblée Consultative, l'emblème européen et qui est devenu par la décision du Comité des Ministres de 1955 "l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe". Le rapport évoque aussi la protection juridique accordée à l'emblème et conclut qu'une démarche commune des deux assemblées et un vote conjoint sur un même texte de résolution relatif à un symbole commun soulignerait la complémentarité des deux institutions au service d'une tâche commune. Par sa Résolution, adoptée à une large majorité, mais au terme d'un débat assez controversé le 11 avril 1983, le Parlement: ... (2)"DÉCIDE que le drapeau européen adopté en 1955 par l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe, drapeau qui représente une couronne de douze étoiles d'or sur fond d'azur, sera le drapeau européen;" La Résolution décide en outre "de retirer le drapeau utilisé jusqu'à présent d'une manière non officielle par le Parlement européen, ..." Elle charge son Président de dégager dans les meilleurs délais possibles un accord dans le sens précité avec le Président de l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe. Enfin, le Président est chargé "de veiller à ce que les gouvernements des États membres de la Communauté décident que toutes les institutions européennes arborent ce drapeau".

En analysant cette importante résolution du Parlement européen, plusieurs constats peuvent être faits:

- a) le drapeau des douze étoiles est reconnu être le drapeau européen;
- b) les modalités de sa reprise (par les Communautés) doivent être recherchées par un accord entre les Présidents des deux assemblées;
- c) la résolution semble ignorer le pouvoir décisionnel des Conseils des Ministres respectifs aussi bien au niveau des Communautés qu'au niveau du Conseil de l'Europe;
- d) la résolution statue sur le principe mais garde un caractère intérimaire dans la mesure où elle prévoit encore des contacts avec le Conseil de l'Europe pour la recherche d'un accord d'ensemble; néanmoins, le Président devrait intervenir auprès des gouvernements "dès maintenant". Nous sommes ici en face d'une attitude pressée, mais aussi incohérente.

La résolution a été transmise au Conseil de l'Europe par le Secrétaire Général du Parlement européen le 28 avril 1983. La mise en œuvre des dispositions de la résolution du 11 avril s'est avérée laborieuse, d'autant plus que de nouvelles élections des membres du Parlement européen étaient prévues pour juin 1984.

Au niveau de l'Assemblée parlementaire, la Commission des questions politiques et celle de l'aménagement du territoire et des pouvoirs locaux ont été invitées à formuler un avis relatif à la résolution du Parlement européen. Un certain embarras parmi les membres de l'Assemblée a fait tarder l'adoption de cet avis. C'est ainsi que les discussions au sein de la Commission des questions politiques en 1983 ont abouti à la conclusion que l'avis, quant au fond, devait être formulé par la Commission de l'aménagement du territoire et des pouvoirs locaux. Cette dernière a longtemps hésité à se prononcer et c'est seulement en septembre 1984 qu'elle a adopté son avis, qui a été communiqué aussitôt au président de l'Assemblée, Karl Ahrens :

"... A l'issue de la discussion, la Commission s'est prononcée à l'unanimité en faveur de l'utilisation d'un seul drapeau, le drapeau d'azur à douze étoiles d'or, par toutes

les institutions européennes. En outre, le drapeau symbolisant l'Europe, aucune addition d'autres sigles ne semble opportune à la Commission, ni pour le Conseil de l'Europe, ni pour les Communautés européennes...".

Parallèlement, des contacts directs ont eu lieu entre les présidents des deux assemblées en juin 1983. Ils avaient convenus que la poursuite des discussions devait se faire sur la base d'un avis juridique des services du Conseil de l'Europe. Une telle note a été élaborée par K. Ahrens au cours de l'été, et transmise le 6 octobre 1983 à Piet Dankert, Président du Parlement européen. Sur sa proposition, le Bureau du Parlement européen a décidé de saisir sa Commission politique et sa Commission juridique pour recueillir leur avis (février 1984). Pour la Commission politique, K. U. von Hassel a de nouveau été chargé d'élaborer l'avis à l'intention du Bureau du Parlement européen. Cet avis, adopté par la Commission politique le 21 mars 1984, plaidait en faveur d'une double décision : adoption du "drapeau général pour l'Europe" (les douze étoiles conformément aux textes du Conseil de l'Europe) et adoption d'un "étendard ou drapeau de l'Institution", qui comporterait un sigle ou emblème spécifique de chaque Institution à l'intérieur du cercle des douze étoiles. (K. U. von Hassel s'était entretenu de son projet avec le Président de l'Assemblée du Conseil de l'Europe le 15 mars 1984.)

Entre temps, à l'initiative de la délégation allemande, le Conseil des Communautés s'est également penché sur le problème du drapeau européen. La délégation allemande estimait en effet qu'en vue des prochaines élections des membres du Parlement européen, le Conseil devait se saisir de la proposition du Parlement européen et adopter le drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe comme drapeau de la Communauté, "dès qu'un accord aura été conclu entre le Parlement européen et le Conseil de l'Europe". Des réunions du Groupe des Affaires Générales du Conseil des Communautés au mois de mars 1984 semblent avoir donné un avis favorable à la proposition du Parlement européen. Toutefois, un avis négatif émis entre temps par la Commission juridique du Parlement européen, présidée par Simone Veil, a amené le Groupe des Affaires Générales à surseoir à ses délibérations et à attendre une prise de position définitive du Parlement européen.

Il aura fallu attendre les résultats des délibérations du groupe de travail sur "L'Europe des citoyens" (Comité Adonnino), qui seront soumis au Conseil Européen de Milan (28/29 Juin 1985) et les décisions de ce conseil pour connaître les positions communes des instances communautaires en la matière. Cette position a été, par la suite, formellement approuvée par le Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe (février 1986), et son Secrétaire Général a été chargé de faire savoir au Président de la Commission qu'il a "pris bonne note avec satisfaction de la proposition du Comité Adonnino ... et de la décision prise par le Conseil européen de Milan". Les conclusions du Conseil de Milan ont été mises en forme réglementaire par une réunion du Conseil des Ministres "Affaires générales", tenue le 21 avril 1986. Les résultats ont été rendus publics par une déclaration faite à la presse le 22 avril par le Commissaire Carlo Ripa di Meana, en soulignant trois points:

"En premier lieu, un accord sur le drapeau des institutions communautaires est intervenu. Sur un fond bleu outremer clair du ciel d'Occident, 12 étoiles d'or représentent les peuples européens (...) Ce drapeau, qui a déjà connu une forte sympathie populaire comme drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe, témoigne de la volonté de la Communauté de devenir le centre et le moteur d'une construction européenne à grande portée qui

rassemble tous les pays d'Europe occidentale. (...) une cérémonie solennelle de levée du drapeau aura lieu à Bruxelles devant le siège de la Commission le 29 mai ...".

La veille de cette première levée du drapeau européen devant les bâtiments de la Commission de Bruxelles, le Secrétaire Général du Conseil de l'Europe a remis à son tour une déclaration à la presse: "Cette journée est une journée faste pour l'Europe. La décision des institutions de la Communauté d'adopter le drapeau européen qui sert d'emblème au Conseil de l'Europe depuis 1955, et l'Hymne européen en vigueur depuis 1972 est une décision heureuse pour tous les Européens. A partir de ce jour, toutes les institutions européennes et 385 millions d'Européens se reconnaissent dans ce cercle de douze étoiles sur fond d'azur et dans cette Ode à la Joie de Beethoven ...".

Quelques réflexions critiques

Il est indéniable que toute la procédure d'adoption du drapeau européen par les "Douze" a créé un malaise et s'est passée dans la confusion et dans l'ambiguïté. Le Conseil de l'Europe porte cependant une part de responsabilité dans cette affaire: l'ambiguïté est née au berceau du drapeau, elle a été, somme toute, un défaut congénital. En effet, pour l'Assemblée Consultative, en adoptant le cercle de douze étoiles d'or, cet emblème devait être le drapeau pour toute l'Europe, devant fédérer toutes les forces au service de son union. Par sa décision du Comité des Ministres le 8 décembre 1955, il a été institué un emblème pour le Conseil de l'Europe.

Néanmoins, dans la pratique et dans l'action extérieure du Conseil de l'Europe, le drapeau a toujours été présenté comme "le drapeau européen" et à de rares occasions seulement comme "le drapeau du Conseil de l'Europe". Du côté des Communautés, l'initiative a été prise par le Parlement européen. La première proposition de Ingo Friedrich et consorts du 31 octobre 1979, dénotant une certaine arrogance, déclarent dans son énoncé des motifs être "résolue à donner à la Communauté européenne un symbole avec lequel les peuples européens puissent s'identifier". Une ambition d'universalisme européen y est clairement affichée ; elle décide en outre "d'adopter un drapeau européen qui sera azur à douze étoiles d'or disposées en cercle".

En utilisant la description héraldique du drapeau européen ou bien l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe, les auteurs feignent ignorer que ce drapeau existe déjà et qu'il avait été adopté par les représentants gouvernementaux des pays membres du Conseil de l'Europe, y compris ceux des Communautés européennes. L'ironie des dates a voulu que quelques semaines seulement avant l'initiative Friedrich (le 4 octobre), l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe venait de recevoir la confirmation de sa protection internationale sous le régime de l'OMPI.

Il est vrai que le rapport de K. U. von Hassel et la résolution du Parlement européen reconnaissent la paternité du Conseil de l'Europe et préconisent l'adoption d'un drapeau communautaire en concertation avec ce dernier. Cette concertation a eu lieu, elle a joué à plusieurs niveaux, mais elle a aussi souffert de l'absence d'une attitude claire et cohérente des organes et services du Conseil de l'Europe tout comme des intentions divergentes des différentes instances communautaires.

Les décisions qui devaient être prises par le Conseil des Communautés ont été préparées par un groupe de travail intergouvernemental (Comité Adonnino) à l'intention du Conseil de Milan. Pourtant, cette phase décisionnelle s'est faite, apparemment sans

aucune consultation avec le Conseil de l'Europe. L'idée première des "pères" du drapeau européen, selon lesquels toutes les institutions européennes devaient se placer progressivement sous cette bannière commune pour faire avancer ce projet commun - l'union des peuples de toute l'Europe - a été escamotée par la démarche de la Commission des Communautés et de ses services.

Mais il y a eu pire : dans la phase de sa proclamation et des premières mesures d'application, toute référence aux origines mêmes du drapeau a été écartée. Un exemple particulièrement parlant mais pas unique a été fourni par des membres du Parlement européen en juillet 1986: une proposition de résolution a été déposée par Luis Guillermo Perinat Elio sur l'utilisation du drapeau européen "considérant que la Communauté a récemment adopté officiellement le drapeau désormais appelé à représenter l'entité politique que constitue la Communauté européenne et qu'elle en a spécifié la forme et les couleurs de l'emblème, (...) considérant qu'il est nécessaire de réglementer l'utilisation du drapeau communautaire (...) demande que dans un premier temps, en vue d'éviter toute équivoque, la Communauté "se charge elle-même du contrôle et la distribution des drapeaux européens".

Pouvait-on exprimer plus clairement la volonté de monopoliser le drapeau aux douze étoiles d'or pour l'usage exclusif des "Douze" ? Il est impossible de reconnaître à l'auteur de cette proposition l'excuse de l'ignorance des antécédents, car les formules utilisées dans ce texte très détaillé rappellent trop clairement les textes de l'Assemblée et du Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe, notamment les Résolutions et Recommandations sur son utilisation et la Résolution du Comité des Ministres adressée aux États membres relative à la protection juridique de l'emblème du Conseil de l'Europe.

Il est vrai aussi que par la suite de telles tendances ont été quelque peu tempérées. C'est ainsi que dans une communication de la Commission des Communautés au Parlement européen de juin 1988 sur le programme "L'Europe des citoyens", le rôle du Conseil de l'Europe dans le choix des symboles est mieux reconnu. Au chapitre "La prise de conscience de l'identité européenne" on pouvait lire que "le symbole qui a connu le plus grand succès a été celui du drapeau communautaire. Après avoir fait référence à la Résolution d'avril 1983 du Parlement européen "souhaitant que le drapeau communautaire soit celui créé par le Conseil de l'Europe", la communication se poursuit en ces termes : "le Conseil européen ayant marqué son accord sur l'introduction et le Conseil de l'Europe sur son utilisation, le drapeau communautaire constitue désormais le symbole par excellence de l'identité communautaire et de l'unification européenne. Il est donc permis de constater que les ambiguïtés n'ont pas été entièrement éliminées et le moment serait peut-être venu pour le Conseil de l'Europe de prendre une initiative cohérente pour clarifier le statut du drapeau européen et des emblèmes des institutions européennes s'y rapportant."¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ Aloïs Larcher, "Le drapeau de l'Europe et l'hymne européen, La genèse de deux symboles ". Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg, septembre 1995 **apud** "The symbols of the European Union". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

See also: European flag - Council of Europe, "Drapeau européen". In *Library and Archives*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:

<http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/flag/default.asp>

B.2 The European Flag¹⁶⁶

It was then that the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges undertook to examine the question.

"Considering that the peoples of Europe should have a common emblem symbolizing their unity": this was the motive stated by Mr. Bichet and a number of his colleagues in a request dated 18 September 1953 that the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe be included in the agenda of the session.

A week later, on 25 September 1953, Mr. Bichet, on behalf of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, submitted a report on the question, after which the Assembly adopted Resolution 41, deciding, "to take as its emblem an azure flag bearing a circle of fifteen stars ..."

The report stated: "The complete circle symbolizes unity, whereas the stars shining in the firmament symbolize the hope of our nations".

At the same time, Recommendation 56 was adopted by the Assembly, asking the Committee of Ministers to: "adopt the same emblem as the symbol of the Council of Europe as a whole" and "instruct the Secretary General to enter into negotiations with the other European institutions to ensure that the emblems adopted by them [should] have features similar to that adopted by the Council of Europe".

The idea behind this project was that each of the European institutions should later insert a symbol of its own in the centre of the circle. For the Committee, the main consideration was that agreement should be reached upon an emblem for the Assembly, which might be adopted for the Council of Europe as a whole and also serve as a common denominator for all existing or future European institutions. The Committee also considered that it might be unwise to embark upon a lengthy procedure before the emblem could be put into effective use. For that reason, it submitted a draft resolution to the effect that the emblem should be adopted by the Assembly within the limits of its competence (in particular, for use during Assembly sessions) and a draft recommendation to the Committee of Ministers to adopt the same emblem as the symbol of the Council of Europe as a whole.

The discussion in the Assembly showed that there was general agreement as to the need for such an emblem, but doubts were expressed as to the wisdom of selecting fifteen stars; the case of the Saar was mentioned, and also possible future increases in the membership of the Council of Europe. Forty-nine members voted in favor of the draft, 17 voted against and there were seven abstentions (Resolution 41).

Recommendation 56 referred the matter to the Committee of Ministers. The political objections to the number of stars finally led to the proposal that "there should be a purely symbolic number of stars or preferably a symbol which was indivisible".

¹⁶⁶ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971, **apud** Council of Europe, "European anthem". In *Documents. Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 12, 2006 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

The Ministers' Deputies were instructed to co-operate with the representatives of the Assembly (in the Joint Committee) in seeking a solution, taking account of the need to adopt a common emblem.

The Assembly agreed to postpone the implementation of Resolution 41, but hoped that the discussions would soon end in a satisfactory solution being found. However, discussions at various levels and the proceedings of an ad hoc committee continued throughout 1954, and it was only in June 1955 that the Committee of Ministers was able to submit to the Assembly "two designs for an emblem which it [considered] acceptable".

On 25 October 1955 the Assembly chose between the two projects and adopted unanimously Recommendation 88 recommending the Committee of Ministers "to adopt as Council of Europe emblem the azure flag bearing a circle of twelve stars ...".

On 8 December 1955, the Committee of Ministers, by Resolution (55) 32, adopted the emblem officially for the Council of Europe. During a public sitting of the Committee of Ministers on 13 December 1955, the emblem was presented by the Chairman.

The Assembly took up this question again in 1956 in its debate on "the role of the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe in the field of information". In addition, in Recommendation 94, asked the Committee of Ministers to instruct the Secretary General to request the other European organizations to adopt emblems bearing a close resemblance to the Council's emblem. In Resolution 93, adopted on the same occasion, the Assembly resolved, among other measures, that the emblem would be displayed both inside and outside premises where the Consultative Assembly or its committees were sitting, and that representatives to the Consultative Assembly would be authorized to carry a plate bearing the emblem on their motorcars.

It is striking to see how insistently the Assembly sought to bring the emblem into common use among European institutions and to make all Europeans aware of it.

The debate in the Assembly in April 1956 showed very clearly the importance which its members attached to the "popularization" of the emblem, considering it a powerful factor for the crystallization of the European idea.

B.3 The European Flag – Memorandum presented to the Council of Europe by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-European Movement, Secretary General of the European Parliamentary Union (Gstaad, 27 July 1950)¹⁶⁷

The question of the flag of the Council of Europe, to be discussed by the Second Session of the European Consultation Assembly, ought to find a definitive solution by giving Europe a symbol of its unity.

To be adopted by public opinion, the flag should comply to the following conditions:

- 1) It should be a symbol of our common civilization;
- 2) It should present a European emblem;
- 3) It should not provoke any national rivalry;
- 4) It should represent a tradition;
- 5) It should be beautiful and dignified.

The flag that has been representing ever since 1923, the idea of a United States of Europe, complies to these five conditions: a golden sun on a blue background, with a red cross in the middle of the sun.

*

This flag combines three symbols: the Sun, the Red Cross the Blue Sky.

Thus it unites the symbols of the Greco-Latin civilization and of Christianity, the two basic elements of modern Europe.

The Sun is the eternal symbol of light, of spirit, of progress, of prosperity and of truth.

The Red Cross is being recognized by the while world, by Christian and non-Christian nations as a symbol of international charity and of the brotherhood of man.

The Cross has been, since the fall of the Roman Empire, the great symbol of Europe's moral unity. It is but natural that this symbol should figure within the European Flag - just as it appears on the flags of Switzerland, of Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and other European nations.

The crushing majority of European Christians will not admit the cross being removed from the European flag - while the none-Christian minority cannot oppose this

¹⁶⁷ R. Coudenhove-Kalergi, "The European Flag", Memorandum presented to the Council of Europe by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-European Movement, Secretary General of the European Parliamentary Union. Gstaad, 27 July 1950. In "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191", *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

symbol, inseparable from our history and civilization; as the Christian minorities in the Near East do not oppose the national symbols of the Crescent and the Star of David.

The Blue Sky, the natural background of the Sun, is a symbol of peace. Blue is the bound to be the basic color of the European Flag, since all other colors have at present a special meaning: the red flag = Bolshevism; the green flag = Islam; the yellow flag = quarantine; the black flag = mourning, the white flag = capitulation.

The Emblem

Europe should have an Emblem, connected with its flag, to serve as an instrument of propaganda – as the Soviet-Star serves Bolshevism and the Swastika served Hitlerism.

Such a European Emblem constitutes the center of the flag of the U.S.E.: the red-cross on the golden (yellow) sun. Without colors, it is a cross in a circle.

This design has been found, as a pre-Christian symbol of world-harmony, on Celtic and Germanic monuments.

National Neutrality

The flag of the U.S.E. has no national character, since it has no resemblance with any national flag. Thus it avoids the dangers of misinterpretations that would arise if letters of the alphabet were used as elements of the European Flag. The letter E, for instance, meaning "Europe", might also be read for "England"; the letter F, meaning "Federation", for "France"; the letter D, meaning "Democracy", for "Deutschland"; the letter U, meaning "Union", for "U.S.A" or "USSR" with all the fatal consequences of such interpretations.

Tradition

The red cross that constitutes the center of the flag, has been undoubtedly the first European Flag at the time of the Crusades.

Combined with the sun on a blue background, it has become the most ancient symbol of the European idea. Since 1923 this flag has been adopted throughout Europe, as a symbol of the Pan-European Movement. Acclaimed by the first Pan-European Congress in Vienna in 1926, this flag has floated over the roofs of Geneva, to great in 1929 the European Initiative of Aristide Briand, the Honorary Chairman of the Pan-European Union.

After the war, the European Parliamentary Union, that has launched the idea of a European Parliament elected by the national parliaments, has adopted this flag in December 1947, by an unanimous vote of its Council.

Beauty and Dignity

The evident beauty and dignity of this flag have never been contested.

All these reasons recommend the adoption of this flag by the Council of Europe.

Should the Council choose another symbol of its present structure of an association of sovereign nations, our flag will, under all circumstances, continue to be the symbol of the struggle for a European Federation - up to the birthday of the United States of Europe.

Gstaad, 27 July 1950

B.4 Memorandum from the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe on the European Flag (Strasbourg, 16 July 1951)¹⁶⁸

Confidential

1. The purpose of an Emblem

There are no ideals, however exalted in nature, which can afford to do without a symbol.

Symbols play a vital part in the ideological struggles of today. Ever since there first arose the question of European organisation, a large number of suggestions have more particularly been produced in its connection, some of which, despite their shortcomings, have for want of anything better been employed by various organisations and private individuals. A number of writers have pointed out how urgent and important it is that a symbol should be adopted, and the Secretariat-General has repeatedly been asked to provide a description of the official emblem of the Council of Europe and has been forced to admit that no such emblem exists.

Realising the importance of the matter, a number of French Members of Parliament (1) have proposed in the National Assembly that the symbol of the European Movement be flown together with the national flag on public buildings. Private movements such as the Volunteers of Europe have also been agitating for the flying of the European Movement colours on the occasion of certain French national celebrations.

In Belgium the emblem of the European Movement was used during the "European Seminar of 1950" by a number of individuals, private organisations and even public institutions. Certain newspapers criticised the use of this emblem and expressed their regret that the Council of Europe had adopted it which is untrue.

At Strasbourg the "E" flag has been widely used during Sessions, but to the surprise of the public, although it has been hoisted on private houses it has never been flown from French official buildings or buildings of the Council of Europe. On the other hand, a considerable amount of rivalry has manifested itself at the Seat of the Council inasmuch as the blue flag with the golden sun and red cross of the European Parliamentary Union has also made an appearance there.

This latter emblem, created by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi in 1923, is still used by him. The green "E" emblem dates from the early days of the European Movement. Both, however, are private emblems which do not affect the problem of a Council of Europe flag and its official use.

In August 1950, the Assembly examined the Report drawn up by the Secretariat-General at the request of the Committee on General Affairs on practical measures designed to make the peoples of Europe more directly aware of their unity. The

¹⁶⁸Council of Europe, "European flag - Drapeau européen". In *Library and Archives*, Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:
<http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/flag/default.asp>

Assembly referred the various chapters of this Report to the Committees qualified to deal with them. One of the measures advocated was the adoption of a flag. This proposal is a matter for the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges to decide (AS/AG (50) 85).

2. Design of the emblem of the Council of Europe and its use

The Assembly must reach a decision as to the principle of adopting an emblem, as to its design and the use to which it is to be put. This last point will briefly be dealt with here, partly on the basis of procedure and regulations established by the United Nations in a similar connection.

The text to be submitted to the Assembly for later recommendation to the Committee of Ministers might read as follows:

"The Consultative Assembly recommends to the Committee of Ministers:

Article 1: That the emblem of the Council of Europe shall be (description).

Article 2: That the Governments of Member States shall use the emblem of the Council of Europe conjointly with the national flag on all official buildings and on all occasions when flags are officially required to be flown, including the 5th May of each year, the anniversary date of the signing of the Statute of the Council of Europe.

In cases where it is flown together with a national flag, that of the Council of Europe shall be placed to the right of the national flag.

Article 3: The emblem of the Council of Europe shall be flown:

(a) On all buildings of the Council of Europe;

(b) On the official residence of the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretaries-General;

(c) On all vehicles used by the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, the President and Vice-Presidents of the Consultative Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretaries-General, whenever these personages are riding in the vehicles.

Article 4: The specialised authorities established within the Council of Europe and the non-governmental organisations recognised by the latter shall be entitled to use the Council flag subject to conditions to be laid down by order of the Secretary-General.

Article 5: The flag of the Council of Europe may be used by individuals of the Member States provided it is at all times treated with respect.

Article 6: The Secretary-General shall be responsible for the carrying out of these provisions."

3. Design of the Emblem

It would seem wiser not to adopt any flag already existing. Some are already employed by certain organisations, which should continue to use them. A completely new flag must be designed; on the other hand, any proposals submitted to this effect should fulfil the following requirements:

(a) Sufficient symbolical significance;

(b) Simplicity;

(c) Legibility;

(d) Harmony;

(e) Pleasing appearance;

(f) Orthodox heraldic design.

A. Symbols proposed

A very large number of symbols have been suggested. Those most frequently mentioned may be classified as follows:

- A cross - symbol of Christian civilisation, of Europe's crossroads (North - South, East - West), of command; reminiscent of the Crusades; the only symbol common to half the flags of Member States (Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Norway, Saar, Sweden, United Kingdom). Sometimes, as a variant, the Cross of St. Andrew, symbol of the Grand Duke of Burgundy, which appears historically the most appropriate.

- An "E" - Used by the European Movement, sometimes improved by being detached from the border of the flag, but criticized by experts in heraldry as being "more of a signpost than a flag".

- A white star in a circle - used in 1944-45 by the armies of liberation.

- Multiple stars - equivalent to the number of Member States in the Council of Europe and appearing either in the form of green stars on a white ground, white stars on a red ground, or silver stars for the Associate Members and golden stars for full Members.

- The coat-of-arms of the Town of Strasbourg - Argent, a bend gules, symbolising the official Seat of the Council of Europe.

- A sun - representing dawning hope.

- A triangle - representing culture.

B. Colors proposed

Some have suggested a combination of all the colours already used for the various flags of Europe. One of the earliest proposals sent in by a Strasbourg citizen was even accompanied by a statistical study of the colours employed, and was designed in blue, green, yellow, black, white and red in proportion to the extent these colours occur in the national flags. Green and white, the colours of the European Movement, are more often suggested; it should perhaps be pointed out in this respect that the original motive indulging the choice of green by Mr. Duncan Sandys was the use of the complementary colour to red; this has, however, been generally overlooked and green is advocated rather as symbolising youth and hope. On the other hand, some people have held that the true heraldic colour for Europe is blue (just as black is the colour for Africa, yellow for Asia and green for Australia); it has not been possible to trace the origin of this theory.

C. While it is true that an orthodox heraldic device and adequate symbolic significance are of some importance, good visual recognition, attraction to the eye, and facility of reproduction are even more essential. When first examining the proposals received, it therefore appeared wiser straight away to reject:

- (a) All intricate designs bearing symbols difficult to draw or particularly complicated to reproduce;

- (b) Clashing color combinations, however ingenious.

- (c) Multicolored emblems on the diagonal - such as the Cross of Burgundy - too reminiscent of the house flags of shipping companies.

The reasons militating against the use of emblems of existing Movements (European Parliamentary Union and European Movement) have already been given above.

D. Main proposals advanced

All proposals have been submitted to the members of the Committee. It is, however, in practice impossible to describe them all. Below will be found those proposals which appeared most worthy of the Committee's attention:

(a) The Manné proposal: This is the above-mentioned Strasbourg proposal based on the statistical distribution of the various colours on the European flags. Its design is in the form of four horizontal stripes - blue, green, yellow and black (secondary colours) - a triangle in red and white, the dominant colours, being placed adjacent to the pole. These colours (red and white) are not only those most frequently found on European flags, but also constitute the colours of the Town of Strasbourg. Every European will find in this composite flag the colours with which he himself is familiar.

(b) The Martin-Levy proposal: Designed by one of the curators of the Strasbourg Museum and a member of the Secretariat-General. White silk ground with a green cross bearing in the centre the coat-of-arms of the Town of Strasbourg. This flag resembles the colours of the European Movement and thus pays tribute to the founders of the Council of Europe; the cross, symbol of Christianity, is also the symbol of Europe's highways (North, South, East and West) at the converging point of which stands Strasbourg (the city of crossroads). This design is easily copied and is particularly harmonious to the eye, especially if the cross is shifted slightly towards the pole in the manner of Scandinavian flags.

This design met with considerable approval, but also with some criticism for the following reasons:

(i) White is easily soiled. It is therefore better not to have a flag with a white ground;

(ii) No federal flag has so far borne the coat-of-arms of the capital as its central motif.

(iii) Exception can be taken to the cross.

(c) The Coudenhove proposal: Count Coudenhove-Kalergi favours the white flag bearing a red cross whose four branches extend to the edges of the flag - i.e. the flag of St. George.

(d) The Prince de Schwarzenberg proposal: The latter proposes that the "first European symbol" - the labarum of Constantine - be adopted; that is, a red flag with a yellow cross.

(e) The Lucien Philippe proposal: Fifteen green stars in three rows on a white ground.

(f) The Wirion proposals: Monsieur Wirion, the Luxembourg expert in heraldry, considers that green and white should in all events be retained. He proposes various combinations (a star with eight forked points, the Burgundy Cross, a white sun on a field of green, etc.) but prefers a design based on the Martin-Levy proposal, reversing the colours (field of green and white cross) and doing away with the Strasbourg coat-of-arms. M. Wirion, however, at the beginning of March 1950, said he agreed that the white ground should be left, even though it is easily soiled. He was willing to accept the white ground with a green cross provided the Strasbourg coat-of-arms at the centre was only used for the pennants of Council personages and flags flown on Council buildings. In all other cases the coat-of-arms should be omitted.

(g) The Sommer proposal: Monsieur Sommer of Neuilly suggests that the aesthetic shortcomings of the "E" of the European Movement be remedied by detaching it from the edges of the flag and creating a neat geometrical design; this design he has studied in detail.

(h) Mondon proposals: Monsieur Mondon, a cartographer of Bad Godesberg, has proposed a white triangle, symbol of culture, on various fields.

(i) Muller proposal: Monsieur Muller of Wiesbaden proposes a red flag bearing the word "Europa" in gold lettering, with a golden sun and a white hand making the sign of the oath.

(j) Harmignies proposal: Suggests the creation of a new heraldic device - a Cross of Europe on similar lines to the Cross of Lorraine, Toulouse, Malta, Jerusalem, etc. The Cross of Europe would consist of four "E"s backed on to a square. This proposal was accompanied by a series of designs demonstrating its effect on coats-of-arms, flags, pennants, medals, etc.

(k) Poucher proposal: As far back as 1939, Monsieur Poucher proposed a federal banner which was virtually the reverse of the flag of the United States of America, with blue bands and a red quarter in one corner.

(l) H. C. proposal: A European flag decorated with the international code sign of the letter "E". This flag would be divided horizontally into two halves, the upper blue and the lower red. These two colours also correspond to those generally adopted by the right and left wing parties respectively. The flag would be distinguishable from the flag of the City of Paris, which is also blue and red, by being divided horizontally.

It will be for the Committee to choose between these various proposals and to prepare a Report explaining its choice to the Assembly.

(1) Proposal submitted by M. Bichet and colleagues.
Strasbourg: Consultative Assembly, Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, Sub-Committee on Immunities, 16 July 1951

B.5 Letter from Filippo Caracciolo to Representatives to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (Strasbourg, 7 December 1951)¹⁶⁹

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
SECRETARIAT-GENERAL
Strasbourg, 7th December, 1951

¹⁶⁹ "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191". In *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:
<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

Monsieur le Représentant,

The Council of Europe has at present no flag of its own. It flies the colours of the fifteen Member States, and obviously cannot convert to its own use flags belonging to private movements, however widely supported these movements may be.

These circumstances led the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges to decide a few days ago that before making any decisions regarding the form of a European flag, it should ask the Secretariat to circulate in writing to the Representatives of the Assembly a request for their opinion on the matter.

I have the honor accordingly to submit herewith

(1) Twelve cards in color, repeating a selection of the most characteristic designs, which was originally made by the Secretariat General at the request of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges;

(2) A memorandum explanatory of these designs, which was also prepared for the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges;

and

A form of reply, which you are hereby requested to be good enough to fill in and return as soon as possible, and in any case not later than Monday, 10th December, to Monsieur Caracciolo, Clerk of the Assembly.

Thanking you in anticipation for your kind attention to the matter, I beg to remain,
Monsieur le Représentant,

Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]

F. Caracciolo

Deputy Secretary-General

Clerk of the Assembly

B.6 Lettre d'Arsène Heitz à Filippo Caracciolo (Strasbourg, 5 janvier 1952)¹⁷⁰

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE
SECRÉTARIAT GÉNÉRAL
Strasbourg, le 5 janvier 1952

¹⁷⁰ "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191". In *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

Monsieur,

J'ai l'honneur de soumettre à votre bienveillante attention un projet de drapeau européen, dont certaines caractéristiques conviendraient particulièrement au drapeau de l'Union Européenne et de l'Armée.

Ce drapeau s'inspire de l'Étendard de Charlemagne par sa couleur verte, (dont il est possible de varier la teinte) et des drapeaux des États Scandinaves pour la disposition de ses emblèmes.

Il sera donc :

1) vert, en souvenir de l'Étendard donné à Charlemagne par le Pape Léon III, lors du sacre à Rome à la basilique Saint Pierre en l'An 800.

2) portera la croix rouge au liseré d'or, ces deux couleurs symbolisant le sacrifice et la fraternité des peuples unis dans un même idéal, la prospérité et la civilisation qui résultera de cette union.

3) Dans le cas de l'adoption de ce drapeau par l'Union Européenne et l'Armée, il sera facile d'insérer au cœur de la croix l'emblème national de chacun des États participants. En effet il est difficile d'effacer brusquement et de remplacer sans transition des pavillons nationaux qui ont suscité l'enthousiasme et le sacrifice de tant de héros pour leur patrie.

Le fait d'autre part de mettre la croix figurant sur les emblèmes Scandinaves, à l'étendard de Charlemagne, peut symboliser l'avènement d'une Europe plus complète que celle de l'Empire Carolingien.

Les renseignements concernant l'Étendard de Charlemagne se trouvent à la bibliothèque Château des Rohans à Strasbourg.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, mes sentiments très respectueux.

[signature]

HEITZ

Service du Courrier.

Monsieur F. Caracciolo
Secrétaire Adjoint,
Greffier de l'Assemblée
Conseil de l'Europe
STRASBOURG

B.7 Letter from Filippo Caracciolo to Representatives to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (15 February 1952)¹⁷¹

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
SECRETARIAT-GENERAL
15th February 1952

Sir,

Emblem of the Council of Europe

At the request of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges a referendum was held among all Representatives during the last few days of the Third Session of the Assembly on various proposals put forward for an emblem of the Council of Europe.

The results of this referendum are as follows:

48 Representatives have so far returned the questionnaire submitted to them.

Of these 48 Representatives, 2 rejected all the proposals submitted, 16 favoured one only and 14 placed the twelve proposals in order of preference as requested

23 of the 48 replies - that is, nearly half - gave first preference to Proposal No. 1: the flag of Count Coudenhove, on a field azure a gold sun bearing a cross gules. This proposal also came second twice, third twice, fifth once, sixth once, tenth once and eleventh once. Among the comments and suggestions made about this proposal, the following should be noted:

- a) No emblem of an institution of which Moslems are members may bear a cross. (Comment of a Turkish and a British Representative);
- b) The general design could be retained with the addition of a crescent in the upper left-hand quarter when the emblem is used in Moslem countries;
- c) Both the sun and the cross should be placed in the upper left-hand quarter;
- d) The cross might extend to the edges of the flag in both directions.

The proposal obtaining the second largest number of votes was No. 7 (the reverse of the American flag) . It came first 9 times, second 6 times, third twice, fourth once, fifth once, seventh 3 times, eighth, ninth and tenth once each.

Among the comments on this proposal the following may be noted:

- a) It is too American;
- b) It is good because it is American;
- c) The barry should consist of 10 pieces instead of 13.

Other proposals given first preference were as follows:

No. 2 5 times.

¹⁷¹ "Le drapeau - The Flag, 2191". In *Archives historiques du Conseil de l'Europe - Historical archives of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

No. 3 twice.
No. 5 once.
No. 9 once.
No.10 twice.
No. 11 once.
No. 12 twice.

Among the general comments accompanying the replies the following are worthy of note:

- a) Green is not a good colour since it quickly fades;
- b) Only the Coudenhove proposal is possible;
- c) Only Proposals 2 and 3 (cross argent on a field vert and a cross gules on a field argent) are possible;
- d) Proposal No. 4 might be adopted but without the Strasbourg coat-of-arms in the centre;
- e) Proposal No. 11 (on a field gules a sun or, and "Europa" in gold lettering) might be adopted without the white hand (two identical replies);
- f) The idea of a flag with stars only, like No. 12, might be adopted but in different colours (on a field gules stars argent). This, however, is too servilely American, state two Representatives.
- g) 4 Representatives asked for a further investigation into the whole problem.

I thought you would like to know the results of this inquiry which will be submitted to the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges at its next meeting.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

[signature]

F CARACCIOLO.

Deputy Secretary-General

Clerk of the Assembly

B.8 Resolution 41(1) on the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (25 September 1953)¹⁷²

1. The Assembly resolves to take as its emblem an azure flag bearing a circle of fifteen stars or (on an azure ground a circle of five-pointed stars or, none of which are touching).
2. This flag shall be flown outside the buildings of the Council of Europe whenever the Assembly is in Session.

¹⁷²Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, "Resolution 41 on the choice of an emblem for the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe". Res (53) 41, Strasbourg, mise à jour 26.01.2006[30.05.2005]. Retrieved December 6, 2006 from : <http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta53/ERES41.htm>

3. Its use on other occasions shall be determined later by the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly.

This Resolution was adopted by the Assembly at its twenty-third Sitting, on 25th September, 1953 (see Doc. 198, Report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges).

B.9 Recommendation 56(1) of the Consultative Assembly on the choice of an emblem for the Council of Europe (25 September 1953)¹⁷³

The Assembly,

Having adopted as its emblem an azure flag bearing a circle of fifteen stars or,
Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:

- (a) adopt the same emblem as the symbol of the Council of Europe as a whole ;
- (b) instruct the Secretary-General to enter into negotiations with the other European institutions to ensure that the emblems adopted by them shall have features similar to that adopted by the Council of Europe.

This Recommendation was adopted by the Assembly at its twenty-third Sitting, on 25th September, 1953 (see Doc. 198, Report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges).

B.10 Recommendation 88 (1955)¹ of the Consultative Assembly on the emblem of the Council of Europe (25 October 1955)¹⁷⁴

The Assembly,

¹⁷³ Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, *Recommendation 56 on the choice of an emblem for the Council of Europe*. Strasbourg, Retrieved December 6, 2006 from :

<http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta53/EREC56.htm>

¹⁷⁴ Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, *Recommendation 88 on the emblem of the Council of Europe*, Strasbourg , 1955. Retrieved December 12, 2006 from:

<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta55/EREC88.htm>

Requested by the Committee of Ministers to reconsider the question of the choice of a Council of Europe emblem;

Having examined the alternative proposals for an emblem,

Recommends to the Committee of Ministers :

(a) to adopt as Council of Europe emblem the azure flag bearing a circle of twelve stars or (an azure flag bearing a circle of five-pointed stars or, which do not touch) ;

(b) to instruct the Secretary-General to enter into negotiations with the other European institutions in order to ensure that the emblems adopted by them shall bear a close resemblance to that adopted by the Council of Europe.

The Recommendation was adopted by the Assembly at its 25th Sitting, on 25th October, 1955 (see Doc. 443, draft Recommendation of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges and Explanatory Memorandum by M. Bichet, Rapporteur).

B.11 Resolution (55) 32 adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (8 December 1955)¹⁷⁵

Emblem of the Council of Europe

The Committee of Ministers,

Having taken note of Recommendation 88 adopted unanimously by the Consultative Assembly on 25th October, 1955,

Decides to adopt for the Council of Europe the following emblem: on a field azure a circle of twelve mullets or, their points not touching. The emblem is in accordance with the descriptions and the design attached.

Heraldic description

On a field azure a circle of twelve mullets or their points not touching.

Symbolical description

Against the blue sky of the Western world, the stars symbolise the peoples of Europe in the form of a circle, the sign of union. The stars are twelve in number and are invariable, the figure twelve being the symbol of perfection and entirety.

Geometrical description

¹⁷⁵ Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, "Resolution (55) 32 - (Adopted by the Ministers' Deputies): Emblem of the Council of Europe", 9th December, 1955. In *Documents of the Committee of Ministers 1955 - II*, July - December, 1955; *Documents du Comité des Ministres 1955 II*, Juillet - Décembre 1955, p. 205 **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Flag". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

The emblem is in the form of a blue rectangular flag of which the fly (F) is one and a half times the length of the hoist (H). Twelve gold stars situated at equal intervals form an undefined circle of which the centre is the point of intersection of the diagonals of the rectangle. The radius (R) of the circle is equal to one-third of the height of the hoist. Each of the stars has five points which are situated on the circumference of an undefined circle of which the radius (r) is equal to one-eighteenth of the height of the hoist. All stars are upright - that is to say, with one point vertical at 90° and two points in a straight line at right angles with the mast.

The circle is arranged so that the stars appear in the position of the hours on the face of a clock. Their number is invariable.

The colour, heraldic azure, is represented by light ultramarine blue.

The colour heraldic or is represented by deep chrome yellow.

Appendix C May, the day of the Robert Schuman Declaration established as Europe Day

C.1 Declaration of 9 May 1950

This is the full text of the proposal, which was presented by the French foreign minister Robert Schuman and which led to the creation of what is now the European Union.

World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers, which threaten it. The contribution, which an organized and living Europe can bring to civilization, is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. In taking upon herself for more than 20 years the role of champion of a united Europe, France has always had as her essential aim the service of peace. A united Europe was not achieved and we had war.

Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity. The coming together of the nations of Europe requires the elimination of the age-old opposition of France and Germany. Any action taken must in the first place concern these two countries. With this aim in view, the French Government proposes that action be taken immediately on one limited but decisive point.

We proposes that Franco-German production of coal and steel as a whole be placed under a common High Authority, within the framework of an organization open to the participation of the other countries of Europe. The pooling of coal and steel

production should immediately provide for the setting up of common foundations for economic development as a first step in the federation of Europe, and will change the destinies of those regions, which have long been devoted to the manufacture of munitions of war, of which they have been the most constant victims.

The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible. The setting up of this powerful productive unit, open to all countries willing to take part and bound ultimately to provide all the member countries with the basic elements of industrial production on the same terms, will lay a true foundation for their economic unification.

This production will be offered to the world as a whole without distinction or exception, with the aim of contributing to raising living standards and to promoting peaceful achievements. [...]In this way, there will be realized simply and speedily that fusion of interest which is indispensable to the establishment of a common economic system; it may be the leaven from which may grow a wider and deeper community between countries long opposed to one another by sanguinary divisions.

By pooling basic production and by instituting a new High Authority, whose decisions will bind France, Germany and other member countries, this proposal will lead to the realization of the first concrete foundation of a European federation indispensable to the preservation of peace. To promote the realization of the objectives defined, the French Government is ready to open negotiations on the following bases.

The task with which this common High Authority will be charged will be that of securing in the shortest possible time the modernization of production and the improvement of its quality; the supply of coal and steel on identical terms to the French and German markets, as well as to the markets of other member countries; the development in common of exports to other countries; the equalization and improvement of the living conditions of workers in these industries.

To achieve these objectives, starting from the very different conditions in which the production of member countries is at present situated, it is proposed that certain transitional measures should be instituted, such as the application of a production and investment plan, the establishment of compensating machinery for equating prices, and the creation of a restructuring fund to facilitate the rationalization of production. The movement of coal and steel between member countries will immediately be freed from all customs duty, and will not be affected by differential transport rates. Conditions will gradually be created which will spontaneously provide for the more rational distribution of production at the highest level of productivity.

In contrast to international cartels, which tend to impose restrictive practices on distribution and the exploitation of national markets, and to maintain high profits, the organization will ensure the fusion of markets and the expansion of production.

The essential principles and undertakings defined above will be the subject of a treaty signed between the States and submitted for the ratification of their parliaments. The negotiations required to settle details of applications will be undertaken with the help of an arbitrator appointed by common agreement. He will be entrusted with the task of seeing that the agreements reached conform with the principles laid down, and, in the event of a deadlock, he will decide what solution is to be adopted.

The common High Authority entrusted with the management of the scheme will be composed of independent persons appointed by the governments, giving equal representation. A chairman will be chosen by common agreement between the governments. The Authority's decisions will be enforceable in France, Germany and other member countries. Appropriate measures will be provided for means of appeal against the decisions of the Authority. A representative of the United Nations will be accredited to the Authority, and will be instructed to make a public report to the United Nations twice yearly, giving an account of the working of the new organization, particularly as concerns the safeguarding of its objectives.

The institution of the High Authority will in no way prejudge the methods of ownership of enterprises. In the exercise of its functions, the common High Authority will take into account the powers conferred upon the International Ruhr Authority and the obligations of all kinds imposed upon Germany, so long as these remain in force.¹⁷⁶

C.2 The 25th anniversary of the 'Schuman Plan'¹⁷⁷

The dawn of Europe

9 May 1950 — 'Today, Wednesday 9 May, at 5 p.m. in the Salon de l'Horloge at the Quai d'Orsay, the Minister of Foreign Affairs will make an important announcement.' There, in a room bursting at the seams, a tall, frail man, speaking quietly with an eastern accent, acquainted his audience with the document that was to be relayed all over the world by telephone and wireless. Robert Schuman was rectitude and intrepid conviction personified: this was the source of that coolness which he had displayed when, as President of the Council in 1947, he had been confronted with a national strike.

In order to gauge the significance of what had just taken place, we have to think back to the period, one which the young of today have difficulty imagining. It was barely five years since the end of the most horrifying of wars. Although Germany had a government, it had not recovered its sovereignty: it required, in matters of foreign policy, the agreement of the three Allied Commissioners. The Ruhr was administered by an International Authority, on which Alain Poher was the French representative. The Saar

¹⁷⁶ "Declaration on 9 May 1950". In *Europa. Europe Day, 9 May*. Retrieved November 17, 2006 from: http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/decl_en.htm

¹⁷⁷ On 25th anniversary of the declaration made on 9 May 1950, Pierre Uri, former colleague of Jean Monnet, recalls the preparations for the Schuman Plan in an article written for the French newspaper *Le Monde*.

Pierre Uri, "L'aube de l'Europe: Le vingt-cinquième anniversaire du Plan Schuman", in *Le Monde*. No 9 427, 09.05.1975, p. 1, 4. Translated by the CVCE, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. Europe Day". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*.

Retrieved November 6, 2006 from:

<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

had been placed under the protectorship of Gilbert Grandval. A conference was about to be held in London to determine the increase in the level of Germany's steel production.

One year earlier, in Jean Monnet's garden, an informal meeting with neither instructions nor an agenda was held between him, accompanied by Étienne Hirsch and myself, and his British counterpart, Edwin Plowden, who in turn had with him Robert Hall, Economic Adviser to Her Majesty's Government. That Germany happened to have been forgotten was remarked upon in passing.

From that point on, Jean Monnet's mind was never to be at rest for a moment. Then, one May Day weekend, the idea was brought into focus. With him were Étienne Hirsch and Paul Reuter, the jurist. There were three themes: Franco-German relations; coal and steel, chosen for their symbolic value as the means of war and of peace; and supranational authority. A first paper was roughly drafted. The following day, Monnet called me and showed it to me. My words were: 'This changes everything, everything falls into place: German sovereignty, the Saar.' As for the economic plan, one clarification was still required: the merging of markets instead of an interventionist organisation, allowing conditions to determine of their own accord the highest level of productivity. I was delegated to rewrite it. Bernard Clappier, Principal Private Secretary to Robert Schuman, joined us. He immediately appreciated the immense prospect that had opened before us, the gigantic game of double or quits in which his superior was invited to play a part.

The changes made, continuing right up to the ninth draft, which was adopted on Saturday 6 May, were limited. René Mayer had Africa added; Georges Bidault, the Prime Minister, asked for a reference to France's constant efforts to achieve a united Europe. This became: 'Europe has not come into being, in its stead we have had war'; the Quai d'Orsay covered itself with the allusion to Germany's obligations, 'as long as these remain'.

The secret had been well kept. An emissary sent to Konrad Adenauer had immediately obtained his enthusiastic support. Dean Acheson was in Paris on his way to the London Conference: he was not quite sure what to think of the paper that he was shown in confidence. The project could have been a Bidault Plan: his Principal Private Secretary, who did not care for Monnet, forgot to inform him of the meeting. We read in *Le Monde* that the President was supposed to have received the information. Two Ministers were in on it: René Mayer and René Pleven. On Wednesday morning, 9 May 1950, they helped Robert Schuman to have the project adopted by the Council of Ministers.

Acceptance by Italy and Benelux was not long in coming. What was urgent was to get to London. There, Monnet met Stafford Cripps; he asked Hirsch and me to join him. After the refusal, Robert Hall said to me: 'Hazy fears.'

A style without precedent

The conference convened for the drafting of the ECSC Treaty had been called for 1 June. We prepared a working paper divided up into articles, which were adopted, given greater depth or supplemented by negotiation. Monnet created a style that was without precedent. No translation, no minutes. Agreement on one point was not dependent on agreement on another: in accordance with a German word that he had just learnt — *Junktim* — there was no conditionality. To cap it all, as a Dutch friend of mine has just reminded me, Hirsch and I were not afraid to argue in front of the others. It was not in

order to flaunt any disagreement: it was research that we made a point of conducting openly. The most experienced negotiators were thrown by this approach: how could they put forward their national position if there were no French national position? We won exceptional credit by means of these tactics. No meeting between two delegations took place without a Frenchman participating. The French delegation played the part, which is so novel and so essential, of the catalyst, and by doing so it foreshadowed Europe.

Right in the middle of the discussions fell, like a bombshell, the unfortunate declaration by John McCloy, High Commissioner for Germany, who proposed the setting up of 12 German divisions. It was the opposite of what we were trying to do: in the quest for European sovereignty, to ignore completely the issue of German sovereignty. A response had to be improvised: the idea of a Defence Community. The team that drew up the Treaty for it simply inserted, where they had no business to be, the clauses that we had drawn up for coal and steel. When Paul Van Zeeland refused a genuine common budget by reducing it to the sum of the contributions determined by each parliament, when every decision by the Allied High Commission was made subject to the unanimous agreement of the Allied Council, I thought that we were just storing up trouble: the headlights were trained on a supranational authority, but it would be totally bereft of powers.

At the time of the preparatory work on the ECSC Treaty, Hirsch took the lead in a large proportion of the economic and technical discussions; the State Councillor, Maurice Lagrange, took charge of the legal aspects; I dealt more particularly with the social and commercial issues. But everyone dabbled in everything. Our conference was interrupted so that the French delegation could complete the drafting of a plan; it also delivered a memorandum on the transitional period: this was converted effortlessly into an agreement. A reading committee, in which I was at Lagrange's side, took care of questions that had not yet been settled, completed the final drafting of the texts and, if memory serves, accepted without changing a word the agreement on the transitional arrangements. It remained for the Ministers to agree on the seat of the institutions: this very nearly took a dramatic turn. In the end, Joseph Bech, thanks to his good nature and his skill, managed to have the Community installed in Luxembourg, France keeping the Parliament for Strasbourg.

When, on 10 August 1952, Jean Monnet took up the Presidency, the small handful of principal negotiators immediately got down to work. One day, the story will have to be told of what those first months of unrelenting labour were like, of the pace at which that work was performed in order to put the institutions in place, to make contact with industries and governments and to complete all the tasks before the opening of the Common Market for coal and steel.

The same spirit held sway as had done during the negotiations: each country's difficulties were regarded as common difficulties and, as such, to be settled in common. For cooperation, in the sense of European organisation as fathered by the Marshall Plan, was not enough: it meant either standstill, or clumsy compromise, or agreement forced through by the outside power, America, who held the purse strings. It was up to Europe to find in its new style of working its own internal federator. Institutions, too, but ones set up for specific tasks and which would exclude that worst of evils: the spirit of domination, which demeans the one that dominates as much as the one that is dominated. And also this new concept of what Jacques Rueff called an institutional market, that is to

say, initiative that is free but circumscribed by conditions that match it to the circumstances of our day. And, particularly, retraining, this great invention that was to protect the labour force from the costs and the risks of progress, so that any change in employment might become an opportunity for promotion.

In his retirement, General de Gaulle allowed himself to mock what he called this ‘muddle of coal and steel’ and to attack the person whom he described as ‘the instigator’, without naming him. He regarded us as naive. He did not properly appreciate the extraordinary authority which Frenchmen enjoyed, both in the Paris negotiations and in those for the Treaty of Rome. Where is his policy of table-thumping now? History will show that, for 15 years, the greatest and most peaceful revolution of our time was halted and almost killed off. When, after the General’s return to power, Adenauer overcame his reservations and met him, he did admit that he had underestimated the political significance of what had been achieved. This tardy recognition did not stop the wily politician, who proposed a Franco-German agreement of which nothing has come barring sporadic meetings, which sometimes exacerbated antagonisms, from proclaiming that Franco-German reconciliation was all his doing. Those who can remember are well aware how much the Declaration of 9 May 1950 had, in the course of a few days, suddenly changed the Franco-German tandem for ever.

Seen as a whole, the entire significance of what happened on that day lay in the changing of relations between nations. We have known subsequent crises. Jean Monnet remains the most optimistic: ‘What we have made is solid; the proof is that, every time that there are crises, they are overcome.’ Today, he is thinking about a task that is even more extensive and more difficult: the prohibition of the spirit of domination. This will also have to entail changing relations between men.

Pierre Uri

Appendix D Official documents regarding the adoption of the European anthem

D.1 L'hymne européen

Les origines de l'hymne européen sont beaucoup moins complexes et sa naissance a connu une évolution relativement droite. Là aussi les premières propositions sont venues d'hommes et de femmes européens dès les premiers mois d'existence du Conseil de l'Europe. Une fois de plus, un nombre impressionnant de propositions de textes et de mélodies pour un hymne européen affluèrent vers la jeune institution de Strasbourg.

Ici encore, l'organisation de manifestations à caractère européen et notamment celles organisées dans le cadre de jumelages entre villes et communes et de la Journée de l'Europe (5 mai) avaient fait sentir le besoin d'un hymne qui soit symbole et expression de la fraternité européenne.

Certains responsables locaux passaient même à l'action en improvisant leur "hymne à l'Europe" en espérant qu'il trouverait d'autres adeptes et soit peut-être même consacré officiellement. Était-ce un geste prémonitoire ? Toujours est-il qu'à l'occasion de la célébration du 10^e anniversaire du Conseil de l'Europe, le 20 avril 1959, les chœurs de St. Guillaume de Strasbourg avaient interprété l'Ode à la Joie de Beethoven.

Cette initiative ponctuelle, mais hautement symbolique a trouvé un prolongement dans une démarche de la section belge du Conseil des Communes d'Europe. Elle décidait tout simplement en 1961 de faire imprimer et diffuser parmi ses membres une partition et un disque d'un "Chant européen des Communes" dont le texte s'inspira du thème des jumelages et de la solidarité intercommunale. Par contre, la mélodie retenue était bel et bien une adaptation de l'"Ode à la Joie", dernier mouvement de la 9^e Symphonie de Beethoven.

Dans une lettre adressée en octobre 1963 au Secrétaire de la Commission des pouvoirs locaux de l'Assemblée Consultative du Conseil de l'Europe, le Secrétaire général de la section belge justifia en ces termes l'initiative de sa section: "Les nombreuses cérémonies de jumelage organisées dans notre pays, la participation importante des communes belges à la Journée de l'Europe, à la Journée Européenne des Écoles et à la Campagne en faveur de l'utilisation du Drapeau de l'Europe, nous ont fait apprécier la nécessité d'un hymne européen qui pourrait être exécuté conjointement avec les hymnes nationaux. Il m'a semblé intéressant de vous communiquer les résultats encourageants de cette initiative au moment où il est question de "choix officiel d'un hymne européen".

Les 7^e États Généraux du Conseil des Communes d'Europe, tenus à Rome en 1964, ont appuyé cette initiative par une résolution exprimant le vœu "qu'un hymne européen soit adopté par le Conseil de l'Europe et les Communautés européennes". La même résolution avait d'ailleurs souhaité "que chaque commune adopte et arbore en permanence le drapeau de l'Europe". Les participants estimaient en effet qu'il importe que le sentiment européen puisse se créer ou se renforcer grâce aux symboles et aux cérémonies publiques.

En corollaire avec les discussions relatives à une Journée de l'Europe, l'idée d'un hymne européen avait été maintes fois évoquée dans les discussions, notamment de la Commission des pouvoirs locaux de l'Assemblée Consultative, mais également au cours des premières réunions de la Conférence des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe. Mais l'argument le plus puissant en faveur de l'introduction d'un hymne européen venait probablement de l'institution du "Prix de l'Europe" par l'Assemblée Consultative (depuis 1955) et de l'attribution de "Drapeaux d'honneur" aux communes particulièrement actives pour la propagation de l'idée européenne. Les cérémonies de remise de telles distinctions organisées avec grand faste par les communes faisaient régulièrement naître le désir de clôturer une telle cérémonie par l'exécution d'un hymne européen.

Mais du vœu maintes fois exprimé à la présentation d'un projet précis, le chemin était encore long : dans un premier temps l'idée d'un concours européen a été ventilée à plusieurs reprises et abandonnée ensuite.

En mai 1970, le Conseil municipal de Strasbourg, à l'initiative de Pierre Pflimlin maire de la ville, décida de créer un "Grand Prix de Strasbourg de la chanson européenne" avec l'espoir, formulé d'une manière un peu vague, de pouvoir en dégager un hymne européen.

Cependant, les différentes initiatives lancées à la même époque poussèrent les hommes politiques à agir plus rapidement.

En décembre 1969 une lettre fût adressée par le ministère français des Affaires culturelles au Président de la Commission de l'aménagement du territoire et des pouvoirs locaux, soumettant un nouveau projet d'hymne européen invite la commission parlementaire à donner suite aux différentes initiatives. Tout en approuvant la proposition d'un hymne européen et en reconnaissant même l'urgence de son introduction eu égard aux nombreuses sollicitations dont les membres individuels de la commission avaient fait l'objet au cours des dernières années à l'occasion notamment de cérémonies de remise de drapeaux d'honneur à des collectivités locales, l'ancienne Commission des pouvoirs locaux éprouvait des difficultés à se mettre d'accord sur la procédure à suivre. C'est l'idée d'un concours européen et la crainte des aléas de ses résultats qui paralysait toute initiative concrète pendant de longs mois.

Il aura suffi d'une lettre du Président de la Table ronde pour la relance de la "Journée de l'Europe", Kjell Evers, Président de la Conférence des pouvoirs locaux, qui avait été chargé par ce comité, à l'issue d'une réunion tenue le 1er février 1971, de soumettre à la commission compétente de l'Assemblée les vœux pressants de ses membres de voir enfin un hymne européen institué sur une base officielle par les organes du Conseil de l'Europe.

Cette fois-ci, les réactions des membres de la Commission étaient non seulement favorables à l'unanimité, mais ils préconisaient lors d'une réunion le 22 avril 1971, un calendrier d'urgence : dépôt immédiat d'une proposition de résolution et présentation d'un rapport avec une recommandation appropriée à la réunion de la Commission Permanente, qui pouvait adopter une telle proposition au nom de l'Assemblée à sa prochaine réunion à Berlin.

C'est le Président de la commission, René Radius, qui fut nommé rapporteur. Le projet de rapport a été élaboré au cours du mois de mai et approuvé par la commission à sa réunion du 7 juin 1971.

Comme prévu, le rapport a été inscrit à l'ordre du Jour de la Commission Permanente, réunie à Berlin les 7 et 8 juillet. Le rapporteur faisait une fois de plus valoir le besoin exprimé par tant d'Européens de disposer dorénavant, en plus du Drapeau européen et de la Journée de l'Europe, également d'un hymne pour pouvoir exprimer par cette trilogie de symboles leur unité et leur attachement à des valeurs communes.

Après avoir rappelé aussi les très nombreuses propositions, textes, certains déjà accompagnés de leur traduction dans d'autres langues, partitions de musique reçues dès 1949 au Conseil de l'Europe et provenant aussi bien de particuliers que de groupements européens privés, la première suggestion a été faite tendant à confier à un jury la sélection parmi une cinquantaine de projets déjà enregistrés à Strasbourg.

La deuxième suggestion, longtemps en discussion, était celle d'organiser un grand concours européen, ouvert à tous les talents contemporains. Mais alors : quelle composition pour le jury ? Quels critères appliquer ? N'allait-on pas déclencher de nouvelles passions nationalistes, éveiller de nouvelles rancunes ?

Au niveau de la commission de R. Radius, les discussions tournaient de plus en plus autour d'une troisième alternative : ne valait-il pas mieux regarder le patrimoine musical européen, un compositeur déjà bien ancré dans le souvenir et dans la sensibilité des Européens ? Un Beethoven, Charpentier, Mozart, Tchaïkowsky ? Les émissions des programmes "Eurovision" avaient déjà mis à contribution M.A. Charpentier. Les "Royal Fireworks" ou la "Watermusik" de G.F. Haendel offrirait aussi des passages déjà très populaires et bien "cantabile".

Mais il y avait surtout Beethoven, somme toute un vrai Européen : né à Bonn, d'une descendance hollandaise et arrivé aux sommets d'un génie musical à Vienne. Il y avait justement l'année "anniversaire" de Beethoven en 1970 et également les nombreux "précédents" de cérémonies européennes déjà entourées soit par sa mélodie, soit avec son texte, de l'Ode à la Joie de sa 9^e Symphonie, désignée pour la circonstance comme un hymne européen.

Mais les paroles de Schiller étaient-elles vraiment adaptées à la sensibilité de notre temps ? Étaient-elles aptes à éveiller une conscience européenne ? Les discussions parmi les membres de la commission parlementaire arrivèrent très rapidement à la conclusion qu'il valait mieux - au moins pour le moment - renoncer à un texte pour ne pas compromettre l'acceptation par tous de l'hymne européen. Un jour peut-être, un génie de la poésie européenne pourrait proposer un texte, rédigé dans les principales langues européennes et répondant aux différentes sensibilités des nations qui composent notre vieille Europe ?

Par contre, l'unanimité s'est cristallisée au cours des réunions successives de la Commission de l'aménagement du territoire et des pouvoirs locaux du mois d'avril et de mai pour déposer la proposition de résolution tendant à "promouvoir l'utilisation, dans les pays membres comme Hymne européen la partie de la 9^e Symphonie constituée par les 20 premières mesures du 4^e mouvement (Prélude à l'Ode à la Joie)".

Le débat en Commission Permanente relatif à cette proposition n'a été ni long, ni controversé, à l'exception d'une voix sceptique d'un parlementaire italien qui redoutait la naissance d'un chauvinisme européen, pouvant trouver son expression dans un hymne européen.

Mais le projet et le rapport explicatif l'accompagnant reflétaient bien les sentiments et les convictions de la grande majorité de l'Assemblée parlementaire et c'est ainsi que la Résolution 492 relative à un hymne européen a été adoptée le 8 juillet 1971 par la Commission Permanente, agissant au nom de l'Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe :

" (...) Considérant qu'il convient à présent de doter l'Europe en formation de son hymne, outre son emblème et sa Journée, à l'instar des symboles de nos États nationaux;

Considérant qu'il convient de porter le choix sur une œuvre musicale représentative du génie de l'Europe et dont l'utilisation dans les manifestations à caractère européen constitue déjà l'ébauche d'une tradition;

(...) Décide :

a) de proposer l'acceptation par les pays membres comme hymne européen du Prélude à l'Ode à la Joie, 4e mouvement de la 9e Symphonie de Beethoven;

b) de recommander son utilisation dans toutes les manifestations à caractère européen, le cas échéant, de pair avec l'hymne national des pays respectifs;

c) d'inviter la commission chargée des relations avec les parlements nationaux et le public, la commission de l'aménagement du territoire et des pouvoirs locaux, ainsi que la Conférence européenne des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux de l'Europe, à prendre toutes les mesures appropriées pour la mise en œuvre de cette résolution."

Il est intéressant de relever ici le fait que l'Assemblée n'a pas formulé de recommandation, adressée dans de pareils cas au Comité des Ministres. L'Assemblée - craignant sans doute les habituelles tergiversations de ce dernier et, sachant surtout que l'application d'une telle initiative devait se faire avant tout au niveau des collectivités locales européennes, au niveau de ses citoyens - charge deux de ses commissions de promouvoir l'utilisation de l'hymne européen et d'associer la Conférence des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux de l'Europe à cette action.

Il est clair que dans la vision de l'Assemblée, l'hymne devait être le troisième maillon de la "trilogie" des symboles européens et former ainsi un support efficace à la célébration de la Journée de l'Europe et finalement au renforcement d'une conscience européenne.

Selon le statut et les règlements en vigueur, ce texte de résolution fut néanmoins transmis au Comité des Ministres "pour information" et pour en prendre note.

Il faut croire cependant que cette résolution a mis le Comité des Ministres dans un certain embarras. Pouvait-on, fallait-il laisser agir l'Assemblée seule dans une question reconnue importante par les représentants des gouvernements ? Et surtout, pouvait-on parler d'une décision du Conseil de l'Europe tant que le Comité des Ministres ne l'avait pas prise ?

On se souviendra que déjà dans l'affaire du drapeau européen en 1955, le Comité des Ministres avait également pris les décisions finales tout en modifiant quelque peu les recommandations et les intentions de l'Assemblée. Il en a été de même lors de l'adoption de la Journée de l'Europe en 1964. Aussi, le Comité des Ministres, après avoir "pris note" dans un premier temps, a repris l'examen de la question, et à sa réunion du 12 janvier 1972 au niveau des Délégués "a approuvé la proposition de l'Assemblée relative à l'acceptation par les pays membres comme hymne européen du Prélude à l'Ode à la Joie ..."

Les ministres ont également exprimé l'espoir que cet hymne sera joué à l'occasion de manifestations européennes et notamment de la Journée de l'Europe.

Parallèlement, le Secrétaire Général a été chargé d'entrer en contact avec Herbert von Karajan en vue de la préparation d'un arrangement musical de l'Hymne, de son orchestration et de son exécution officielle sous sa direction.

Cette orchestration a été exécutée par l'Orchestre philharmonique de Berlin sous la direction de H. von Karajan et enregistrée et diffusée sous forme de disque par la "Deutsche Grammophon". L'arrangement de la partition, fait par H. von Karajan, a été confié à la maison d'édition Schott's Söhne à Mayence. En fait, trois versions ont été proposées: une pour orchestre symphonique, une pour instruments à vent et une pour piano seul.

La préparation de la Journée de l'Europe de 1972 a été l'occasion d'une vaste campagne d'information relative à l'hymne européen. Dans un message de la "Table Ronde pour la Journée de l'Europe" diffusé aux médias, aux collectivités locales et aux Organisations non gouvernementales, celle-ci exprime l'espoir "Que l'hymne de l'Europe, le 5 mai prochain, retentisse dans le plus grand nombre possible de communes et d'écoles de notre continent. Que la Journée de l'Europe 1972 soit l'occasion pour l'Europe de faire connaissance avec son hymne."

L'hymne européen et les Communautés/L'Union européenne

Cela n'étonnera personne que certaines voix se soient aussitôt élevées, aux Communautés, préconisant un hymne propre à la Communauté européenne. Une première initiative dans ce sens a été lancée par un membre britannique du Parlement européen. Au Conseil de l'Europe elle a fait aussitôt l'objet d'une question parlementaire de R. Radius, adressée à Antony Royle, Président en exercice du Comité des Ministres. Interpellé en sa qualité de Ministre de Sa Majesté, A. Royle a pris ses distances, mais avec une certaine prudence: " ... le gouvernement britannique n'a pas d'opinion définitive en la matière".

Finalement, ce sont les travaux du Comité Adonnino sur "l'Europe des citoyens" qui vont régler à la fois la question de l'hymne communautaire comme celle du drapeau. Ses propositions ayant été approuvées par le Conseil européen de Milan en juin 1985, C. Ripa di Meana, membre de la commission pouvait annoncer en avril 1986 l'accord intervenu. En indiquant que la cérémonie solennelle de levée du drapeau devant le siège de la Commission aurait lieu le 29 mai suivant, le Commissaire ajouta, un peu sèchement: "le Prélude de l'Hymne à la Joie de Beethoven, nouvel hymne européen, sera interprété".

Dans sa communication au Parlement européen sur "l'Europe des citoyens" le 24 juin 1988, la Commission a été plus explicite: "Le drapeau et l'emblème ont été introduits au début de 1986 par les institutions communautaires qui ont pris acte en même temps, de la proposition du Comité Adonnino visant à ce que le prélude à l'Ode à la Joie de la 9e Symphonie de L. van Beethoven, qui a été introduit comme hymne européen par le Conseil de l'Europe en 1970, constitue également l'hymne communautaire ...". Depuis lors, le drapeau, l'emblème et l'hymne connaissent une utilisation croissante à l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur de la Communauté.

Le même constat vaut pour le Conseil de l'Europe.

Strasbourg, septembre 1995¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁸ Commission des Communautés européennes - Direction générale X. *Note à l'attention des Chefs de Bureau, Objet: Drapeau, emblème et hymne de la Communauté*. VDE/JSB X/B/1. Bruxelles, 16.04.1986, **apud** "The symbols of the European Union. The Anthem". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from: <http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

D.2 Report of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe on a European anthem (10 June 1971)

Rapporteur: Mr. RADIUS

I. Draft resolution
presented by the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities²

The Assembly,

1. Having regard to the adoption in 1955 by the Committee of Ministers of the European flag, and the creation of Europe Day in 1964;

2. Considering that it is now time to choose an anthem for the Europe we are building in addition to the emblem and Europe Day thus following the pattern set by the symbols of our national States;

3. Being of the opinion that it would be preferable to select a musical work representative of European genius and whose use on European occasions is already becoming something of a tradition;

4. Recalling that initiatives for the creation of European symbols have already originated in the Consultative Assembly and the European Conference of Local Authorities representing the local authorities of Europe;

5. Resolves:

(a) to propose the acceptance by member countries as a European anthem of the Prelude to the Ode to Joy in the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony;

(b) to recommend its use on all European occasions if desired in conjunction with the national anthem;

(c) requests the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities and the European Conference of Local Authorities to take all necessary steps to implement this resolution.

II. Explanatory note
by Mr. Radius

Introduction

On 26 August 1949, a letter was sent to Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak, "First President of Europe", which began thus: "May I, as a mother who suffered all kinds of trouble during the last war, including internment (by the Germans) send you my 917th song. This song, or hymn, is an appeal to everyone in the world who desires peace unreservedly and aspires to join forces to bring about the United States of Europe".

This letter was accompanied by the words and tune of the "Chant de la Paix" by Mrs. Jehanne-Louis Gaudet, and is the first document in a bulky file on the European anthem. Proposals and pleas for such an anthem have come from the peoples of Europe in still larger numbers, perhaps than for the European flag. Tunes, scores, orchestral

arrangements and words, often in three, four or even twelve languages, have come pouring in and the authors have often been impatient to know what fate attended their projects in the Chambers of the Council of Europe.

Some mention the progress towards union as the reason for their proposals: there was the Parisian who wrote to the Secretary General in May 1955: "After the various ratifications of the Paris Agreements, I think the time has come to publish the European anthem", and in 1955 Mr Coudenhove-Kalergi said on the question of the anthem: "I should like to propose the hymn from Beethoven's 9th Symphony as a European anthem, but I fear that I may discredit this suggestion by taking the initiative myself now that the proposal to institute a Europe Day has been rejected".

In 1962, the Director of Information, replying to a question by a member of the Assembly, said that in his opinion a well-known existing work should be taken to avoid having to choose between the anthems proposed.

After the adoption of the European emblem, some more urgent promptings came from municipal organizations. In 1963 the Secretary General of the Belgian section of the Council of European Municipalities wrote to the Secretariat of the Committee on Local Authorities saying that in 1962 it had published a score and a record of a "European song" based on Beethoven's music, adding that "the numerous pairing ceremonies ... the large-scale participation of Belgian municipalities in Europe Day, European Schools Day and the campaign for use of the European flag [had] shown the need for a European anthem which could be performed together with the various national anthems". He continued: "The choice of Beethoven's setting of the Ode to Joy has enabled us to avoid the pitfalls of a competition, in which it would no doubt have been very difficult to agree unanimously on the winner. Moreover, the tune is one which was taught in schools long before the Council of Europe was ever thought of".

The April 1963 issue of the bulletin of the Netherlands section of the European Movement contained an article on the subject of a European anthem. The writer considered that skepticism was no longer justified, considering the numerous functions of a European nature, and in particular Europe Day, which would be highlighted by the European flag and a European anthem. As the choice of such an anthem, the writer had doubts about the wisdom of composing new music and stated his preference for the last movement of Handel's Royal Fireworks Music, referring specifically to apt use made of it by the Directorate of Information of the Council of Europe to introduce its radio broadcasts. It is perhaps regrettable that this tradition has been abandoned. The same writer thought that the question of the words would be more difficult to settle.

The most substantial demand came from the 7th Etats Généraux of the Council of European Municipalities, held in Rome in 1964. In a resolution adopted at the closing sitting, the wish was expressed that a European anthem should be adopted by the Council of Europe and the European Communities. The movers of the resolution thought that public symbols and ceremonies were needed to create and strengthen European-mindedness.

In January 1965 the President of the Consultative Assembly, replying to a public figure that had made proposals in favor of a European anthem, wrote: "The problem of the European anthem is present in our minds and the Committee on Local Authorities of the Consultative Assembly has been occupied with it for some time".

Then again, I was approached recently by a number of people prominent in French cultural life who were interested in the institution of a European anthem. I informed the members of my Committee, and several of them said they would be glad if the Committee would do something. Some reported spontaneous moves on the part of local authorities to have some musical work or other (usually Beethoven's setting of the Ode to Joy) performed as a European anthem for the purpose of giving greater solemnity to functions of a European nature. Such action reveals, without any possible doubt, that a profound need was felt by an increasing number of Europeans to give musical expression to their feeling of belonging to a single community sharing the same destiny.

Quite recently, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities, I received a letter from Mr. Evers, Chairman of the Round Table for Europe Day and President of the European Conference of Local Authorities. This letter, dated 11 March 1971, explains the purpose of the meeting of the Round Table held in Paris in February 1971, which was attended by representatives of European governmental and non-governmental organizations. The arrangements for the celebration of Europe Day on 5 May 1971 were then settled and preparations were made for Europe Day 1972.

"One of the unanimous conclusions of the Round Table was that it would be desirable for a European anthem to be instituted to symbolize the faith of our peoples in the cause of European unity.

In the knowledge that the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities has already considered the possibility of a European anthem, such as is urgently called for by local authorities, the Round Table would be most grateful to your Committee if it could again include this matter in its deliberations with a view to adopting in due course a recommendation to the Consultative Assembly and the Committee of Ministers recommending the official institution of such an anthem. "

The Committee at its meeting in Paris on 22 April 1971 discussed the Round Table's appeal at length. The unanimous conclusion of the debate in which most members took part was that the time had come to initiate a move, at least in the Consultative Assembly, in favor of the progressive introduction of a genuine European anthem.

All members were against the idea of a competition for the purpose of "producing" an anthem; on the other hand, it was agreed unanimously that Beethoven's music was representative of the European genius and was capable of uniting the hearts and minds of all Europeans, including the younger generation. Also, bearing in mind that the tune of the Ode to Joy, from the last movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, had frequently been performed as a European anthem by local communities in particular, the Committee considered it preferable to give official approval to this incipient tradition and to propose the prelude to the Ode to Joy.

An arrangement of the work was in fact made for the Belgian section of the Council of European Municipalities in 1961 and published by Schott Frères of Brussels; this could be used for reference purposes.

As regards the words for an anthem some doubt was felt, mainly with regard to the words of the Ode to Joy, which were in the nature of a universal expression of faith rather than a specifically European one.

Members also wondered whether any words acknowledged as "European" could ever be translated into another language and accepted as such by the other linguistic groups of the European family.

The Committee therefore preferred, for the time being, to propose only the tune for a European anthem, without words, and to allow some time to pass. One day perhaps some words will be adopted by the citizens of Europe with the same spontaneity as Beethoven's eternal melody has been.

Some people may argue that to propose a European anthem is too bold an undertaking for politicians. I disagree entirely and the second part of this memorandum will attempt to show that such a move is consistent with a line of action by the Consultative Assembly, dating right back to the first hours of its existence, which can be called "spreading the European idea". From the very start, the Assembly has been working in this field and has taken the initiative on numerous occasions. It may be that the Assembly has not always worked at the task with the same enthusiasm; it may be that it has sometimes hoped to win more spectacular victories in other fields. But today at a time when the medium-term task of the Council of Europe is under discussion there is talk of an enlargement of the European Communities, we should do well to recall that the Council of Europe is required by its Statute to propagate the ideal of European unity and thus to prepare the citizens of Europe to live together in a spirit of solidarity and fraternity.

No one can claim that this task has been accomplished; on the contrary, in this time of calculated self-interest, when discussion on the subject of Europe is dominated by figures, tariffs and contribution levels, it is more than ever necessary that the Assembly should try to raise the debate to its high level of twenty-five years ago.

Moreover, in discussing the future of the Council of Europe, the Assembly and the Council's other organs should not lose sight of what is an urgent and all-important task: to inspire the peoples of Europe, who are still divided in more than one respect, with a genuinely European spirit, compounded of generosity, of faith and of fellowship.

Spreading the European idea: one of the Assembly's supreme tasks.

As early as its first session in 1949, the Consultative Assembly, faithful to the Statute of the Council of Europe, considered that one of the most urgent and noble of tasks was to spread the European idea and to awaken a genuine European consciousness among the peoples.

At its sitting on 6 September 1949, the Assembly referred to the Standing Committee, "with a recommendation for their favorable consideration", a resolution proposing "to the governments of Members of the Council of Europe that they should systematically organize the instruction of the great mass of the people, pointing out to them the undeniable advantages of union for Europe ..."

The proposal continued: "The members of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe should be requested to give their governments every assistance in their power in this great work ..." Several committees then examined the problem, which was considered very important.

At the request of the Assembly's Committee on General Affairs, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe presented a report in August 1950 on "the practical steps which might be taken to make public opinion directly aware of the reality of European Union ..."

The first such step proposed was the adoption of a European flag for which the following reason was given: "It seems advisable that the idea of union between the States of Europe be given concrete form by a symbol". The Secretary General recalled that Count Coudenhove-Kalergi had laid before the Secretariat a proposal that the Consultative Assembly should adopt the flag of the Pan-European Movement. The Bureau of the Assembly had considered that the Assembly itself should give an opinion.

It is interesting to note that the other practical steps proposed included a European stamp, European broadcasts, and European television. To lend weight to his proposals, the Secretary General quoted an article by the French writer Daniel Rops, which included the following passage: "A flag is only a symbol: agreed. It is only the expression of a myth. However, even before Georges Sorel it was constantly being borne out that, it is the great myths that lead the world and that symbols have a profound effect on men. The day that a European Hymn salutes the European flag, as today the national Hymn salutes the national flag in various countries, a great step will have been made along the road towards this essential union. That is why the Volunteers are right to continue their crusade for all the great towns of France to be decked with flags on 14 July; on this day, when we celebrate both liberty and fraternity, such a manifestation would have its full effect."

Plea for a European anthem

"To think of their common heritage ... their shared hopes": that is the significance which the French Prime Minister attributed to Europe Day, and it is also the inspiration of all those who, ever since the moves towards European unity began, have been demanding and proposing an anthem for a United Europe.

True, it can be argued that the final objective, a united Europe, has not yet become reality, but we already have the "shared hopes", those which inspired the Assembly in its untiring efforts to endow this nascent Europe with her Emblem, its Flag and its Day.

At this crucial hour in Europe's search for her identity, the time has perhaps come to provide her with what she still lacks in the trilogy of symbols by which our States identify themselves: like them, she needs her Flag, her Day, and her Anthem. These will give her the new impetus she needs in order to advance on the road to unity, and she will find therein a resounding expression of her driving force and of her faith.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹ Mr. Radius (rapporteur), *Report on a European anthem*, Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Doc. 2978, 10 June 1971, *apud* Council of Europe, "European anthem". In *Documents. Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 11, 2006 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

D.3 Resolution 492 (1971)¹⁸⁰ of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe on a European anthem (8 July 1971)

The Assembly,

1. Having regard to the adoption in 1955 by the Committee of Ministers of the European Flag, and the creation of Europe Day in 1964 ;

2. Considering that it is now time to choose an anthem for the Europe we are building in addition to the emblem and Europe Day, thus following the pattern set by the symbols of our national States ;

3. Being of the opinion that it would be preferable to select a musical work representative of European genius and whose use on European occasions is already becoming something of a tradition;

4. Recalling that initiatives for the creation of European symbols have already originated in the Consultative Assembly and the European Conference of Local Authorities representing the local authorities of Europe,

5. Resolves :

(a) to propose the acceptance by member countries as a European anthem of the Prelude to the Ode to Joy in the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony ;

(b) to recommend its use on all European occasions, if desired in conjunction with the national anthem ;

(c) to request the Committee on Parliamentary and Public Relations, the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities and the European Conference of Local Authorities to take all necessary steps to implement this resolution.

Text adopted by the Standing Committee, acting on behalf of the Assembly, on 8 July 1971. See Doc. 2978, report of the Committee on Regional Planning and Local Authorities.

In this resolution of 8 July 1971, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe proposes the acceptance by member countries as a European anthem of the Prelude to the Ode to Joy in the fourth movement of Ludwig van Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

¹⁸⁰ Council of Europe. Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, *Resolution 492 (1971) on a European anthem*, Strasbourg, 08.02.2006. Retrieved December 11 from: <http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta71/ERES492.htm>

D.4 Decision (71) 187 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe: organization of Europe Day (12 January 1972)

The Deputies considered the conclusions of the Round Table for Europe Day held in Paris on 16 September 1971. To the extent that these conclusions required action by the Committee, they are enumerated under (a) - (e) below.

(a) European anthem

The Chairman recalled that the Consultative Assembly had adopted on 8 July 1971 Resolution 492, proposing "the acceptance by the member countries as a European anthem of the Prelude to the Ode to Joy in the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony". At their 201st meeting in September 1971, the Deputies had simply taken note of this resolution. The question now arose whether the Committee of Ministers should not take a formal decision on the adoption of a European anthem.

In the exchange of views, which followed, all delegations expressed agreement, in principle, with the proposal of the Assembly. Some delegations however raised the question of whether the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe was alone competent to take such a decision, given the fact that there were also other European organizations in the field and that the Council did not comprise the whole of Europe.

In reply, the Chairman pointed out that other European organizations and notably the European Communities had been represented at the meeting of the Round Table, which welcomed the resolution of the Consultative Assembly and requested governments to ensure that the European anthem would be played "in as many municipalities and schools and at as many events as possible on 5 May 1972". The meaning of the decision by the Committee of Ministers on the European anthem was the following: the Committee of Ministers had chosen an anthem which it proposed to Europeans.

Decisions

The Deputies

(i) adopted as a European anthem the Prelude to the Ode to Joy in the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony;

(ii) agreed to recommend to their governments that steps should be taken to ensure that the European anthem is played in as many municipalities, schools and at as many events as possible on 5 May 1972, if possible alongside national anthems;

(iii) instructed the Secretary General to make known their decision by sending the following letter :

– to the Presidents or Secretaries General of the Communities and European intergovernmental organizations;

– to the Presidents or Secretaries General of organizations having consultative status with the Council of Europe.

"The Committee of Ministers, meeting at Deputy level, examined at their 206th meeting in Strasbourg, from 11 to 18 January, the Assembly's proposal concerning acceptance by member countries as a European anthem of the Prelude to the Ode to Joy

in the fourth movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony' (Resolution 492 of the Consultative Assembly).

I have the honor to inform you that the Committee of Ministers unanimously approved the Assembly's suggestion, thus proposing that anthem to Europeans.

It should be added that the Consultative Assembly recommended the use of this anthem on all European occasions, if desired in conjunction with the national anthem."

With regard to decision (ii), the Representative of Switzerland said that, in his country, this matter came within the sphere of competence of the cantons; the Confederation was nevertheless prepared to recommend that they have this anthem played in municipalities and schools on 5 May next.

The Representative of the United Kingdom said that it was not customary in his country to play national or other anthems in schools; for this reason, his authorities would probably have to limit themselves to drawing the attention of schools and municipalities to the existence of the anthem.

The Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany said that his government welcomed the proposals made by the Secretariat as an initiative to further the idea of European unity. As to points (b) and (c) of the notes for the meeting, his government could, however, not take a definite position before knowing the financial implications for the budget of the Council of Europe.

(b) Recording and official scores for the anthem

The Director of Press and Information informed the Committee that the Secretary General had approached Mr. Herbert von Karajan who had agreed to prepare the official scores and to conduct the recording. Mr. von Karajan would not accept a fee and the recording would be on a commercial basis. The duration of the anthem in the Karajan version would be exactly fifty-eight seconds.

The Committee having expressed the wish to consider the official scores before publication, the Director informed the Committee that now that the decision on the adoption of an anthem had been taken, the scores to be prepared by Mr. von Karajan could be available in a few weeks' time. He also suggested that if the Committee decided that words should be put to the anthem, an international competition might be organised by the Council of Europe.

The Committee then listened to a recorded version of the music adopted for the anthem.

Decisions

The Deputies

(i) agreed to return to the question of the scores for the anthem at their 208th meeting in March;

(ii) asked the Chairman to address a letter to Mr. von Karajan expressing the Committee's appreciation of his services in this matter;

(iii) decided to postpone for the time being the question of words for the anthem.

(c) Europe Day poster

The Deputies considered the proposal by the Round Table that the Council of Europe publish a poster for use by public authorities and private organizations to mark Europe Day on 5 May 1972.

The Director of Press and Information suggested that in this case, too, a competition might be organised.

The exchange of views which followed did not lead to a conclusion; a majority of delegations felt that time was too short to produce a suitable poster in time for distribution with a view to Europe Day 1972.

The Director of Environment and Local Authorities suggested that the Secretariat might prepare a memorandum on a poster that could be produced within present budgetary limits.

(d) European flag

In the light of the Round Table's request that governments should see to it that national law does not prevent the European flags being flown from public buildings to mark the celebration of Europe Day, most delegations stated that there was nothing in their national law to prevent this. Some delegations were not in a position to state clearly the situation without examining the matter first.

(e) Special budgetary appropriations

On the request by the Round Table that specific appropriations should be made within national budgets for the celebration of Europe Day, the majority of delegations felt that no additional appropriations could be made and that this kind of expenditure would normally be met at the level of local authorities.

(f) Action by parliamentarians

The Representative of Italy, supported by the Chairman, suggested that members of the Consultative Assembly should be requested to promote the organization of events in their respective constituencies on the occasion of Europe Day and, if possible, take part in them in person.¹⁸¹

D.5 Mémoire à l'attention du Secrétaire Général du Conseil de l'Europe (2 mars 1972)¹⁸²

Confidentielle

le 2 mars 1972

OBJET : Hymne européen

¹⁸¹ Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, "XXIII. Organisation of Europe Day ". In *Conclusions of the 206th meeting of the Deputies*. Doc. CM (71) 187, p. 27, **apud** Council of Europe, "European anthem". In *Documents, Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 7, 2006 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

¹⁸² Conseil de l'Europe. *Mémoire à l'attention du Secrétaire Général, Objet: Hymne européen*. MdB/js. Maud de Boer, 2 mars 1972, **apud** Council of Europe, "European anthem", in *Documents, Library and Archives*. Retrieved December 11 from: <http://info.coe.int/archives/hist/hymn/default.asp>

Suite à votre demande, j'ai téléphoné le 28 février à M. Jucker, le manager de M. von Karajan pour fixer une rencontre avec vous ici à Strasbourg.

M. Jucker, qui sera jusqu'en avril à Berlin, m'a répondu qu'il lui était extrêmement difficile de se déplacer, vu son agenda très chargé. Il a ajouté qu'il estimait avoir déjà suffisamment exposé son point de vue à M. Hertwig, notamment en ce qui concerne la question des droits d'auteur. Bien que j'aie insisté, M. Jucker a promis de vous téléphoner le 6 mars au lieu de venir à Strasbourg.

D'autre part, M. Hertwig vous a soumis un projet de réponse (ci-joint) à la lettre de M. Jucker du 18 février, dans lequel il réitère l'intérêt que vous portez à ce que M. von Karajan renonce à ses droits d'auteur.

Personnellement, je pense qu'il sera difficile de changer la position de M. Jucker, même s'il vient à Strasbourg, pour en discuter, comme le propose également M. Hertwig, et c'est la raison pour laquelle je vous suggère de prendre personnellement contact avec M. von Karajan, puisqu'il est bien possible que M. von Karajan adopte une attitude différente de celle de son manager à votre égard.

D'autre part, je vous rappelle que lors de leur 208ème réunion, les Délégués seront invités à prendre note de la partition de l'hymne européen avant sa publication; (à vrai dire ils écouteront d'une bobine la version créée par M. von Karajan).

Jusqu'à présent, la partition n'a pas été reçue au Secrétariat Général, mais il y a du bon espoir qu'on la recevra avant le 10 mars 1972. Au moment que les Délégués procéderont à l'examen du point XXII de l'ordre du jour de la 208ème réunion, vous pourriez faire une déclaration aux Délégués concernant l'organisation de la Journée de l'Europe, au sujet duquel M. Baloup vous fera parvenir une note, et vous pourriez également évoquer les questions de droit d'auteur et droit de reproduction de l'hymne européen.

[signature]

Maud de Boer

Fig. I. The European Flag¹⁸³

Symbolic description

Against the background of blue sky, twelve golden stars form a circle, representing the union of the peoples of Europe. The number of stars is fixed, twelve being the symbol of perfection and unity.

Heraldic description

On an azure, field a circle of twelve golden mullets, their points not touching.

Geometric description

The emblem is in the form of a blue rectangular flag of which the fly is one and a half times the length of the hoist. Twelve gold stars situated at equal intervals form an invisible circle whose centre is the point of intersection of the diagonals of the rectangle. The radius of the circle is equal to one-third of the height of the hoist. Each of the stars has five points, which are situated on the circumference of an invisible circle whose radius is equal to one-eighteenth of the height of the hoist. All the stars are upright - that is to say, with the one point vertical and two points in a straight line at right angles to the

¹⁸³ “Graphical Manual. The European Flag. The Symbols of the EU”. In *Europa*. Retrieved November, 9, 2006 from:
http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/emblem/graphics1_en.htm

mast. The circle is arranged so that the stars appear in the position of the hours on the face of a clock. Their number is invariable.

Fig. II. Emblems - Institutions and bodies¹⁸⁴

EUROPEAN UNION

COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF FIRST
INSTANCE

PARLIAMENT

COURT OF AUDITORS

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
COMITTEE

¹⁸⁴ “Emblems”. In *Europa. Interinstitutional Style Guide*. Retrieved November 9, 2006 from:
<http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-5000200.htm>

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK

COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

EUROPEAN INVESTMENT FUND

EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

OMBUDSMAN

Fig. III. European Day poster gallery¹⁸⁵

2006

2005

2004

2003

2002

2001

¹⁸⁵ "Poster Gallery". In *Europa. Europe Day, 9 May*. Retrieved November 17, 2006 from: http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/gallery_en.htm

Fig. IV. Euro Banknotes¹⁸⁶

Euro 5 Banknote (Front)

Euro 5 Banknote (Rear)

¹⁸⁶ "Euro Banknotes". In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from: <http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/testnotes.html>

Euro 10 Banknote (Front)

Euro 20 Banknote (Front)

Euro 50 Banknote (Front)

Euro 100 Banknote (Front)

Euro 200 Banknote (Front)

Euro 500 Banknote (Front)

Euro 10 Banknote (Rear)

Euro 20 Banknote (Rear)

Euro 50 Banknote (Rear)

Euro 100 Banknote (Rear)

Euro 200 Banknote (Rear)

Euro 500 Banknote (Rear)

Fig. V. Euro Coins – common side¹⁸⁷

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

20 cent

10 cent

5 cent

2 cent

1 cent

¹⁸⁷ “Euro Coins. Common Side”. In *Euro Banknotes & Coins*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from: <http://www.euro.ecb.int/en/section/euro0/coins.html>

Fig. VI. The Euro Sign¹⁸⁸

Fig. VII. Euro Coins¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ Commission européenne, *Sigle officiel de l'euro avec pièces de un euro*, *apud* "The symbols of the European Union. The Currency". In *European Navigator. The Authoritative Multimedia Reference on the History of Europe*. Retrieved 6 November, 2006 from:
<http://www.ena.lu/mce.cfm>

¹⁸⁹ European Central Bank, *The Euro Banknotes and Coins leaflet*, September 2002. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from:
http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/euroleaflet_en.pdf

Euro 2

Euro 2

Euro 2

Euro 2

50 cent

50 cent

50 cent

50 cent

20 cent

20 cent

20 cent

20 cent

10 cent

10 cent

10 cent

10 cent

5 cent

5 cent

5 cent

5 cent

2 cent

2 cent

2 cent

2 cent

1 cent

1 cent

1 cent

1 cent

5 cent

2 cent

1 cent

5 cent

2 cent

1 cent

5 cent

2 cent

1 cent

5 cent

2 cent

1 cent

9. Luxembourg

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

10. Monaco

Euro 1

Euro 2

11. Netherlands

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

12. Portugal

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

13. San Marino

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

20 cent

10 cent

5 cent

14. Spain

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

20 cent

10 cent

5 cent

15. Vatican City

Euro 1

Euro 2

50 cent

20 cent

10 cent

5 cent

Fig. VIII. A logo for European Day in France¹⁹⁰

¹⁹⁰ "Dossier de Press". In *Fête l'Europe. 9 May*. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from: http://www.feteleurope.fr/images/dossier_presse2.pdf