

Elżbieta LESIEWICZ

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

Identity and collective memory in the process of Europeanization

Abstract: The paper discusses the issues of identity and collective memory in the process of Europeanization. These issues have long been the subject of lively debates among scholars and politicians because for the integration process to succeed it is necessary to construct a European identity and collective memory which are indispensable in order to legitimize this process. The paper presents considerations pertaining to the definition and scope of such notions as Europeanization, European identity and collective memory and seeks to answer the question whether it is conceivable to develop a European identity and collective memory of EU citizens. The author concludes by saying that despite the European Union's long-lasting efforts, it has failed to form a collective European identity even though certain types of this identity have found expression through EU institutions and community laws. Collective memory formation is a difficult task since collective memory is divided as it is a confluence of different perspectives and versions. A shared or dialogical memory is what the Old Continent may hope to develop: an agreed memory which transcends respective national horizons. Both European identity and collective memory are still being forged. Their formation is a complex process that has to be designed from scratch. It is a deliberate and planned process focused on maintaining peace and generating prosperity by enhancing economy.

Key words: Europeanization, European identity, collective memory

Concepts of Europeanization, identity and collective memory

The subject matter of this paper concerns the identity and collective memory of the European Union's citizens, which are two complex, multidimensional social structures that have become an element of European debate since the Maastricht Treaty. The establishment of the European Union by virtue of this treaty has effectively expanded the initial economic and regulatory significance of the European Community. The Maastricht Treaty has politicized European integration. The new shape the EU assumed has required democratic legitimization which can potentially

be supported by the formation of a shared European identity and collective memory. Therefore, the following issues are crucial with reference to the need to define such notions as Europeanization, identity and collective memory and, then, to seek the answers to the following questions: (1) is it possible to develop the identity and collective memory of the European Union's citizens; (2) what are the premises to assume that this task can be successfully accomplished and what are the possible obstacles; and (3) is the EU capable of forging collective identity and collective memory?

The considerations herein are based on the prerequisite that identity and collective memory are dynamic phenomena and that social perceptions are transferred by means of communication between generations. This claim is rooted in the constructivist cognition model which assumes, among other things, that whereas facts and regularities are constructed, knowledge is socially produced (Zybertowicz, 1996). In the constructivist approach, European identity is treated as a joint European project, as erecting a common European home capable of accommodating a wide range of diversities. This is not to mean, however, that Europeanness understood in this manner is borderless. Europe is a process of constructing the community, it involves cooperation and, therefore, it has to be founded on an agreed, common body of principles, rights and values. The point is for these values not to exclude and potentially enable everybody to join this community (Jedlicka, 2012).

It is assumed within the framework of this research approach that states operate in the primarily social rather than financial environment, which provides a point of reference for their conceptualization of their own interests and identities. Constructivists assume that the norms, values and principles forged within the framework of European integration can change both the behavior and identity of its participants (Skolimowska, 2015, p. 111). I am aware of the many controversies this model of cognition raises, as noted by Ewa Thompson, who believes that the concept of "community identity and memory" should not be considered to be a purely constructivist notion. Her reasoning is based on the logocentric assumption that there are hierarchies of importance one can refer to in the course of discussion and that, without such hierarchies, the transformation projects of European identity and memory are at risk of suffering from numerous aberrations (Thompson, 2008).

The process of Europeanization has strong historical associations dating back to the beginnings of the European civilization, the cultural, religious and humanistic legacy of the Roman Empire, Greek culture and

the Enlightenment. Therefore, Europeanization is used both in a broader meaning, where it encompasses the entire continent, and in a narrower sense, where it is directly related to the EU. The considerations in this paper do not pertain to the whole of Europe or European civilization but concern the latter, narrower sense of Europeanization as the multidirectional process which is directly and inseparably related to the European Union.

The general meaning of Europeanization refers to the evolving, multifaceted process whereby European way of thinking, procedures and customs diffuse over time and space. Europeanization is bidirectional and occurs both from the bottom up, accounting for the transfer of competence to a supranational level, and from the top down, meaning that European institutions exert their influence on member states which accommodate this influence. These two vertical types of Europeanization are sometimes completed by an informal component of horizontal Europeanization, or the cross-loading of European principles and procedures, which occurs between member states as they communicate, watch and learn from one another. This horizontal process takes place outside any supranational institutions, which is the reason why it is named indirect Europeanization (Burgóński, 2012, pp. 145–146; Riedel, 2015, p. 59).

Europeanization is typically studied in the political, legislative, institutional-and-administrative, economic-and-geopolitical, geographic and sociological dimensions. The considerations herein focus on the latter, and concern societies and citizens, analyzing the matters of the adaptation and evolution of the identity and culture of EU citizens in the process of European integration. Therefore, they take the most recent, sociological approach to Europeanization and focus on the voluntary and automatic adaptation processes of social nature, rather than on mandatory formal changes.

In sociological terms, Europeanization means the outcome of European integration whereby the collective entity adopts community principles, values and lifestyle. It is also related to the promotion and propagation of European identity (Wach, 2011) which, for the purpose of these considerations, is defined as collective identity and signifies the consent of a specific group of people to accept a fundamental and consequential similarity that causes them to feel solidarity amongst themselves (Fliegstein, 2009, pp. 134–136). Understood in this manner, the sense of collective identity is socially constructed, emerging as the intentional or unintentional consequences of social interactions. The way a given group perceives itself

and its members determines the external image of this group as a community and facilitates its identification by others. Consequently, collective identity is defined both from the inside and by commonly shared external opinions (Makowska, 2015, p. 225).

Professor Zdzisław Mach notes that identity is not an attributed, permanent feature that characterizes an individual or group, but a sequence of mutually related changes; identity is constantly being forged. In other words, identity is approached as a continuous process of identification, construction, reconstruction and manifestation in operation. "By this token, identity is a dynamic, processual and contextual phenomenon" (Mach, 1993, p. 5).

Eisenstadt and Giesen also write that collective identity is a phenomenon emerging in the course of social interactions rather than a phenomenon of natural origin (Eisenstadt, Giesen, 1995, pp. 74–77). Developing identities means identifying with the opinions and characteristic features of a certain group of people, which results in the selection or exclusion of certain elements in the process of distinguishing oneself from others. This is of particular importance in these social groups where the power of loyalty is related to their shared origin or legacy dating a long way back in history (Lipiński, 2012, p. 44).

Collective memory is the fundamental element allowing identity formation. Identities express the sense of continuity in time and space, and they are a product of memorization processes. On the other hand, what is memorized follows from the specific features of a given identity (Gillis, 1994, p. 3; Misztal, 2003, p. 135).

Collective memory is far from being a unanimous concept, therefore the definition by Halbwachs is used here, who approached collective memory as a pool of recollections that are reconstructed in the spatial-temporal context, in the circumstances a given society is experiencing, where this society is interfering with how memory operates (Halbwachs, 2008, p. 423). Academic discourse reflects the prevailing approach to memory, which is as changeable as the environment where it operates and the reactions that occur in this environment. Memory is a dynamic process where an active role is played by the subjects who create and maintain this memory (Assmann, 2008; Wolff-Powęska, 2011; Saryusz-Wolska, 2009). According to Szacka, memory has the following functions: it conveys the values and desirable behavior models; legitimizes power; contributes to the sense of collective identity; and sustains the presence of ancestors, fate and symbols over time (Szacka, 2006, pp. 405–427).

Memory stands for the ability to store information, allowing people to recall and update the experience and facts which are apparently outdated. Therefore, the past should not be understood only as a source of memories that are produced in the present and can shape future activities of individuals, because how people remember and interpret past events, information and participants of events depends on their current circumstances. Recollections people generate operate within the framework of specific historical, anthropological, socio-political and cultural contexts, therefore changing over time. They are shaped by the contemporary ideologies, value systems and conflicts (Szpociński, 2003, p. 19). “In other words, the community, politics and social context have an influence on how we remember the past. These preferences allow us, or even authorize us, to neglect, transform and reorganize memories which we do without reflecting too much. When we, or our world, change, our memories are revised to fit the new circumstances” (Ziębińska-Witek, 2010, p. 147).

Europeanization in the context of identity and collective memory

As the project of European integration sprung up after World War II among European elites, who recalled the tragic experience of the two world wars, the concept of European identity formation emerged. Initially, the issue of a common European identity was not of interest to the EC's founding fathers and then of EU institutions. That was the time when the theory of neofunctionalism was implemented with its main assumption that “Europe should be united primarily by economic means and in order to attain economic objectives” (Dudek, 2008, p. 83; Kaczmarczyk, 2011, pp. 25–39).

As time went by, however, it became necessary to strengthen European identity to counterbalance the legitimization weakness of the European project. Creating European identity, based on common references to the past, was approached as an inevitable outcome of the communication process between nations, which is inspired by integration in other fields. Attention was given to the elements that could potentially become part of collective memory thereby making it possible to overcome strong animosity between specific states and parts of Europe. This particularly concerned the identity constructed on the basis of remembrance about the past, the legitimization of different objects and events related to the maintenance of power relations, political construction of the knowledge about

the past and, last but not least, resolving the issues of nondemocratic regimes and infringement of human rights.

It is worth noting, however, that as the process of European integration advanced and new members joined the European Community, European political institutions began to attribute greater importance to the need of defining European collective identity. Initially, there appeared declarations pertaining to common values and convictions whereas the notion “European identity” was derogatory, which resulted from fears of losing national identities. These circumstances were not conducive to implementing institutional activities in this field. Founding the European integration project solely on the joint economy and EU politics was not sufficient for a European identity to form, therefore certain steps had to be taken (Konieczna, 2016, p. 27).

The term “European identity” was first mentioned in 1973, at the European summit in Copenhagen, and it referred to the common internal interests, legacies and traditions of the nine EC members at the time, while taking into account the “dynamic nature of European unification.” Due to quantitative and qualitative changes in the European Union, a far-reaching diversity of political culture, traditions and customs was introduced (Cichocki, 2012, p. 1).

In 1984, the declaration on the need to strengthen European identity was adopted in Fontainebleau. The Committee for a People’s Europe – known as the *Adonnino Committee* – was then established. *It concentrated on strengthening the EC’s identity and developing the mechanisms of promoting the positive perception of integration among the citizens of member states. The policy on European identity changed following the introduction of “European citizenship” by the Maastricht Treaty, which endeavored to create a common EU identity by means of institutionalizing European citizenship* (Konieczna, 2016, pp. 27–37). A number of other EU treaties and documents also referred to this matter. The EU’s treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights are the most significant and unambiguous sources of the “envisaged” European identity. On account of their legally binding status, these documents can be treated as the agreed building blocks of European identity. The Preamble to the Lisbon Treaty provides the most overt declaration of the fundamental principles laying the foundations for the “envisaged” European identity. The currently binding Lisbon Treaty provides the foundation for the current endeavors to form a European identity. According to the Treaty, European identity is founded on the principles of “freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and re-

spect for human rights” (*Treaty of Lisbon*, 2007). The fundamental values of “rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law” are defined as being inviolable and inalienable (*Treaty of Lisbon*, 2007). The Charter of Fundamental Rights stipulates that the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. The Charter places the individual at the heart of its activities by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice (Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the European Union). The characteristics of the European identity listed in the Charter resemble those in the Preamble to the Lisbon Treaty.

In the opinion of Smith, it would be possible to implement the European project and build Europe on the basis of collective identity if Europeans developed a collective memory, recollections, traditions and symbols reminiscent of those nation-states have (Smith, 1991, p. 152). Memory is among the key factors of community formation in relation to family, language, nation, religion and territory. This is the collective memory discussed in the below sections.

Memory is the fundamental element of what has recently been named identity. Leggewie asks such questions as: “Does Europe need a common memory at all? Is it not rather values or interests or external dangers that hold the unified Europe together? Conversely: can groups and communities in a modern society function without a common memory? The classical European nations have refuted that and found that in order to be able to act in solidarity within set boundaries, one needs a supply of shared memories” (Leggewie, 2006).

The concept of collective European memory is relatively young and, since its very beginning, it was approached as a project that should be implemented and as a reality to be reconstructed by referring to social, cultural, historical, political, moral and economic categories. Public discourse frequently referred to mythical and symbolic arguments, historico-cultural community, common legacy, that is the elements that are typically associated with the origin of modern nations (Szwed, 2005, pp. 310–344).

As a consequence, the policy of the European Union is largely focused on “collective memory” formation. We are dealing with the Europeanization of culture and symbolization of public space which strengthens the sense of homeliness and the awareness of shared European spiritual and intellectual legacy. The policy towards the past has an important func-

tion forming identity and legitimizing authority. Myths, symbols, martyrdom, heroism and oppression should provide elements that will integrate a community in time and space. Recollections, myths and the like are conveyed to a large extent by the memory policy, which encompasses both tangible (historic monuments) and intangible symbols (rituals). There is a wide catalogue of activities performed for this purpose, such as exhibitions, conferences, seminars and movies. Educational policy is among key elements of memory policy since teaching history, emphasizing historical facts and retrospections contribute to identity formation (Closa Montero, 2010).

Aleida Assmann notes that institutions, associations, states and nations produce memory using symbols thereby creating a kind of their own identity (Assmann, 2006). National myths embody such collections of symbolic images shared by the residents of a region or state. Such myths may both be rooted in the past and refer to the future.

Consequently, politicians and intellectuals began to promote the idea of the “memory of the Holocaust” as the founding myth of the European Union. The Holocaust has become a crucial benchmark for universal values, human rights, tolerance and protection of minorities. The memory of the Holocaust is to provide Europeans with a common identity. This envisaged community may also mean Europe as a shared memory and a legacy of traumatic history. Since 2005, one of the conditions for candidate countries to the European Union has been to acknowledge the memory of the Holocaust (Assmann, 2010, pp. 36–49).

The discussion on the special place the Holocaust held in the European culture of remembrance witnessed a flashpoint when the Cold War ended, and Eastern Europeans demanded that their collective memory and dramatic history be respected and the memory of communist regimes be included in the European history of freedom (Droit, 2009).

According to Assmann, the only hope to bring a divided Europe together and make its memory into an integrating and collective culture of remembrance is provided by dialogic remembering. She understands dialogic memory as the policy of two or more states that share a common policy of violence, acknowledge each other’s participation in the traumatic history of the other party and empathically integrate its suffering into its own tradition. Assmann notes that a united Europe does not need a uniform picture of European history but an agreed picture; the point is not a uniform meta-narration but the dialogic references and mutually communicating the national memory images. Dialogic memory is

anchored in national memory but, thanks to a transnational perspective, it goes beyond the national horizon. European memory should become a collective value belonging to everybody. Europe has a collective future, therefore it should also have a collective memory (Assmann, 2010, pp. 40–49).

Wolff-Powęska notes that the European Union is founded on the pillars of freedom, democracy and respect for human rights, therefore European memory should accommodate both the experience of Nazi totalitarianism and communism. The lack of shared European historical awareness is among the main hindrances on the path to developing the sense of belonging to the European community. Nevertheless, Europe can never have a homogeneous memory. European identity will not be created by an enforced memory (Wolff-Powęska, 2012).

The opponents of the negative foundation myth associated with the war and genocide suggested that the Treaties of Rome would have been a better foundation myth as the fundamental EU documents and the symbol of positive triumph over adversities.

Claus Leggewie proposes to convert the memory that divides Europe at present into a shared memory. If a collective memory is to mean an identical opinion about the past, it is certain that such a uniform outlook will never be developed in Europe. Collective European memory cannot result from an identical view of the past. Even individual states have been unable to develop such a united outlook (Leggewie, 2011).

Jürgen Habermas, in turn, promotes European civil society. He even goes as far as suggesting that the arbitrarily defined “peoples” be transformed into the “nations of citizens,” that is a new form of social integration, other than nation-state – the nation of citizens which is founded on stimulating myths and emotional symbolism. For such a scenario to succeed the conventional concept of “closed statehood” would have to be renounced and the common good, founded on the agreed objectives and values, would have to be accepted (Habermas, 2005, pp. 552–553).

The respective histories of European nations are so closely interrelated that each of them is a component of a greater whole. A number of individuals, events and processes form a shared legacy of many nations, sometimes of all of them. These shared components of memory, however, are very often perceived in opposite ways. The heroes of one nation are cursed by another nation. What is celebrated as a victory in one place is bemoaned as a defeat in another. One party talks about illegitimate displacements, the other one about the implementation of international

resolutions. The conflicts of remembrance may also be, and frequently are, instrumentalized by the forces trying to utilize them to justify their financial or symbolic claims or, more dangerously, to unify their own national memory and impose its certain form on citizens. In such circumstances, an external conflict over memory is intended to stifle the internal conflict by means of creating an external enemy that has to be opposed with strength, unity and readiness to fight (Pomian, 2008, pp. 4–11).

The European bonds and collective memory are to be enhanced by educational systems, among other things. There were thousands of bottom-up educational projects gradually promoting Europeanization under the auspices of UNESCO, the European Council and other supranational and transnational organizations. They encompassed tutelary networks and groups, teacher unions and associations (EUROCLIO),¹ and publishers of handbooks and teaching materials. All these initiatives influenced the national government policies and decision-making processes concerning the Europeanization of educational ideas and content (Beck, Grande, 2009, pp. 181–187). The activities launched by these organizations respected the educational traditions of respective member states while aiming at enhancing international friendship and collaboration by means of the mutual approximation of their educational systems and the dissemination of new educational ideas. The objective was to enhance international collaboration, support integration processes in Europe and, in particular, to promote the awareness of shared European cultural heritage. Historical education was significantly influenced by the European unification trends. The Europeanization of educational systems has brought about important outcomes. Suzanne Popp has analyzed history textbooks in 27 EU countries. Starting in 2004, she examined historical paintings and pictures illustrating the textbooks. Although she was aware that the textbooks primarily reflected respective national narrations, she also noticed some supranational trends in choosing historical illustrations. She identified a group of about fifteen historical paintings and historical photographs in history textbooks which are shown more often than average.²

¹ The European Association of History Educators was established in 1992 on request of the Council of Europe. EUROCLIO is an international NGO actively coordinating numerous innovations and progress in historical education.

² 1. "Declaration of Independence" by John Trumbull (1756–1843); 2. "Tennis Court Oath" [20 June 1789] by Jacques-Louis David; 3. "The Third of May 1808" by Francisco Goya; 4. "The Congress of Vienna" by Jean-Baptiste Isabey; 5. "The Massacre at Chios" by Eugene Delacroix or "Greece on the Ruins of Missolonghi" by the

Textbook authors all around Europe must have ascribed an outstanding historical symbolic power to these images and considered them particularly suitable for collective identity formation. Their choice was in no way influenced by the authorities and was not controlled in any way. It allowed a collective European image of history to be promoted and European history could be presented not separately, or as an annex to a distinct national history, but was integrated into the national and regional identities and history (Popp, 2010).

The purpose of many organizations committed to the promotion of Europeanization is to negotiate and implement such a European perception of history that allows the bellicose past to transform into the future of neighbors. These endeavors produced the first textbook about the history of Europe which was introduced in ten EEC countries in 1992. It was an unquestionable achievement of West European historians and history educators. It meant their ability to overcome the national perspectives on history, long-standing stereotypes and prejudices in order to present a unified picture of the history of Western Europe.

The European Commission initiated the White Paper on Education and Training which presented the future prospects of education, including historical education (*White Paper on Education and Training – Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society*, 1995). On December 12, 2006, the European Parliament and the Council adopted the “Europe for Citizens” program for 2007–2013, which establishes the legislative framework to support an extensive range of organizations and activities promoting the “active European citizenship.” The supranational objective of the program is to bring together members of local communities from all over Europe in order to exchange experiences, opinions and values; learn lessons from history and build the future (Europe for Citizens, 2008).

In 2007, the German Minister of Education, Annette Schavan, proposed to write a common history textbook. The majority of member states

same artist; 6. “Liberty leading the People” by E. Delacroix; 7. “The Proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles” by Anton Alexander von Werner; 8. “Congress of Berlin” by A. A. von Werner; 9. “The Signing of Peace in the Hall of Mirrors, Versailles” by William Orpen; 10. “Lenin speaking to Red Army recruits” [20 May 1920] (photograph) or “Lenin in the Bolshevik headquarters in October 1917” by Wladimir A. Serow; 11. “Guernica” [Bombing of the town of Guernica on 26 April 1937] by Pablo Picasso; 12. “Yalta Conference, 4–11 February 1945” (photograph, different versions); 13. “Raising a flag over the Reichstag” by Jewgeni Chaldej (photograph, different versions); 14. “Fall of the Berlin Wall, opening on the night of 9 November 1989” (photograph, different versions).

gave “informal” support to this educational innovation. Only Polish and Dutch ministers expressed a different opinion. The idea of the common history textbook returned in Istanbul on May 4, at the 22nd session of the *Standing Conference of Ministers of Education of the Council of Europe*. *Talks were held on numerous topics, including the history textbook that had already been written by 35 authors. The final declaration obliged the respective ministers of education to promote this textbook. Poland was the only country to refuse to sign the declaration. The textbook authors chose five historical events: the Spring of Nations in 1848, the period from 1912–1913, 1919 and the Versailles Conference, 1945 and the Conference in Yalta and Potsdam, and 1989. The team of authors also included a Pole, W. Borodziej, who wrote the chapter on Yalta as seen from the Polish perspective. The concept of the common textbook stirred vivid discussions in many countries. Polish right-wing politicians did not support this idea, but a number of Polish intellectuals saw the need for such a textbook (Fedyszak-Radziejowska, 2007). Professor Zdzisław Mach believes that the process of designing such a textbook could help revise a one-sided approach to some facts and eliminate white spots. In his opinion, if the European Union is to function as a socio-cultural community and the European identity is to be formed, collective historical education seems indispensable (Prof. Mach, 2007).*

Numerous intellectuals stress that Europe should accommodate its diverse tales. A multitude of different interpretations is inescapable. Yet in order not to slip into utter arbitrariness, a specific European dimension needs to be pursued by applying a constructivist approach. Gerhard Haupt opts for a comparative method to be employed when writing European history as it allows one to transcend national frameworks and place a given problem in at least two different contexts. Historians employ this method to describe different phenomena and compare them in terms of differences and similarities. The comparative method has its incontestable advantages allowing the stereotypes of national historiographies to be overcome thereby showing familiar phenomena from new perspectives (Haupt, 2004). This method was applied during the “Polish-German Memorial Sites” project that has been carried out since 2006. Nations live in the network of bilateral and multilateral relations, therefore collective memory has to account for the history of their mutual influences as well (Hahn, 2010, pp. 31–35). Hannes Siegrist notes that instead of pursuing the homogenization, or even harmonization of European history, education and coherence of the tale should be emphasized. According to the

principle of cosmopolitic integration, multitude is not a problem but the solution. You are a European because you admit to having many different identities. This concept somewhat relieves the EU from the requirement to forge unity and sees the power of Europe in its ability to acknowledge internal differences (Siegrist, Petri, 2004). Therefore, the purpose of the proponents of European identity formation should entail developing such a model that encourages and protects the diversity of individual European states and societies instead of imposing cultural unification.

Karl W. Deutsch was right to note that identity issues come to the fore at times of crises and escalating threats (Deutsch, 1968). The process of European identity formation was considerably influenced by the crises that have shaken the EU. They released numerous forces which exerted an adverse impact on the European identity diminishing its significance. The conceivability of forming a European identity was undermined becoming particularly visible in the context of the difficulties related to the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, which translated into the extent of civil support the Treaty enjoyed that became apparent soon after it was adopted (Eichenberg, Dalton, 2007). The combination of factors conducive to crises, starting with the aftermath of the global financial crisis and the European indebtedness crisis which ensued as its consequence, the crisis of the eurozone and the migration crisis, all pose a considerable challenge to European unity and solidarity, as evidenced by the intensifying national movements expressing their discontent and opposition against the European Union (Rudnicki, 2016).

Summing up, it may be said that the concept of forming a collective European identity sprung up at the beginning of the European integration project after WW II among the European elite which remembered the tragic experience of the two world wars. The EU's founders assumed that European identity would be the product of European integration. It was, and still is, supposed to legitimize the establishment of the European Union. It started as a project to be implemented over time, which it remains to this day. According to Zygmunt Bauman, we perceive identity as something to be created rather than discovered; as the object of our endeavors rather than the target we should accomplish; as something we need to put together using different components or select from the available wholes (Bauman, 2007, p. 18). Taking this approach, European identity formation seems to be a complex process, but a deliberate and planned one. European identity has always been a certain concept which has been pursued because it is believed to bring concrete outcomes. However, the predomi-

nance of national identities constituting “envisaged communities” has always hindered European identity formation. They stem from the shared origin, language, history and culture (Gellner, 1991). Europe continues to hold debates and disputes over the common denominator of the culture of the Old Continent, over the symbolic dimension of the EU related to its flag and anthem, among other things, and over the “appropriate” values to form the core of supranational identity. All this reflects the problem of imposing categories and interfering in the process of the interpretation of social reality and interfering in symbols. Despite the European Union’s long-lasting efforts, it has failed to form a collective European identity even though certain types of this identity have found expression through EU institutions and community laws. Europeanization is facing yet another significant challenge, namely memory, being the fundamental element of identity. Memory forms identity. It is difficult to form a collective European memory since collective memory is divided, being a confluence of different perspectives and versions. A shared or dialogical memory is what the Old Continent may hope to develop: an agreed memory which transcends respective national horizons. A crucial role is played by common interests driving the efforts to create the agreement.

Bibliography

- Assmann A. (2006), *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*, München.
- Assmann A. (2010), *Ku europejskiej kulturze pamięci*, “Kultura Współczesna”, no. 1.
- Assmann J. (2008), *Pamięć kulturowa. Pismo zapamiętywane i polityczna tożsamość w cywilizacjach starożytnych*, Warszawa.
- Bauman Z. (2007), *Tożsamość. Rozmowy z Benedetto Vecchim*, Gdańsk.
- Beck U., Grande E. (2009), *Europa kosmopolityczna. Społeczeństwo i polityka w drugiej nowoczesności*, Warszawa.
- Burgoński P. (2012), *Europeizacja polskiej polityki równościowej i antydyskryminacyjnej*, “Przegląd Europejski”, pp. 145–146.
- Cichoński P. (2012), *Problemy z tożsamością obywateli Unii Europejskiej*, “Biuletyn Instytutu Zachodniego”, no. 94.
- Closa Montero C. (2010), *Negotiating the past: Claims for recognition and policies of memory in the EU*, CSIC Working Paper, no. 8.
- Deutsch K. W. (1968), *The analysis of international relations*, Englewood Cliffs.
- Droit E. (2009), *Die Shoah: Van einem westeneuropäischen zu einem transeuropäischen Erinnerungsort?*, in: *Europäische Erinnerungsräume*, eds. K. Buchinger, C. Gantet, J. Vogel, Frankfurt.

- Dudek M. (2008), *Polityka kulturalna a proces integracji europejskiej*, "Społeczeństwo i Polityka", no. 2.
- Eisenstadt S., Giesen B. (1995), *The construction of collective identity*, "European Journal of Sociology", vol. 36, no. 1.
- Fliegstein N. (2009), *Who are the Europeans and How does this Matter for Politics*, in: *European Identity*, ed. J. Checkel, Oksford.
- Fedyszak-Radziejowska B. (2007), *Europa – wspólnota niepamięci?*, <http://gosc.pl/doc/765792.Europa-wspolnota-niepamieci/2>, 12.02.2017.
- Haupt H-G. (2004), *Die Geschichte Europas als vergleichende Geschichtsschreibung*, "Comparativ", no. 14.
- Gellner E. (1991), *Narody i nacjonalizm*, Warszawa.
- Gillis J. R. (1994), *Memory and identity. The history of a relationship*, in: *Commemorations. The politics of national identity*, ed. J. R. Gillis, New Jersey.
- Habermas J. (2005), *Faktyczność i obowiązywanie. Teoria dyskursu wobec zagadnień prawa i demokratycznego państwa prawnego*, Warszawa.
- Halbwachs M. (2008), *Społeczne ramy pamięci*, Warszawa.
- Hahn H. H. (2010), *Po co nam historie ausecond degré*, "Kultura Współczesna", no. 1.
- Jeismann K. E. (1979), *Geschichte Europas für den Unterricht der Europäer: Prolegomena e. Handbuchs d. europ. Geschichte für d. Lehrer d. Sekundarstufe II – Materialien e. europ. Konferenz in Münster/Westfalen, 17.–20. Dezember 1979. Studien zur internationalen Schulbuchforschung*, Bd. 27.
- Jedlicka K. (2012), *Prawnopolityczny wymiar europejskiej tożsamości*, "Przegląd Prawa i Administracji", no. 90, Wrocław.
- Kaczmarczyk Ł. (2011), *Tożsamość i kultura w Unii Europejskiej w świetle zasady jedności w różnorodności*, "Kultura – Media – Teologia", no. 7.
- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:083:0389:0403:en:PDF>.
- Konieczna K. (2016), *Polityka wobec tożsamości narodowych we współczesnej Europie – tożsamość europejska*, in: *Nowe tożsamości w kulturze europejskiej*, eds. R. Chęciński, G. Ronge, A. Woroch, Poznań.
- Leggewie C. (2006), *Equally criminal? Totalitarian experience and European memory. Doświadczenia totalitarne a europejska pamięć*, <http://www.eurozine.com/equally-criminal/>, 12.05.2017.
- Leggewie C. (2011) *Przekleństwo dobrego uczynku*, "Tygodnik Powszechny", <http://tygodnik.onet.pl/1,71565,druk.html>, 23.06.2016.
- Lipiński L. (2012), *Tożsamość i pamięć zbiorowa w badaniach politologicznych*, "Przegląd Politologiczny", nr 3.
- Mach Z. (1993), *Symbols, Conflict, and Identity. Essays in Political Anthropology*, SUNY Press, Albany.
- Makowska M. (2015), *Badanie konstruktywistyczne w badaniach nad tożsamością europejską*, in: *Zastosowanie konstruktywizmu w studiach europejskich*, ed. J. Czaputowicz, Warszawa.

- Misztal B. A. (2003), *Theories of social remembering*, Maidenhead–Philadelphia.
- Pomian K. (2008), *Miejsca pamięci w Europie środkowo-wschodniej. Doświadczenia przeszłości. Przesłanie na przyszłość*, "Przegląd Polityczny", no. 89.
- Popp S. (2010) *Trans-European convergences in national textbooks for history education? An approach to the comparison of image sources in schoolbooks*, "Yesterday and Today" no. 5, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2223-03862010000100012, 9.07.2017.
- Prof. Mach: *Wspólny podręcznik to dobry pomysł* (2007), <http://wyborcza.pl/1,76842,3944029.html>, 27.06.2017.
- Program Europa dla Obywateli (2008), http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/guide/documents/EACEA_2008_0185_PL.pdf, 23.04.2017.
- Riedel R. (2015), *Europeizacja polityk publicznych*, "Wrocławskie Studia Politologiczne", no. 18.
- Rudnicki Z. B. (2016), *Kryzys w Unii Europejskiej a tożsamość europejska*, "Przegląd Europejski", no. 2.
- Saryusz-Wolska M. (2009), *Pamięć zbiorowa i kulturowa. Współczesna perspektywa niemiecka*, Kraków.
- Siegrist H., Petri R., (2004), *Geschichten Europas. Probleme. Methoden und Perspektiven*, "Comparativ", no. 14.
- Skolimowska A. (2015), *Teoretyczne i empiryczne zastosowanie konstruktywizmu do analizy zewnętrznych relacji UE*, in: *Zastosowanie konstruktywizmu w studiach europejskich*, ed. J. Czaputowicz, Warszawa.
- Smith A. D. (1991), *National identity*, London.
- Szacka B. (2006), *Przebudowa ustrojowa i pamięć przeszłości*, in: *Współczesne społeczeństwo polskie. Dynamika zmian*, ed. J. Wasilewski, Warszawa.
- Szpicociński A. (2003), *Miejsca pamięci*, "Borussia. Kultura. Historia. Literatura", no. 29.
- Szwed R. (2005), *Tożsamość europejska versus tożsamość narodowa? Transformacja tożsamości zbiorowych Unii Europejskiej*, in: *Konstruowanie jaźni i społeczeństwa. Europejskie warianty interakcjonizmu symbolicznego*, eds. E. Hałas, K. T. Konecki, Warszawa.
- Thompson E. (2008), *Postmodernizm, pamięć, logocentryzm*, in: *(Nie)obecność. Pominięcia i przemilczenia w narracjach XX wieku*, eds. H. Gosk, B. Karwowski, Warszawa 2008.
- Treaty of Lisbon, Preamble*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:TOC>, 25.11.2017.
- Wach K. (2011), *Wymiary europeizacji i jej kontekst*, "Zeszyty Naukowe", no. 852.
- White Paper on Education and Training – Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society* (1995), European Commission.
- Wolff-Powęska A. (2011), *Pamięć brzemię i uwolnienie. Niemcy wobec nazistowskiej przeszłości*, Poznań.
- Wolff-Powęska A. (2012), *Czytaj Kanta Europo*, "Gazeta Wyborcza", 11–12 II 2012.

Ziębińska-Witek A. (2010), *Historia i pamięć w ekspozycjach muzealnych*, "Borussia. Kultura. Historia. Literatura", no. 47.

Zybertowicz A. (1996), *Przemoc i poznanie*, Toruń.

Tożsamość i wspólna pamięć zbiorowa w procesie europeizacji

Streszczenie

Artykuł poświęcony jest dwóm zagadnieniom tożsamości i wspólnej pamięci zbiorowej w procesie europeizacji. Problematyka ta od lat jest przedmiotem ożywionej dyskusji naukowców i polityków, bowiem koniecznością udanego projektu integracyjnego stało się skonstruowanie europejskiej tożsamości i wspólnej pamięci zbiorowej niezbędnej dla legitymizacji tego zamierzenia. W artykule przedstawiono rozważania dotyczące definicji i zakresu pojęć tj.: europeizacja, tożsamość europejska i wspólna pamięć zbiorowa, jak i skoncentrowano się na poszukiwaniu odpowiedzi dotyczącej możliwości wypracowania tożsamości europejskiej i wspólnej pamięci zbiorowej obywateli Unii Europejskiej. W konkluzji autorka stwierdziła, iż pomimo szeregu starań ze strony Unii Europejskiej nie udało się wypracować wspólnej europejskiej tożsamości, aczkolwiek pewne jej rodzaje zaczęły wyrażać się za pośrednictwem instytucji UE i prawa wspólnotowego. Również wykształcenie wspólnej pamięci zbiorowej jest zadaniem trudnym, gdyż pamięć zbiorowa jest pamięcią podzieloną, jest splotem różnych perspektyw i różnych wersji. Nadzieją dla Starego Kontynentu zatem jest pamięć podzielana lub dialogiczna – uzgodniona przekraczająca horyzont narodu. Tożsamość europejska i wspólna pamięć zbiorowa, wciąż są w fazie kształtowania się. Budowanie ich to złożony proces, który konstruowany jest od podstaw. Jest on celowy i zaplanowany oraz skoncentrowany na utrzymaniu pokoju i tworzeniu dobrobytu poprzez wzmacnianie gospodarki.

Słowa kluczowe: europeizacja, tożsamość europejska, pamięć zbiorowa

