

New Europe College

Europa Program

Yearbook 2007-2008



FEDERICA ALESSANDRA BROILO
MARIOARA-CAMELIA CRĂCIUN
EMANUELA NEAMȚU (GRAMA)
DANIEL HABIT
EMILYA KARABOEVA
TCHAVDAR MARINOV
IRINA POPESCU-CRIVEANU
IRINA STĂNCULESCU
ADA ȘTEFĂNUȚ
IOANA TUDORA

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



DANIEL HABIT

Born in 1978, in Germany

Ph.D. Candidate, Institut für Volkskunde, Munich

Dissertation: *"The Production of Europe". The European Capitals of Culture between Construction and Reception*

Member of Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde

Member of Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde

Several field researches in Germany and in Greece

Publications in international academic journals

Participation to conferences and symposia both in Germany and abroad

(EU-)EUROPEANIZATION, (POST-)MODERNISM, (NO-)PLASTIC

Since January 1, 2007, when Romania and Bulgaria joined the European Union, the supranational community consists of 27 states. After the first round of the “enlargement big bang” when ten southern and Eastern European countries became member in 2004, the Union itself sees the enlargement as another step in its development towards a truly European Union including all states on the continent. Therefore the accession negotiations with countries like the former Yugoslav and Soviet Union states, the Microstates or Turkey will continue. But as the Union cannot handle some sort of hole within itself by excluding the Balkan countries, the question whether Turkey will become a member or not will be a breaking test not only on a European level but even more in the several participating national societies and their political landscape. The first round of the enlargement towards the east in 2004 confronted the Union with various problems and difficulties that were not taken into account before and that demanded a great integration effort on very different levels. On the side of the new member states, the primary euphoria changed into reflexes of rejection and the rise of nationalistic and anti-European movements especially in Poland and Hungary but also in the Baltic states can be seen as an aspect among others of the so-called “Post-Beitritts-Syndrome” (“post-accession-syndrome”, Roth 2006: 9), that concerns almost all new member states in Eastern Europe. In the case of Bulgaria and Romania, the EU seemed to be better prepared and conducts the integration process with a lot more attendance and measuring instruments. The mistakes of the year 2004 should be avoided and so a more critical point of view on the two new members was obtained. This strategy also included a possible suspension of the EU accession for one year to 2008 if the different requirements especially in the field of the legal system, corruption and the integrated administrative control system for agriculture (IACS) are not achieved.¹

Within the last years the Union realized that the profound changes that have already taken place and the immense developments that are still to come especially in the economic, social, administrative and legal sector cannot be implemented and achieved without an accompanying cultural program. The search for a European spirit and the different attempts of creating a cultural identity can be found in the strategies of the European cultural policy and the numerous publications on the servers of the Union such as http://europa.eu/index_en.htm as the central “gateway” or <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/index.htm> as the server for European laws and regulations. With the enlargement towards Eastern Europe, this search for a common European base for a cultural identity got on one hand more complicated, as the “European house” got twelve new rooms and twelve new architects with their own ideas and pictures in mind how the joint building should look like. On the other hand, the shared history among Eastern European states since the end of the Second World War and their socialist experience might bring some new input to the discussion on European values and ethics.

Based on a short introduction to the different concepts of Europeanization as they are used in the scientific as well as in the popular discourse within the national contexts this paper focuses on the cultural identity program carried out by the European Union through its different programs and institutions. Taking into consideration some aspects of the construction of national identities in the 19th century the concept of the European Capitals of Culture (ECC) will be placed as the center of attention. A case study of Sibiu 2007 as one of the European Capital of Culture will lay the ground for some consideration on tradition, authenticity, (post)modernism and the general acquaintance with cultural heritage and tourism.

The framework of a possible analysis of interactions in nowadays Europe as it is presented here doesn't equate Europe with the European Union although it seems remarkable to which extent the Union managed to occupy the term Europe and to present itself as not the only but the most important player on a European level labeling other concepts than the one of a EU-Europe as almost impossible. One of the main problems in the analysis of Europeanization is the overuse of different concepts in science. Harmsen and Wilson distinguished eight differences, reaching from Europeanization as a new form of European governance and as national adaptation to policy isomorphism and new forms of political management and from Europeanization as modernization and “joining Europe” to the reconstruction of identities, transnationalism and cultural

integration (Harmsen/Wilson 2000). As the term Europe and its “-nization” will be used to a certain extent in this paper, the reader might follow their introduction in the “Yearbook of European Studies 14” and might excuse a possible overuse.

If the use of the term Europeanization raises awareness of the complex environment which both sustains and limits the narrower project of European integration, then the introduction of yet another neologism into an admittedly already overcrowded lexicon can perhaps be forgiven (Harmsen/Wilson 2000: 24).

Forms of Europeanization and European Ethnology²

For a somehow still “young” discipline such as European Ethnology carrying its genuine topic already in its name, Europe constituted a challenge from the very first beginnings of the discipline. Due to its concept of self-reflection both in terms of methods and contents and the dynamic structure of the European integration process, this search can be seen as inherent in the self-conception and the path appears to be the destination. Almost like the European Union struggles for a European identity, the discipline itself has been searching for a proper name and a new conceptual outline since the Volkskunde congress in Arnheim, Netherlands in 1955. Hofer claims the development of the discipline in Germany to be influenced by some kind of “Germaness”, stating that

the original impetus for the German reform (or revolution) in ethnology came from a negation of German nationalism. Because of the success of the reform-movement, however, contemporary ‘new ethnology’ in Germany is making less use of ‘international’ anthropological inspirations than most other European countries (Hofer 1996).

The so called “Falkensteiner Tagung” in 1970 and the following reorientation and renaming of the several university institutes marks more a “turn” in the internal concepts than a paradigm shift in the sense of Thomas Kuhn (Kuhn 1962).³ The turns in cultural sciences were rather careful and experimental than Copernican and cannot be regarded as being finished by now. In the 1980s, Marcus and Fischer underline the experimental character in cultural studies, “the play of ideas of free authoritative paradigms”, as they call it: “critical and reflexive views

of subject matter, openness to diverse influences embracing whatever seems to work in practice, and tolerance of uncertainty about a field's direction and of incompleteness in some of its projects" (Marcus 1986:10). In this frame European Ethnology emancipated itself from the former understanding as a descriptive ethnography mainly concentrating on rural life and cultural expressions (although these fields are still to be worked on). The European perspective of the discipline with its various names at German speaking universities⁴ focus on players and practices and the handling of their everyday life in their personal, social and spatial context.⁵ The focusing on the "Europeanization of Europe" therefore includes both the perspectives of ethnology in as well as of Europe and recalls Hetcher's notion of "internal colonialism" (Hetcher 1975). In this process the "culturalisation" of European themes appears remarkable, even questions of economic, political or administrative matter are expressed with the help of cultural terms referring to motives of a regional, national or European dimension. Culture seems to play an important role in the gentrification of important topics and sets them in an authentic and intense light (Kaschuba 2007a: 3).⁶

Ethnology of Europe used to focus on imaginations and narratives and their interpretation and migration in European contexts. Culture was reduced to symbols and this reduction did not only mean a very confining understanding of culture but also of the discipline itself by reducing their competences and abilities. According to Welz, an adequate concept of culture must allow to take also artifacts and practices and their production, distribution, transformation, adoption and use into consideration. Not only European symbols and images can be seen as cultural expressions but also the publications of the European Union and their institutions, the regulations, protocols and orders must be seen as cultural products (Welz 2006: 12). Following the path of an analysis of the representations of Europe, five approaches appear indispensable due to the scientific as well as the media discourse⁷:

– The creation of EU-Europe

Motivated by EU-intern studies like Shore's "Building Europe" or the works of the French social anthropologist Abélès, this perspective focus on the concrete identity work carried out by the European Commission and its institutions (Shore 2005, Abélès 1996). The main result (and actually the greatest problem the EU has to face in the invention of a

European identity) is the characterization of this Europeanization process as a “top-down-process” organized from Brussels. And as the “European integration process has conspicuously failed to engender a transnational public” (Shore 2005: 20) since its beginning in the 1950s, the EU attempts stay somehow indeterminate and ambiguous and lack connection to the European society. To exemplify this internal Europeanization lacking concrete interconnection, the European Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat) might act as an indicator. The permanent publishing of “European” numbers and figures works like a “motor of imagination” (Kaschuba 2007a: 13), pretending that the announcement of these already can be seen as an integration benchmark although they are far away from reality.⁸

– Global-European vs. local-national

In politics, science and media the mentioned idea of a European spirit gains more and more importance and each of the three play its own role in the “Invention of a (European) tradition” (Hobsbawm 1992). Especially in the field of media and arts the imagination of Europe seems quite popular and appears as a common text, sponsored by the various EU support programs. Shore mentions in this context the double strategy of as well the invention of people’s Europe as well as of the *homo europaeus*, both trying to create an offer of European identification as a supranational model. The legitimation for this is drawn out of historic reasons as the reference to European high culture such as art, literature, music or science can be found throughout the centuries as a sort of self-legitimation of the elite. This “Europeanness” faces actually a new form of nationalism (“Britishness”, “Polishness”, “Romanianness”) that also follows the above-mentioned rules of culturalisation. The case of the politics of blockade of the Polish government in 2006/07 or the tensions between the Russian minority and the Baltic States show the pretension of the local-national as the true, authentic that has to be preserved and saved. Prevention of Europeanism with the help of Europe.⁹

– “Old” vs. “new” Europe

This differentiation focuses not so much on the one made by the former US-American Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld but on the Eastern enlargement of the European Union. The collapse of the socialistic system

and the following national reconstruction caused different traditions in the field of politics, legislation, investments and above all a different perception of the role of the state. As the new member states are not yet as regulated as the Western European countries, advantage of location arise and the economic challenge is easier to accept than in countries that stick to the Western ideal of the welfare state. The new member states appear more flexible in the adoption of the changes caused by the EU membership and their development of a neo-liberal capitalist system seems to go even further than in Western Europe. But on the other hand, the political and cultural power balance did not change and the determinative authority stayed in the West. "In contrast, the East – the putatively 'new' Europe – is clearly ascribed to almost no political competence, social substance, or cultural resources – or at least not any that ultimately have to be preserved and integrated in the European center" (Kaschuba 2007b: 9).

– The construction of a European collective memory

In this process, the motive of delimitation, classification and segregation plays an important role and becomes obvious in the discourse on the role and influence of Islam in Europe. Fundamentalists on both sides refer to collective forms of memory and construct authenticity and self-legitimation in a reciprocal way: whether by terms of glorification or of rejection of the European. The internal constructions of a European format follow the mechanisms of the national symbolism of the 18th and 19th century but face a structural problem as almost all symbols and possible mnemotops in the sense of Pierre Nora's "Lieux de Memoire" are occupied in a regional or national context.¹⁰ But as it will be shown in the following, the European Union not only became aware of the importance of an integrating cultural concept for Europe, but also emphasized its efforts to find, create and present a common basis. Due to its importance in the process of identity construction, the discourse on a collective memory and its presentation can be exemplarily studied in the discussion on European museums such as the Musée de l'Europe (MDE) in Brussels, the Musée des Civilisations de l'Europe et de la Méditerranée in Marseille and the Museum Europäischer Kulturen in Berlin.¹¹

– Cultural contact, exchange, transfer

A great emphasize in the analysis of Europeanization is put on the cultural exchange within Europe in everyday life. This focus is not reduced to the developments after the Second World War but also include the contacts and exchanges in former centuries, “it means adopting the models and fashions of others, such that at the end we can no longer recognize the starting point and can no longer seriously ask what is ‘ours’ and what ‘foreign’” (Kaschuba 2007b: 14). This analysis must consider all aspects of everyday life in every form and focus on actors, practices, imaginations and the question of motivation and purpose. And furthermore, a European Ethnology should focus on the Europeanization-mechanisms, that try to turn former local, regional or national cultural items into European products, as the European integration appears as a highly knowledge based process, stabilizing itself throughout the intermediation and implementation of processes. Barry examines for the European Union

a whole range of regulations and devices, governing and monitoring everything from the cleanliness of beaches to the design of electrical equipment and the safety of toys. The European Union has surprisingly few bureaucrats, no teachers, no prisons, and no doctors. It has few human representatives with which it is possible to identify. But it does possess an array of procedures, regulations, and standards that govern the behavior of human and nonhuman devices throughout its territory and, indeed, beyond (Barry 2002: 143).

From an anthropological point of view Europe can be seen as a perfect example of what Turner called a “master symbol” as it includes the three characteristic properties of a symbol (condensation, unification, polarization of meaning) and appears as a polysemous entity embracing a wide spectrum of meanings, visions, approaches and ideas (Turner 1997).

The construction of cultural identity and the national state

According to the general concepts of a cultural identity and a collective memory, the two main concepts of a nation refer to the idea of a solidarity community.¹² This community defines itself through memory of historical-political events and its pathos is focused on an existing or expected state.

Therefore a nation can be considered as a community of remembrance that needs a memory to create an identity.¹³ This collective memory consists of two dimensions. As a communicative memory it works as a frame based on interaction concerning the latest past and which evokes and disappears with its participants, a generational memory. The cultural memory instead is more profound, survives generations and is stabilized through symbols, pictures, cultural artifacts and of course, the most important from an anthropological point of view, through space and places, through "*Erinnerungsfiguren*" (figures of memory) as Assmann calls them following Halbwachs (Assmann 1999: 34). According to this, every collective has to form an identity if it wants to persist in time. So the past is not only a simple picture but also a social construction whose consistence develops from the sensual requirements and present necessities. In difference to the communicative memory that is in general accessible for all members of the community, the cultural memory was and still is created by groups of specialists. Depending on time and space and the cultural environment, these specialists can belong to very different groups within the community and can reach their legitimacy throughout very different ways and forms. These specialists have the whole range of memory figures at their disposal such as texts, pictures, monuments, buildings, borders and landscapes and can use them in their sense. Several authors put emphasis on the role of narration, of stories and myths to show the importance of the connection to the past and the origin (Assmann 1999: 79-80). Based on these assumptions a nation appears as an "Imagined Community" constructed by "The Invention of Tradition" which finds itself in a "Tradition of Invention".¹⁴

The constructability of national identity depends on the degree to which a reliable state exists. Lepsius distinguishes two constellations, although both poles didn't exist in a pure form. On the one hand the "Nation of Citizens" whose members can feel proud of their constitution, their institutions, their achievements and their history. The narratives and myths being told in this context of the invention of tradition put the present in a reasonable, inevitable and irreversible light. The lack of a referable state leads to the construction of the nation whether as a "Nation of Culture" or as an "Ethnic Nation". The members of such communities can find their common goods only in an imagined common culture or origin. In this case, the myths show the deficits of the present and aim on its overcoming in the future (Lepsius 1982).

As the Western European nations developed more in the direction of the citizen's nation, several authors show the relevance of the cultural or ethnic nation for Eastern European countries.¹⁵ This dichotomy can be seen in the context of the contradiction the European Union has to face since the acceptance of the post-socialistic countries and especially when Romania and Bulgaria joined the Union. Under Ottoman rule for almost half a millennium and part of the socialistic block for half a century, the adoption of the values and norms of the European Union mean a great challenge both for the political class and even more for the societies. This Europeanization cannot be compared to that of the 19th and early 20th century as this development was a voluntary process out of the societies themselves, but the Europeanization or rather "EU-ization" nowadays interacts as a political project from above (Roth 2006). Furthermore, to some extent its heteronomy can be compared to the Ottoman and socialistic rule and explains the strong national movements throughout Eastern Europe.¹⁶

European identity as a project¹⁷

As mentioned above, the idea of Europe as a unified continent is not an idea of the European Union but can be found throughout the centuries in very different forms and settings. But all these imaginations have problems in defining what Europe actually is and the question of possible European borders will remain unanswered.¹⁸ For this reason the constructors of Europe try for almost three thousand years to find a somewhat cultural common sense on which a European identity might be created. Pictures such as Europe, the queen among the continents and the myth of Europe and Zeus can be found over and over again in illustrations throughout the centuries, nowadays in the various publications of the Union and as satirical exaggerations in caricatures.

After the Second World War and accompanied by the United States and against the Soviet Union a new chapter of the European integration was written which finally led to the establishment of the European Union in 1993. Still not there where the EU wants to be and sees itself the EU becomes a rival to the nation state concerning both its level of influence on formerly national competences as well as the level of acceptance and identification in the member states. This can be seen in the surveys of the Eurobarometer asking for the level of orientation towards your city,

your region, your nation and Europe.¹⁹ And as the ongoing changes in the social, economic, political and legal sector are as profound and fundamental as they are, the bureaucrats and “eurocrats” in Brussels and elsewhere discovered the role of identity for their project. The enormous changes that they have to force on the way to a well functioning Union can only be achieved by creating a European spirit, and therefore they invented a great number of projects and programs to create an idea of a European identity. Due to the theories of national symbolism that distinguish between four forms of symbolism (active, verbal, medial and concrete symbolism)²⁰ the problem of the European Union becomes evident: As the first three categories are easy to create and construct, the Union has no lack of superficial forms of self legitimation and signs of power. On the contrary, the overwhelming self-promotion leads to some sort of intentional ignorance towards the manifestations as they appear to be constructed and artificial. As an extreme example, the non-perception of the “Europe Day” and the discussion whether it should be celebrated on the 5th or the 9th of May can be found throughout the continent.²¹

But the category of the concrete symbolism is not that easy to design and implement as the European Union has to compete with the national state and its historic advantage. Landscapes and food, costumes and buildings, monuments and events, and above all places and spaces are exceedingly national connoted and not as easy to invent. But as the EU became aware of the necessity of a European spirit the number of programs and the amount of available funds increased and accumulated in the program “Culture 2000”.²²

Although the EU’s efforts especially in the interconnection of Europe by implementing “Cultural roads”²³ for example, the effortless interchangeability of the symbolism remains without any identification potential and appears only as political marketing without any sustainable background (Giesen 1999: 135).

Seen in this perspective, *construction européenne* appears not only as a teleological grand narrative about ‘destiny’ and ‘progress’ but also as a project of social engineering reminiscent of Leninism. In either case, ‘culture’ has provided the idiom through which elites try to galvanize and mold public opinion (Shore 2000: 222).²⁴

The Cultural Policy of the EU

The idea of creating a common European culture has come to occupy a strategic place in the thinking of EU officials, as the necessity of it to support the bureaucratic and technical aspects of the integration became more and more obvious. The 1996 European Commission "First Report on the Consideration of Cultural Aspects in European Community Action" summed it up clearly: "Cultural policy must make a contribution to strengthening and to expanding the 'European model of society built on a set of values common to all European societies'" (CEC 1996).

As the invented "post-nationalist" symbols turn out to be pale imitations of nationalist iconography and as the ideology of "Europeanism" has had a notable influence only on some EU officials and politicians themselves and only to a certain extent to the philosophical and intellectual elite, the EU strengthened its efforts to encourage the European people to be part in the construction of Europe, so that this process turns from a top-down to a more bottom-up development. As a key-project in this "grassroots-movement" field of the cultural policy of the European Union serves the formerly project "Culture 2000" which ended in 2006 but was re-established with even more funds labeled as "Culture 2007-2013". On the basis of former cultural programs such as Kaleidoskop, Ariane or Raphael the Union puts emphasize on small, transnational projects carried out mainly by NGOs and NPOs.²⁵ The inner conceptions of the program and the regulations of the application process aim on overcoming of the reproaches the Union was and still is confronted with over and over again: overorganization, overintellectualization and the distance to the European people. The projects supported so far show the advantage of the concept, as a wide understanding of the term culture is noticeable and so the projects reach from MACHU (Managing Cultural Heritage Underwater) over DanseLabA3 (contemplation and reflection of dance) to PEPRAV (European Platform for Alternative Practice and Research on the City).²⁶ But as Cultural Policy is a new field both to the Union as financier and to the various groups and organizations as receiver, an appropriate instrument for evaluation and control is still missing. The main problem of a European Cultural Policy is the contrast between the conception of Europe as a unified and singular cultural entity and the conception of Europe as space of diversity with different cultures and people. The different metaphors in use like "unity in diversity", "cultural mosaics" or "family of cultures" remind us of the different terms used in the US-American immigration discourse

“salad bowl” vs. “melting pot”) and none of them “adequately address this fundamental contradiction between the foundational idea of Europe as an ‘ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe’, understood as a plurality, and the idea of integration as a process leading to a ‘European people’” (Shore 2006: 7).

Becoming a European Capital of Culture

Among the diverse programs, strategies and approaches in the Union’s cultural policy, the concept of the “European Capital of Culture” marks an outstanding example of the interference between the Union itself, the aligning city (or even region) and its civil society and the consuming visitors.²⁷ On the initiative of the then Greek Minister of Culture Melina Mercouri, the idea of creating a European City of Culture was brought up in 1983 and in 1985 Athens became the first in a row of 38 cities (till 2008).²⁸ Invented as Cultural City of Europe, the title was awarded for one year to a European city until 2001, when a new EU decision expanded the program to two cities. Until 2019, the countries hosting the capital have already been chosen and are requested to suggest two candidate cities to the Union. A selection panel consisting of two members is appointed by the European Parliament, two by the Council, two by the Commission and one by the Committee of the Regions assess the proposals from the candidate cities on the basis of the criteria pointed out in the criteria catalogue in decision 1622/2006/EC. In short, the catalogue claims to “foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from the relevant Member States and other Member States in any cultural sector; highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe; bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore” (CEC 2006: 3).

By taking a look at the vast publications of the European Commission the over and over again repeated mantra of the “European Dimension” and the permanent accentuation of the term culture it is hard to resist the impression of an evoked or provoked Europeanization by all means.²⁹ Sassatelli’s qualitative content analysis of the nine European Capitals in 2000 shows the repetition and misapplication of the word Europe tending to work as a totem, “a symbol that is itself part of the sacred it represents” (Sassatelli 2002: 446). The mapping of the Capitals and the spatial development of the concept unearth the changes of the Union’s structural and cultural policy. Since the beginning in the 1980s with

renowned representatives of a European art and cultural history such as Florence (1986), Berlin (1988), Paris (1989) or Madrid (1992), the focus shifted from the metropolises to the periphery and “second” or even “third” cities like Thessaloniki (1997), Bergen (2000), Graz (2003) or Patras (2006) appeared on the European cultural map. Due to the negative experiences of the past especially in the field of a sustainable city development and a dubious European dimension the European Union implemented beside the “Guide for cities applying for the title of European Capital of Culture” extensive control and evaluation mechanisms, as

candidate cities must present the role they have played in European culture, their links with Europe, their place in it and their sense of belonging. They must also demonstrate their current participation in European artistic and cultural life, alongside their own specific features. This European dimension may also be designed and perceived by the cities through the dialogue and exchange which they establish with other cultures and artists from other continents, so as to foster intercultural dialogue (Guide 2007: 13).

When Sibiu was nominated in 2002 together with Luxemburg to host the European Capital in 2007, the Romanian membership was not conceivable and therefore the nomination marks an outstanding measure. But as mentioned above, the program of the European Capital of Culture can be seen in the context of the internal colonization of Europe and in the case of Sibiu, Western strategies and accesses towards cultural heritage and concepts of traditionalism and authenticity clash together with the local conditions and expectations.

Renovation, Restoration, Rebuilding

This case study of the city of Sibiu as the Cultural Capital of Europe 2007 follows the biography of a city as in Lindner’s concepts of the “Habitus of the city” (2003), an understanding of the city as well as “locus”, the place and space of fieldwork and as “focus” in the sense of the object of investigation (Hannerz 1980) and Venturi’s approach of a “post-European city” in Europe due to which the ongoing changes in the continent’s cities rely more on a debate of the cities past than on the cities future (Venturi 2004). In the case of the restoration and renovation actions that came upon Sibiu in the preparations for the European Capital of Culture, the two major players were the Romanian state in form of the local representative of the

Romanian Ministry of Culture and the GTZ, the German “Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit” organizing technical cooperation for sustainable development. The efforts of the Romanian state must be seen as a city decoration in a Potemkin way, as they are reduced to the very city center and only to the visible fronts of the buildings (although they are classified as “historic buildings”). The concepts of the GTZ go further and provoked a much higher interference in the local urban processes and constellations. Starting in September 1999, the GTZ focuses on city’s renovation and restoration of historic buildings and public spaces in order to protect and conserve in sense of the (German) “Denkmalschutz”. Aiming on the improvement of housing conditions and the city’s cultural heritage and symbolic capital, the concept involves local enterprises, tries to provide new jobs and asks for a sustainable development. On the basis of empower for self-help the projects do not try to reconstruct complete buildings but to concentrate on the whole inner city as a space to be protected.³⁰

The main activities of the Project have comprised:

- support for the planning and management capacity of the City Hall (advisory support for selected aspects of historic center management);
- training and retraining of different specialists such as architects, civil engineers, craftsmen, etc.;
- information and awareness raising for the main stakeholders (both landlords and tenants);
- exchange of experience and cooperation; and
- creation of a group of consultant architects providing free advisory services for owners and tenants of the historic center. (GTZ 2007: 3)

Although the renovation and restoration of Sibiu’s inner center meant an improvement of housing conditions and of touristy and economic attractiveness, a transformation of the symbolic values of the city can be determined as the places of value for the citizens went to the outskirts, to the places with a high rate of fluctuation and consuming such as shopping malls or the airport. Even in the city center former places of symbolic value fight with the representatives of the socio-economic chance such as the four Romanian mobile telephone companies and the numerous bank branches in Bălcescu Street (Venturi 2004: 107). Public investments shift from the concrete to the imagination and therefore loose the capacity of symbolic representation, the emerging places appear as Augé’s “Non-

Lieux" characterized by non-relations, non-history and non-identity (Augé 1992).

So the conception and performance of the city's past relies on the period between 1600 (or even before, taking the sarcophagus in the "Franz Binder" World Ethnographic Museum at Sibiu's Piața Mică into consideration) and the 1930s and fades out the overthrowing history of the 20th century including the war period and the socialist times, the changes caused by migration, the 1989 revolution and post-socialist discourses. The motto of the European Capital of Culture program, "City of Culture – City of Cultures" seems to make sense at first sight, but on closer examination especially the last part appears difficult. Of course the city's program considers the long-lasting connection and interference between the Romanian population and the Transylvanian Saxons and the city itself can be seen as a symbol of a more or less harmonious interaction between different ethnic groups, especially when compared to cities with interethnic riots since the fall of the socialist regime such as Targu Mures for example.³¹ The above mentioned concept of culturalization appears as a concept of ethnicization as the different ethnic groups among the population and their differences are emphasized. According to the European motto "unity in diversity" the city constructs itself along the idea of diversity. The synthesis of empathy based identity in the local and regional culture – the cultures – with educated humanistic universality – the culture – is considered to be one of the two basic assumptions and utopias of the European city, whereas the other one is based on the idea of urbanity and the polarity of public and private sphere.³²

As a major point within the concept of the European Capital of Culture refers to the restoration and renovation of the city, great emphasize was put on the improvement of the cities attraction to tourists. Compared to the status of the inner city some years ago, a visitor in 2007 cannot help but get the impression of a nice, clean medieval city with solid pavement, a working street lighting and somehow kitschy illumination and of course well renovated houses. A great number of cafes, bars and restaurants join the attractiveness palette of the inner city center, most of them opened recently in the last few years. One of the main questions in the discourse on Sibiu will be the question of a sustainable tourist development, whether the attractiveness to visitors and possible investors will correspond to the advancement of the city's infrastructure that will remain in every case. These infrastructure measures concentrate on traffic connections such as streets and railway and resulted in the enlargement of Sibiu's airport

from a small regional one to an airport that fulfills the requirements for international flights.

Postsocialist Modernism and Postmodern Europeanism

In the inner city center the problematic of almost all former European Capitals of Culture becomes visible. On one hand they are forced to meet the expectations of an international audience towards the tangible objects of a historic place such as a renovated and well-kept city center with the common range of offers for visitors such as churches, museums and all sorts of historic buildings. Still following Enzensberger's "Theory of Tourism" with the three columns touristification, commodification and standardization, the city's culture is transformed into a product ready for consumption. The inner urban space has been functionalized, made aesthetic and attractive for economic reasons focusing on tourists (Enzensberger 1987).

On the other hand, the responsible authorities must match these expectations to the local environment and its economic, infrastructural, social and cultural possibilities. The financial resources in the amount of 16 million Euros for the cultural program in Sibiu must be distributed among the various projects whereas for the cultural heritage 40 million Euros are estimated. Compared to these sums, the financial support of the European Union in the amount of 1.5 million Euros seems more like a symbolic gesture than a sustainable support.³³ Furthermore, the expectations and requirements of the European Union towards the Cultural Capitals have to be satisfied as the cities find themselves in a competition with every other European city for investors, tourists and EU support. Beside the honor and glory the chosen cities have to feel, the program of the European Capital of Culture includes the danger of a financial balancing act and the history of the program includes some somehow frightening examples of cities overextending themselves as they were trying to fulfill all the expectations of the above mentioned groups of interest.³⁴

In the case of the renovation and restoration of the urban space in the city center, attention has to be drawn on the role of the GTZ and the approaches of their projects as the dilemma the different actors find themselves in becomes obvious. Equipped with a total amount of 1.5 million Euros, the Agency tries to achieve the impossible. As the sum is not sufficient for the renovation of complete buildings, it provides support

for the owners and tenants of the Sibiu historic center in the rehabilitation works of their buildings. The officials state that in several cases the support to the house owners must be considered as a symbolic donation for rather cosmetic than profound improvements and that emphasize is also put on to raise public awareness for maintaining the vivid cultural heritage. For this reason, in 2002 the Rehabilitation Award was invented, trying to “offer recognition to those private owners who did correct rehabilitation works on historic buildings” (GTZ 2007: 13).

The small term “correct” gives a first idea of the problems inherent to the program as the understanding of “correct” differs between the Agency and the citizens. The GTZ linked the donation of the financial support to in their eyes a “correct” use of materials, styles and renovation approaches. Not all costs for the necessary measures were covered but the citizens applying for support had to contribute between 35% up to 65% of the amount. Several cases are documented where citizens had to sell parts of their household and furniture to gather the money they needed to benefit from the GTZ aid.³⁵ The Agency wants the citizens to use “traditional” materials and colors shown on various flyers, leaflets and brochures and tries to spread its idea of a traditional, well-renovated medieval city center. In their eyes, the use of wood instead of plastic, of regional, warm colors instead of lurid ones, of old roof tiles with patina instead of new ones seems more appropriate. On the side of the citizens of Sibiu a tendency towards new, “modern” materials and styles can be observed as many buildings assembled plastic windows and doors or used “not-traditional” colors when renovating their houses. As an answer to this misuse of the cities cultural heritage, the GTZ invented the “No-Plastic in the historic center” campaign in 2006 based on three columns. First, an exhibition in the local chamber of architects provided an overview of photos taken in Sibiu of inappropriate windows in opposition to “correct” rehabilitated or new windows. Second, a competition for the inhabitants of the historic center, where people were asked to mark their windows with a special sticker to take part in a lottery drawing for the restoration of their windows. The stickers distinguished between “Așa da” and “Așa nu”, marking the houses as “correct” or “incorrect” in the GTZ understanding and visible for everyone. And finally third, a competition for primary school pupils, “in which they were encouraged to express their opinion on plastic elements in the historic center” (GTZ 2007: 13).

The “incorrect” renovated houses were not only marked with a sticker showing a red, crossed out “Nu” but also documented and shown in

the publications of the Agency, commented with expressions like “Sad” or “Badly renovated”. In a small city like Sibiu this sort of denunciation provokes a climate of social pressure among the citizens. Pointing on misused courtyards and wrong letter boxes, the GTZ did not reduce its engagement to the visible public parts of the buildings but interfered in the citizens’ privacy. This conflict over cultural property can be seen as a sort of “politics of recognition” (Rowlands 2004: 223) between the right of every individual to build his house in the way he wants it to be and the right of collective expression and identity. The Agency’s understanding of the neighborhood as local, traditional and heritage-valued produces a static and stable context, resistant to changes. The inhabitants’ own approach towards their property is only accepted when sticking to the GTZ’s picture of the city, otherwise it is openly criticized and denounced. Appadurai states this development as a process of producing and reproducing locality in the given setting:

As these local subjects engage in the social activities of production, representation, and reproduction, they contribute, generally unwittingly, to the creation of contexts that might exceed the existing material and conceptual boundaries of the neighborhood. [...] And all of these possibilities contribute to subtle shifts in language, worldview, ritual practice and collective self-understanding. Put summarily, as local subjects carry on the continuing task of reproducing their neighborhood, the contingencies of history, environment, and imagination contain the potential for new context (material, social and imaginative) to be produced (Appadurai 1996: 185).

The possibility of producing and reproducing of locality in the way the inhabitants wants it to be turned into an impossibility by the engagement of the GTZ that appears as a new form of cultural imperialism.

An important role in the creation of new desires and ways of private restorations played the appearance of home improvement stores such as “Praktiker”, “Bricostore” or “Mobexpert” with their vast propositions of new materials and modern designs.³⁶ Coming along with a great marketing offensive, proclaiming their products and way of living. The growth and development of these companies in all Eastern European countries shows the hunger for something that is considered as being postsocialist, as it documents the availability and freedom (or even pain) of choice and as being modern, as the use of the products documents a development in

the personal environment. Quite a few researchers have researched this hunger for normality, all showing that the consumption of Western goods is a representation of what the inhabitants imagine to be “normal” and that this concept of “normality” orientates itself at the idea of a Western way of normal life (e.g., Rausing 2002, Fehervary 2002, Fujii 2005).³⁷

In contrast to this, the engagement of the GTZ appears as postmodern Europeanism, as the ideals of preserving and retaining accord to the guidelines of the conservation of ancient monuments not considering the role and requirements of the inhabiting population. This idea of preserving puts the idea of a common cultural heritage above the wishes and desires of the individual. The postmodern aspect of the work of the GTZ accords to the mistakes of the so-called “*Dorferneuerung*” (village development) in Germany in the 1960s to 80s, where the availability both of money and new materials and designs led to results, that are nowadays considered as being unaesthetic, ugly and not suitable for the villages as the modern look doesn’t blend into the grown cultural landscape. In the self-conception of the GTZ, these mistakes should be avoided abroad and the city development should be carried out according to a postmodern understanding of conservation, which includes the use of old materials, designs and techniques. Where the Agency’s architects and town planers see ugliness and bad taste, the house owner sees triumph, advance and improvement. In the cognition of Sibiu’s citizens, the GTZ and the EU are put on the same level and both are considered as representatives of Western Europe, or even more drastically, as a new form of a foreign hegemony.

Due to several factors, Sibiu can be seen as a perfect example for what Johler called a “European Place” (Johler 2002). First, Sibiu’s history can be considered as a truly European history concerning questions of migration, interethnic coexistence, changing national belongings and ideological systems that can be found in the habitus of the city. And second, Sibiu and the special conditions of being a European Capital of Culture in the first year of Romania’s EU membership allow a focus on spaces and places where the “New Europe” is constructing itself and can be experienced in its symbolism and materialization. In a European context, cities play a double role, as they are agents as well as goals of Europeanization. In their context, the simultaneity of globalization and localization becomes visible and merge in the concept of “glocalization”, combining deterritorialization and reterritorialization.³⁸

Cultural festivals and the festivalization of culture

The touristified and culturalized urban space cannot be considered as different to the world but as a difference in the world as it is decontextualized from the everyday life both of the citizens as well as from the visitors. It can be considered as a kind of “third space” in the sense of Bhabha, located between both groups, decontextualized from their environment but accessible for both (Bhabha 1994). Influenced by the experience of transformation from the ordinary to the extraordinary, from work to leisure and consumption, from serious to game. These binary differentiations abrogate in the third space, the ordinary becomes extraordinary, leisure can be experienced as stressful, and work appears as joyful. The potential of change and alteration of this space can be found in its lack of relation, its delitescence and openness. And as these spaces usually include all facets of culture with competing symbols and global processes in the local context, they find themselves in the context of change and alteration.

Following approaches of a so called “festivalization research”, the increase in urban events and festivals must be seen in the context of urban transformation processes, due to which festivalization means a critical term for the contemporary trend of strengthening a city’s image and reputation throughout popular events (Häussermann/Siebel 1993). This development is marked by a campaign mobilization of money, people and media as well as the spatial, temporal and topical concentration of city policy measures and energies towards on goal, towards the big event. Of course celebrating and public events in the urban space can be found throughout the centuries and can be considered as an anthropological constant. But under the influence of global changes of structures new problems of orientation, governance and legitimation arise for the local policy and festivalization offers new solutions and possibilities of composition. Considering the concept of the European Capital of Culture as sort of a festivalization of the urban space as public events play an enormous role, the case of Sibiu can be approached according to the basic assumptions of Gyr 2003. Due to this, festivalization includes a new type of city politics. These events like open-air concerts, markets and exhibitions do not encourage the city development but rather demonstrate the city’s political and cultural ambitions and attractiveness on a local, regional, national and European level. By the performance and instrumentalization of common sense and civic engagement, accordance and identification with the city is evoked

on both sides. Therefore, a compensative character of the events can be stated as the city's real problems are not solved but camouflaged through distraction. The program for Sibiu 2007 includes a vast amount of examples for this aspect.³⁹ Furthermore, the term of festivalization cannot be reduced to the context of city development but includes different other aspects of life in times of Schulze's "*Erlebnisgesellschaft*" (thrill-seeking society), finding its way of expression in a orientation of pleasure and feeling in thinking and lifestyle (Schulze 1992). This orientation is accompanied by event institutions, producing places and times of event almost in to an industrial extent. Their formats can vary from event-cooking to event-Christmas and from event-eating to event-shopping and therefore find their culmination in the rising number of shopping malls. The importance is shifted from the content to the pure participation and interpretation and the difference between Goffman's "front and back region" become indistinct. This participation and consumption of the events can be seen as an urban identity offer proposed by the conglomerate of the different organizers whereas the creation of identity is left to the visitor, both the local and the foreign.

Cultural Tourism and Disney-Town

As the classification of the tourist's world is no longer depending on physical, cultural or political settings but on social and medial construction, the role of tourism especially for the location of cities on a global cognition map is doubtless. On this map, the associations and images linked to the cities become visible and show their ranking in a global hierarchy relying on different values such as attractiveness to tourists, sponsors and media. Tourism establishes a spatial framework including images, (hi)stories, buildings, people so that the space can be merchandised and touristified. This redefining process of the urban space and its festivalization even include the danger of the loss of immanent conditions and representations as they step behind the events that are easier to consume (Wöhler 2003). As cities offer themselves to tourism in a process of self inventing, their urban space turns to a space of possibilities presenting "citytainment" (Selle 2004: 131) to both the inhabitants and the visitors. Among the group of tourists, the cultural tourist and especially the cultural city tourist must be distinguished. But as there are probably as many definitions of cultural tourism (even of both words

on their very own) as cultural tourists, a critical review of the definition carried out by the European Travel Commission ETC and the World Travel Organization WTO seems useful. Their report "City Tourism and Culture – The European Experience" is based both on a conceptual⁴⁰ and an operational⁴¹ definition. As an advantage appears first of all the vast understanding of "cultural attraction" which includes as well mobile and immobile attractions and also intangible aspects like atmospheres and all kind of subjective aspects. Second, it is not so unspecified and excludes other forms of tourism. A disadvantage is of course that the two definitions are limited to cities in foreign destinations, thereby excluding domestic tourism from this study. Furthermore, the focus is on tourism to towns and cities and not to villages and/or the countryside. Within the field of cultural tourism, the report distinguishes between five prototypes of cultural tourists (The purposeful, sightseeing, serendipitous, casual and incidental cultural tourist).⁴² Both the EU in its concept of the European Capital of Culture and the evaluation report of Palmer and Rae 2004 underline over and over again the important role of the cultural tourist in the creation of a European identity, and therefore ask the participating cities to develop sustainable instruments and attractive offers to a "European society":

Attractiveness, from local to European level, is one of the main objectives for a Capital of Culture: how can it attract not only the local and national population but also foreign tourists? In the case of a city located in the Baltic countries, for example, the question could be formulated as follows: how could the event be of interest to a Spanish, Greek or Swedish tourist? This is the type of issue with which the candidate cities will be confronted. Any type of strictly local event should therefore be avoided. The promotion of tourism at European level is also one of the challenges of the event (Guide 2007: 13).

Within the concept of tourism as an economy of difference, cultural city tourism puts itself on top of the hierarchy, as the other has to be presented as local in terms of space and former in terms of time. Their culture has to be brought into consumerable forms so that the visitors can experience it. In general, this happens through traditionalizing and the artificial production of authenticity, representing a symbolic capital that cannot be purchased but arises from the city's historic background.⁴³ Therefore it is even more set into place, old buildings whose exact history is not as important as the atmosphere they create, open air markets with

Christmas feeling beginning in the middle of November, thematic festivals which even don't need a relationship to the city. For the case of Sibiu, this development becomes visible in the overwhelming indication of historic monuments through small signs at almost each house in the inner city. For remarkable historic places and buildings it might make sense when some information is given, too. But in numerous cases in Sibiu the signs just give the simple explanation "house", but at least in four languages to underline both the multiethnic past and the international future.

This "setting into place" or performance of the city is perfectly described with the German term "*Inszenierung*", a term actually used in contexts of theatre and play. *Inszenierung* means the use of intimacy and authenticity patterns for a complementary purpose, for the establishing within the cities' competition in the age of total economy. Like in a paternalistic factory the citizens shall be motivated to play an active role in the development of the city by the evocation of some sort of corporate feeling and pride. In Sibiu 2007 this strategy occurs in the various entrance free concerts of bands and actors such as Eros Ramzotti, The Prodigy, Scorpions or Europe, whose best times are already somehow over. These events provoke a kind of group feeling among the spectators that is transported and reproduced throughout modern forms of grassroots communication such as YouTube or various blogs.

Considering the above mentioned points and the results of participating observation in Sibiu, in positive terms the impression of a disneyfication of Sibiu cannot be repressed as the numerous strategies of the production of culture are too evident. Taking a closer look at some of the renovated buildings and the strategies of the GTZ and the Rumanian Ministry of Culture the impression of a Potemkin village comes to one's mind, as many buildings are just set into place to fit the requirements of a European Capital of Culture but lack sustainable renovation. A perfect and sad example at the same time might be the building of Universitatea de Arhitectură și Urbanism 'Ion Mincu', whose outside façade has been renovated recently in a very attractive looking manner. Opening the door to the courtyard, a disastrous interior appears just relying on pillars and support columns. Ironically or even cynically, this building hosts the section of restoration.

If the past should work as some kind of social glue, the city's society has to agree upon it and this might turn out to be rather difficult if its representations lack authenticity. The semantic of the term includes concepts of truth, origin, identity that are reliable and profound.

Furthermore, authenticity consists of two basic dimensions. On one hand, it is based on the level of belief and authority (independent from the tangible world), and on the other hand it is based on material and substance. As an attribute, authenticity exists both on the side of signification and interpretation and as well on the side of the tangible artifact. Following the approaches of a theory of authenticity (Kiesow 1988) and the somehow common assumption of the social construction of reality carried out by Berger and Luckmann 1966, the tangible aspects of any kind of object loses its importance. The object or artifact does not turn into a monument because of their materiality, but because of the allocation of this attitude, through an act of interpretation. As a consequence the object gains symbolic value as a reaction to the loose of its practical value.

In his "Theory of the leisure class", MacCannell sees the modern tourist as an ancestor of the pilgrims, of course not seeking for salvation but for authenticity (MacCannell 1976). According to the above mentioned commodification and commercialization of space and places, the modern tourist can only experience provided sceneries and created authenticity. As this perspective turns out to be too culture critical, recent studies put emphasize on the personal role of the tourist who has to develop his own idea of and approach on authenticity (Seidenspinner 2006).

The buildings in Sibiu classified as historic monuments stand in their very own microcosms as a symbol for the ongoing process of Europeanization at a larger scale, although they have different structures. The buildings include their own stories, ideas and minds and show the difficulties in the handling of the local history in its very own environment and the preferences of the different groups of interest trying to prepare heritage for future generations on a European level. Both the story and the material are ruled and changed by time but it is them constituting the monument.

Conclusions, Cohesions, Consequences

The case study of Sibiu and the questions upon heritage, authenticity, tourism and culture tried to follow the general question of the purpose of EU's cultural policy. The official answer usually given is to "promote artistic and cultural cooperation" and create a "common cultural area characterized by its cultural diversity and shared cultural heritage" (CEC 2006b). The scientific answers depend on the political, socio-

cultural and national background of the author. Therefore, they oscillate between the above mentioned pessimistic and critical view of the EU and Europeanization process as some sort of cultural imperialism with similarities to the implementation and methods of (internal) colonialism and socialism on the one hand coming along with egalitarianism and the loss of competences. On the other, the more enthusiastic and optimistic authors stress the economic and social improvements in the last twenty years and underline the peace bringing effect of the Europeanization process (although the case of former Yugoslavia and the new nations in this region show the difficulties Europe has to face within itself). From an anthropological point of view, the answer can only be given by taking a look on the concrete situations and moments when the term “Europe” or “European” is in use, when people consider something as European, when the term can be found in objectivations and subjectivations.

The approach of this small case study is some sort of reconciliation and comparison between the ideal visions of the European Union and the concrete implementation in situ. This comparison can be (and hopefully will be) made in various fields, as the Union interacts in almost all fields of everyday life of its citizens. Therefore, the publications of the EU must be considered as a cultural product (Welz 2006) displaying the image the EU has of its citizens and of its own, of the role of culture and how to use it, and of the vast fights between the different groups of interests in the process of Europeanization. Due to the personal scientific background of the author, the anthropological approach towards a “*volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen*” analysis of the European Union has to include the following perspectives:

– The comparison

Following Gerndt’s emphasis of the comparison as a promising method for a European Ethnology (1977), the specific attitudes of the single case become clear and obvious. For the case of the “European Capital of Culture”, the comparison between Patras 2006 and Sibiu/Luxemburg 2007 shows the advantage of this methodological approach as several levels of examination gain sharpness.⁴⁴ The role of tourism within the cities’ concept might serve as a short example, Patras as a transit city focused on one-day-visitors, the cultural program throughout the year rather addressed the local and regional population. Sibiu was interested in the stereotype of the cultural city tourist, coming for three to four days, with a

focus on the city's history, its architecture, museums and expecting a nice, save city center with a acceptable range of cafes, bars and restaurants. Luxemburg rather celebrated itself and its citizens with a lot of events in the urban public space and the including of the city's almost perfect cultural infrastructure.

– The interference

This point focuses on the cities' role within their regional, national and European environment and their relationship to these figures on the one hand, and on the interference and communication processes between the participating groups, organizations, citizens, tourists and their institutions on the other hand. In short, the chaotic organization in Patras and the problems inside the administrative board can be seen in the context of the city's role on a regional (transit harbor and not attractive to tourists) and national level (struggling against Pireaus for the third place in Greek's city hierarchy after Athens and Saloniki). Going further, the general problems of Greece with the EU become obvious and can be experienced on an every day level in the urban context. Sibiu tried to get attention on a European level by promoting itself in all kind of media, the new airport tried to attract both tourists and sponsors and in general the event must be seen in the context of the Romania joining the European Union and the resulting enthusiasm and optimism. Luxemburg as the "best European country" (according to the level of acceptance of the Union among the citizens, see Eurostat) showed its self conception as truly European, transnational city by including the Sar-Lor-Lux-Region, reaching from Luxemburg to Germany and from Belgium into France.

– The context

As the cities and the event of the European Capital of Culture cannot be seen without the cities' situation, the perspective of the context has to include the cities' history and future, their economic, social, ecological and cultural environment. The leading discourses have to be discovered to explore the picture the city has of itself. The consciousness of the citizens and their relationship to the above mentioned figures helps to understand the role the title of the "European Capital of Culture" plays in the memory of the city. The historic context for example opens the perspective on the role the cities are able to play on a European level. Patras considers itself

as a truly European city, being the main harbor on Peloponnes with the cradle of European democracy and places like Olympia and Sparta. The ignorance among the citizens of Patras towards the title can be explained of the city's past as one of the most European places on the continent on the one hand and with the long history of foreign rule of the city on the other hand. Therefore the European Union appears as an ancestor of these foreign rulers and lacks acceptance. As already mentioned, Sibiu's past became its future and was set into place wherever it was possible. The former importance of the Saxons repeats itself in the engagement of the mayor Johannis. Luxemburg's role as a small independent Grand Duchy and as an international financial hotspot gave the city the opportunity to present a very opened and playful concept.

– The unspoken

In the discourse of the "*Inszenierung*" of the city, a main focus should be on the unspoken things in the city, on the taboos, the white spots on the city's memory. The approaches of Foucault's discourse analysis seem helpful, as they raise questions of power and its use and misuse. Taking the historic context, the Ottoman rule in Patras is never mentioned although the city's street map results from a vengeance of the Ottomans in 1822. The "City of Culture – City of Cultures" 2007, Sibiu, does not consider its socialist past at all, and the culture of local Roma groups does not seem to play a role. And the in some cases semi legal practices of Luxemburg's banks and credit institutes only offers great possibilities to cultural infrastructure but is not even mentioned on a humoristic level.

– The reflection

Last but not least, every anthropological work must include a reflection of the one's own role in the field, one's own assumptions, stereotypes, pictures in mind. In the case of a comparison of three European cities and their dealing with the title of the European Capital of Culture, the researcher finds itself in various different contexts each of them claiming reflection of the perspective on the field. In Patras, questions concerning the European Capital of Culture were sometimes considered suspicious, as the researcher was seen as some kind of curious foreigner from Western Europe trying to control the local strategies. On the other hand, the southern German background caused sympathies among elder people,

as they have worked for several years as “*Gastarbeiter*” around the cities of Stuttgart or München spending now their retirement pension at their place of birth. The case of Sibiu reveals almost all facets of the emic-etic-determination, the autostereotype vs. heterostereotype and the resulting dilemma as Roth showed in his general survey of doing research in post-socialist countries (Roth 2005). And whereas the two mentioned cities only provide a small amount of information, Luxemburg offers a highly reflective, critical perspective on itself and wants the researcher to be part of the evaluation process.

Meanwhile, the European Union strengthens its cultural policy and the program of the European Capital of Culture gained more acceptance, both on the side of the Eurocrats in Brussels and elsewhere and on the side of the participating cities. The projects of the future Capitals sound promising and show a creative and sustainable approach to the concept, the rising number of cultural tourists in the cities show the interest among Europeans and the peace-bringing influence of the Union will hopefully manage the conflicts in former Yugoslavia.

NOTES

- ¹ The various fields of critic on the part of the EU can be found in the monitoring reports on the state of preparedness for EU membership of Bulgaria and Romania. See COM 2006/596.
- ² The following outline of the discipline's history focuses on the development in the German speaking university and museum landscape. Further and of course more detailed introductions can be found e.g. in Kaschuba 2003.
- ³ Kuhn considers his concept of the paradigm shift in the disciplinary understanding of the 1960s referring to somehow closed scientific communities whereas the changes of the 1970s engaged almost all human sciences and must be seen as a truly inter- and transdisciplinary phenomenon. According to the critics of Kuhn's concept and the character of the German "movement of 1968" within the universities the term "turn" seems more appropriate.
- ⁴ Almost every one of the 28 institutes in Germany, Austria and Switzerland has a different name, the most common and important terms are Volkskunde, Kulturanthropologie, European Ethnology, Vergleichende Kulturwissenschaften, Empirische Kulturwissenschaften or combinations of these.
- ⁵ For an overview on the different current approaches see e.g. Binder 2005.
- ⁶ There are various examples for this culturalistic strategy in all sorts of European topics, whether it is about the regional origin of products like champagne, beer or sorts of Romanian liquors, questions on the use of genetically changed seeds or on a free employment market or the questions concerning a European strategy towards international migration or Turkey's possible membership.
- ⁷ For the following see Beichelt 2007, Kaschuba 2007a, Viehoff 1999.
- ⁸ This thinking and experiencing of Europe through numbers and figures lead to a change in the perception of Europe. As McDonald points out, these mental changes eased considerably the way of governing Europe in the last years (McDonald 1996).
- ⁹ In the same way argues the FPÖ, the Austrian "Freiheitliche Partei", starting a campaign in January 2008 with the goal of establishing a new European right-wing movement. Together with the French "Front National", the Belgian "Vlaams Belang" and "Ataka" from Bulgaria, the movement claims for a strengthening of the national state and struggles against the foreign infiltration of Europe. So again in this case, a movement argues with anti-European arguments on a European level and shows its own absurdity.
- ¹⁰ For the concept of mnemotops see also Assmann 1999.
- ¹¹ "In Brussels the MDE is seen in the context of the construction of the European Union, a union which, as can be seen, has not been readily accepted by many groups in Europe, although it has been embraced by political leaders.

- In Berlin the MEK stands at the border between Eastern and Western Europe, a link in a world which has known times of artificial division, on a site which has seen tragedy in Europe. In Marseille the MCEM is part of an aspiration to stop Europe being cut off from its Mediterranean roots, not to see Europe isolated for reasons of economy, religion or national security, from a world which has always been closely bound to it, and which, in turn, has helped shape it, particularly over the last two centuries. These three museums have now woven a basic but robust fabric, extending beyond borders, beyond the academic and administrative considerations of any one nation to which they belong, they have formed a solid basis for other museums in Europe to be built, or for other museographic initiatives for constructing Europe based on a sense of belonging to a shared culture, with no exclusive domains, but as a citizen of the world" (Colardelle 2002: 235).
- ¹² The first reference to this concept can be found in the speech of Ernest Renan in 1882 in Paris (Renan 1882):
- "Une nation est donc une grande solidarité, constituée par le sentiment des sacrifices qu'on a faits et de ceux qu'on est disposé à faire encore. Elle suppose un passé ; elle se résume pourtant dans le présent par un fait tangible : le consentement, le désir clairement exprimé de continuer la vie commune. L'existence d'une nation est (pardonnez-moi cette métaphore) un plébiscite de tous les jours, comme l'existence de l'individu est une affirmation perpétuelle de vie."
- ¹³ As the presented concept of identity is applicable both to a collective as well as to an individual identity, a wide understanding of identity is necessary, e.g. White: "Identity is any source of action not explicable from biophysical regularities, and to which observers can attribute meaning. An employer, a community, a crowd, oneself, all may be identities. An identity is perceived by others as having an unproblematic continuity" (White 1992: 6).
- ¹⁴ See for the following Anderson 1993, Hobsbawm 1992, Suter 1999.
- ¹⁵ "In the Balkans, for example, multiethnic empires such as the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empire were superseded by the new nation states which were built on the principle of an absolute mono-ethnic basis. This resulted in a rejection of any ethnic or cultural diversity and a negative approach to cultural difference in general, since any difference was treated as a threat to national cohesion and a potential incentive for territorial claims by neighbouring states" (Nitsiakos 2004: 26), see also Schulze 1999.
- ¹⁶ "Nationale Selbstbestimmung und der Wechsel von der leninistischen Klassenkampf-Ideologie zum nationalen Grundkonsens stellen das einzig gemeinsame Band dar, das die verschiedenen Gruppen und Interessen dieser Laender vereinigte" (Schulze 1999: 333), see Rothacher 2004, Koschmal 2006.
- ¹⁷ Following Castells, European identity can be understood as an identity project as its constructors search for a common basis to build on. "But this is precisely

- what an identity project is: not a utopian proclamation of dreams, but a struggle to impose alternative ways of economic development, sociability and governance. Probably, only if these embryos find political expression will the process of European unification ultimately be accomplished" (Castells 2001).
- 18 The disruption among the Union's member states can be seen in the conflicts on a European constitution, the question of a possible membership of Turkey and the reserved position in the discussion on the future of Kosovo.
- 19 The publications of this "motor of imagination" can be found on the homepage of Eurostat, <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>.
- 20 For a general overview see Motyl 2001, furthermore still Gellner 1983 and Smith 1991.
- 21 The list of invented symbols is almost endless and contains all forms classical, nationalistic symbols such as flag, anthem, money, passport, day, motto, father of the union, myths, medals, stamps and licenses.
- 22 More information on the concept and the background of this program can be found on the homepage of the Directorate-General for Education and Culture (http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/index_en.html) and on the culture website of the European Commission (http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/index_en.html).
- 23 Founded in 1987, these routes along different European developments in space and time want to present a European cultural heritage. Key objective of the program is "to raise awareness of a European cultural identity and European citizenship, based on a set of shared values given tangible form by means of cultural routes retracing the history of the influences, exchanges and developments which have shaped European cultures; to promote intercultural and interreligious dialogue through a better understanding of European history; to safeguard and enhance the cultural and natural heritage as a means of improving the quality of life and as a source of social, economic and cultural development; to give pride of place to cultural tourism, with a view to sustainable development." http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/aware/Routes/intro_en.asp#TopOfPage
- 24 Bogdanor also draws attention to this comparison. In his opinion, the EU shares much in common with the failed ideals of socialism, both being products of an era which still believed in technological progress, in growth and rationalism. Both also have a flawed view of human nature, and both suffer from the dead handoff impersonal bureaucracy that tries to direct human vitality into narrow institutional channels (Bogdanor 1990).
- 25 In contrast to the cultural programs before 2000 whose focus was rather narrow, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007-2013 include all possible forms of cultural projects, as long as a European reference is apparent. On <http://www.cupid.culture.info/> all projects that were granted a funding can be found.

- 26 See <http://www.machuproject.eu/index.html>, <http://www.danselaba3.com/>,
<http://www.peprav.net>.
- 27 As Gyr calls it, this “Eventisierung als urbane Identitätsleistung” (“Eventism as a urban identity achievement”) disbands the determination between inhabitants and visitors, as the inhabitants become tourists in their own city (Gyr 2003).
- 28 She is reported to have said, “it is time for our [the Culture Ministers’] voice to be heard as loud as that of the technocrats. Culture, art and creativity are not less important than technology, commerce and the economy” (Myerscough 1994: 1).
- 29 The unconsidered use and abuse of the term culture and the accentuation of the “European Dimension” appear like a leitmotif, e.g. “Guide for cities applying for the title of European Capital of Culture”.
- 30 Till August 2006, 358 buildings in the inner city were consulted and about 70 restored. The total project sum of 1,5 Million Euro was provided by the German Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau. The support of the single projects was only enabled if the house owner were able to finance between 40-65% of the total sum on their own. The reconstruction of the inner city is understood as a preserving urban regeneration with a participating and integrative approach as all groups in the city are addressed. For further details see the webpage “Fundatia pentru Reabilitare Urbana, derulat de Societatea Germana pentru Cooperare Tehnica (GTZ) si Primaria Municipiului Sibiu”, <http://www.gtz.sibiu.ro/index.php>.
- 31 In March 1990, short but violent riots occurred between the Hungarian, the Romanian and the Roma population leaving five dead and hundreds of injured people. The exact background and development as well as role of Western media are still discussed and also the following trials didn’t succeed in illuminating the course of events. Andersen emphasizes the role of nationalism and the role the both involved nation states played but also shows the economic background of the conflict (Andersen 2005).
- 32 Siebels (2004) collection of articles dealing with the development of the European city offers a huge variety of approaches to the topic.
- 33 “The cities holding the title in 2010 will be the first to be allocated a prize rather than a subsidy. This prize will be awarded to the Capitals of Culture in honor of Melina Mercouri no later than three months before the start of the event, provided that they have met the commitments made during the selection phase and followed the recommendations of the panel, particularly as regards the European dimension to the event. The allocation for this prize will constitute the Community co-financing of the event and therefore will replace the aforementioned subsidy; it will amount to 1.5 million euros.” (Guide 2007)
- 34 Until 2007, only one extensive report on the financial and social development of the participating cities has been commissioned and published. The

financial problems and the pressure the cities find themselves can be found there (Palmer/Rae 2004).

35 For example the case of Rodica Vestemean who has 60 Euros pension at her disposal per month and whose house was chosen to take part in the renovation program (Lauer 2007).

36 The home improvement store "Praktiker", belonging to the Metro-Group, started its engagement in Rumania in 2002 and runs 20 branches all over the country.

37 For the case of Albania, Fujii shows the ambiguous use of the term normal as it "is often used in two paradoxical ways: one is to represent what should be considered normal in a universal way (which is, in effect, life according to the Western standard), such as having a big television set or Internet at home; the other is to reflect their own existing reality, to some extent carried on from socialist times, such as living with alimited supply of water and frequent power cuts." (Fujii 2005: 193)

38 For the concept of glocalization and its role in the European city see Grainger/Cutler (2000: 14): "Cities are at present going through historical transformation, fuelled by an opposition between globalization on the one hand and socio-cultural identity on the other. The paradigm is characterized by new forms of space, expanded by economic and technological flows. In this new space the declining power of national government is being taken up by local and regional government, strengthening citizen representation. Although regions are debased at a national level, they are real at a local level. This links to Swyngedow's (1992; 1997) concept of 'glocalization' which he defines as 'the combined process of globalization and localterritorial reconfiguration' (1992: 161). In other words, cities and territorial states are being re-territorialized."

39 The event search engine on the Sibiu web page delivers 1599 hits for events during the whole year (<http://www.sibiu2007.ro/de/cautare2007.php>).

40 "The movement of persons to cultural attractions in cities in countries other than their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs." (ETC 2005: 15)

41 "All movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama to cities outside their normal country of residence." (ETC 2005: 15)

42 "The purposeful cultural tourist (Cultural tourism is the primary motive for visiting a destination and the tourist has a very deep cultural experience); The sightseeing cultural tourist (Cultural tourism is a primary reason for visiting a destination, but the experience is less deep); The serendipitous cultural tourist (A tourist who does not travel for cultural reasons, but who, after participating, ends up having a deep cultural tourism experience); The casual cultural tourist (Cultural tourism is a weak motive for travel and the resulting experience is shallow); The incidental cultural tourist (This tourist

does not travel for cultural reasons, but nonetheless participates in some activities and has shallow experiences)." (ETC 2005: 4)

⁴³ Contrary to this assumption, Göschel shows the availability of local culture and identity, as both companies and private households prefer places in the city with a high cultural reputation, even if their establishing means the destroying of these places (Göschel 2004: 167).

⁴⁴ This text must be seen in the context of the author's PhD project at the Institut für Volkskunde/Europäische Ethnologie, LMU München with the title "Die Inszenierung Europas. Kulturhauptstädte zwischen Konstruktion und Rezeption." The project is based on a comparison of the three European Capitals of Culture in 2006 and 2007, Patras, Sibiu and Luxemburg and asks for the local strategies in the transformation process of the cities. A more precise and further going description can be found on the website of the Institute www.volkskunde.lmu.de.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abélès, Marc 1996: "La Communauté européenne: une perspective anthropologique". In: *Social Anthropology* 4, 33-45.
- Andersen, Christoffer 2005: *Resurgent Romanian Nationalism: In the Wake of the Interethnic Clashes in Tirgu Mures March 1990*. Online: http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/Andersen_senior_thesis.pdf
- Anderson, Benedict 1993: *Die Erfindung der Nation. Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Assmann, Jan 1999: *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in den frühen Hochkulturen*. München.
- Augé, Marc 1992: *Non-lieux. Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*. Paris 1992, Frankfurt/M.
- Barry Andrew 2002: "In the Middle of the Network". In: Law, John, Annemarie Mol (Ed.): *Complexities. Social Studies of Knowledge*. London, 142-165.
- Beichelt, Timm 2007: "Dimensions of Europeanization". In: Bafoil, Francois, Timm Beichelt (Ed.): *Européanisation. D'Ouest en Est*. Paris. Online : http://www.kuwi.euw-frankfurt-o.de/de/lehrstuhl/jp/es/dokumente/publikationen/beichelt2007dimensions_europeanization.pdf
- Binder, Beate et al. 2005: *Ort. Arbeit. Körper. Ethnografie Europäischer Modernen* (= 34. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde). Münster.
- Bhabha, Homi 1994: *The Location of Culture*. New York.
- Bogdanor, Vernon 1990: "Of Ideals and Institutions: Diversity in Europe?" In: *Encounter* 74, 39-42.
- Castells, Manuel 2001: *European unification in the era of the network state*. Online: http://www.opendemocracy.com/democracy-europefuture/article_347.jsp
- CEC 1996: *First Report on the Consideration of Cultural Aspects in European Community Action*. Brussels.
- CEC 2006: *Decision No 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019*. Brussels.
- CEC 2006b: European Commission: *Culture 2000: Presentation*. Online: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/culture2000/cult_2000_en.html.
- Colardelle, Michel 2002: "Des musée de l'Europe, pour une conscience européenne. Museums of Europe, Awareness of Europe". In: *Comparare* 2002/2, 228-237.
- COM 2006/596: *Communication from the Commission. Monitoring report on the state of preparedness for EU membership of Bulgaria and Romania*. Online: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2006/sept/report_bg_ro_2006_en.pdf
- Enzensberger, Hans Markus 1987: "Eine Theorie des Tourismus". *Universitas* 42, 660-676.
- ETC 2005: *City Tourism and Culture – The European Experience*. Brussels.

- Fujii, Gen 2005: "Ruins, Decay and New Constructions: Materializing Family in Postsocialist Housing in Gjirokaster, Southern Albania". In: *Ethnologica Balcanica* 9, 185-200.
- Gellner, Ernest 1983: *Nation and Nationalism*. Ithaca.
- Gerndt, Helge 1977/78: "Die Anwendung der vergleichenden Methode in der Europäischen Ethnologie". In: *Ethnologia Europaea* 10, 2-32.
- Giesen, Bernhard 1999: "Europa als Konstruktion der Intellektuellen". In: Viehoff, Reinhold, Rien T. Segers: *Kultur, Identität, Europa. Über die Schwierigkeiten und Möglichkeiten einer Konstruktion*. Frankfurt a.M., 130-146.
- Göschel, Albrecht 2004: "Lokale und regionale Identitätspolitik". In: Siebel, Walter (Ed.): *Die europäische Stadt*. Frankfurt, 158-168.
- GTZ 2007: *Sibiu Historic City Center Rehabilitation Project*. Online: http://www.gtz.sibiu.ro/pdf/docs/02_02_01_en.pdf
- Guide 2007: *Guide for cities applying for the title of European Capital of Culture*. Online: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/eac/ecocs/pdf_word/guide_to_candidates_en.pdf
- Gyr, Ueli 2003: "Festivalisierung und Eventisierung als urbane Identitätsleistung". In: Binder, Beate et al. (Hrsg.): *Ort. Arbeit. Körper. Ethnographie Europäischer Modernen. 34. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde* (=Schriftenreihe Museum Europäischer Kulturen 3). Berlin, 243-249.
- Harmsen, Robert, Thomas Wilson 2000: "Introduction: Approaches to Europeanization". In: *Yearbook of European Studies* 14, 13-26.
- Häussermann, Hartmut, Walter Siebel (Eds.): "Festivalisierung der Stadtpolitik. Stadtentwicklung durch große Projekte" (= *Leviathan* 13). Opladen.
- Hetcher 1975: *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*. London.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, Terence Ranger: *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge 1992.
- Hofer, Tamas 1996: "National Schools of European Ethnology and the Question of 'Latent Ethnicity'". In: *Ethnologia Europaea* 26, 89-96.
- Johler, Reinhard 2002: "Local Europe. The Production of Cultural Heritage and the Europeanization of Places". In: *Ethnologia Europaea* 32, 7-18.
- Kaschuba, Wolfgang 2003: *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. München.
- Kaschuba, Wolfgang 2007a: *Europäisierung als kulturalistisches Projekt? Ethnologische Betrachtungen*. Online: <http://www.kaschuba.com/texte/Europaeisierung.pdf>
- Kaschuba, Wolfgang 2007b: "Old and New Europe: Representations, Imaginations, Stagings". In: Darieva, Tsyplima, Wolfgang Kaschuba (Ed.): *Representations on the Margins of Europe. Politics and Identities in the Baltic and South Caucasian States*. Online: <http://www.kaschuba.com/texte/Old%20and%20New%20Europe.pdf>

- Kiesow, Gottfried 1988: "Identität – Authentizität – Originalität". In: *Deutsche Kunst- und Denkmalpflege* 46, 113-118.
- Koschmal, Walter 2006: "'Europäisierung' als Metapher und Aufgabe". In: Schubert, Helga (Ed.): „Europäisierung“ – Begriff, Idee und Verwendung im interdisziplinären Diskurs (= forost Arbeitspapier 38). München, 11-18.
- Kuhn, Thomas 1962: *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago.
- Lepsius Rainer M. 1982: "Nation und Nationalismus in Deutschland". In: Winkler, Heinrich (Ed.): *Nationalismus in der Welt von heute*. Goettingen, 12-27.
- Lauer, Katrin 2007: "Dauerbaustelle europäische Kulturhauptstadt: Hermannstadt". In: *Aachener Zeitung* 27.2.2007.
- Lindner, Rolf 2003: "Der Habitus der Stadt. Ein kulturgeographischer Versuch". In: *Petermanns geographische Mitteilungen* 137, 46-53.
- MacCanell, Dean 1976: *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York.
- Marcus, George, Michael Fischer 1986: *Anthropology as Cultural Critique. An Experimental Moment in the Human Science*. Chicago, London.
- McDonald, Maryon 1996: "Unity in Diversity. Some Tensions in the Construction of Europe". In: *Social Anthropology* 3, 47-60.
- Motyl, Alexander 2001 (Ed.): *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*. New York.
- Myerscough, John 1994: *European Cities of Culture and Cultural Months*. Glasgow.
- Nitsiakos, Vassilis 2004: "National Identities and the European Unification". In: *Ethnologica Balcanica* 8, 23-34.
- Palmer/Rae Associates 2004: *European Cities and Capitals of Culture. Study Prepared for the European Commission*. Brüssel.
- Rausing, Sigrid 2002: "Re-constructing the 'Normal': Identity and the Consumption of Western Goods in Estonia". In: Mandel, Ruth, Caroline Humphrey (Eds.): *Markets and Morality: Ethnographies of Post-Socialism*. Oxford, 127-142.
- Renan, Ernest 1882: Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? S. Pétel pour la collection électronique de la Bibliothèque Municipale de Lisieux. Online: http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/bib_lisieux/nation01.htm
- Roth, Klaus 2005: Observing Socialist and Post-Socialist Everyday Culture: Inside and Outside Perspectives. In: Ders. (Ed.): *Sozialismus: Realitäten und Illusionen. Ethnologische Aspekte der sozialistischen Alltagskultur*. Wien, 223-242.
- Roth, Klaus 2006: „Europäisierung“. Zur Problematik eines Begriffs. In: Schubert, Helga (Ed.): „Europäisierung“ – Begriff, Idee und Verwendung im interdisziplinären Diskurs (= forost Arbeitspapier 38). München, 7-10.
- Rothacher, Albrecht 2004: Weg und Bilanz der Transformation in osteuropäischen Staaten. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte B 5-6. Online: <http://www.bpb.de/themen/68R9OL.html>

- Sassatelli, Monica 2002: Imagined Europe. The shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy. In: European Journal of Social Theory 5
- Schultze, Gerhard 1992: Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart. Frankfurt a.M.
- Seidenspinner, Wolfgang 2006: Authentizität. Kulturanthropologisch-erinnerungskundliche Annäherungen an ein zentrales Wissenschaftskonzept im Blick auf das Weltkulturerbe. In: Volkskunde in Rheinland-Pfalz 20, 5-39.
- Selle, Klaus 2004: Öffentliche Räume in der europäischen Stadt – Verfall und Ende oder Wandel und Belebung? Reden und Gegenreden. In: Siebel, Walter: Die europäische Stadt. Frankfurt, 131-145.
- Shore, Chris 2005: Building Europe. The Cultural Politics of European Integration. London.
- Shore, Chris 2006: "In uno plures?" EU Cultural Policy and the Governance of Europe. In: Cultural Analysis 5, 7-26.
- Smith, Anthony 1991: National Identities. Cambridge.
- Suter Andreas 1999: *Nationalstaat und die "Tradition der Erfindung". Vergleichende Überlegungen*. In: Geschichte und Gesellschaft (GG) 25, 480-530.
- Turner, Victor 1997: The Forest of Symbols. New York.
- Venturi, Marco 2004: Die posteuropäische Stadt in Europa. In: Siebel, Walter: Die europäische Stadt. Frankfurt, 105-111.
- Viehoff, Reinhold, Rien T. Segers 1999 (Ed.): Kultur, Identität, Europa. Über die Schwierigkeiten und Möglichkeiten einer Konstruktion. Frankfurt a.M.
- Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg , Andreas C. Bimmer, Siegfried Becker 2003: Einführung in die Volkskunde/Europäische Ethnologie. Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte. (= Sammlung Metzler; Band 79). Stuttgart.
- Welz, Gisela: Europäisierung als kalkulatives Regime. In: Poehls, Kerstin und Asta Vonderau (Ed.): Turn to Europe. Kulturanthropologische Europaforschung (=Berliner Blätter 41). Münster 2006, 11-26.
- Wöhler, Karlheinz 2003: Kulturstadt versus Stadtkultur. In: Bachleitner, Reinhard, Jürgen Kagelmann (Eds.): KulturStädteTourismus. München, Wien, 21-34.
- White, Harrison 1992: Identity and Control. A Structural Theory of Social Action. Princeton.