Critical Heritages (CoHERE): performing and representing identities in Europe

Work Package 1 Work in Progress:

Framing European Heritage and Identity: The Cultural Policy Instruments of the European Union

AUTHORS: Anthony R. Zito and Susannah Eckersley, Newcastle University

ONLINE DATE: October 2018

CoHERE explores the ways in which identities in Europe are constructed through heritage *representations* and *performances* that connect to ideas of place, history, tradition and belonging. The research identifies existing heritage practices and discourses in Europe. It also identifies means to sustain and transmit European heritages that are likely to contribute to the evolution of inclusive, communitarian identities and counteract disaffection with, and division within, the EU. A number of modes of representation and performance are explored in the project, from cultural policy, museum display, heritage interpretation, school curricula and political discourse to music and dance performances, food and cuisine, rituals and protest.

Work Package 1, **Productions and Omissions of European heritage,** provides a critical foundation for CoHERE as a whole, interrogating different meanings of heritage, historical constructions and representations of Europe, formative histories for European identities that are neglected or hidden because of political circumstances, and non-official heritage.

This document presents a paper that has been presented at two conferences, the International workshops on Public Policy, held in Pittsburgh USA on 26-28 June 2018 and UACES Annual Conference, 2-5 September 2018. The paper presents preliminary findings only; the authors are conducting field work in the 2018-2019 period to finalise the research and to add several more case studies. The paper examines the European Union (EU) policy efforts to construct a European Heritage. We assess how the EU uses particular policy instruments to build myths of European integration, heritage and identity. Using the policy instruments (Capano and Lippi 2017), policy framing (Schön and Rein 1994) and political myths (Della Sella 2010, Kølvraa 2016) literatures, the paper explores how the EU has selected instruments driven by an internal or external policy impetus and whether the decision-makers are framing the instrument in terms of achieving policy efficiency or political legitimacy. The instruments in turn engage with the longer term efforts in the EU institutions and member states to build political myths articulating particular visions of what the EU represents and should evolve towards. The illustrative case study (the European Heritage Label) follows EU efforts to select, design and implement policy and examine over time how these instruments and their framings reinforce/undermine particular political myths that operate in the EU (e.g. a common European identity, a Creative Europe).

Keywords: Tangible heritage, cultural institutions, EU history, EU policy, cultural policy, Brexit

Framing European Heritage and Identity: the Cultural Policy Instruments of the European Union
Anthony R. Zito and Susannah Eckersley

Professor Anthony R. Zito
Newcastle University
Politics/GPS
NE1 7RU
Email Address: Anthony.zito@ncl.ac.uk

Dr. Susannah Eckersley
Media, Culture, Heritage
Newcastle University
Email Address: Susannah.Eckersley@newcastle.ac.uk

1. Introduction

The European Union (EU) finds itself in a series of events and crises that challenge the direction and future of EU integration: the economic crash of 2007, Brexit, the 2018 Italian elections and so forth (Falkner 2016). The Brexit referendum outcome particularly highlights a concern that EU policy-makers have had about the seeming lack of resonance between the EU integration project and the wider EU population. The 1992 Maastricht Treaty referendum and especially the Treaty of Rome II (the product of the EU Constitutional Convention process) referendum results signalled this reality even earlier (Hooghe and Marks 2006; Beetham and Lord 1998). Although EU policy-makers have recognised this problem and the issues of maintaining an EU identification based on a series of abstract constitutional rights (e.g. freedom of movement), the search for solutions is ongoing and uncertain. As the debates concerning the failed EU Constitution demonstrate, the EU policy-makers have sought to link integration to the deeper senses of European identity and community, generating controversies and disagreement along the way (Norman 2003; Schlesinger and Foret 2006). It is in this context that the EU decision-makers started to take a greater interest in creating a common cultural policy, to tap into ideas of a common heritage and identity (Craufurd Smith 2004). Communicating, maintaining and indeed creating a common cultural heritage consequently has become an important and explicit part of the European integration process, but it is fraught with political and policy implications which are potentially subject to questioning and contestation as this contribution explains.

The central purpose of this contribution is to assess how the EU uses a particular set or 'mix' of policy instruments to build particular myths of European integration, heritage and identity. Hood (1983) defines policy instruments as the tools by which actors implement their governance strategies. In many complex industrialised national policy sectors, there is likely to be a mix of policies (Flanagan *et al.* 2011); instruments can reinforce and/or undermine each other for various reasons when used together in the same policy sector.

What particularly interests us here is the array of instruments that the EU has selected to enhance its cultural heritage. The European Commission (2018d) explains the 'cultural heritage of the EU' as 'a rich and diverse mosaic of cultural and creative expressions, our inheritance from previous generations of Europeans and our legacy for those to come'. Although this EU description of this policy priority is our starting point, this contribution will interrogate the various explicit and tacit values and perspectives that underpin the EU's

cultural heritage approach. The contribution will offer a much more nuanced picture of the tensions, priorities and exclusions contained in the EU policy approach to cultural heritage. Using the theoretical apparatus of policy framing and the narrative of myths, the contribution explores how the EU has designed policy instruments to deliver outcomes that are often at variance with each other (e.g. to protect the single market versus acknowledging societal groups that have been marginalised) and that reinforce/undermine particular EU myths.

The contribution is structured as follows. The next section explains the theoretical framework, which involves a synthesis of the policy instrument and policy framing literatures with the political understanding of myths. The third section provides an overview of the main policy instruments operating in the EU Cultural Heritage and how the instruments are supposed to function individually. The fourth section presents the case study, allowing us to drill down further into the thinking behind the instrument selection and interaction with the wider political/policy/social landscape. We use the single case study approach for this paper in order explore our theoretical argument; the case, the European Heritage Label (EHL), is an informational instrument explicitly managed within the EU cultural heritage sector. The longer term plan for the research will be to add at least 3 more case studies to more fully examine the theoretical propositions more thoroughly. We gather the evidence for the four case studies through a documentary search as well as interviews of policy elites and cultural site visits as appropriate. Both the theoretical and empirical work is funded by the EU Horizon 2020-funded project CoHERE (Critical Heritages: Representing and Performing Identities in Europe). The fifth and concluding section summarises the findings and draws a wider picture of the operation of myths and instruments within the EU Cultural Heritage policy.

2. Theoretical framework
Patterns of decision-makers' choices
There is a range of different approaches to understanding how policy instruments inform policy. There have been several significant attempts to assess policy instruments in a wider context. One of the most influential is Hall (1993), who places the type of instruments and their settings in the wider context of the policy principles and paradigms that inform the instruments. This approach has the merit of incorporating both micro elements, i.e. the policy instruments, with more macro considerations of the broader policy philosophies; significant change can happen at both levels although truly transformational change is likely to happen at the more macro ideational level. Lascoumes and Le Galès (2007) argue that scholars need to study 'the long term political careers' of instruments, including the debates and controversies about their creation and revision to make more visible the policy choices behind the selection and implementation of these instruments. It is in the policy instrument that social choices and discourses seem to crystallise in actual policy responsibility for achieving policy goals. Table One (see the end of the section) reflects our re-working of the Hall combination of micro and macro factors within the policy process.

This contribution makes an original statement in this area by looking not only at the micro level activity and implications of the cultural heritage instruments but also at the wider discursive themes that underpin and inform the instruments (while also accepting that instruments can take on lives of their own in shaping how people think and act – Lascoume and Le Galès 2007). Policy instruments are where policy-makers concretely impact upon society (Wurzel *et al.* 2013). The contribution accordingly combines elements of the policy instrument with the literatures on policy framing and on political myth-making.

Calibrating and selecting the specific instrument

Starting at the most micro policy choices for the cultural heritage sector, we need to focus on the basic design of the instruments and how they are calibrated to deal with specific public policy issues (see Table One). An important consideration to the design of the policy instrument and its calibration will be the question of the degree the policy-maker define the *means* of achieving policy within the instrument and the degree to which the policy maker is specifying the policy *ends* to be achieved within the instrument (Jordan *et al.* 2005; Russell and Powell 1996).

Moving towards broader policy choices, we use Hood's (1983) classic typology of instruments to reflect instrument design decisions. Hood focuses on how public actors manipulate particular resources to achieve their policy aims. Keeping in mind that some instruments can contain more than one of these characteristics, the four basic resources that underpin instruments are: organization (establishing official or unofficial organisations and networks to govern policy problems); authority (harnessing legal, administrative and hierarchical powers); finance (offering money - e.g. subsidies - or taking it - e.g. charges and taxes); and information (using knowledge and communication to steer societal behaviour or using it as an input to inform public policy).

Choosing the sectoral approach to instruments

Capano and Lippi (2017) link the study of policy instruments and macro policy considerations by arguing that two key, often conflicting, drivers inform how policy makers choose instruments; their approach focuses on how decision-makers perceive the instrument in relationship to the policy goal to be achieved as well as its wider context. This framework provides the broader contextual motivation behind the policy choice. The first driver is the concerns about ensuring the legitimacy of the instrument choice, namely that it takes into account the preferences and interests of certain groups who confer this validity. This legitimacy can be conferred internally (by actors within the policy sector holding particular norms) or externally by groups outside the sector in another policy field, country *etc*. (Capano and Lippi 2017). The second set of considerations that a policy-maker must face is the question of the instrument's effectiveness in achieving the policy goal. Policy-makers may opt for instruments uniquely designed for a particular sector (specialized instrumentality), or instruments that policy makers perceive to cover a range of different sectors, policy problems and scenarios (generic instrumentality) (Capano and Lippi 2017).

Although specific instrumentality is theoretical possible, the EU cultural heritage sector is one where unique instrument design does not exist, with multiple instruments impacting on culture from other policy sectors as well as instrument designs found in other sectors operating in the cultural sector. This leads to situations where policy actors adopt a range of tools in a non-specific way, i.e. the instruments may not be the best instrument to fit the policy problem, but they suit the general political and technical attitudes of those with a strong input in the process (*contamination*, see Capano and Lippi 2017, 283-284). Alternatively, policy makers introduce instruments that generally suit a range of situations and have an external legitimation, and thus are relatively easy to adopt in the particular sector (*stratification,* see Capano and Lippi 2017, 285-286). As we shall see, given the relative newness of the cultural heritage sector stratification is the likely dynamic. In Table One, the Capano-Lippi analysis helps to explain the decisions that policy-makers make with regards to the overarching programmatic needs of a policy sector, i.e. what toolbox of policy instruments do they select?

Policy framing

Having established the micro foundations behind the policy choices, we now add the cognitive understanding of how policy actors view particular policy problems and the policy sectors that confront these problems. The policy framing approach expects policy-makers, when facing situations where the basis in knowledge is contestable and uncertain, to co-construct a narrative that enables the policy-makers to assess the problem, formulate a solution and cajole others to join in this solution (Snow and Benford 1988).

A critical element to the framing of a policy problem is the assessment of the potential role that other actors/communities can play in the policy problem, and therefore policy framing will shape the extent to which other actors are included and/or benefit/lose from the policy decision and instrument choice. Consequently, actors that are excluded may seek to contest this framing, potentially offering a *counter* (alternative) frame. In a particularly nebulous area such as culture, heritage and identity, we are particularly likely to see different actors in the political system focusing different aspects of the question, as well as how these aspects link to each other, leading them to pursue very different perceptions of reality and of what constitutes appropriate public policy (Schön and Rein 1994).

Frames provide a crucial element in defining what the interests of the actors are in the policy sector, and thus which instruments actors think are appropriate. Policy framing accordingly explains the processes that inform how policy-makers perceive both the legitimacy and instrumentality of the instrument in a particular sectoral context, faced by a particular policy problem that they have framed. This occurs via two discursive efforts (Schön and Rein 1994): (1) policy actors use persuasion, evidence and other means to ensure that their policy frames/narrative dominate the policy dialogue; the second discursive struggle focuses on securing the place of policy stories that trigger the adoption of specific policy tools. It is possible that the different coalitions of policy actors may over time reflect on the frames and policy problem, and come to a consensual determination about the policy debate (Schön and Rein 1994). However, equally possible is that the groups of actors may seek to build alliances and seek to overcome politically the opposition to the frame, or also seek some form of horse-trading to satisfy the other groups. Table One maps out these choices within the framework. Consensus building may involve an attempt to link the different frames that the various actors hold, but equally they could simply be held to co-exist. It is much less likely that exclusion and horse-trading will lead to a synthesis of frames.

Given the focus on this paper on how EU actors have sought to promote a particular version of cultural heritage, it is important to get a sense of how *official frames* operate (Noakes 2000). Noakes (2000) posits that state and other actors who wish to retain their governing authority and protect their legitimacy will seek to use official frames to mobilise groups within society to support their positions and to refute alternative perspectives (and potential frames). These public actors normally will use an established repertoire of frames to respond, but there may be instances where the actors feel the necessity to search for new framings to maintain societal legitimacy and authority. By utilising these framings, often with other governance resources such as legal authority and budget money to spend, the official frame can dominate at the expense of other counter framings. However, past studies of EU framing suggest that framings, including official ones, can co-exist in the same policy sphere; policy actors, for example, can seek to evolve the governance in an area by seeking to shift frames over time. Sometimes the actors successfully make the change over time (Radaelli 1995). Sometimes they are only partly successful in bringing about change (Lenschow and Zito 1998) but other times unsuccessful in overthrowing the current dominant frame (Daviter 2011).

Political myths

Policy instruments and the frames that underpin them tend to focus on the immediate policy problems and sectors, but part of the core issues determining policy choices in the field of EU cultural heritage are broader values and philosophies about the nature of Europe, its identity, its heritage and culture. Given the presence of these grand narratives, we conceptualize the political myth-making that might be contained in instruments and confer legitimacy to those who govern using official frames (Della Sala 2010). We do not intend myth-making to mean a pejorative or value judgement assessment, but rather signify the construction of longer-term narratives that carry a set of political meanings and that explain EU thinking over time, including how this thinking deals with cultural historical notions of time and evolution (Flood 2013; Probst 2003). Kølvraa (2016) and other have suggested the importance of mythical narratives that both depict the past and link this vision of the past to contemporary political issues and the contemporary pursuit of a particular utopian end point.

As EU integration is an ongoing political and economic project, the definition of political myth that resonates most is Bottici's 2007 (p. 99) definition, which focuses on myth as a process. This involves a process of both saying and acting that engages a range of actors (made up of narrators, receivers and potential re-narrators) in the activity of continually working and re-working on the myth. Political myths offer a way to map cognitively the social world (including personalities, traditions, artefacts and social practices – see Bell 2003) and events, but also involve a determination to act and a dramatic impetus to do so (Bottici and Challand 2006). Political myths are not inherently political because of their content but rather due to the way the narrative relates to and comes to address the political conditions of a given group. Political myths need to be shared by a given group and address the specific political conditions in which the group exists (Flood 2013). Myths are narratives that: (a) give meaning and significance to political events by creating a sequence of events and practices that functions as a coherent plot (Bottici 2007, 112-115); and (b) involve a network of symbols that include images, figures and characters (p. 106). Bottici (2007, 111, 209-226) makes the point that any type of content can become the object of a mythical narrative, but that it is needs to be meaningful for people, in their given context, in the here and now, for the narrative to continue as a sustaining political myth. All social activities and practices can act as vehicles for reception of and therefore the continued working upon the mythmaking (Bottici and Challand 2006, 320).

In his overview of the application of political myths to EU integration, Della Sala (2010) distinguishes between two types of myths present in European integration as well as other myth-making. On the level of grand narratives, there are foundational and primary myths that have a core role in explaining the identity of the (EU) community that exists and why the community has gathered together (Della Sala 2010, 6-7). The core integration narrative that the EU has been responsible for ensuring the prevention of war as well as democracy and prosperity in post 1945 Europe is EU's most important primary myth. These primary myths help to generate derivative or secondary myths, which help sustain the legitimacy of EU political authority by giving meaning to the political action that the EU takes on behalf of the EU political system and society. The analysis of such secondary myth-making highlights the importance that both less visible and more visible policy sectors such as competition policy and environmental policy have had in justifying EU integration (Akman and Kassim 2010, Lenschow and Sprungk 2010). In the existential debates about EU integration such as the Brexit referendum campaign, EU environmental regulation was framed (for example by Caroline Lucas, UK Member of the European Parliament) as one reason for the United Kingdom to retain its EU membership. The study of EU cultural heritage needs to be aware of the primary myths about EU integration which inform cultural heritage policy but also the relevant secondary myths that underpin it. Lähdesmäki (2018) has

investigated two heritage efforts by EU institutions to support three primary EU myths surrounding its founding, concerning the common historical legacy that Europeans share, the re-birth of a common Europe after political disruption caused by World War Two and the Communist domination of Eastern Europe, and the importance of the EU Founding Fathers.

This paper argues that policy instruments and the policy frames that inform these instruments constitute activities, arenas and processes, which in turn support EU secondary mythmaking in the cultural sector, and thus support overall the mythmaking of the EU integration process. As will be seen in the next section, EU cultural heritage policy often results from other policy sectors and reflects a wide range of frames as well as myths. This means that the political choice decision-makers face is one where they may push for instruments and frames that appeal to different myths. Although it is a theoretical possibility, policy-makers generally choose to avoid removing policies and the attached myths and instead layer new policies and myths on existing ones. Kay describes the putting together of different policies as 'tense layering' where policy-makers have added a new set of institutions to an existing set, creating a set of tensions involving the material, instrument dynamics and the more ideational framing and myth-making between the old and new layers. This tension could be resolved by an eventual new synthesis in terms of the policy frame and the overarching myth or else the tension between layers could remain until some long term change happens (see Table One).

Table One. Policy choices framework (inspired by Hall 1993)

Concept	Political focus	Political choices
Myth-making	Co-producing narratives that give meaning to EU events and policies	1. Replace current myth with new myth(s) 2. Layer new myth on top of current myth(s), allowing tensions to fester 3. Layer new myth with the eventual aim of a new synthesis
Framing	Co-produced view and narrative of how to resolve a policy challenge the sector faces	1. Persuade others to accept framing 2. Buy off others without persuasion 3. Exclude others without persuasion
Policy programme of instruments	Policy instrument choices made for the sector	1a. Contamination 1b. Stratification 2. Scenarios where instruments uniquely designed of the sector
	Type of instrument to meet particular policy challenge	1. Authority 2. Information 3. Finance 4. Organisation
Specific Policy Instrument Design	Calibration of the instrument	1. Degree to which the means contained within the

		instrument is prescribed or flexible 2. Degree to which the ends of the instrument are prescribed or flexible

3. Overview of the instruments in the EU cultural heritage *repertoire*

This section surveys the main categories of policy instruments operating in the EU Cultural Heritage sector, explaining the wider sector context and the groupings of instruments that exist in the sector. This overview relies on the EU Commission's (2016a, 2017a) mapping exercise as well as academic surveys of activity in this area (especially Craufurd Smith, ed., 2004; Psychogiopoulou, ed., 2015).

Up until the inclusion of an article on culture in the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the EU's acknowledgement of common cultural issues was extremely limited as the member states had quite diverse views on such a policy priority. Article 167 of the Lisbon Treaty notes the need for the EU to supplement member state efforts by (only where necessary) fostering an understanding of the culture and history of the European peoples as well as conserving cultural heritage. Craufurd Smith (2015) argues that the overarching EU cultural policy and the programmes the EU initiated between 1992-2006 took quite a wide-ranging approach as well as one that contained both overt cultural aims with a focus on industrial development and professionalization of the sector. After 2007, the EU focus has shifted more towards economic and technological development as the priority, with a narrowing of the core objectives, concentrating more on the economic potential of culture and the need for sustainability in the selected projects (Craufurd Smith 2015). Our research approach in this study focuses particularly on those current instruments that retain an explicit aim of enhancing and maintaining cultural heritage, and the relation between culture and history within this larger context. However, we also stress the possibility that certain instruments with no explicit cultural heritage orientation nevertheless can have a significant but unintended consequence on EU cultural heritage efforts.

Organisation

The EU has one agency, the Education, Audio-visual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), to administer various funding programmes that include culture. By its very multi-programmatic nature, EACEA contains a number of frames, focusing particularly on intercultural communication. The European Commission (2013) Decision establishing the agency has no explicit reference to cultural heritage, but makes clear the agency's need to implement the Culture Programme and Creative Europe activities in addition to projects enhancing integration and market principles of free movement, such as European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS). More numerous are a series of networks and non-governmental bodies that gather experts and stakeholders to generate greater information and knowledge concerning EU priorities. Some of these networks have been created in other policy sectors but have a specific cultural heritage dimension, such as the Member States Expert Group on Digitalisation and Digital Preservation (primarily framed around economic competitiveness) and European Marine Observation and Data Network (marine knowledge and sustainable growth) (European Commission 2007). More specifically focused on cultural heritage was the Horizon 2020 Expert Group (EG) on Cultural Heritage, which was active in 2014. Despite its title, the group's broader mission focused its role in support the cultural heritage agenda by making

efforts that 'can build on the potential of new business models and social innovation to stimulate financing in this sector and promote its effective contribution to the green economy' (European Commission 2016c). The network of law enforcement authorities and expertise competent in the field of cultural goods (EU CULTNET) has an explicit aim of protecting cultural heritage, but much of the focus is framed in terms of illegal goods operating within the common market and protecting EU citizens (Council of the European Union 2012).

Authority
The prescriptive rules that have a more explicit engagement with culture and cultural heritage tend to focus on enhancing the Internal Market and protecting the community within its borders. Thus, for example, Directive 2014/60 regulates the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the member state territory; it is framed in terms of cultural heritage, but also on preserving the market (EU 2014). Regulation 116/2009 on the export of cultural goods has a dominant frame focused on the preservation of the single market. The EU also has made use of more flexible instruments to support cultural heritage initiatives, most especially the Regulation establishing the Creative Europe Programme involving funding, guidelines and organisation as well as the use of authority (EU 2013). The objectives are specifically framed in terms of protecting Europe's cultural and linguistic diversity and cultural heritage but also equally around the competitiveness of the cultural and creative sectors and on sustainable economic growth.
Interestingly, the regulatory instruments that have drawn more cultural heritage attention are ones that that unintentionally have had very meaningful consequences on a given policy sector. EU rules and norms may inhibit or undermine European efforts at cultural heritage. An important example of this is the EU effort to protect the internal market by restricting state aid; the 1998 Commission regulation, and its successor legislation, offer the recognition of this potential negative impact by allowing certain categories of aid to be continued, including culture and heritage conservation (European Commission 2017c).

Finance
There is a wide range of financial instruments that impact on cultural heritage explicitly but the biggest and most important of them are more specifically focused on other frames to support EU integration. In terms of budgetary weight, the major EU spending programmes, specifically the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EARFRD), the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), Programme for the Environment and Climate Change (LIFE), Instrument for Pre-Enlargement (IPA), and the EU programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (COSME) all have funded cultural heritage but have a much larger focus on other core integration frames (European Commission 2017a). The EU has funds focused more generally on knowledge and research, such as the Joint Research Centre (JRC), ERASMUS, Horizon 2020, the European Research Area, that support research.

Information
Informational instruments with a focus on cultural heritage are the most prevalent in this policy sector; they are also the most diverse. There are some tools, notably EUROSTAT, which provide online statistics on cultural consumption but also have a much larger framing around the market and other aspects of EU integration (European Commission 2017a). A number of documents set the agenda and give the basis for other informational and other

cultural heritage instruments, including plans (e.g. the Council Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018), strategies (e.g. the Commission 2014 Communication 'Towards an integrated approach for cultural heritage for Europe'), digital platforms (e.g. Europeana), recommendations, and decisions (European Commission 2017a). Some informational instruments provide a designation that draws attention to cultural values as well as sometimes providing funding or prize money and/or legal protection as appropriate: e.g. the European Heritage Label.

Despite a focus on heritage, the examples of informational instruments show the simultaneous importance of other frames: for example, Recommendation 2005/865/EC on film heritage and the competitiveness of related industrial activities similarly frames objectives in these differing directions (EU 2005). Another example is Decision 2017/864 establishing 2018 as the European Year of Cultural Heritage; it frames its core objectives as protecting cultural heritage and as a means of integration, but also equally in terms of realising EU cultural heritage's economic potential and as an external relations vehicle for engaging with Third Countries (EU 2017).

4. Case studies.

European Heritage Label

Background

The European Heritage Label (EHL) is an informational instrument operating in the Creative Europe Programme, arising out of an inter-governmental initiative involving primarily France, Spain and Hungary. This initiative was connected to the 2005 French Referendum result on the EU Constitution Treaty (interview with EC official 27.06.2017). The original 2005 concept has been described as being 'part of a response to the growing gap between Europe and its citizens' (European Union, undated). The decision for establishing the EHL was formally agreed in 2011 (European Union 2011). The Decision intended to strengthen a sense of belonging to the European Union, and was particularly framed around the notion of shared 'European values' and cultural heritage, on an appreciation of diversity (national and regional) and intercultural dialogue (European Commission 2012, 5). Further objectives included raising the symbolic value and profile of significant sites for European history and culture, or for those relating to the development of the EU, in order to increase understanding among citizens particularly in relation to human rights and democratic values, as well as to increase tourism and bring economic benefits (ibid). As will be seen below, similar instruments exit in, for example, the UN context, so this was a case of stratification and layering an informational instrument within the heritage context.

The aim for EHL sites is that they 'should become 'gateways' for citizens to explore and increase their understanding of Europe' (DG Education and Culture or DGEC 2013, 3). The process of becoming an EHL site is based on voluntary applications from within the heritage sector itself. These are then considered via a national selection process, before nationally selected sites are nominated for consideration at the EU level. There are currently 38 EHL sites (listed on (https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label_en). The label affords no protection for the site, nor does it support its management, educational and outreach activities in any meaningful way, beyond the symbolism and potential prestige of the label itself. Financial responsibility for individual EHL sites remains that of the relevant nation, region or city, according to the cultural policy mechanisms and regulations of that member state. The financial and public sustainability of EHL sites is therefore precarious and beyond the control of the EHL organisation.

Framing

The primary objectives of the tool are: 'strengthening European citizens' sense of belonging to the Union', and 'strengthening intercultural dialogue' (European Union 2011, Art. 3, 1). While the Decision on the enactment of the EHL provides a detailed list of the aims, objectives and the underpinning rationale behind the EHL, it also contains inherent contradictions. In particular, the idea that these sites encompass common values of European citizens, yet that in addition they simultaneously 'need' to raise citizens' awareness of "their common cultural heritage" (European Union 2011 Art. 3, 2). Lähdesmäki (2017a, 58) considers the articulation of the EU through presenting a common, shared culture, heritage and memory across Europe to be a means to 'appeal to people's feelings of belonging, sense of communality and cultural and social attachments' - in other words, a strategy to justify cultural integration in the EU through affective means. This is clearly articulated within the EHL documentation itself, for example, the 2017 Panel Report Executive Summary includes comments from Tibor Navracsics (Commissioner Education, Culture, Youth and Sport) highlighting the value and significance of a European sense of identity not only in relation to the notion of belonging to a community of Europeans, but also to strengthen national, regional and local identities (DG EC 2017, 5).

The primary frame for the EHL is articulated as being about fostering or encouraging a sense of belonging to Europe, through an understanding of European history, culture and memory, in particular in relation to key figures, moments and sites (all of which could be summed up under the term heritage) and connected to 'shared values':

> The general objectives of the European Heritage Label are to strengthen European citizens' sense of belonging to the European Union, in particular that of young people, based on shared values and elements of European history and cultural heritage, as well as an appreciation of national and regional diversity, and to strengthen intercultural dialogue. (European Commission 2012, 5).

The notion that heritage sites holding the EHL can help to foster a sense of European belonging among citizens of Europe, and particularly for young people is also clearly articulated in the aims of the EHL Decision:

> …a better understanding and appreciation, especially among young people, of their shared yet diverse heritage would help to strengthen the sense of belonging to the Union and reinforce intercultural dialogue" (European Union 2011, 2),
> and can be seen in the reports of the expert panel judging applications and in the evaluation and monitoring reports of the programme, where the sites are described as becoming '"gateways" for citizens to explore and increase their understanding of Europe' (2012, 3).

Within this broad framing, it is also possible to identify several secondary level frames, which can be articulated as both generic themes, which cross the various instruments in our contribution, but also reflect instrument-specific details. The first secondary frame can be set under the generic term sustainability, which is relevant to all of our case studies, articulated in differing ways according to the individual frames for each. In terms of the EHL, the sustainability frame relates to the provision of a public heritage 'offer' – which may encompass not only a site itself, but also the education and outreach programmes associated with it. Embedded within the requirements for this 'offer' is the expectation from the EHL that the sites listed within it will generate, expand

and sustain a public sense of belonging and attachment which goes beyond the local, regional or national to encompass the European scale (European Union 2011; European Commission 2012, 4-5).

A further secondary frame across all the case studies is one of public accountability and public value. While there is no formal mechanism for public or financial accountability to the EC within the EHL framework, and there are no actual funds attached to being designated as an EHL site, the frame of public and cultural value – within a 'symbolic European value' - is accorded some significance (European Commission 2012, 4). The third secondary frame running across all the case studies is the idea of a 'better society', which can be understood as both a goal for working towards, by means of the case study instruments, and as an acknowledgement of some of the challenges running through European societies. In the case of the EHL, it is clearly framed as being a means to promote and encourage a sense of unity, notwithstanding the diversity inherent within European heritage:

> The Treaty on the Functioning of the European union (TFEU) aims at an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe and confers on the Union the task, inter alia, of *contributing to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore*. (European Union 2011, 1, our italics).

The over-arching purpose of the EHL can therefore be understood as being to create a 'better society' of Europeans who understand and reflect on their 'shared' past in order to work towards a common future.

Myth-making
On the level of the 'myth', all of our case studies take this idea of a 'better society' further and as such they are articulated as being significant for the 'community of Europeans'. The sense of a shared past, a shared responsibility to one another, and a shared path towards a common future – however problematic and contested many of these notions may be – underpins all of the instruments in different ways. The notion of a 'shared' past is crucial to the 'myth' of a clearly identifiable 'European culture' which is the basis for the EHL, and its perceived value as a tool by which to educate young people about the significance of 'their' European heritage and to promote intercultural dialogue. As the Decision outlines:

> For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common values, history and culture as key elements of their membership of *a society founded on the principles of freedom, democracy, respect for human rights, cultural and linguistic diversity, tolerance and solidarity*. (European Union 2011, our italics)

The contradictions within the tool itself and its framing inevitably create tensions and expose gaps between the levels of the tool, the frames and the myth. While sites can be designated as having 'European significance', the nature of what this might be is itself contested. Furthermore, it appears that applicants to the EHL frequently misunderstand this myth-making, nor do the visitors to EHL sites necessarily pick up on it. If the European significance is not evident to visitors, then any cultural value which the general public attach to it must therefore be based on other layers of significance. The lack of

funding and of accountability for recipients of the EHL mean that it inevitably has a primarily symbolic value to those responsible for the management of the sites, even though visitors to the sites may not be aware of the EHL significance, or even of it as a status at all.

The value and purpose of EHL are therefore closely connected to the mythology of a European memory and identity; this mythology is itself premised on emotional and affective influencing strategies (see also Lähdesmäki 2017b:710) and the use of culture and heritage as a form of soft power (Clarke, Bull & Deganutti 2017, Schreibner 2017). This is reinforced through the strong 'branding' informational dimensions of the EHL: successful applicants to the label are expected to use the EHL logo and publicity materials in order to strengthen the visibility and reach of the idea of a collective 'European heritage', over and above the national, regional or local notions of heritage. Lähdesmäki considers this 'politics of image-making' to be part of an EU strategy for integration, apparently from below, rather than overtly top-down measures (2014:410), and which exemplifies a *more-than national* approach to presenting heritage as European. Following Ashworth and Graham (1997: 383-384), Lähdesmäki argues that the EU uses a dual approach to articulating and presenting a 'European heritage', built on 'the idea of European unity' and 'the unity of European ideas' (2014:414); this is a framing within which the EHL (both its sites and the process of articulating its purpose, values and designation) sits very comfortably.

The EHL therefore provides one means by which heritage sites can align themselves with common frames and myths of EU policy, ironically underpinned by circular reasoning. Heritage sites apply to have EHL status designated to them, thereby 'proving' their significance and value to European citizens, while simultaneously committing themselves to providing the means by which European citizens (especially young people) can learn about European values, in order to come to understand themselves and each other, as Europeans.

Outcomes

Our research has uncovered a number of difficulties that this instrument faces. First, there are difficulties in articulating the 'European significance' of a heritage site, which may already have significance to and/or labelling or designation from other layers of heritage governance (for example, national protected monument status or UNESCO World Heritage Site status), appear to be a common problem for sites applying to the EHL. Failure to do so successfully is given as one of the primary reasons for sites not being awarded the label in the panel reports from the first report in 2013 onwards (DGEC 2013:10, 2014:4, 2015:15, 2017:19). The challenges of developing and articulating the EHL alongside a pre-existing international heritage framework, such as UNESCO World Heritage Sites (which is premised on the contested notion of 'universal value' as discussed by Labadi 2013), is evident in the questions section of the website, where the differences between these two heritage lists are described as:

> Whereas the UNESCO World Heritage List seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world, the European Heritage Label focuses on the European narrative and how the sites have contributed to the progress of European history and unity (European Commission 2018c).

Connected to this, is the second challenge of how sites intend to communicate their European values and significance to audiences/visitors, again one of the key objectives

for the tool itself, but also a primary cause of failure for many applicants (DGEC 2013:10, 2014:4, 2015:15, 2017:19). The question of whether those submitting the applications to the EHL on behalf of individual sites, and those on the expert panel judging the applications actually agree on what 'European significance' might be, is also addressed in the monitoring reports (DG 2013:10, 2014:4, 2015:15, 2017:19, 26), where applicants (both prospective and failed ones) are encouraged to engage more with this issue.

Third, there is the problem that not all sites with unequivocal European significance will actually apply to for the EHL. For example, the Berlin Wall Memorial in Berlin – although it holds an earlier version of the EHL designation, also known as a 'European Heritage Label' as part of the Network Iron Curtain (https://www.netzwerk-eiserner-vorhang.de/index.php/label.html), presumably part of the earlier inter-governmental action – is not an official EU EHL site in the current scheme:

> We are not listed in the current one, because they changed their nomination procedures. In 2011, we were labelled in the so-called intergovernmental scheme and now they have a different, governmental procedure, and we have not applied for that. Because we say, 'why should we? …no one has taken it [the original EHL status] away' (interview with Axel Klausmeier, Director, Berlin Wall Memorial, 21.11.2017)

This is despite clearly seeing itself as a site of deeply significant historical, cultural and political value for European citizens (interview with Axel Klausmeier, Director, Berlin Wall Memorial 21.11.2017) and being considered a 'highly desirable' site for the EHL policy officer (interview with EC official 27.06.2017).

Fourth, EHL sites are expected to implement the aims of the Decision, in alignment with the more detailed objectives, projects and plans they will have set out in their individual applications but without any specific funding from the EU/EC to support such efforts. Reports from the EHL monitoring highlight this as a key problem inherent to the EHL tool, primarily based around the challenge for sites to implement new measures without new funds (2014:21, 2017:27, 29). A further problem caused by this lack of funding is the lack of accountability in relation to: whether the concrete plans set out in the applications are ever achieved, whether the plans are sustainable in any way for the future and whether either the EU or the general public of European citizens has (or feels that it has) any means by which to hold sites to account or to judge the success or failure of the EHL as a tool.

Fifth, and most important for our analysis, is that the belief in such a thing as a unified and identifiable 'European heritage' exists at all is itself highly problematic and contested, connecting to the ongoing debates around what constitutes 'European memory' or 'European identity', and why (for example, in Assmann 2007; Bodei 1995; Macdonald 2013; Ribeiro 2013; Sierp and Wuestenberg 2015, Cento Bull and Lauge Hansen 2016 and in Whitehead and Bozoglu 2017 in relation to the CoHERE project), which are heightened in relation to contemporary discourses of populism which focus on identity, belonging and migration. While the idea that EHL sites should aim to promote 'intercultural dialogue' may have been developed in order to provide counter-narratives to right-wing populism, it is based on the questionable premise that a single European culture exists which could be brought into dialogue with other, non-European cultures. Added to the criteria for the EHL as being 'of European significance', this highlights a questionable ethno-centric perspective which appears to be at the very core of the EHL.

While the argument can be made that sites reflecting a more diverse history and heritage of, in and connected to Europe may not have applied to the EHL (and cannot be forced to do so), it is problematic that the current list does not include sites clearly articulating themselves within the long histories of Europe's connections to the rest of the world (such slavery, colonialism, trade, knowledge exchange, *etc.*) or with the heritages of plurality and diversity within Europe (of religions, identities, sexualities, *etc.*).

As such the current position of the EHL is an indicator that there is still some way to go before the EC slogan of 'unity in diversity' is reflected in its official heritage instruments. Indeed, the vision for EHL in 2030, set out in the 2017 Panel Report draws out a number of interesting aims for the future direction of the EHL, relating to contemporary social and cultural change within Europe, as well as a changing perspective on the role of heritage within society – and even of what heritage may be understood to be. This may well be a reflection of the growing recognition internationally - and quite recently within continental Europe - of a more critical and political understanding of heritage (as described by Macdonald 2013:17), which goes beyond the 'authorised heritage discourse' Smith 2006). For example, within the 2017 panel report on the EHL, the vision for the EHL in 2030 highlights an understanding of heritage which is new for the EHL, at the same time as seeing Europe's past, present and future in a wider, more inclusive frame:

> The starting point is the willingness of the *EHL sites* to "*meet the past and walk to the future*" and their strong commitment to present the European values of human dignity, freedom, equality, solidarity, and the principles of democracy and the rule of law. (2017:7, original italics)

In the vision, the panel offer new and dynamic ambitions and objectives which they feel the EHL should work towards for the future, offering strategies for how this may be achieved. These address many of the criticisms and concerns of this case study – of problematic, potentially ethno-centric, notions of 'European-ness' and of 'European values', of what constitutes 'heritage' and how and why it may be 'shared' by communities living within Europe, as well as the relevance beyond Europe (2017:7-8). The problem of the lack of funding, and associated challenges in the sustainability of the activities and management of EHL sites, as well as in the accountability of the sites to the public and the EU are addressed by the ideas within the Vision (2017:8), clearly articulating these as needing additional EU support to solve, by highlighting their relevance to policy-makers and politicians:

> The European institutions use *the EHL sites* to illustrate their policies and challenges… Politicians and decision-makers use the examples and visit EHL sites with the citizens.
> …By offering a genuine heritage experience, they provide an alternative to unrealistic expectations, populist and opportunist information, fake news and wishful interpretations of the past. (2017:8 original italics)

5. Conclusion: an instrumental mosaic

The preliminary assessment of these cultural heritage research suggests the following basic trajectories for EU policy. The first is that cultural policy reflects a stratification of instruments, reflecting Capano and Lippi. The instruments are layered together in this policy sector in a way that does not seem to involve a high level of interaction on any particular policy problem and EU societal group. Our preliminary research effort does not demonstrate

a substantive interaction. The research does show that certain instruments that have no explicit cultural heritage purpose do work against some of the explicit cultural heritage efforts, but do so for unintended reasons. At the same time, case studies such as the EHL stress that the tensions can exist *within* the instruments at the level of framing and myth. Given the use of the metaphor of mosaic to depict European cultural heritage mentioned in the introduction, it is an apt metaphor to depict the policy mix of instruments at work in the cultural heritage policy sector: the mix reflects a fairly incoherent mix and mosaic of instruments often carrying multiple (and sometimes contradictory) policy frames.

The more interesting story about the policy mix is at the ideational and cognitive level where frames and mythological narratives operate. Unsurprisingly, the instruments with explicit cultural heritage origins, such as EHL, have a primary framing around cultural heritage and identity; funding programmes such as the Horizon 2020 have a much broader frame. At the same time, all of the instruments are contributing to the EU myths of a diverse but unified community that the EU is enhancing. As Cultural Routes and Horizon 2020 demonstrate, cultural heritage contains a number of instruments that come from multiple official EU frames and that support important EU secondary myths. As such, none of these official frames and myths are providing a counter narrative to each other. At the same time, their mutual existence in the stratified world of cultural heritage policy instruments means that they are in competition with each other in terms of values (e.g. tourism, consumer choice, and cultural preservation). Furthermore, certain frames, centred on EU market reinforcement and economic competitiveness, and certain myths of the inevitable progress of the EU market and free movement, have the greater voice in the sector.

6. References

Interview with EC official, conducted by Susannah Eckersley in Brussels, 27.06.2017.

Interview with Professor Axel Klausmeier, Director of the Berlin Wall Memorial Foundation, conducted by Susannah Eckersley in Berlin, 17.11.2017.

Akman, P. and Kassim, H., 2010. Myths and myth-making in the European Union: the institutionalization and interpretation of EU Competition Policy. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *48* (1), 111-132.

Ashworth, G. and Graham, B., 1997. Heritage, identity and Europe. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 88 (4), 381-388.

Assmann, A., 2007. Europe: a community of Memory? *GHI Bulletin*, no. 40 Spring, 11-25.

Bell, D.S., 2003. Mythscapes: memory, mythology, and national identity. *The British journal of sociology*, *54*(1), 63-81.

Beetham, D. and Lord, C., 1998. *Legitimacy and the European Union*. London: Longmann.
Bodei, R., 1995. Historical memory and European identity. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 21 (4), 1-3.

Bottici, C., 2007. *A philosophy of political myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bottici, C. and Challand, B., 2006. Rethinking political myth: the clash of civilizations as a self-fulfilling prophecy. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *9* (3), 315-336.

Capano, G. and Lippi, A., 2017. How policy instruments are chosen: patterns of decision makers' choices. *Policy Sciences*, *50* (2), 269-293.

Cento Bull, A. and Lauge Hansen, H., 2016. On agonistic memory. *Memory Studies*, 9 (4) 390.

Clarke, D., Cento Bull, A. and Deganutti, M., 2017. Soft power and dark heritage: multiple potentialities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23 (6), 660-674.

Council of Europe, no date. Impact of European Cultural Routes on SMEs' innovation and competitiveness. http://culture-routes.net/sites/default/files/files/StudyCR_en.pdf Date accessed 27.7.2018.

Council of Europe, 1987. The Santiago de Compostela Declaration. 23 October 1987

Council of Europe, 2012. Joint Programmes between the Council of Europe and the European Union in 2011. ODGProg/Inf(2012)9. http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/delegations/council_europe/documents/more_info/joint_p rogrammes_between_the_council_of_europe_and_the_european_union_in_2011_en.pdf.

Council of Europe, 2018. About Routes4U Project. https://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes-and-regional-development/about.

Council of the European Union, 2012. Draft Council Resolution on the creation of an informal network of law enforcement authorities and expertise competent in the field of cultural goods. 14232/12. Brussels, 4 October 2012 http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=ST%2014232%202012%20INIT

Craufurd Smith, R., 2004. Community intervention in the cultural field: continuity or change? *In* R. Craufurd Smith (ed.) *Culture and European Union Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19-78.

Craufurd Smith, R., ed., 2004. *Culture and European Union Law*. Oxford: Oxford University EHL Panel, 2017.

Craufurd Smith, R., 2015. The cultural logic of economic integration. *In:* E. Pscychogiopoulou, ed., *Cultural governance and the European Union: protecting and promoting cultural diversity in Europe*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 7-24.

Daviter, F., 2011. *Policy framing in the European Union*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Della Sala, V., 2010. Political myth, mythology and the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *48* (1), 1-19.

(European Commission) DG Education and Culture, 2013. European Heritage Label 2013 Panel Report,

(European Commission) DG Education and Culture, 2014. European Heritage Label 2014 Panel Report, available: https://ec-europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/library/ehl-2014-panel-report_en.pdf (accessed January 2018).

(European Commission) DG Education and Culture, 2015. European Heritage Label 2015 Panel Report, available: https://ec-europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/library/ehl-2015-panel-report_en.pdf (accessed January 2018).

(European Commission) DG Education and Culture. 2017. European Heritage Label 2017 Panel Report, available: https://ec-europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/library/ehl-2017-panel-report_en.pdf (accessed January 2018).

European Commission, 2007. Commission Decision of 22 March 2007 setting up the Member States' Expert Group on Digitisation and Digital Preservation (2007/320/EC).

European Commission, 2011. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Horizon 2020 - The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0808.

European Commission, 2012. 2012 work programme for establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label. C(2012)1317 of 2 March 2012, available: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/c-201201317_en.pdf (accessed January 2018).

European Commission (2013). Commission implementing Decision of 18 December 2013 establishing the 'Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency' and repealing Decision 2009/336/EC.

European Commission (2016a). Mapping of cultural heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities. Last updated ? 2016.

European Commission (2016b). http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=3091.

European Commission (2017a). Mapping of cultural heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities. Last updated August 2017. http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/reports/2014-heritage-mapping_en.pdf.

European Commission (2017b). Commission Regulation (EU) 2017/1084 of 14 June 2017 amending Regulation (EU) No 651/2014 as regards aid for port and airport infrastructure, notification thresholds for aid for culture and heritage conservation and for aid for sport and

multifunctional recreational infrastructures, and regional operating aid schemes for outermost regions and amending Regulation (EU) No 702/2014 as regards the calculation of eligible costs.

European Commission, 2018a. Buildings. https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-efficiency/buildings

European Commission, 2018b. *Cultural tourism*. http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/cultural_en. Date accessed 27.7.2018.

European Commission, 2018c. Frequently asked questions. https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/frequently-asked-questions_en. Date accessed 16.8.2018.

European Commission, 2018d. *Supporting cultural heritage.* https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/culture-policies/cultural-heritage_en [Accessed 23.5.18]

European Union, undated. Background document to the open public consultation on the evaluation of the European Heritage Label action.

European Union, 2005. Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2005 on film heritage and the competitiveness of related industrial activities
(2005/865/CE).

European Union, 2011. Decision No. 1194/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2011 establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label, available http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:3201101194#d1e413-1-1 (accessed January 2018).

European Union, 2013. Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020) and repealing Decisions No 1718/2006/EC, No 1855/2006/EC and No 1041/2009/EC Text with EEA relevance.

European Union, 2015. Directive 2014/60/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State and amending Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012.

European Union, 2017. Decision (EU) 2017/864 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 on a European Year of Cultural Heritage (2018).

European Union, 2018. Directive (EU) 2018/844 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 amending Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of

buildings and Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.L_.2018.156.01.0075.01.ENG.

Falkner, G., 2016. The EU's current crisis and its policy effects: research design and comparative findings. *Journal of European Integration*, 38 (3), 219-235.

Flanagan, K., Uyarra, E. and Laranja, M., 2011. Reconceptualising the 'policy mix' for innovation. *Research Policy* 40 (5), 702-713.

Flood, C., 2013. *Political myth: a theoretical introduction*. London: Routledge.

France, 2007. Décret n° 2007-363 du 19 mars 2007 relatif aux études de faisabilité des approvisionnements en énergie, aux caractéristiques thermiques et à la performance énergétique des bâtiments existants et à l'affichage du diagnostic de performance énergétique. JORF n°68 du 21 mars 2007 page 5146 texte n° 9. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000645843&categorieLien=id

Hall, P., 1993. Policy paradigms, social learning and the state. *Comparative Politics*, 25 (3), 275-296.

Hood, C. (1983). *The tools of government.* London: Macmillan.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G., 2006. Europe's blues: theoretical soul-searching after the rejection of the European Constitution. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *39*(2), 247-250.

Jordan, A., Wurzel, R.K. and Zito, A., 2005. The rise of 'new' policy instruments in comparative perspective: has governance eclipsed government? *Political studies*, *53*(3), 477-496.

Kay, A., 2007. Tense layering and synthetic policy paradigms: the politics of health insurance in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *42*(4), 579-591.

Kølvraa, C., 2016. European fantasies: on the EU's political myths and the affective potential of utopian imaginaries for European identity. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *54*(1), 169-184.

Labadi, S., 2013.UNESCO, Cultural Heritage and Outstanding Universal Value, Altamira Press, New York

Lascoumes, P. and Le Galès, P., 2007. Introduction: Understanding public policy through its instruments—from the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation. *Governance*, *20* (1), 1-21.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2012. Rhetoric of unity and cultural diversity in the making of the European cultural identity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 18 (1), 59-75.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2014. The EU's Explicit and Implicit Heritage Politics. *European Societies*, 16 (3), 401-421, DOI: 10.1080/14616696.2014.894547.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2016a. Comparing notions on European cultural heritage in EU policy discourse and scholarly discussion. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, *11*, 1-14.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2016b. Scholarly discussion as engineering the meanings of a European cultural heritage. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19 (6), 529-546, DOI: 10.1177/1367549416631996.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2017a. Narrativity and intertextuality in the making of a shared European memory. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 25 (1), 57-72, DOI: 10.1080/1478204.2016.1159544.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2017b. Politics of affect in the EU heritage policy discourse: an analysis of promotional videos of sites awarded with the European Heritage Label. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 23 (8), 709-722, DOI:10.1080/13527258.2017.1317649.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2018. Founding myths of European Union Europe and the workings of power in the European Union heritage and history initiatives. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, DOI: 10.1177/1367549418755921.

Lähdesmäki, T., Turunen, J., Kaasik-Krogerus, S., Mäkinen, K. and Ceginskas, V., 2018. Policy brief: increasing the benefits and transparency of the European Heritage Label.

Lähdesmäki, T. and Wagner, A., 2015. Discourses on governing diversity in Europe: Critical Analysis of the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 44, 13-15.

Lenschow, A. and Sprungk, C., 2010. The myth of a green Europe. *JCMS: Journal Of Common Market Studies*, *48*(1), 133-154.

Lenschow, A. and Zito, A.R., 1998. Blurring or shifting of policy frames? Institutionalization of the economic-environmental policy linkage in the European Community. *Governance*, *11* (4), 415-441.

Macdonald, S., 2013. *Memorylands: heritage and identity in Europe today*. London: Routledge.

Noakes, J.A., 2000. Official frames in social movement theory: the FBI, HUAC, and the communist threat in Hollywood. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *41*(4), 657-680.

Norman, P., 2003. The European Convention: divided into the final weeks. *EuroComment Briefing Note*, no. 2.1, 3 June.

Nypan, T., 2007. The inadvertent impact of EU Directives on cultural heritage and a possible solution. Paper presented at the EHHF Summit in Prague. 9-11 May 2007. http://ehhf.eu/sites/default/files/201407/EHHF_0507_TMN.pdf

Nypan, T., 2009. Effects of European Union legislation on the built cultural heritage. European Heritage Heads Forum. http://ehhf.eu/sites/default/files/EffectsofEULeg_2009.pdf.

Probst, L., 2003. Founding myths in Europe and the role of the Holocaust. *New German Critique*, (90), 45-58.

Pscychogiopoulou, E., ed., 2015. *Cultural governance and the European Union: protecting and promoting cultural diversity in Europe*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Radaelli, C.M., 1995. Corporate direct taxation in the European Union: explaining the policy process. *Journal of Public Policy*, *15*(2), 153-181.

Ribeiro, R., 2013. Narratives of redemption: memory and identity in Europe. *In:* R. Cabecinhas and L. Abadia, (eds). *Narratives and social memory: theoretical and methodological approaches*, Braga: Centro de Estudos de Comunicação e Sociedade (CECS), 221-231.

Russell, C. and Powell, R.,1996. Practical Considerations and a Comparison of Instruments of Environmental Policy. *In:* i J. van der Bergh, (ed.). *Handbook of Environment and Resource Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 230-247.

Schlesinger, P. and Foret, F., 2006. Political roof and sacred canopy? Religion and the EU constitution. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *9*(1), 59-81.

Schön, D. and Rein, M., 1994. *Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schreibner, H., 2017. Intangible cultural heritage and soft power – exploring the relationship. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, 12, 44-57.

Shore, C., 1993. Inventing the 'People's Europe': critical approaches to European Community 'Cultural Policy'. *Man*, New Series, 28:4, 779-800.

Sierp, A. and Wuestenberg, J., 2015. Linking the local and the transnational: rethinking memory politics in Europe. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23 (3), 321-329.

Smith, L., 2006. *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.

Snow, D.A. and Benford, R.D., 1988. Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*(1), 197-217.
Whitehead, C., Bozoğlu, G. 2017. Heritage and Memory in Europe: a review of key concepts and frameworks for CoHERE. http://cohere-ca.ncl.ac.uk/#/grid/319

Wurzel, R., Zito, A. and Jordan, A., 2013. *The European government and governance mix: a comparative analysis of the use of new European environmental policy instruments*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.