



# Cultural Base

Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

Florence, 1-2 December 2016

Anna Triandafyllidou,  
Jeremie Molho &  
Irina Isaakyan  
European University Institute

### Work Package 3

December 2016

[info@culturalbase.eu](mailto:info@culturalbase.eu)

[www.culturalbase.eu](http://www.culturalbase.eu)

© 2016 CulturalBase



This project has received funding from  
the European Union's Horizon 2020  
research and innovation programme  
under grant agreement No. 649454





# Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

## Table of Contents

<b>1. WORKSHOP RATIONALE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. WORKSHOP DYNAMICS AND SESSIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
INTRODUCTION TO THE CULTURAL BASE PLATFORM	6
SESSION 1: EUROPEAN HERITAGE: BETWEEN CONFLICT AND CONSENSUS	8
SESSION 2: NEW CULTURAL COMMONS FOR EUROPE IN THE 21ST CENTURY	12
SESSION 3: CREATIVITY AND DIGITALISATION: SYNERGIES AND TENSIONS	15
SESSION 4: DEBATE IDEAS FOR A NEW RESEARCH AND POLICY AGENDA ON CULTURAL HERITAGE AND EUROPEAN IDENTITIES	18
<b>4. CONCLUDING REMARKS</b>	<b>22</b>



# Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

## 1. Workshop rationale

---

The European Union is at yet another crossroad after the Brexit referendum's results, the overall rise of the Far Right in several EU countries, and while another migrant and refugee flows crisis is still looming. Indeed the EU once more needs an Escape to the Future – it needs to creatively rethink what it is that holds us Europeans together, what sets us apart, how we are different from other continents, what is unique in our culture, and indeed how do we deal with our conflicts and diversity.

Coming up with new ideas on Europe's identity and cultural heritage can indeed be a lever for social innovation which can improve quality of life, feelings of security and of trust across Europe, and may also boost economic activity.

This workshop is the last of a series of encounters between researchers, stakeholders and policy makers in the wider field of European cultural studies, organised under the auspices of the CulturalBase Platform. Building on our previous work, we propose here a set of topics which put forward priorities for future research and policy programmes. Our aim is to discuss this with cultural heritage managers/decision makers – people coming from both public and private organisations who make decisions and create synergies in this domain about projects, programmes and policies. At the same time we are involving in the discussion grassroots stakeholders: smaller organisations but also larger networks that work on the ground with heritage and the arts. The scope of the workshop is to engage in dialogue and build a new research and policy agenda for European cultural heritage and for European identity/ies.

The workshop is organized by the Global Governance Programme of the European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies in the framework of the Cultural Base: Social Platform on Cultural Heritage and European Identities project, funded by Horizon 2020.



# Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

## 2. Participants

---

Simona Bodo, ISMU Foundation - Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity

Jasper Chalcraft, Sussex University

Jill Cousins, Europeana Foundation

Carlo Cubero, Tallinn University

Gerard Delanty, Sussex University

Cornelia Dümcke, Culture Concepts

Lars Ebert, European League of Institutes of Arts (ELIA)

Mercedes Giovinazzo, Interarts

Elisa Grafulla Garrido, EUNIC

Marcus Haraldsson, Europe Grand Central

Vittorio Iervese, University of Modena

Péter Inkei, Budapest Cultural Observatory

Perla Innocenti, University of Northumbria and University of Glasgow

Višnja Kisic, Europa Nostra Serbia

Sabrina Marchetti, Ca' Foscari University

Ulrike H. Meinhof, University of Southampton

Susana Pallarés, University of Barcelona

Dominique Poulot, University of Paris I

Arturo Rodríguez Morato, University of Barcelona



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

Philip Schlesinger, University of Glasgow

Isabelle Schwarz, European Cultural Foundation

John Sell, Europa Nostra, JPI

Isidora Stanković, University of Paris I

Grete Swensen, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research

Tamás Szűcs, European University Institute

Anna Triandafyllidou, European University Institute

Aleksandra Uzelac, Institute for Development and International Relations

Sarah Whatley, Coventry University

Matías Zarlenga, University of Barcelona

Orit Kamir, Israeli Center for Human Dignity



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### 3. Workshop dynamics and sessions

---

#### Introduction to the Cultural Base Platform

##### **Arturo Rodríguez Morato:**

First of all, I would like to explain the basic logic of our project. We are a Social Platform, aiming to develop a research agenda and policy recommendations in the area of cultural heritage, cultural identities and cultural expressions. We are now in the last phase of the project. This is a collective work with many people involved including academics and various stakeholder networks. One kind of stakeholders is practitioners related to cultural institutions and administrations. We are promoting debates for building these agendas. This includes workshops (such as this one and a previous one held in Barcelona) and online consultations.

We work across the following three main analytic perspectives: Cultural Memory; Cultural Inclusion; and Cultural Creativity. We are actually considering the field of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Identities from these three perspectives.

Our project has several phases. In phase 1 from mid-2015 we explored research literature and policy developed in six thematic areas (outlined on our website). We discussed them at the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop, where we identified 12 thematic areas for research and policy recommendations. In phase 2 we elaborated Vision Documents on each of the 12 thematic areas selected identifying their future scenarios and main challenges. We have discussed on these Vision Documents within the whole Social Platform through online consultations and in a big conference held in Barcelona. Now we are in the third phase. From the results of the previous discussions and documents we are currently elaborating a complete research agenda and policy recommendations along the lines of our three thematic axes.

##### **Anna Triandafyllidou:**

Cultural Base is a coordination-and-support action, building on already existing research to translate it to policy-makers. As a response to the crisis, there was a feeling that culture responds to contemporary challenges better than economics: in terms of *who* we are, it makes us think about our lives and to make choices. However, during this last couple of years, Europe has faced a number of challenges. Refugee flows have



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

grown dramatically. The capacity of different European countries to receive them was uneven. Populist discourses and movements have been rising throughout Europe. We are also at a phase of post-industrial transformation, and the EU lifestyle has been seen in danger. Populists think that we should go back to our historical past and ‘gain control’ over our lives. However, this is not just a European issue, think only of the US 2016 election result. Plus in different countries in Europe we witness different dynamics. Last but not least, Brexit is another “elephant in the room”.

So this is the context in which our dialogue with stakeholders is inscribed. This coming Sunday (4 December) we have an important Referendum in Italy and the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of Austrian elections. We seek cultural heritage as a way to rethink our values and to go beyond such populist debates. The 3 panels of today will reflect specifically on the 3 basic thematic axes of the project. We tackle each set in each panel. We also try to speak to a wider policy agenda.



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

# Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

## Session 1: European Heritage: Between Conflict and Consensus

Chair: Sabrina Marchetti, Ca'Foscari, University of Venice

Introduction: Jasper Chalcraft and Gerard Delanty, University of Sussex

Discussants: Višnja Kisic, Europa Nostra Serbia, Lars Ebert, European League of Institutes of Arts (ELIA)

### **Gerard Delanty:**

I would like to invite you to the reconsideration of what might be an important perspective on culture for the next year. There is much to suggest that nations are now deeply divided and that the greater divisions are now within than between nations. We have identified four areas for future research and policy.

### **Jasper Chalcraft:**

Between conflict and consensus – the truth is that in such a milieu, we cannot agree on everything. At least, we could agree that heritage is important. First, we should recognize the importance of heritage for identity, and that it might have a key role in mediating between different policy areas of the EU's cultural action. Second, we must try to reconcile the conflict between cultural heritage and economic heritage. One main problem is found in the critical interpretation of heritage as being a peculiarly Western heritage, and with strong echoes of the 'imperial western civilising project'; minority heritages rarely receive funding, which is instead frequently used on projects, sites and practices that support the majority narrative of the past. We need to consider this criticism carefully, but not be overly constrained by it. Recent heritage activities like UNESCO's #UNITE4HERITAGE bring back the issue of heritage rights and access to culture. Human rights are often criticised as Eurocentric, but they are also a way that transnational grassroots movements resist coercion and they may help to make more plural pasts.

We often think about transnational heritage and forget to look at differences within the nation or the region. This raises a number of questions to think about in the future. Which (local) communities will be involved in and excluded from heritage debates? How can we include dominant institutions in negotiating (minority) cultural heritage? What is the role of digital technologies in pluralising European identities? Could



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

heritage rights be a useful framework for supporting educational and non-commercial uses of the past?

Whenever we try to pin-down what exactly is European heritage we risk conflict. Our transnational heritages are often difficult pasts, for example as in the case of colonial soldiers in the First World War.

### **Gerard Delanty:**

We should distinguish between different levels of thinking about such things. Unfortunately, the widely used term “civilization” does not work any more in relation to cultural heritage. There are tensions between European and non-European heritage. What is the Europe that is envisioned as pluralized? We are experiencing problems with singularity versus plurality, and European heritage becomes the main reference point. I am personally interested in the mechanisms, or processes, of going and flowing in cultural heritage. What is the normative significance for heritage and plurality? Under what conditions do cultures become inter-penetrated by each other?

### **Višnja Kisic:**

I am a Serbian representative for *Europa Nostra* and heritage researcher. My research focus is on heritage dissonance. Both presentations touch upon the notion of plurality and interactions in European heritage.

Another challenge is the idea of historical understanding once we open the Pandora box of our cultural heritage. The challenge is establishing the policy agenda while defining the basic concept of heritage (which in the meantime remains still ambivalent). We should also acknowledge the role of social boundaries in plurality related to heritage: instead of defining the heritage as transnational, we should focus on the plural aspects of its manifestation within one particular community.

We should also recognize and explore the role of transnational memory – and the fact that any individual can actually create her/his own heritage through this trajectory. When we recognize the heritage differences, all venues become suddenly very open – but also extremely uncomfortable, thus creating heritage dissonance.

Unfortunately, one aspect of heritage has been ignored: we missed talking about communism as a valid East-European and European heritage rather than just an evil of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It should be incorporated into the European cultural heritage.



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

The problem is that participation in heritage-concentrated places such as museum visits does not necessarily mean critical thinking – citizens must be specifically taught to deal with heritage. People are not prepared to deal with cultural plurality. In this relation, the role of museums should be explored more. Educational, media, and arts policies should focus on what the individual can realistically do.

### **Lars Ebert:**

My perspective is that of a practitioner. Rethinking cultural heritage and resolving its conceptual ambiguity represents a major challenge. Victims can be also perpetrators in the eyes of the other. The local community, and its understanding of history, has to be included in the heritage debates. Who actually sets the heritage agenda? Everyone has the right for self-representation and heritage claims. When dealing with heritage, we must find the appropriate ethics of conflict resolution.

### **Questions:**

- Can you please explain more your position on communism as a specifically European project? How can we bring back the focus on the historical episode?
- Can we avoid hegemonic cultural narratives? What kind of ideology is behind them?

### **Višnja Kisic:**

Heritage policy is always open because heritage corresponds to different values. Heritage is a complex phenomenon, there is always heritage dissonance, heritage is always conflictual. Any attempt to stabilize it shall lead to further conflicts.

### **Gerard Delanty:**

Transnational heritage adds complexity – we should give representation of different groups. Inheritance from the past is always positive. But there is an issue regarding the way the interpretation of the past is re-evaluated. There is by now a patrimonial approach to heritage, meaning that other possible interpretations are excluded.

### **Jasper Chalcraft:**

There is a lot of pressure on culture. But identification with the past is open, and this is a very risky process. The problem is narrating a new narrative for Europe. Who has the right for the European heritage? Anyone. We cannot avoid hegemonic narratives. Yet, researchers and practitioners should find ways deal with plurality.



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### **Lars Ebert:**

To recognize shame as part of heritage is not a burden.

### **Questions:**

- How to deal with the market dimension?
- Shall we commemorate the 1917 October Revolution?
- What shall we tell to uneducated citizens? How can we create heritage that would be open to plurality but still warm to our heart?
- Will it be possible to create a European heritage that would fight Islamophobia?
  
- Could we have some research on tipping points?
- One thing we have not said is that narratives come because people have an interest in them. At the same time, there is still Holocaust denial and competition for victimhood among the EU states. Islamophobia and anti-Semitism are very much part of the closure of the national. How can we explain this?

### **Jasper Chalcraft:**

(Citing the FARO Convention) Every person has a cultural choice to engage in a heritage of his/her choice while respecting that of others.

We have not yet mentioned cultural diplomacy – but it could be important. We still have a very material option of negotiating cultural objects. A further problem is that cultural rights are often thought of as minority rights – of the minority claiming the authorship. This leaves the legal and policy interpretations of heritage rights with a lot of complex baggage.



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### Session 2: New Cultural Commons for Europe in the 21st Century

Chair: Perla Innocenti, University of Northumbria and University of Glasgow

Introduction: Anna Triandafyllidou, EUI

Discussants: Simona Bodo, ISMU Foundation & John Sell, Europa Nostra

#### **Anna Triandafyllidou:**

There is something European in all national identities. There is a national version of Europe found in each country. It makes sense to speak in plural about European identities. The relationship between European identity and class needs to be explored more.

Concerning the theme of diversity, the EU has the slogan of “nurturing diversity”, and this slogan refers to historicity of national and regional relations. But the question of what happens to migrants and post-migration minorities is not included in the slogan.

Religion is often incorporated in the cultural heritage – but it often becomes invisible. In discourses, “religious diversity” is used to stop wars – but not to add to cultural heritage. We question the role of history – as a method and as a variable.

We also need to acknowledge the dark side of European identities. There are people who lack mobility resources, or just do not want to become European. There are a lot of mobility projects that end up with poverty, marginalization and interrupted careers. The reality does consist only of happy-go-lucky Erasmus students.

#### **Simona Bodo:**

Opening to alteration does not mean becoming tolerant. While cultural capital can be accumulated heritage cannot – it comes with experience. How is heritage defined by individuals? How can museum become a place of diversity and cultural heritage? We should look for mechanisms to encourage interaction between people at the grassroots level. A key research recommendation is to focus on past initiatives to study shared spaces.

#### **John Sell:**



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

Cultural heritage is not necessarily good. We should remember about the changed nature of political discourses. Is it really necessary to define heritage? Or is it enough just to believe in it? Regarding the question of religion, now we see countries where non-believers became the majority. The question of religion is often the one of new religions such as Islam but also evangelical churches. Do they exclude themselves or are they excluded by others? The traditional working class are fearful because of globalisation. They have lost working class culture because of the diminishing role of the working class institutions such as the trade unions. The working class has been deskilled. This is part of the heritage.

### **Questions:**

- How should we understand the notion of shared space in relation to heritage?
- Why are excluded audiences asked to wear uniforms? Does it give them the opportunity to engage emotionally – and not only culturally? How can we create new connections between people and objects?
- Should there be more formalized shared place like museum?
- Most of Europe will claim that her heritage is neutral, and this is a problem of the lack of knowledge.
- How does the heritage dialogue between researchers and policy-makers relate to populist threats and growing discourses against unity and diversity?

### **Simona Bodo.**

Most museums have been created in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to represent and validate national or local identity. This hinders most museums from embracing this new way of working. There is also a semantic reason for this. The immediate association of heritage is with inheritance: you are born with it, it is not something that you embrace.

Before, there were a lot of talks about museums as places where intercultural dialogue takes place. I conducted a research on this subject and what came out, was that there were different understandings of what it meant, and a lot of ambiguity: 1- an approach towards promoting a native understanding (showcasing difference). 2- the promotion of heritage literacy (new citizens not familiar with a country's heritage). 3- ethnographic heritage had been promoting self-awareness in migrant communities, helping them to keep a link with their own culture of origin.

### **John Sell:**



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

Heritage is a word that does not make much sense for ordinary people. They do not understand it. Museums are interesting because they can tackle things that other places cannot. But the bad side of commercialization destroys heritage.

Why do older people visit their native places? Not only because they were born in these places or because they lived there when they were young, but because these places were associated with some important cornerstones.

### **Anna Triandafyllidou:**

Heritage and identity are issues in which the majority are not interested. The issue of identity is visible when it is contested and challenged. Why are we talking about museums as the epicentre of heritage? What about the zones of free time and family time? What about socialization in cafes? Many things are now more and more interactive – but the leading interactive role belongs now to the Internet. In my childhood we went to the theatre, which is another alternative to restore heritage. Minorities have less free time to go to the museum because of their workloads. We need to dig more into this socio-economic aspect.



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### Session 3: Creativity and Digitalisation: Synergies and Tensions

**Chair:** Arturo Rodríguez Morato, University of Barcelona, CulturalBase Coordinator

**Introduction:** Philip Schlesinger, University of Glasgow

**Discussants:** Jill Cousins, European Foundation; Sarah Whatley, Europeana Space

#### **Philip Schlesinger:**

The aim of the session was to put the questions raised by the Digital Single Market in a longer-term perspective.

The first presentation *inter alia* set out key points addressed in the Vision Document produced for CulturalBase's Barcelona conference in May 2016.

The session as a whole involved discussion about the current state of play in the policy field and its implications in practice. The respondents presented their thinking about first, the Europeana project and second the relationship of performance (notably dance) to the current drive for the digitisation of culture. The introductory talk set out key policy moves and also the agenda for future research.

#### **Jill Cousins:**

It is important to learn how to measure the impact of the digital market on culture. The issue we faced by Europeana is that it can only see material if it is out of copyright and consequently out of the digital market. Over the past 10 years, the EU has created a legislative framework, which remains complex to navigate. One of the fastest growing sector is cultural sector which is composed in SMEs. But they have another role, they have a role in shaping what culture is today. For the Digital Single Market to work, we need copyright agreements to allow works to circulate more freely, for access and payment. It is about making sure that what you want to access is accessible from wherever you are.



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### **Sarah Whatley:**

We should learn more how to measure value. What is important is not only *what* we measure but also *how* we measure. Different member states have different notions of copyright.

Digital technologies have entered the performance sphere offering new opportunities. Creativity and the digital economy are interconnected interdependent. They correspond to mixed communities, mixed practices. It creates productive tensions.

It is important to know what it's happening at the underground level, where there is a growing community related to common wealth. They promote a social action, and they work on a different economic model. It's a sharing community, not interested in commercial exploitation, even though they have created some really interesting innovative tools, which have an impact in the museum communities per example.

### **Philip Schlesinger:**

The digital economy is spread around the world but with regional interpretations. In the field of copyright it is still very difficult to achieve agreement on how the rules are applied across the European space and this is likely to continue.

In the last 15 years, creativity was obliged to speak the language of growth. This is a curious situation. We know the limitations of this model. But those who point this out are not listened to. If you want to access resources you have to walk the walk and talk the talk. If not, you're regarded as someone who does not understand the rules of the game. This mode of thought has 20 years of history behind it and has never weakened. It has even spread to China, with indigenized varieties elsewhere. If I were a consultant, I would want to beat the game by using the terminology. How can I put this so that I'm not compromised, and doing the thing I want to do?

### **Jill Cousins:**

The previous Commissioner was seriously about making money out of culture. It puts us in a difficult position on what we should be doing. Now we are bringing back the argument that we need to make connectivity the key. There are many ways to create creative objects. For example, Europeana is developing games about cats. You cannot imagine how many ways there are to turn your cat into a masterpiece.

### **Sarah Whatley**



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

There is an issue around work stolen and appropriated, which creates complexities. One of the works of a very well known dancer in the contemporary dance milieu was put on YouTube. And Beyoncé used it. The dancer in question was not happy about it and criticized Beyoncé for missing the point of the work. She asked other people to remix the work and put out their own versions. Many were done. She turned the problem into an interesting project.

### **Philip Schlesinger:**

#### Directions for digital development:

1. The Europeana example of war memories showed that it was indeed considered important *to do something really valuable*: people were giving time to deposit and they did it with hope that it would make a difference.
2. We must *ask whether any given initiative is free* or whether it is intended to make a profit.
3. In economic terms, people usually tend to think about the short term and this should be considered. *How do you argue about the rationality of public purposes in a field that is market-driven?*



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### Session 4: Debate Ideas for a New Research and Policy Agenda on Cultural Heritage and European Identities

**Chair:** Tamás Szücs, EUI

**Discussants:** Grete Swensen, NIKU, Norway; Peter Inkei, Budapest Cultural Observatory; Marcus Haraldsson, Europe Grand Central; Elisa Grafulla Garrido, EUNIC

#### **Tamás Szücs**

The goal of this presentation is to present the latest institutional development within the European commission, the collaboration with the European Parliament, regarding the organisation of the European Year of Cultural Heritage in 2018. The general approach was adopted 10 years ago and decisions regarding the organisation were adopted 2 days ago, so the timing of the conference is good. The schedule is from early 2017.

Cultural heritage has been a priority since 2007. There is a consensus among EU institutions that European cultural heritage is a resource, and its correct management increases social cohesion and has economic benefits. Several DGs are involved in this project. It will benefit from different programs and lines of funding. It will be the only European year under the Juncker commission, so it will have an important part to play. This is why the European Commission decided to set up a Working Group in 2017. Members of civil society will be invited during the implementation stage. Meetings with cultural stakeholders have started during the preparation phase. There seems to be a potential for the year to lead to concrete outcomes.

In 2018, policy recommendations will be elaborated. Furthermore a regulation on cultural imports into Europe will be proposed and hopefully adopted (to fight against illegal trade of cultural artefact). In the framework of Creative Europe, separate projects may be launched. One of the objectives was to commemorate the victims of the atrocity of communism. Another category of action is the events, which are essential to reach out to citizens. A series of events could be organised around the Cultural Heritage Days. This year offers an opportunity for cultural stakeholders to participate and to contribute. The Cultural Base project is mentioned. It could be involved in the planning phase in 2017 and the implementation in 2018.



**Cultural  
Base** Social Platform  
on Cultural Heritage  
and European Identities

## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### **Grete Swensen**

NIKU is an independent research institute for applied research on cultural heritage. Archaeological conservation, adaptation of building, cultural heritage and development, polar region and indigenous people. I am an ethnologist, focusing the use of cultural assets in contemporary society. I worked on how the adaptive reuse of buildings can be an asset in development.

Heritage is not necessarily something we are proud of. Maybe we do not have enough tools and experience on how to approach it in real life situations. Heritage dissonance allows for different uses and conflicting memories to be talked about. But we also need to get across the borders between experts and users. We agree on dissonance, but do we agree with other people? Does the rest of the cultural heritage sector agree with this? They never talk about the dissonance. There are a lot that do not think this way. They think of cultural heritage as an economic asset.

When it comes to cultural heritage, it is related to intangible heritage. Migrants brought a lot of memories. Using oral history is very important. Methodology is important. There are many ways of telling a story. We have to step out of our own disciplines, to reach out and enable user participation, find new way of involving artists in new settings. There also is a need to change the research funding from very short-term problems to more long-term issues of stimulating creativity and intercultural encounters.

### **Peter Inkei**

There are basic ideological problems with identity. It is the case when identity is used as national character. In that sense it is a binding concept. You have to wear and you are bound to those characteristics. This is a closed concept of identity. From inside it is a brand and from outside a cliché. Regarding European identity, it is not only an order coming from the European Commission. We are interested in exploring what brings us together. There is the external approach: How Chinese or South Africans think of Europeans. This is a test, which can recompose our common perceptions. As for the internal approach, beyond the dominant narrative, which are the other components of society, what should be taken in account? One aspect is class, particularly working class, which is losing ground.

We were encouraged to conduct studies in relation to migrants. What do they see of their heritage? A suggestion is a permanent forum (not just *ad hoc*). The European year of heritage is a good occasion to create a forum like this. The simplistic memory treatments are not new. It's not just conscious falsification, but also ignorance and



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

amnesia. In my part of Europe, where 10 million lives, 1 millions of other people lived (German Armenians, Turks) and left during the Balkans wars. What process of the European year of heritage can be developed? In the practice of Europa Nostra, a lot was for the restoration of the monument and not on the meaning. When you go to Thessaloniki, you do not know Ataturk was born there. It is not only important for tourism, but also to celebrate the diversity of the place.

### **Marcus Haraldsson**

Possibly, the digital shift brings new possibilities for learning and sharing knowledge. Facebook feeds can be viewed as an on-going heritage, without copyright. There is a fragmentation of the cultural landscape in the media. We can access a lot more information, but there are also social bubbles.

I initially worked on environmental conflicts in China. I was a journalist on Chinese politics. In the last job in China, I was travelling in borders. These borderlands taught me a lot about this culture and its diversity. Then I went to South Africa, I didn't know anything about this country. I did an exhibition about crossborder traders. But I decided to change my role into a facilitator. People themselves were responsible for their stories. They were representing their own material. I developed this as a method. I got a scholarship at Columbia to develop it. I developed an app to enable people to do it: Interactive storey-telling on borders. People also want to show their methods. We started therefore Europe Grand Central. It is a network of cultural centres in Europe and Mediterranean. Different organisations have joined, such as the European Capital of Culture of 2020, or a library. We can search on 35 projects. There are self-estimates of projects and subjective measures are developed.

### **Elsa Grafulla Garrido**

It is important to understand Europe in global terms, European heritage within a globally connected world. A research action of the EU Commission on the proposition of the Parliament was developed: 54 countries were covered to analyse the role of culture in their relation with EU. When approaching the other there is a tendency to showcase our value and culture positively. But at the same time, there is a need for mutual listening, the building of understanding and trust. If you talk beyond positive and negative, then you are in the position to build a relationship.

The council of minister adopted conclusions on preparatory actions, pointing at a lack of coordination and a need for strategic approach at EU level. The joint communication was born at the end of June (toward a cultural strategy for international relations). Three



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

main actions were adopted: First, a wider and deeper definition of culture (beyond arts), second, the concept of mutuality, building trust and understanding, third, three thematic pillars (Intercultural dialogue, socioeconomic development and culture, cooperation on cultural heritage). It will define a lot of the actions that will take place in the future.

How does research inform action? A lot of research is unknown and not used. There is a gap between academia, practitioners and policymakers. One of the goals of projects should be to influence policymakers, beyond research agenda to influence policy. How can you help build bridges? You need to translate your work in an understandable language, despite the risk of oversimplifying. It is also important to fully exploit the potential. Building bridges would help gathering data for your research.

### **Questions**

How is it translated into practice that it is a European year of heritage in the practice of cultural actors who are involved in making tours and restoration?

How was this year chosen?

The place of Southeast Europe and neighbours potential members

### **Tamas Szucs**

It was a conscious decision to have just one year. The commission thought it would be interesting to have this year, because it is the anniversary of the end the first World War. I do not know of other propositions of commissions that went through so fast (5 months for adoption). There was an agreement of the necessity of this year.

We are planning to develop better statistics for heritage by working with Eurostat. But Eurostat depends on member state data. In some member states, there is no data. Some do not want to provide data on this. DG grow is keen for initiatives on tourism. There is cooperation with UNESCO on world heritage site routes.

### **Marcus Haraldsson**

Producing data that is useful for policy is not easy. It implies trying to put in boxes things that cannot be put in boxes. A lot of practitioners do not want to be in a spreadsheet. But a lot of practitioners want their stories to be told. But if it is for statistical purposes, they do not want to spend time on that.



## Synthetic Summary of the Debates of the Florence Policy Workshop

### 4. Concluding Remarks

---

We all share that heritage is important for reconciliation. But our emphasis on heritage dissonances can be problematic – heritage is a double sword – it can celebrate diversity but it is also used by populists in a very nationalistic and exclusionary way.

We covered new ground such as freeing culture from the market, without ignoring the cost of culture.

There are a lot of linkages between national and European programmes, but there could be more. There are different versions of Europe.

There is a need for more coordination support actions. More funding to exploit and disseminate what has already been done.