Introduction

THE EUROPEAN POLICY OF CULTURE
Between economic paradigm and the rhetoric of exception
Oriane Calligaro, with the contribution of Antonios Vlassis

This document is the English version of:

Oriane Calligaro, With the contribution of Antonios Vlassis« La politique européenne de la culture », *Politique européenne* 2017/2 (No 56), p. 8-28.

Translated and edited by Cadenza Academic Translations
Translator: Peter Collins, Editor: Matt Burden, Senior editor: Mark Mellor

----

Available online at :

----

https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E_POEU_056_0008--the-european-policy-of-culture.htm

----

How to cite this article :

Oriane Calligaro, With the contribution of Antonios Vlassis« La politique européenne de la culture », *Politique européenne* 2017/2 (No 56), p. 8-28.

Introduction

The European policy of culture
*Between economic paradigm
and the rhetoric of exception*

Oriane Calligaro
Université Catholique de Lille, Université libre de Bruxelles

With the contribution of Antonios Vlassis
University of Liège

Translated by Cadenza Academic Translations[1]

Jean Monnet's phrase "If I had to do it all over again, I would start with culture" is frequently voiced by politicians and those on the artistic and cultural scene. Although the words have long been known to be apocryphal, the phrase continues to be quoted with the aim of enlisting the founding father's posthumous support in calling for greater EU intervention in the cultural sector or even a "European cultural policy." The EU, in fact, does not have a cultural policy, strictly speaking. Its work in the cultural sector is modestly funded, adheres strictly to the principle of subsidiarity, and is scattered among numerous different areas of intervention and funding systems. Due to its fragmented nature, studies on the subject refer rather to "cultural Europe" (Autissier 1999; Dubois 2001), the "Europe of culture" (Sticht 2000; Autissier 2005), or "the cultural politics of Europe" (Shore 2000; Patel 2013a); there are few that allude to a "European cultural policy" (Denuit 2016).

It is difficult to define the limits of cultural policy as a form of public intervention, even in countries like France where it is highly institutionalized (Dubois 1999). Its hazy outlines are partly the result of the elusive nature of the subject itself, culture being such a vast and polysemous category. On the one hand, the term refers both to architectural, artistic, and intellectual heritage from the past, as well as contemporary cultural expressions and artifacts created by artists or produced and distributed by cultural industries. On the other hand, in its anthropological sense, it refers to traditions, customs, values, and a set of ways of life and representations (Bennett 1998, 102–105). Culture thus has a dual nature, oscillating between symbolic and

---

1   Translator's note: Unless otherwise stated, all translations of cited foreign language material in this article are our own.

material spheres and between intrinsic value and market value, thus raising a series of economic, social, and identity-based issues for those involved in its governance. The formulation and implementation of European intervention in the cultural sector thus relate to three types of closely associated dimensions: The global industrial and trade dimension, due to the importance of cultural goods in commercial exchanges, especially since the end of the 1980s; the socio-economic dimension, since cultural industries—which have a considerable media, economic, and symbolic influence—and professional cultural organizations put political pressure on government authorities and EU institutional bodies; and lastly the political and cultural dimensions, since cultural expressions can be used to promote European identity and are also inseparable from national, regional, and local identities, producing tensions and competition among those promoting these different levels of identity.

Culture as a European issue is thus located at the confluence of different fields of public policy and different levels of governance. It is this multidimensional aspect that this special issue of *Politique européenne* intends to explore. The subject of the issue is "European policy of culture" rather than European cultural policy, insofar as culture can be enlisted and regulated within commercial, industrial, communication, and even development policies, beyond a cultural policy in the strict sense. Adopting a range of methodologies and scales of analysis, the six contributions in this issue also provide an account of the range of actors and levels of governance in play in the definition and implementation of the European policy of culture. The area of governance constituted by EU institutions and their interactions with national governments interlocks with other areas where norms and practices are built, also defining the contours of culture as a European issue. These include international organizations such as the Council of Europe and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), multilateral trade agreements, development partnerships with third countries, and European cultural events staged at a local level. These different areas are spaces in which not only institutions and government may operate and intervene, but also artists, professional associations from the cultural sector, representatives of the creative industries, and internet giants, all of which shape the European policy of culture, to different degrees and in different ways. After a reminder of the history of the development of EU competences in the cultural sector and a presentation of the state of the art, this introduction will then present the objectives and the main lines of analysis followed in this special issue, introduce the contributions contained, and finish with the conclusions they allow one to formulate.

Context and emergence of a European policy of culture

The concept of a European policy of culture raises fundamental questions about its range and its objectives, as neither the limits nor the content of such a policy are self-evident. Should the policy promote a common European culture—and if so, what would that be?—or should it promote the diversity of national and regional or local cultures present on the continent (Bonet and Négrier 2011)? How can one then justify the restriction of this policy to the countries within the EU at the exclusion of members of "Greater Europe", represented by the Council of Europe? Are artistic creation and the production and dissemination of European cultural products ends in themselves of EU intervention, or rather cross-sectoral resources (Yúdice 2003) used to achieve economic, social, democratic, and other objectives? Lastly, can a European policy of culture limit itself to encouraging collaboration among artists and cultural institutions within the EU, or should it promote and disseminate European culture and European cultural products around the world?

These issues have affected and continue to affect the emergence and the definition of EU intervention in the cultural sector. The EU was late to enter this field of public policy, but it has become an important player. And though not granted a legal basis until the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, EU intervention actually started much earlier. From the 1960s onwards, the European Court of Justice, the European Commission, and the European Parliament all produced judgments and legislative documents amounting to discreet intervention in the field of culture. The initiatives were initially limited to the regulation and harmonization envisaged by the treaties. Representatives of the cultural sector (notably from film), however, and those acting within the European Parliament, the Commission, and at a governmental level all applied pressure on the European Communities in the 1960s, and even more so in the 1970s and 1980s, to take "positive" action to support culture. And it was in the 1980s that Jean Monnet's apocryphal phrase emerged to justify an intervention with no legal backing and opposed by numerous member states.

The emergence of EU cultural intervention has been affected by two major tensions: the opposition of member states to EU intervention in a sensitive sector linked to the representation of power and identities, and divisions over the nature of the intervention, which are rooted in the recognition (or lack thereof) of the "exceptionality" of cultural goods. The opposition

of member states is mainly explained by the fact that, on a national level, several countries deal with culture in very different ways, and this makes it difficult to reach an agreement on a common approach (Littoz-Monnet 2007; Dubois 2015). The intervention of EU bodies in the cultural sector has long been associated with the promotion of a common European identity and a federalist vision of the European project, thus rendering it unacceptable to certain member states that favor a purely regulatory approach. For this reason, the cultural competences finally included in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty adhered to the strict principle of subsidiarity, and, while referring to a common heritage, make reference to cultures in the plural. Article 128 stipulates that "the Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore."[2] The article is ambiguous in its reference to both "diversity" and "common heritage." Intervention in culture, then, is characterized by a tension between the diversity of cultures in Europe and the promotion of a common European culture.

A second tension results from the opposition between culture and the market and the possible "exceptionality" of cultural goods within the market. Although those who promote an interventionist policy have stressed the specificity of cultural goods and services and their role in the emergence of a European identity and a more politically integrated Europe, culture as an EU competence is primarily a sector of the economy and thus subject to the laws of the common market (Dubois 2001; Littoz-Monnet 2007). Divergent visions about whether the cultural sector should be protected or liberalized have given rise to profound divisions between member states. These divisions focused on the concept of "cultural exception" ("*exception culturelle*") during the European debate on the scope and objectives of the "Television Without Frontiers" directive adopted in 1989 and subsequently revised several times, and during multilateral discussions on the General Agreement on Trade in Services in 1993, as well as the treatment of cultural goods and services on the agenda of trade negotiations. The concept of cultural exception recognizes that cultural goods and services, seen as vehicles of ideas, values, and collective representations, "are not goods like any others," according to the then president of the European Commission, Jacques

---

2   Article 128 of the Maastricht Treaty, then Article 151 of the Treaty of Amsterdam and now Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Delors, in 1993, and must therefore be exempt from certain European and international free market regulations. The principle of cultural exception also therefore legitimizes public policies in favor of cultural goods and services, as they cannot be reduced to simple consumer goods (Depetris 2008; Vlassis 2015a). The concept of cultural exception has been integrated into EU policy via a linked concept, that of "cultural diversity," which is found in the "European agenda for culture in a globalizing world" adopted in 2007, the first policy framework in cultural matters adopted on an EU-wide scale. The text sets out three objectives: The promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue; the promotion of culture as a catalyst for creativity within the framework of the Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs; and the promotion of culture as a vital element in EU international relations. These objectives refer to three fundamental dimensions of culture as a European issue: Culture as a means of expressing identities; culture as a resource for achieving socio-economic goals; and lastly, culture as an element of European influence on a global scale.

State of the art

The complexity of culture as an area of European public policy, viewed both as a marker of identity and a factor of economic growth, together with its slow and arduous integration into EU competences, have inspired a considerable body of literature in a range of disciplines. The majority of research tends to emphasize the role or the place of culture in the process of European integration limited to the EU and to specific aspects of EU intervention in the field of culture (Dubois 2001, 263). There are few studies that offer an overall vision of the "Europe of culture" beyond the borders of the EU, in a long-term approach that integrates the contributions of international and non-governmental organizations (Brossat 1999; Autissier 2005; 2016).

Political scientists, focusing on the study of the institutions involved, have analyzed the competing visions of EU cultural intervention and have retraced the various stages in its emergence in the 1980s and 1990s (Polo 2003; Littoz-Monnet 2007). Other studies, in political science, sociology, and history, have looked at specific EU cultural programs, such as the European Capitals of Culture launched in 1985; MEDIA, which was created in 1987 to support audiovisual industries; and the comprehensive program, "Creative Europe," adopted in 2014. These studies examine the way these programs were created

(Littoz-Monnet 2012), the role of experts in the process (Patel 2013b), and their implementation by national and local authorities or by cultural actors (Sassatelli 2009; Erickson and Dewey 2011; Patel 2013a). In a number of studies, researchers noticed the gradual inclusion of EU cultural intervention in initiatives undertaken to encourage growth and competitiveness following the 2000 Lisbon Strategy. Some have identified a "paradigm shift" from a cultural policy focused on developing regional, national, and European identities to one prioritizing economic considerations (Littoz-Monnet 2015). This has been described as the "creative turn" in cultural policies (Schlesinger 2017). Others interpret the increasing centrality of economic objectives as one of the forms of "governmentalization" of culture within the framework of European integration (Barnett 2001). Looking outside the EU, this governmentalization of culture has been conceptualized in studies that note the growing subordination of culture to objectives focusing on social transformation (Bennett 2003; 2007). This governmentalization has also been noted in the approach of UNESCO (Pyykkönen 2012). Under the pressure of a globalization shaped by neoliberal norms, the function of culture has been reduced to that of a resource, a mere "expedient" (Yúdice 2003).

Culture has also been instrumentalized within the context of European integration as a means of constructing identity and creating political legitimacy. EU cultural intervention has thus been interpreted as an attempt to generate a European identity or a sense of "Europeanness" and so legitimizing the EU in the eyes of citizens (Shore 2000; Calligaro 2013). Other writers have attempted to identify the foundations and the symbolic and identity-related effects of EU intervention in the cultural sector, some by analyzing its legal basis (Craufurd Smith 2004a), and others by studying the way it has been interpreted or adapted by local cultural actors (Sassatelli 2009). Other studies have focused on the joint development of visions of European culture and identity promoted by EU policies, from a relatively essentialist model to a more inclusive approach based on the concept of citizenship (Staiger 2009; Calligaro 2014).

Legal scholars have also contributed to the literature on the EU and culture, either through a cross-sectoral analysis of the impact of European law on culture in different domains such as trade, education, and sport (Craufurd Smith 2004b), or by demonstrating the effects of EU legislation on national cultural policies, in some cases identifying a Europeanization of these policies (Romainville 2015). Political scientists have also observed forms of Europeanization of national cultural policies in a given geographical region,

such as Southern Europe (Dubois and Négrier 1999), in the transformation of cultural networks as a result of EU policies (Pongy 1997), and in the various uses at a local level and for cultural purposes of EU structural funds (Hélie 2004).

Lastly, several authors have underlined the role of culture in EU trade negotiations. Since the 1990s, in a context marked by the emergence of a service society and the move to "information capitalism," a major issue has been the treatment of cultural goods and services in EU trade agreements, since the ability of governments and the EU to intervene in the cultural industries sector has been closely linked to their multilateral and bilateral commitments. In that respect, a large number of studies in political science and law have analyzed the impact of international economic integration on EU cultural policies (Psychogiopoulou 2015a) and on the commitments of the EU in connection to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Richieri Hanania and Ruiz Fabri 2014; Vlassis 2016); the strategies of the European Commission in dealing with the "trade/culture" interface (Loisen and De Ville 2011); and the power relations within EU bodies when defining these trade strategies (Vlassis 2015b).

This vast body of literature is based on an institutionalist and functionalist approach that highlights three major aspects: Power relations and the configuration of actors in political processes, with a particular focus on the political contribution and the resistance of national governments to EU cultural policy; the strategies and respective roles of the EU institutions such as the European Commission and the European Parliament in the genesis and implementation of the EU cultural policy and their not insignificant ability to change the direction of political processes; and lastly, the importance of the EU as a driver for changing cultural policies or in approaching culture as an object of public policy on a national and local level. In general, the literature dealing with culture beyond the bounds of EU intervention in the cultural sector in the strict sense is somewhat limited. A recent collective, multidisciplinary work has offered an overview of the treatment of culture by the EU through the concept of "cultural governance," tackling a variety of sectors of public intervention (Psychogiopoulou 2015b). In order to better understand the multidimensional nature of culture, this special issue also explores various domains of public policy and sets out to emphasize the diversity of the actors involved and their visions of culture and its governance.

Accounting for the many spaces and actors in the European policy of culture

By employing a range of different disciplinary approaches, this special issue sheds light on the dynamics of negotiations on culture as a European issue between EU bodies and other categories of actor involved in its definition, at various scales. Our objective is to provide a more comprehensive view of EU policy related to culture by including its interactions with actors often ignored in the existing literature and by analyzing the rarely explored areas where this policy is created and implemented. This special issue demonstrates that the European policy of culture is deployed at sectoral, local, and transnational/international areas and examines three categories of actor that, within these areas, contribute to the construction of culture as a European issue: International organizations (Council of Europe and UNESCO), whose production of norms regarding culture may be influenced or adopted by the EU; national or transnational interest groups (professional cultural associations, cultural industries, internet giants) who try to intervene in the creation and implementation of the European policy of culture with differing levels of success; and lastly, local actors, public authorities, and artists, who stage European cultural events in partnership with the EU.

In order to provide an account of the multidimensionality of the European policy of culture, the contributions in this issue employ empirical materials and varied methodologies from a range of disciplines: political science, sociology, law, and communication sciences. This enables them to examine issues of a sociocultural, political, economic, and legal nature, all of which are needed in order to understand the scope and objectives of the European policy of culture. The plurality of approaches and levels of analysis make it possible to define a number of factors that shape this policy, such as the evolution of the legal framework, technological developments, and economic or institutional transformations.

An initial objective, then, is to understand both how international organizations influence the direction of the EU in the area of culture and how the EU seeks to affirm a coherent position on the world stage. The article by Oriane Calligaro reminds us that the Council of Europe, endowed with competences in culture since its founding in 1949, was able to act as a benchmark for EU action in the field of culture. It shows that despite their interaction, the two organizations have developed different approaches to their European policy of culture. Beyond Europe, numerous UNESCO norms have had an impact

on EU positions in the field of culture, both on its internal and international policy. In 2007, for the first time in its history, the EU ratified a multilateral legal instrument in the area of culture: the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions adopted by UNESCO in 2005. The articles by Lilian Richieri Hanania and Ben Garner demonstrate the repercussions of this kind of commitment on EU policies in two areas: trade policy and development partnerships with third countries—both outside the field of culture in the strictest sense. These articles also demonstrate that the EU is not passive in these dynamics: it may also take part in the definition and dissemination of norms and practices in the cultural sector on a global level, notably in the design of international conventions or multilateral and bilateral trade agreements.

A second objective is to show how the European policy of culture is also shaped by non-governmental actors who promote or articulate their visions of culture on a European, national, or local level. Professional associations, cultural industries, and artists attempt to influence the direction of EU policies or to participate in their implementation, given that EU intervention in the cultural sector has a direct impact on their activities. Three further authors in this special issue explore the perspectives of these actors in their interactions with the EU. The article by Céleste Bonnamy analyzes the stand taken by French writers' associations against EU copyright policies and reveals the difficulties they had in organizing themselves and making their voice heard on a European level that was largely alien to them. In order to explain their differing positions with regard to the nature of EU intervention in audiovisual media, Antonios Vlassis observes certain actors who are more deeply embedded in European governance: companies in the digital sector and European professional associations from the audiovisual sector. Lastly, Dario Verderame studies actors who have much looser relations with the EU—public authorities and artists who created and organized the Festival of Europe in Florence. This allows him to observe how culture in Europe is interpreted on a local level. The special issue thus seeks to illustrate the very wide spectrum of ways in which the European cultural issue may be analyzed, from the global level down to the local level, and by actors whose positions are very different with regard to the EU decision-making process.

Lastly, this special issue draws attention to one overarching topic: the impact of the digital transition on the European policy of culture. This unprecedented transformation in the production, dissemination, and consumption

of a number of cultural goods makes it necessary to radically rethink the scope and objectives of public intervention in cultural matters. Whether it is a question of protecting the rights of artists or of promoting European cultural works, it is true that local, national, and European regulations have been weakened by the transnational, deterritorialized aspect of digitalization and by the commercial strategies of the internet giants. A coherent European response to the economic, social, and cultural effects of the digital transition requires an internal consensus that is far from having been reached. This radical upheaval is therefore now giving rise to fiercely negotiated reforms on a European and international level in which the divergent visions of culture of those participating become entrenched, providing researchers with a privileged vantage point. Richieri Hanania analyzes the effect of the digital transition on EU foreign trade policy regarding culture, Vlassis its effect on EU regulations in audiovisual media, and Bonnamy its effect on copyright.

Presentation of the contributions

In order to lend historical depth to the current debates presented subsequently in this issue, the first article by Calligaro provides a comparative analysis of the content promoted in the cultural programs of the Council of Europe and the EU throughout their existence. The objective of the study is to establish, on the basis of categories that have emerged from the sociology of culture, the types of culture they have favored, such as heritage, "highbrow," learned, elite, popular, minority, and youth cultures. The orientations that these two European organizations have given their respective cultural interventions reflect their very different raison d'êtres. In the 1950s, the Council of Europe initially stressed European "highbrow" culture. However, in keeping with its role as defender of (political, social, and economic) rights that it increasingly asserted, it very rapidly sought to promote the diversity of cultural expressions, minority cultures, and cultures located on geographical or social fringes. Over the course of the last decade, its work to promote culture has now evolved into an instrumental use of culture in policies to encourage democratization, social cohesion, and territorial development. The EU's aspiration to effect a wider political integration based on a common historical and cultural foundation has inspired those promoting EU cultural intervention since its inception and has long led them to favor an elitist culture based on heritage, although content has very gradually been diversified and there has been an increasing emphasis on socio-economic objectives.

The article by Verderame pursues this analysis of the content of cultural programs, but focuses on a case study limited in time and space. He explores the practices and staging of culture at the Festival of Europe in Florence: an event that is presented as European but that is in fact rooted at a local level. This biennial event was conceived in 2011 as part of the European Commission's communication policy and as the cultural component of the conference on the State of the Union, a political and academic event organized by the European University Institute in order to display EU powers and the EU agenda. The institutional links between the Festival of Europe and the EU were subsequently dissolved. This analysis of the 2015 festival reveals the content attributed to the Europe of Culture by local public authorities and cultural actors. The article demonstrates that despite the distance between the European political and administrative "center," numerous local actors still proposed events and performances in categories in line with EU cultural policies, in particular those relating to "heritage" and "diversity," which were also largely presented as resources for local economic development.

The article by Bonnamy widens the focus from a local to a national level in an analysis of how cultural professionals—two associations of French writers' representatives—are confronted with the effects of the single market and EU management of the digital transition on copyright: the legal framework that regulates and protects their work. Focusing specifically on the field of literature, this contribution explores the conflict between a way of understanding artists and their work that is rooted in a national tradition and another that emerges within the framework of European economic integration. It provides an illustration of how cultural goods cannot be reduced to consumer products and the consequences of attempting to do so. Cultural professionals, in this case writers, are economic agents that produce marketable goods, however they believe that they require specific protection due to their status as artists and creators, and, by extension, their creation. This vision is incompatible with the reform to copyright in the digital era adopted by the European Commission. The difficulty for French writers in accessing the supranational European space in which decisions were being made on these reforms explains their opposition and the transnationalization of their campaign.

The mobilization of cultural professionals at a European level is explored by Vlassis. The debates and controversies among the main European associations in the audiovisual, cultural, and digital fields regarding the appropriate mechanisms for regulating the audiovisual sector in the context of the digital transition are highlighted in this study on the reform of the European Audio-

visual Media Services Directive. The article reveals that the approaches of these associations—whose members are highly exposed to the effects of the digital transition and the motivating forces of this transformation—are highly divergent when it comes to the scope and the objectives of EU audiovisual policy within this new context. On the one hand, the arguments of the digital and communications associations are based on a profound challenging of public intervention in cultural matters in favor of a digital market in audiovisual services able to function without any major obstacles and aimed at achieving economic, cultural, and social objectives. On the other hand, a large number of associations of public broadcasters and cultural professionals (filmmakers, producers, screenwriters) argue in favor of new public measures on a European level, as the existing cultural policies can do little to counter the unfair competition and the undermining of existing balances in the different cultural sectors by the new digital actors.

The two last contributions study the place of culture in EU foreign policy. The article by Ben Garner explores how the EU includes cultural issues in its development policy and in the framework of its commitments as signatory to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The study examines the inclusion of a protocol on cultural cooperation in the economic partnership between the EU and the Caribbean Forum (CARIFORUM). Using a political sociology approach based on large volumes of qualitative data, the article analyzes the implementation process of the protocol and pays close attention to the different uses made of international norms promoted by UNESCO under the banner of cultural diversity or cultural development. He demonstrates that culture is a vital issue both for the European negotiators in their pursuit of commercial objectives in developing countries and for their Caribbean interlocutors seeking to integrate the cultural sector in their economic diversification strategy. The study highlights a profound disconnect between the institutional actors involved in the drawing up of the protocol on cultural cooperation and the cultural actors and professionals in the CARIFORUM countries, largely excluded from the negotiations and, at times, mobilized against the economic partnership with the EU. By adopting a top-down, instrumental approach to culture based essentially on economic goals, the EU's foreign policy glosses over cultural issues, as they exist on a local level.

Finally, the article by Richieri Hanania studies the treatment of culture in EU foreign trade policy, focusing on the effects of the digital transition, in particular for the strategy adopted by the EU with regard to the circulation

of audiovisual goods and services. The rise of new technologies has caused major EU commercial partners, the most important of which is the United States, to promote on the world stage a drive to liberalize the exchange of cultural goods and services. Based on a legal analysis of numerous regional trade agreements, the article demonstrates that, in the context of the digital transition, the EU has managed to preserve some policies and measures based on cultural exception, since audiovisual goods and services have been granted special treatment in these agreements. In an effort to protect European cultural products within a commercial area that has become highly porous due to digital technologies, the EU has been able to apply international norms, particularly those included within the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, showing once again how the European cultural issue is involved in global dynamics.

Conclusion: Economic paradigm and the rhetoric of exception and diversity

Initially within the framework of the 2000 Lisbon Strategy and then in that of the Europe 2020 strategy launched in 2010, the EU has pursued an agenda committed to growth and competitiveness. The integration of cultural policy in this agenda has been accompanied by the recognition of cultural diversity as an EU norm. The 2007 "European agenda for culture in a globalizing world" marked a paradigm shift for EU cultural intervention that has since been openly subordinated to economic objectives (Littoz-Monnet 2015). The text simultaneously asserts the function of culture as a catalyst for growth and employment and the necessary defense of cultural diversity and inter-cultural dialogue, while in the same year the EU became a signatory to the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. This special issue illustrates these two aspects of the European policy of culture; this can be seen in the interactions, or even the conflicts, between the different actors involved.

Since then, the exceptionality of cultural goods has been integrated into the discourse of all actors involved in the European policy of culture. No one seeks to question it directly and it seems to be taken into account at all levels in negotiations on the European cultural issue. On the international stage, the EU's position is to uphold the cultural exception, even in the digital age, taking a unique stand compared to other global actors. The use of this

exceptionality, however, may serve very different causes. Actors pursuing essentially economic objectives, such as representatives of digital companies or negotiators of EU trade agreements, enlist principles that are written into European and international frameworks, such as "cultural diversity," "cultural development," "cultural identities," and "intercultural dialogue." In order to bypass the dichotomy between culture and trade, these actors seek to point out that not only are free exchange and competitiveness compatible with the flourishing of cultural expressions, but even that the liberalization of exchanges encourages the diversity of content and the dynamism of cultural production. This discourse is met by different forms of resistance from actors who have a different understanding of the exceptionality of culture. This is the case of French writers who attribute a particular status to creators and their creations, endangered by the implementation of a digital single market. Similarly, public broadcasters and audiovisual professionals assert that it is impossible to protect and promote European and national cultural works without specific interventionist measures. Several articles in this issue reveal that the digital transition has reactivated debates and entrenched positions on the need to regulate the circulation of cultural goods and services in order to preserve products considered to be exceptional.

Disagreements over how to interpret the notions of exceptionality of culture or cultural diversity are not only observed in the case of digital transition. The polysemous concept of cultural diversity can be used highly selectively. The protocol on cultural cooperation associated with the EU-CARIFORUM partnership limited its interpretation of cultural diversity to the production of so-called creative industries. The activities and products of a group of local cultural actors were not taken into account, and this led to opposition to EU intervention—in this case its trade policy. This selective use of cultural diversity is closely linked to the integration of culture within a paradigm of growth and competitiveness. They converge in the discourse of international organizations with competences in cultural matters, such as the EU, the Council of Europe, and UNESCO; the cultural diversity promoted is that which is capable of stimulating economic activity, and thereby even employment and social cohesion. Thus, there is only room for certain types of actor in this economic paradigm that largely structures the European cultural issue. This means that other types of cultural expression find themselves excluded from negotiations, both within Europe and in areas where the EU pursues its foreign trade activities. The power of this paradigm is such that numerous cultural actors adapt the way they formulate and conceive their activities to fit EU categories and ensure a place for them in the cultural space redefined

in this manner. This is illustrated by the Festival of Europe in Florence, where categories such as "heritage" and "diversity" were enlisted as part of a rhetoric of "economic development through culture" in a cultural event that is local but that refers to a symbolic European space.

The link between culture and European identity/identities needing to be protected and promoted continues to be enlisted, but is not the most important justification for the European policy of culture. The economic paradigm, which, depending on the context, is formulated in terms of creativity, development, or competitiveness, has become dominant. The exceptional nature of culture as a vehicle of collective representations and identities, however, cannot be entirely set aside. Thus it is enshrined, at the most basic of levels, in EU intervention, and to a great extent in that of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, via ambiguous norms referring to "diversity" or "exception" that leave plenty of room for interpretation and appropriation. It thus appears that the adoption of the rhetoric of exceptionality and diversity by a wide range of actors involved in the European policy of culture goes hand in hand with an instrumental use of culture for the pursuit of broader objectives of economic development, intended to encourage social, or even democratic, development. This orientation of the European policy of culture reflects not only the general development of the EU agenda, but also that of international organizations with competences in culture outside of Europe.

Reference list

Autissier, Anne-Marie. 1999. *L'Europe culturelle en pratique*. Paris: La Documentation française.

Autissier, Anne-Marie. 2005. *L'Europe de la culture, Histoire(s) et enjeux*. Paris: Actes Sud.

Autissier, Anne-Marie. 2016. *Europe et culture, un couple à réinventer? Essai sur 50 ans de coopération culturelle européenne*. Toulouse: Éditions de l'Attribut.

Barnett, Clive. 2001. "Culture, Policy and Subsidiarity in the European Union: From Symbolic Identity to the Governmentalisation of Culture." *Political Geography* 20, no. 4: 405–426.

Bennett, Tony. 1998. *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London: Sage Editions.

Bennett, Tony. 2003. "Culture and Governmentality." In *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality,* edited by Jack Z. Bratich, Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy. New York: SUNY Press.

Bennett, Tony. 2007. "Making Culture, Changing Society: The Perspective of 'Culture Studies.'" *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 4-5: 610–629.

Brossat, Caroline. 1999. *La culture européenne: définition et enjeux*. Brussels: Bruylant.

Bonet, Lluìs, and Emmanuel Négrier. 2011. "The End of National Cultures? Cultural Policy in the Face of Diversity." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17, no. 5: 574–589.

Calligaro, Oriane. 2013. *Negotiating Europe: EU Promotion of Europeanness since the 1950s*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Calligaro, Oriane. 2014. "From 'European Cultural Heritage' to 'Cultural Diversity?' The Changing Core Values of European Cultural Policy." *Politique européenne*, no. 45: 60–85.

Craufurd Smith, Rachael. 2004a. "Article 151 and European Identity." In *Culture and European Union Law*, edited by Rachael Craufurd Smith, 277–297. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Craufurd Smith, Rachael. 2004b. *Culture and European Union Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Denuit, Renaud. 2016. *Politique culturelle européenne*. Brussels: Bruylant.

Depetris, Frédéric. 2008. *L'État et le cinéma en France: le moment de l'exception culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Dubois, Vincent. 1999. *La Politique culturelle. Genèse d'une catégorie d'intervention publique*. Paris: Belin.

Dubois, Vincent. 2001. "Europe culturelle" In *Dictionnaire des politiques culturelles de la France de 1959 à nos jours,* edited by Emmanuel de Waresquiel, 263–266. Paris: Larousse/CNRS.

Dubois, Vincent. 2015. [2nd edition]. "Cultural Policy Regimes in Western Europe." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* 460–465. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Dubois, Vincent, and Emmanuel Négrier. 1999. "L'institutionnalisation des politiques culturelles en Europe du Sud: éléments pour une approche comparée." *Pôle Sud,* no. 10: 5–9.

Erickson, Mary, and Patricia Dewey. 2011. "EU Media Policy and/as Cultural Policy: Economic and Cultural Tensions in MEDIA 2007." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17, no. 5: 490–509.

Hélie, Thomas. 2004. "Cultiver l'Europe. Éléments pour une approche localisée de 'l'européanisation' des politiques culturelle." *Politique européenne*, no. 12: 66–83.

Littoz-Monnet, Annabelle. 2007. *The European Union and Culture: Between Economic Regulation and Cultural Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Littoz-Monnet, Annabelle. 2012. "Agenda-Setting Dynamics at the EU level: The Case of the EU Cultural Policy." *Journal of European integration* 34, no. 5: 505–522.

Littoz-Monnet, Annabelle. 2015. "Encapsulating EU Cultural Policy into the EU's Growth and Competiveness Agenda: Explaining the Success of a Paradigmatic Shift in Brussels." In *Cultural Governance and the European Union: Protecting and Promoting Cultural Diversity in Europe*, edited by Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, 25–36. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Loisen, Jan, and Ferdi De Ville. 2011. "The EU-Korea Protocol on Cultural Cooperation: Towards Cultural Diversity or Cultural Deficit?" *International Journal of Communication*, no. 5: 254–271.

Patel, Kiran Klaus. 2013a. *The Cultural Politics of Europe: European Capitals of Culture and European Union since the 1980s*. London: Routledge.

Patel, Kiran Klaus. 2013b. "Integration by Interpellation: The European Capitals of Culture and the Role of Experts in European Union Cultural Policies." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 51, no. 3: 538–554.

Polo, Jean-François. 2003. "La naissance d'une direction audiovisuelle à la commission: la consécration de l'exception culturelle." *Politique européenne,* no. 11: 9–30.

Pongy, Mireille. 1997. "Entre modèles nationaux et eurogroupes d'intérêts professionnels: l'action de l'Union européenne dans la culture." *Culture et conflits*, no. 28: 125–145.

Psychogiopoulou, Evangelia. 2015a. "Culture in the EU External Economic Relations. In *Culture and International Economic Law,* edited by Valentina Vadi and Bruno de Witte, 229–245. New York: Routledge.

Psychogiopoulou, Evangelia. 2015b. *Cultural governance and the European Union: Protecting and Promoting Cultural Diversity in Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pyykkönen, Miikka. 2012. "UNESCO and Cultural Diversity: Democratisation, Commodification or Governmentalisation of Culture?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18, no. 5: 545–562.

Richieri Hanania, Lilian, and Hélène Ruiz Fabri. 2014. "European Media Policy and Cultural Diversity at the International Level: The EU's Role in Fostering the Implementation of the 2005 UNESCO Convention." In *The Palgrave Handbook of European Media Policy*, edited by Karen Donders, Caroline Pauwels, and Jan Loisen, 493–508. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Romainville, Céline. 2015. *European Law and Cultural Policies*. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Sassatelli, Monica. 2009. *Becoming Europeans. Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies*. Basingstoke: Routledge.

Schlesinger, Philip. 2017. "The Creative Economy: Invention of a Global Orthodoxy." *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 30: 73–90.

Shore, Cris. 2000. *Building Europe. The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.

Staiger, Uta. 2009. "New Agendas? Culture and Citizenship in EU Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15, no. 1: 1–16.

Sticht, Pamela. 2000. *Culture européenne ou Europe des cultures? Les enjeux actuels de la politique culturelle en Europe.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Vlassis, Antonios. 2015a. *Gouvernance mondiale et culture: de l'exception à la diversité*. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.

Vlassis, Antonios. 2015b. "Négociations commerciales récentes et industries culturelles: de l'affrontement politique à la réconciliation normative?" In *Un nouveau pont sur l'Atlantique: l'Accord économique global entre l'Union européenne et le Canada,* edited by Christian Deblock, Stéphane Paquin, and Joël Lebullenger, 261-279. Montréal: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Vlassis, Antonios. 2016. "European Commission, Trade Agreements and Diversity of Cultural Expressions: Between Autonomy and Influence." *European Journal of Communication* 31, no. 4: 446-461.

Yúdice, George. 2003. *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Oriane Calligaro

Associate Professor of Political Science, European School of Political and Social Sciences (ESPOL), Université Catholique de Lille
Visiting Professor, College of Europe, Bruges
Associate Researcher, Centre d'étude de la vie politique (CEVIPOL) (Center for the Study of Politics), Université libre de Bruxelles
Co-Director of the journal Politique européenne.

oriane.Calligaro@univ-catholille.fr

With the contribution of Antonios Vlassis

Senior Researcher and lecturer, Center for International Relations Studies (CEFIR), University of Liège. antonios.

vlassis@gmail.com

Translated and edited by Cadenza Academic Translations

Translator: Peter Collins,
Editor: Matt Burden,
Senior editor: Mark Mellor