

# EUROPE: IMAGINATION AND PRACTICES. INTRODUCTION I.

---

JURIJ FIKFAK

---

*The EU constitutional crisis has shown how "Europe" is far from being a homogeneous entity. It is a mix of countries both large and small, old and new, that perceive and present themselves in different ways, and use different culturally-constructed strategies and tactics in relation to an imagined "Europeanness." Based on concrete practices between an EU member state and a non-member state, the author discusses Eurocentrism and the relations between official and subcultural discourse. This also involves examining selected texts in several books (Wolfe, Kockel, and Vivod) and issues raised by scholarly groups and their discourse regarding where the center of Europe lies, the relations between old member states and candidate countries, and desire and uneasiness as the fundamental ambivalence of old and new EU countries.*  
Keywords: eastern Europe, European union, cultural practices, discourse, desire, uneasiness (Unbehagen).

*Kriza ob sprejemanju ustave Evropske unije je pokazala, kako je »Evropa« še daleč od tega, da bi bila homogena celota. Je zbir držav, majhnih in velikih, starih in novih, ki se dojemajo na različne načine in uporabljajo različno kulturno konstruirane prakse in taktike v razmerju z zamišljeno »evropskostjo«. Avtor na primeru konkretnih praks med članico in nečlanico EU razpravlja o evrocentričnosti in razmerju med uradnim in subkulturnim diskurzom; pri pregledu nekaterih besedil v knjigi (Wolfe, Kockel, Vivod) pa o vprašanih znanstvenih skupnosti in njihovih diskurzov; o tem, kje je središče Evrope; o razmerju med starimi članicami in kandidatkami za članstvo ter in o želji in nelagodju kot temeljni ambivalenci starih in novih držav EU.*  
Ključne besede: vzhodna Evropa, Evropska unija, kulturne prakse, diskurz, želja, nelagodje.

I'm sitting at breakfast this morning in the Terme Hotel restaurant, just an hour or two before my departure back home, scrolling through web pages on my small unit adorned with a symbol of a half-eaten fruit, searching for the best travel options to Paris and from London back home. In the background are some English evergreens, the same as the day before. The majority of the people, eating a buffet breakfast with a lot of local organic foods, are retired; some of them are speaking Italian, looking for some kind of refreshment therapy, new energy; some couples are nattering and annoying each other, unable to avoid the decades-old routine of noticing and complaining about each others' repertoire (invisible to others) of small gestures and winks, questions, and answers. Still others are looking at each other in the same manner of expectation and certainty, with the security and hope of *I am here to be with you* as they did so many decades ago. A few pairs of old girlfriends tenderly support each other; here and there is a lonely man, letting others take care of his convalescence; there are also two younger ladies in their late twenties, in high boots, wearing sweaters somehow at odds with this morning spa scene and somehow unsatisfied with sitting in these firm uncomfortable chairs that do not allow expression of the lines

of the female body, most likely waiting for the male gaze. Conventional discourse would certainly place them as coming from the East. And there is a book in front of me, Romano Prodi's *Moja Evropa* (My Europe) with an introduction by Vojislav Koštunica – at the time the president of Yugoslavia, the country that I was born in and that no longer exists. I am looking for the original title, which is *Un'idea dell'Europa* (*An Idea of Europe*, 1999) and not 'My Europe'. How did this happen? Why did the translator find it necessary to shift the original "one idea" of Europe, in which Prodi expresses one of many possible conceptions about Europe, into the Europe of Romano Prodi?<sup>1</sup> Drinking a Nescafé ristretto with added milk, I think about what to do with all these simultaneities and discordances that are somehow constructing the interplay of realities competing for my attention. As a first attempt, the opening solution is a paraphrase of Marc Augé's *A Place is the non-Place*: a story about Europe is the story about non-Europe.

The story of Europe – of imagination and practices, of desire and uneasiness – can be begun in various ways, whether this be Weizenbaum's ELIZA program developed in the 1960s at MIT, or the choices offered by Raymond Queneau in his story "Un Conte à votre façon" (A Story As You Like It), a tale of peas, beanstalks, and little clouds.<sup>2</sup> Everywhere there is the possibility of choice, which at the same time is limited to only particular typological possibilities or anomalies, although the reader does not perceive this. Readers choose a path in a hypertext manner, whereby they unavoidably overlook certain essential shifts and variations that would clarify or explain the path chosen in the context of the broader horizon. The illusion of free choice is limited by which horizon of understanding or perception the writer of the story or the program built into the course itself.

This also happens in the treatment of Europe, where arbitrariness is bounded by certain connecting and at the same time dominating trends, one of the best known of which derives from the relationship between the center and the periphery. Interest is therefore first of all drawn to the role and significance of the center for the development of the periphery, in which it is best to start at its center – but which one? Even in the case of a geometric center it is clear that this primarily depends on who defines and measures it, and that the decision and selection is largely political. Without doubt, the political and administrative center of Europe is in Brussels.

Here, however, a new slip appears because metonymy takes place: just as Brussels is not the administrative center of all of Europe, but only for its mostly western part, Europe as well (as it is conceived of in "common sense" discourse) is not all of Europe in the geographical or political sense, but what is most often conceived of is only a union of countries – that is, the European Union – and, until 2004, its western part. Part of Europe thus becomes a metonym for all of Europe, and Brussels becomes a metonymic metaphor for its center.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps this step was taken because at that time (i.e., in 2002) Romano Prodi was the president of the European Commission and personified the European Union and its executive power to the translator and President Koštunica.

<sup>2</sup> The story was also adapted for Hypercard (<http://www.thing.de/projekte/7%3A9%23/story.hqx>).

It seems likely that metonymy in the manner of desire is also at work in the head of the Serbian intellectual that chooses an e-mail address at the domain *@europe.com*. At the same time, an e-mail address enables belonging to a larger community and the realization of a desire, and simultaneously a departure from reality in his home environment. Thus the discrepancy between desire to be on the first track and reality on the third or fourth track is even greater; the deficit vis-à-vis the “core” of Europe, which is speeding along “in the first lane”, is also increasingly greater for those “in the second lane”. Within the EU itself in 2006 and 2007, the viewpoint also predominated that it was necessary to think about countries moving with two different speeds within the European Union itself:

*“There are strong national egos in the EU,” said Lüder Gerken, director of the Center for European Policy. “In view of 27 member states, the possibility of a Europe with two speeds is necessary in order to further European integration.” (Schäfer 2007)*

Two metaphors have been used in such discourse: “Europe in two lanes” and “Europe with two speeds.” The frequently mentioned list of countries on the first track and moving at the highest speed, and which represent “core Europe,” does not include any that joined the European Union in 2004. The tendencies for the “core” of Europe indicate two directions: first of all, the emergence of the special political subject of Europe with its center in Brussels, which is emancipating itself from individual countries and taking increasingly more responsibilities from them, and along with this trend the bureaucratic apparatuses they support. Second, at the same time, it is duplicating and repeating two divisions into 1) those countries that accept Brussels and its bureaucracy as the center versus those, such as the UK, that always seek a special position within the EU and are suspicious of the bureaucracy in Brussels, and 2) those that incline toward preserving the division between the West and the East. And the best way to observe this last split happening was in a diplomatic incident that arose alongside the ritual practice of commemorating the dead and exiled.

*On 10 February 2007 a diplomatic crisis arose between Italy and Croatia, after President Napolitano publicly condemned the karst sinkhole (foibe) massacres on Foibe Memorial Day, saying it was the “barbarism of the century,” “Slavic bloodthirsty hatred,” and “aspirations to annex territory.” The European Commission<sup>3</sup> did not comment on this event, but did comment on (and partly condemn) the response by Croatian president Stjepan Mesić, who described Napolitano’s statement as racist because Napolitano did not refer to either Slovenians or Croatians as a nation when he spoke*

<sup>3</sup> EC spokeswoman Pia Ahrenkilde Hansen on Wednesday described as inappropriate the language Croatian President Stjepan Mesić used in response to Italian President Giorgio Napolitano’s statements on Italian victims at the end of World War II, but she would not comment on Napolitano’s statements ([http://vlada.hr/en/naslovnica/novosti\\_i\\_najave/2007/veljaca/premijer\\_sanader\\_ocjene\\_glasnogovornice\\_ek\\_jednostrane\\_i\\_neprihvatljive](http://vlada.hr/en/naslovnica/novosti_i_najave/2007/veljaca/premijer_sanader_ocjene_glasnogovornice_ek_jednostrane_i_neprihvatljive)). Asked whether the Commission had a view on the original remarks by Napolitano, Hansen said she had no immediate comment (<http://dalje.com/en-croatial/eu-scolds-mesic-for-statement-on-italy-massacre/20786>).

*about a "Slavic annexationist aspiration" for the Julian March (at the time, Slovenians and Croats fought together in the Yugoslav Resistance Movement). ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giorgio\\_Napolitano](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giorgio_Napolitano)) He awarded relatives of 25 foibe victims, who had included the last fascist Italian prefect in Zadar, Vincenzo Serrentino, convicted to death in 1947 in Šibenik. That along with naming the "liberation of the city of Zadar and Istria from fascism a 'Slavonic annexationist aspiration'" (Istria and Zadar were part of Italy from 1919 to 1945) was seen by Mesić as "historic revisionism" and open support for fascism. The president Napolitano's remarks on foibe massacres were praised by both (Italian, JF) centre-left and centre-right, and both parties condemned Mesić's statements, while whole Croatia stood by Mesić. (<http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Giorgio-Napolitano>)*

This incident between two statesmen and the reaction from the highest level (the position taken by the EU Commission) reveals several basic questions and problems regarding the imagination and practices that are taking place in Europe. There are questions about the language and power used, about European countries and statesmen of varying importance, who it is allowed to say what to (and who it is not), who is competent, and who (in John Austin's sense) can say something and who cannot. This "little" incident shows and proves not only the asymmetric configuration of Europe, but also raises questions about the geographical and political configuration of western and eastern Europe, about civilization and barbarism, about "old" ("already European") Roman and German nations and "new" ("not-quite-yet European") Slavic (Marc 2009), Hungarian (Böröcz 2000), and other nations.

Napolitano's "notorious" speech (as some sources characterized it) in reality displays not only the basic understanding of the self-evident European asymmetry the Italian president has of the historical and factual importance of some countries and functions in Europe, but also reveals the impregnation of official speech with the re-union (almost unison) between Italy's leftist and rightist parties after the Fini-Violante meeting in Trieste 1998. At the same time, it also displays the connection between public, official, and unofficial (and often subcultural) discourse characteristic of some very conservative groups in the Trieste region and some exile organizations. Napolitano's speech also opens up issues of thinking about the past of Italian fascism and atrocities ranging from Ethiopia to Yugoslavia. It is a dangerous game to speak in metaphors, and especially hyperbole, when depicting the forty-day Yugoslav presence in Trieste and animosities to Italians as the "barbarism of the century," implicitly equating it with the Jewish holocaust and erasing memories about the time, and the rule of Fascism from 1918 and 1943. Some of this discourse is much closer to the discourse present in the neo-Fascist graffiti on the monuments to primarily Slovenian victims of the Second World War (Fikfak 2009).

The incident between the two statesmen shows at least one more level: the issue of

Eurocentrism (Amin 1989).<sup>4</sup> It reveals that Eurocentrism is not only the idea and practices of behavior towards non-Europeans, but also towards all peoples and countries in the eastern part of the continent that are not yet Europeans. Being a part of the true Europe is an appropriate legitimization that provides the opportunity of civilizing and disciplining people and countries that are still not yet considered part of true Europe (i.e., Western Europe) in both the common conception and EU bureaucratic discourse. However, this civilizing practice has been or was (taking into account József Böröcz's viewpoints, 2002) a constituent part of the civilizing practice of the colonial practice of Western European countries, including the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, as well as the Austria-Hungary in the Balkans towards the end of the nineteenth century. Today is civilizing carried out by following the rules that every EU-candidate country must understand and practice (cf. Böröcz 2001), whereas disciplining is usually carried out in an impersonal, "objective" manner, in which the candidate is the "object" of processing.

In this regard, the question "What's Eastern about Eastern Europe" posed by Leon Marc (2009) makes sense on the one hand because it problematizes the usual discourse about Europe as Europe in the west and (not yet) Europe in the east; on the other hand, it uses lower-case and capital letters to repeat the implicit division and the same discourse that enables the repetition and continuation of the inferior status of the East. In this regard, the spokeswoman in Brussels can or is even allowed to avoid the question about the inappropriateness of Napolitano's speech and elements of racism (more precisely, Eurocentrism and its division into barbaric and civilized cultures) and to emphasize the inappropriateness of the speech by Croatian President Stjepan Mesić, who criticized and insulted an old and respectable member of established European society and forgot that the primary role of Croatia and its president is to meet the criteria allowing them to accede to the European Union. Within this framework was secret diplomacy from the Slovenian side, a country that is already a member of EU, in order not to publicly problematize Napolitano's harsh and, at the very least, inappropriate statements about the events after the Second World War in Trieste, and the silence about fascist crimes is even more significant.

This (non)position implicitly enables Italian President Napolitano and the EC spokeswoman Pia Ahrenkilde Hansen (probably also following the instructions of Romano Prodi, the Italian prime minister at that time and the former president of the European Commission) to introduce the tautology of the place of delivering a speech, from which it is allowed to say anything; the path along the Möbius strip of European civilization, on which the dominant of the European Union is always on the right side and is self-fulfilling.

Upon the accession of ten new countries to the European Union in 2004, the adoption

---

<sup>4</sup> In the need to establish Europe as a key category, Rémi Brague (2002: 127) writes about how Eurocentrism is "a misnomer . . . the contrary to the truth" because "no culture was ever so little centered on itself and so interested in the other ones as Europe."

of the Lisbon Treaty, and also during diplomatic incidents such as the aforementioned dispute between Italian President Giorgio Napolitano and Croatian President Stjepan Mesić in February 2007, it was clear that imagination and practice in Europe vary greatly and depend largely on the general public discourse in the media, the transmission of basic knowledge in schools, and concrete internalization and habituation of views about the Self and Other.

All this led to the decision to organize a workshop or a conference dedicated to these issues. During Slovenia's EU presidency, the following invitation was issued for the panel "West" and "East": Dreaming, Writing, Imagining, and Practicing Europe as part of the 10th EASA conference in Ljubljana; the invitation combined two proposals and emphasized the imagination and dreaming of practice (Maria Vivod, Nicoletta Diasio) and reflected imagination practices (Jurij Fikfak, Mladena Prelič):

*The EU constitutional crisis has shown how "Europe" is far from being a homogeneous entity. It is a mix of countries both large and small, old and new, that perceive and present themselves in different ways, and use different culturally-constructed strategies and tactics in relation to an imagined "Europeanness."*

*Panelists will consider key themes, including understanding of the Self and the Other in writing about memories, imagined ideas of Europe, and Europe's continually changing borders. Attention will be paid to the relationships between groups and individuals that seek to maintain a cultural link in the re-creation of their memories and identities in a Europe seemingly captive to its own myths. The diversity of new forms of identification through migration will be explored. We propose the development of the following topics:*

*What do the labels "West" and "East" mean in contemporary European societies? What is "West" seen from the "East" and vice versa, how are these positional categories defined, and how do they become "real" for social actors? How is the issue of power (economic, cultural, etc.) and negotiation important in the discourse between "West" and "East?"*

*What are the elements (differences and commonalities) between cultural practices and images of the "West" and the "East?"*

*Contributions should present European anthropologists' experiences in writing about these topics. The papers presented during the workshop will explore issues relating to the construction of what could be called "integrative ethnography."*

Some participants delivered talks at the panel (e.g., Tatiana Bajuk Senčar, Donatella Cozzi, Karen Denni, Nicoletta Diasio, Mladena Prelič, Maria Vivod, and Nebi Bardoshi) and others were invited to write contributions for the book (e.g., Ullrich Kockel, László Kürti, and Thomas Wolfe). Thus the view from the outside (Wolfe) was contrasted with

the views from the inside, in which authors from both western and eastern Europe were included.

The first concrete issues connected with imagination and practices were manifested during the editorial revision of the texts. For instance, the copy editor/translator (an American linguist) suggested the use of “eastern” and “western” instead of “Eastern” and “Western.”<sup>5</sup> This issue enables us to write a text on texts (i.e., on the internalized practice and obviousness of our horizons as writers).

Which Europe are we referring to when we write the signifier “Europe,” and which eastern or western Europe do we refer to when writing “East” or “West”? The premises for writing the terms “western” vs. “eastern” can differ: for example, the premise for using capital letters can be the political definition, whereas for using small letters the premise can be the geographical definition.<sup>6</sup> However, at the same time, this political definition may only refer to a specific time period, such as the period following the First World War, when Europe was divided into Western, Central, and Eastern Europe, or Europe and the communist Soviet Union (cf. Delanty 2006); it may refer to the period following the Second World War, when as a rule, Europe was divided by the Iron Curtain into communist and capitalist countries and thus even a country in the southeastern Balkans such as Greece could also be defined as a Western country. Following 2004, the question also arose whether the former Warsaw Pact countries that became EU members can be today considered part of Eastern Europe.

**Thomas Wolfe** tackles three discursive fields. The first is a history containing two Europes: the pre-1945 Europe of suffering and wars, and the post-1945 Europe, which is peaceful and strives for the common good. However, as Bhabra (2009) noted, the colonial system led by some European countries (e.g., the United Kingdom, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, and France) ended in the majority of the colonies becoming independent. The most dramatic of these events did not take place until the 1960s, such as the Algerian War in which nearly one million people died. In Africa the consequences of the colonial system continue to be reflected even today in numerous wars and refugee situations. The “peacefulness” of the postwar period is thus drawn with the omission of and failure to recall the suffering and pain of many outside the European continent. Even developments in the Balkans at the end of the twentieth century were perceived as happening to someone else. Ignorance is thus one of the basic components of dealing with “others.” The second discursive field focuses on the radical right and hate speech. Thomas Wolfe correctly emphasizes the slipperiness of definitions because discourse must question the very nature of the capitalist system and unreflected elements of totalitarianism within it. How slippery left-right divisions actually

<sup>5</sup> The suggestion to convert “Eastern” and “Western” into “eastern” and “western” was not followed. In my article I do prefer writing “eastern” and “western”.

<sup>6</sup> Larry Wolff (1994) discusses the (implicitly) cultural definition of Eastern Europe already the time of Enlightenment.

are was clearly shown in the discourse on the foibe (karst shafts) and exiles, which united the former distinctively right-wing party MSI (the successor to Giorgio Almirante's neofascist party, which was renamed *Aleanza nazionale* under the leadership of Gianfranco Finni during the 1990s) and the distinctively leftist (former communist) party in Italy, which in defending and ensuring national unity implied the former Italian territory and forgot all about the violence caused by Fascism that also resulted in the foibe incidents and flight to Italy. Even in this historical meeting and national unifications, or Napolitano's speech about "Slavic barbarianism" or the "barbarism of the century," members of the Italian radical right-wing parties such as *Fiamme Tricolore* can find justification for writing anti-Slav graffiti. At the same time, the national aspect of identification is more important than the political views because the political reconciliation between the Italian and Hungarian communists, who stood up to the Soviet regime in Hungary in 1956, already occurred in 1989 at the ceremonial burial of Imre Nagy, which was also attended by Achille Occhetto. Giorgio Napolitano also paid his respects during his visit to Budapest in 2006. However, the Italian president Napolitano expressed its reconciliation efforts most distinctly in 2009. At the same time, Italian leaders have not yet adopted the joint report by the Italian-Slovenian historical commission (<http://www.kozina.com/premik/poreng.pdf>).

The third discursive field deals with the anthropological and ethnographic aspect, focusing on the increasingly tighter European borders and migration. The issues connected with this refer not only to bureaucracy and especially the police administration and human rights, but also to an in-depth consideration of the meetings and expectations of two or more different worlds, and the issue of instrumentalization on both sides; in addition, complex methodological issues are also opening up, which Wolfe believes also represent the expression of an identity crisis in anthropology.

Another question, which **Ullrich Kockel** specifically raises in his paper, is "Where does Europe lie and where is its center?" This center may be defined geographically (e.g., Poland, Lithuania, etc.), culturally, or by transition theory. The discussion is also connected with the question of where and what central Europe or *Mittleuropa* is; whether *Mittleuropa* is a meteorological concept (Peter Handke) or a cultural one (Drago Jančar, 2000). The explanation of the cultural aspect entails the desire to be in the middle of Europe; this is the desire of those nations and countries that have been excluded from Europe because of their various political systems. Solutions connected with the European nature of Slovenian culture are also being created within scholarly communities and their discourses, which also define discourses at other levels (e.g., the national or, in this case, the Slovenian level). In the enthusiasm of seeking the European or even central European qualities of Slovenian character and culture, the following metaphors and delineations are used: Slovenia is "Europe in miniature" with regard to Carnival costumes (Kuret 1955; 1984), as well as with regard to the fact that three types of culture characteristic of various European regions and countries can be found here: the Mediterranean, Alpine, and Pannonian cultural spaces (Novak 1960);



Slovenia is the meeting point of various cultures (Bogataj 2005), or in other words, by itself it is not merely a cultural meeting point, but also the meeting point of Europe's three or four largest language groups. This is because it borders and at the same time incorporates the Italian or Roman linguistic environment with its Italian minority; with the Slovenian minority in Austrian Carinthia it is part of the Germanic linguistic environment; and with the Hungarian minority in Prekmurje it is part of the Finno-Ugric environment. At the same time, scholars studying Slovenian culture generally implicitly distinguish it from the Balkans and compare and orient it toward the northwest (i.e., especially the Alpine and Mediterranean regions). Thus, in the framework of culture and research on it, Slovenia's bid for independence and establishment as an independent country is perceived as a liberating project because it enables an essential self-identification with European (or even non-Balkan) character. The essentialized Slovenian or authentic elements are emphasized to a great extent, which can also be used by other speakers for self-identification. It is a process of a never-ending project of discovering one's own culture, and discovering and revealing the "folk" (cf. Fikfak 2008), which explicitly persisted all the way to the 1980s; at that time, it was used as the main tool in the advertising campaign titled "My Country (Moja dežela)"<sup>7</sup> and also became a bearer of self-identification to the widest public; today it implicitly serves as a form and opportunity of self-identification in tourism, and at the same time, finding, discovering, and producing one's own special identity, which is a cultural process. This process resembles the "language unification and cleansing" in the former Yugoslavia, where on the basis of implicit political decisions new languages (i.e., Serbian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Bosnian) developed from Serbo-Croatian, with which both the ruling social elite and the motivated members of the community can identify most easily.

The subordination of new member states is addressed by both **Maria Vivod**, Mladena Prelić, and Srdjan Radović (2009). The problem of intellectuals in Serbia and Vojvodina is that they must consider both European and Serbian strategies and face habituations different from those demanded by the European Union. In these circumstances, they are usually first placed in the position of schoolboys that must finish their homework, or even in a position where they must choose between the carrot and the stick.

However, in this they more or less resemble all countries that were part of the former eastern or communist system and are in a state of "Eurosis," as Mitja Velikonja describes the special state of generally almost non-reflected hurrying into Europe in his book *Evroza* (2007). Entering Europe was the general demand, which in Slovenia was also expressed by the large number of votes in favor of joining the European Union.<sup>8</sup> According to Julia

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.mojvideo.com/video-slovenija-moja-dezela-nostalgicna-reklama-za-slovenijo/1ae7bf4ec4bd78275bb9>. The term *dežela* 'country' continues to be a pejorative synonym for Slovenia in Croatian (and to a lesser extent Serbian) media.

<sup>8</sup> The elections were attended by more than 60 % of voters. 89.61 % voted in favor of Slovenia becoming a member of the European Union; <http://www.dvk.gov.si/referendum/eu-nato/>.

Szalai (2003), public discourse in the former communist countries is characterized by uncritical acceptance. The negotiation and accession process was completely different in Austria and even not successful in Norway. Therefore the acceptance of the role of a schoolboy (according to Velikonja) or girl being courted (Ugrešić and Vivod) is the result of an initially subordinate position. Hence also the differences in comprehending “excesses,” because different criteria are used for the same issue and behavior (e.g., the issue of the Slovenian-Croatian and British-Spanish border, or difficulties with adopting the Lisbon Treaty in the Czech Republic and Ireland). This involves a prior handicap; first, due to the habituation of the system that relied on different ruling and management mechanisms (cf. Phinnemore 2006), and the impoverishment of the economy, which was quickly bought by western investors, especially by multinational companies (Lewis 2005), and last but not least because the game of structural asymmetry in decision-making and exerting influence is accepted by both sides.



In addition to the main title *Europe: Imagination & Practices*, perhaps the most suitable subtitle for all of these positions and the book itself would be the title: “Desire and Uneasiness (*Unbehagen*).” It embodies, on the one hand, the passionate desire of the new members to become part of the EU at any price, and Europe’s desire to acquire new territory and even greater economic power on the other. At the same time, this involves uneasiness: both the uneasiness of those that wish to join Europe and have to adapt their habitus and rules and the uneasiness of old members that are now being joined by new ones, who demand rights from the already established system of financial stimulation of one’s own agricultural commercial market, and so on. Old members’ uneasiness sometimes continues to rely on the Eurocentric, civilizationist, and primarily – as shown by Bhabra and Böröcz – colonial discourse, or the discourse of the master, whose residual forms and concepts are also hidden in official discourses, and in many places continue to divide Europe into the West and the East.

... I’m sitting on the balcony, sipping a cup of Illy Moka, and scrolling through web pages ... and I come across something, “fellow-feeling”, by Mauro Buonocuore: *Do you speak European?*<sup>9</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Amin, Samir  
1989 *Eurocentrism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bhabra, Gurminder K.  
2009 Postcolonial Europe, or Understanding Europe in Times of the Postcolonial. *The SAGE Handbook of European Studies*. SAGE Publications. [http://www.sage-ereference.com/hdbk\\_eurostudies/Article\\_n5.html](http://www.sage-ereference.com/hdbk_eurostudies/Article_n5.html).

<sup>9</sup> <http://cdd.stanford.edu/press/2007/ce-speak.pdf>

Bogataj, Janez

2005 *Creative Slovenia: Masterpieces on the crossroads of the European Alps, the Mediterranean, and Pannonia*. Ljubljana: Darila Rokus.

Böröcz, Jozsef

2000 The Fox and the Raven: The European Union and Hungary Renegotiate the Margins of 'Europe'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press: 847–875.

Böröcz, Jozsef, e. a.

2001 *Empire's New Clothes: Unveiling EU-Enlargement*. <http://aei.pitt.edu/144/01/Empire.pdf>; <http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~eu/Empire.pdf>.

Brague, Rémi

2003 *Evropa, rimska pot*. Celje: Mohorjeva družba.

Delanty, Gerard

2006 Borders in a Changing Europe: An Analysis of Recent Trends. *Comparative European Politics* 4 (2): 183–202.

Fikfak, Jurij

2008 Med delom in celoto. Nekatera vprašanja etnološkega raziskovanja in reprezentacije. *Traditiones* 37(2): 27–44.

2009 Cultural and social representations on the border: From disagreement to coexistence. *Human affairs* 19(4): 350–362.

Herzfeld, Michael

1992 Essentialism. In: *Encyclopedia of social and cultural anthropology*. Essentialism from *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. 05-30-2002. Taylor and Francis. <http://www.bookrags.com/tandf/essentialism-8-tf/>.

Jančar, Drago

2000 Srednja Evropa - ideja preteklosti? *Nova revija* 19, 223/224: 1–5.

Kuret, Niko

1955 Aus der Maskenwelt der Slowenen. In: Schmidt, Leopold (Ed.) *Masken in Mitteleuropa, volkskundliche Beiträge zur europäischen Maskenforschung*. Wien: Verein für Volkskunde 201–220, XVII–XXVI.

1984 *Maske slovenskih pokrajin*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba; Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU.

1996 *Das festliche Jahr der Slowenen. Brauchtum in Jahreslauf*. Celovec-Klagenfurt, Ljubljana-Laibach, Wien-Dunaj: Hermagoras-Mohorjeva.

Lewis, Charles Paul

2005 *How the East was Won: Impact of Multinational Companies in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Palgrave: Macmillan.

Marc, Leon

2009 *What's so Eastern about Eastern Europe*. London: Oldcastle Books.

Novak, Vilko

1960 *Slovenska ljudska kultura*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

1996 Einleitung. Slowenien – Volk und Land, Volkskultur und Kulturlandschaften. In: Kuret, N. *Das festliche Jahr der Slowenen*, 11–20.

- Phinnemore, David (ed.)  
2006 *The EU & Romania: Accession and Beyond*. London: The Federal Trust.
- Platzer, Hans-Wolfgang  
1992 *Lernprozess Europa. Die EG und die neue europäische Ordnung*. Bon: Dietz.
- Prodi, Romano  
1999 *Un'idea dell'Europa*. Bologna: Il Mulino.  
2002 *Moja Evropa*. Beograd: BMG. Un idea dell' Europa.
- Radović, Srdjan  
2009 *Slike Evrope. Istraživanje predstava o Evropi i Srbiji na početku XXI. veka*. Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU.
- Schäfer, Torsten  
2007 Calls Increase for a Two-Speed Europe. *DW-World.de Deutsche Welle*. 28. 6. 2007. (<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,2636287,00.html>).
- Szalai, Julia  
2003 Whose claim and whose risk? *Journal of European Social Policy* 13: 58–60.
- Velikonja, Mitja  
2007 *Evroza. Kritika novog evrocentrizma*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX. vek.
- Wolff, Larry  
1994 *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

## EVROPA. IMAGINACIJA IN PRAKSE. UVOD I.

*Besedovanje med italijanskim predsednikom Giorgiom Napolitanom in hrvaškim predsednikom Stjepanom Mesićem, predvsem pa uradna interpretacija konflikta s strani Evropske komisije je bila avtorju osnova za premislek o tem, katere so imaginacije in katere prakse, značilne za Evropo. V njih odkriva sledi neokolonialnega diskurza in povezave med uradnim, medijskim in naposled tudi subkulturnim diskurzom.*

*Zato je z Mario Vivod na mednarodnem kongresu EASA (European Association of Social Anthropology) v Ljubljani organiziral panel, ki naj bi problematiziral razmerja in dojemanja vzhoda in zahoda, imaginacije in konkretnih kulturnih praks. Avtor v besedilu tematizira predvsem tri najbolj pomembne motive oz. elemente, na katere se osredotočajo v svojih besedilih nekateri avtorji,<sup>10</sup> posebej Thomas Wolfe, Ullrich Kockel in Maria Vivod.*

*Thomas Wolfe načenja tri diskurzivna polja; polje zgodovine, v katerem obstajata dve Evropi, tista do leta 1945, Evropa gorja, vojn, in tista po 1945, ki je mirna in si prizadeva za skupno dobro. A kakor je opozoril Bhambra (2009), se je kolonialni system, ki so ga vodile nekatere*

<sup>10</sup> Maria Vivod je v svojem uvodu izčrpno obravnavala avtorje Karen Denni, Nicoletto Diasio, Lászlá Kürtija, Donatello Cozzi, Mladeno Prelić in Tatiano Bajuk Senčar.

evropske države, končal z osamosvojitvijo večine kolonij; posledice kolonialnega sistema pa se v številnih vojnah in beguncih še danes kažejo na afriški celine. Tako se "mirnost" povojnega obdobja zarisuje z izbrisom in pozabo trpljenja in gorja številnih zunaj evropske celine. Drugo diskurzivno polje zajema ukvarjanje z radikalno desnico, sovražnim govorom. Pri tem Thomas Wolfe pravilno poudarja na spolzkost definicij; kako spolzke so delitve levo desno, se je pokazalo v diskurzu o fojbah in ezulih, ki je združil italijanske desne in leve stranke. Tretje diskurzivno polje je antropološko, etnografsko in se nanaša na čedalje tesnejše meje Evrope in migracije. Vprašanja, povezana s tem, se ne nanašajo le na birokracijo, predvsem policijsko upravljanje in človekove pravice, nanašajo se tudi na temeljit premislek srečanj in pričakovanj dveh ali več različnih svetov, na vprašanje o instrumentalizaciji z obeh strani, odpirajo pa tudi metodološka vprašanja, ki so po Wolfu hkrati tudi izraz identitetne krize antropologije.

Drugo vprašanje, ki ga posebej odpira Ullrich Kockel v razpravi je, kje leži Evropa in kje je njeno središče. Diskusija je povezana tudi z vprašanjem, kje in kaj je centralna Evropa ali Mitteleuropa: ali je Mitteleuropa meteorološki (Peter Handke) ali kulturni pojem (Drago Jančar). Razlaga slednjega pomeni željo biti sredi Evrope; gre za željo tistih narodov in držav, ki so bili zaradi različnega sistema iz Evrope izključeni. Rešitve o evropskosti slovenske kulture nastajajo tudi znotraj znanstvenih skupnosti in njihovih diskurzov in določajo tudi diskurze na drugih ravneh, npr. na "nacionalni", v tem primeru slovenski ravni. Tako je Slovenija Evropa v malem pri maskah (Kuret 1965, 1984), prav tako v tem, da so na tem območju trije tipi kultur, značilni za različne pokrajine in države v Evropi, torej mediteranski, alpski, panonski kulturni prostor (Novak 1960, 1980); Slovenija je stičišče kultur (Bogataj 1999): zagledana je kot osvobajajoči projekt, saj omogoča bistveno samoprepoznavo v evropskosti, tudi "nebalkanskosti" itn.

Del podrejenosti novih članic obravnavata tako Maria Vivod kot Mladena Prelić. Težava intelektualca v Srbiji ali Vojvodini je, da mora premisliti tako evropske kot srbske strategije, da se mora soočiti s habituacijami, različnimi od tistih, ki jih zahteva Evropska unija. V tem položaju je navadno vnaprej postavljen v položaj šolarčka, ki mora izpolniti domačo nalogo, ali celo v položaj izbire med palico in korenčkom. A v tem je bolj ali manj podoben vsem državam nekdanjega vzhodnega oz. socialističnega sistema in je v stanju "evroze" (prim. Velikonja 2005). Za javni diskurz v nekdanjih socialističnih in komunističnih državah je značilno nekritično sprejemanje (Szalai 2003), zato je tudi sprejemanje vloge učenca (Velikonja 2005) ali mladega dekleta (Ugrešić, Vivod) posledica vnaprej podrejenega položaja. Gre za vnaprejšnjo hendikepiranost, najprej zaradi habituacije sistema, ki je slonel na drugačnih mehanizmih vladanja in upravljanja, zaradi obubožanosti gospodarstva, ki so ga hitro kupili lastniki z zaboda; nazadnje zato, ker igro strukturne asimetrije odločanja in vplivanja sprejemata obe strani. Širitev Evropske unije na vzhod in vključevanje komunističnih držav za nekdanjo železno zaveso v svoje okvire odpirata vprašanja o tem, kako je "stara Evropa" pripravljena sprejeti države nove Evrope; ali se ustvarjajo Evrope dveh, treh hitrosti, ali obstaja Evropa prvega, drugega, mogoče še tretjega reda. Mesto izrekanja je pridržano tistim,

*ki so v klubu, kandidatke se morajo vsaj za čas obravnavanja kandidature logiki diskurza podrediti. Tako je monografija o Evropi delo oz. so pogledi o različnih diskurzih, ki jih re-producirajo vse strani, "stara", "nova" Evropa in "še ne Evropa", ki velikokrat rekonstruirajo in perpetuirajo staro logiko vladajočega in podrejajočega se diskurza.*

---

Assist. Prof. Dr. Jurij Fikfak, Institute of Slovenian Ethnology  
SRC SASA, Novi trg 5, SI-1000 Ljubljana, fikfak@zrc-sazu.si