

## *Introduction*

# EXHIBITING EUROPE?

## Europeanisation as Cultural Practice

EUROPE IS A CACOPHONY. IN 1987 JOHN CAGE'S *EUROPERA* PREMIERED AT the Frankfurt Opera House. For this piece the American composer used both familiar and unfamiliar parts of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century operas: 'For 200 years the Europeans have sent us their operas. Now I am returning them all to them' (Beyst 2005). Indeed, *Europera* consists of 'ready-made-music'. Not one phrase was composed by Cage himself. Instead, the different arias were put together by a randomiser, and so robbed of any formal or substantial coherence. Cage aimed to eliminate any context that would make *Europera* a coherent work.

For the listener – at least, a listener with an untrained ear – the experience is no pleasure. The work that Cage had by 1991 extended to five *Europeras* does, as a whole, sound too disordered and multi-voiced, too broken and complex. But when treated as representing the idea and elaboration of European culture, the piece becomes something different. From Cage's perspective as an American composer, Europe's culture seems a national cacophony. Ravel, Liszt, Strauss, all together and all at once – that is Europe's culture. Cage's work does not attest to a common, ordered, European cultural identity, but instead to a permanent, self-renewing coincidence, or a conscious lack of focus in the sense used by Edgar Morin (2009 [1990]: 210): 'Europe is a concept with many faces that cannot be superimposed one upon the other without creating a blurred image'. *Europera* is an acoustic simile for this blurred image of European culture, which arises anew, and differently, each time the opera is staged.

By contrast, some politicians and leading European Union (EU) officials describe Europe's cultural roots not in terms of coincidence, but as an ordered diversity. They imagine Europe as a space with a common history and experience, whose very extent and expanse supposedly capture the specific nature of the Continent. As Jean-Claude Trichet, president of the

European Central Bank, put it (2004): 'Although not all of us are necessarily aware of it, all Europeans exist in a unique cultural atmosphere that is jointly influenced and inspired by the poetry of Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Baudelaire among many others. An atmosphere that is also shaped jointly by the thoughts of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Erasmus, Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Kant, Kierkegaard'. This outline of a political 'unity' within a cultural 'diversity' recruits the poets, writers and philosophers invoked here to supposedly homogeneous national cultures, which when added together form 'Europe'. Out of the aleatory play of *Europeras* emerges the ordered and ordering image of a European 'unity in diversity', an imagined property of Europe as a legitimization of its present and future political composition.

It is in this context that the power – and the impotence – of the concept of Europeanisation begin to unfold. Europeanisation has become in part a politically loaded and normative slogan whose varied and repeated use is largely driven by the EU's growing influence on socio-economic relations in Europe. Accordingly, in the academic study of Europe the term Europeanisation has been from the outset, and continues to be, a guiding concept of the political sciences. Here we find Europeanisation generally conceived as the outcome of the politics and policies of European institutions and of legislation applied to member states: 'its predominant connotation stems from the process of Europe's contemporary political integration: since the early 1990s, Europeanization has been most often associated with new forms of European governance and the adaptation of nation-state legal and administrative procedures to the pressures associated with EU membership' (Hirschhausen and Patel 2010: 1). Studies of public policy in particular employ the concept of Europeanisation chiefly in terms of a process of convergence through European legislation (Lehmkuhl 2007; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003). The predominant question concerns, above all, the role the EU plays as a catalyst in the process by which the convergent organisation of national formal and informal institutions is furthered through integration (Börzel and Risse 2003).

However justified it may be to treat many processes of Europeanisation as outcomes of legislation, administrative decrees and introduction of general norms and EU standards, this perspective nonetheless remains conceptually and analytically limited. This form of Europeanisation seems detached from the long-term historical and cultural influences, which go back far beyond the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951–52, and of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957–58. Public policy research is moreover preoccupied with Brussels as a site of processes of political transformation, barely recognising

that Europeanisation results from mutual processes of exchange and negotiation that transcend frontiers, sometimes involving regions and member states below the EU level. Ultimately this line of research is fatally fixated on the state, concentrating on the EU and national state institutions, and largely failing to register that Europeanisation is a social phenomenon. It does not take account of the people who have very often given significant impulse to processes of Europeanisation and then carried them onward (Kaiser 2008: 31): ‘not just small decision-making elites, but also European citizens affected by EU politics and involved to differing degrees in the slow process of forming a European society’.

In this book we wish to counter the schematic conceptualisation of Europe found in the political sciences by proposing that Europeanisation is a process of *making something European*, contributing to shifting forms of individual and social identification in Europe. Such a broad understanding of Europeanisation as making something European necessitates an interdisciplinary approach. Our study has had to integrate different processes and influences that go far beyond politics and policy conceptually, methodologically and analytically. We therefore need to properly account for both the state and the social and individual actors involved in the various processes of Europeanisation. These different actors not only respond to the pressure of cultural conformity arising from the political and economic integration of the EU (Caporaso, Cowles and Risse 2001) but also act on their own initiative, driving the process of Europeanisation on, modifying it or hindering it.

Our consideration of the processes that make Europe therefore takes into account the interweaving of different constructions of Europe, examining the manner in which different actors use and reshape them in the process of Europeanisation. Only in the complex synchronicity of its historical, cultural, social and political relationships does the concept of Europeanisation find its analytical relevance. Europeanisation cannot be considered in isolation from the economic and political integration of Europe since the Second World War any more than it can be entirely identified with this process. In all the forms Europeanisation assumes, there is instead a continuous ‘blending of an “idea of Europe” with the cultural-political project called the EU’ (Poehls 2009: 10). And from this, temporal dislocations necessarily emerge *within* Europe. Specific to generations, they concern social or individual experiences of Europeanisation. Geographically, they relate to ways everyday experience and institutionalisation connect with Europeanisation. They pertain historically to national, regional and local narratives of memory, and their possible convergence within and through Europe. Culturally, they stem from differing ethnic preconditions for Eu-

rope; institutionally, they entail the substantive and structural power of European institutions.

Hence in this book we conceive and study Europeanisation as a cultural practice that first of all takes place in the context of the economic and political integration of the EU. Secondly, in so doing it brings together conceptions of Europe drawn from the history of ideas, and from culture, society and politics. Thirdly, this process is conducted by very different actors within a broad field of action. Explicitly or implicitly this also includes the articulation of conceptions of a common European historical and cultural space. Europeanisation is a cultural practice, and can be described as such to the extent that the central emphasis of the analysis is the production of a specific European culture and history that underlies the ambivalences and aporia noted above, and that is intended as a general contribution to the creation of new forms of individual and social identification in Europe.

This view that making Europe is a cultural practice enables us to introduce Pierre Bourdieu's concept of 'field' into our interdisciplinary approach. Europeanisation happens in a field made up of diverse actors, different contexts and networks of relationships whose (provisional) outcomes are constantly negotiated and culturally produced. Bourdieu's sociological concept has been widely used, and often overused. But we think that its use here is justified, since it is centred upon the 'act of construction of the object' (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 40) and thus of relevance to our theme – Europe as a product of actors, strategies and actions. The actors involved in Europeanisation do not form a homogeneous group, although they might share some social characteristics. The strategies of Europeanisation are not always directed *to* Europe as such. It is more usual that they turn *on* the concept of Europe.

The field concept requires an object of investigation. In this book we deal with processes of Europeanisation occurring in museums, exhibitions and collections. In this way we develop an applied concept of both contemporary Europeanisation and an ongoing process of musealisation (putting something in a museum context): two concepts, distinct but very much reacting to each other. Our initial question is as follows: what happens when the unfocused image of European history and culture, ambivalently charged by the concept and processes of Europeanisation, encounters the museum as an 'identity factory' (Korff and Roth 1990a)? We are interested in the extent to which processes of Europeanisation currently taking shape in different social spheres, and with different degrees of intensity, are reflected in exhibitions, influence the planning of new museums or transform their collections; which objects are selected to represent which Euro-

pean history, and how these then circulate; what master narratives of the history of integration are developed and then compete for attention with each other and with existing national and regional narratives; and how the discursive and material boundaries of 'Europe' are defined through museal representation.

To do this our analysis of contemporary tendencies of Europeanisation must necessarily direct itself to specific museums. The museums, exhibitions and collections described and analysed in this book are overwhelmingly historical – whether national, regional or local – and ethnographic or sociocultural in character. We see the treatment of European motives and narratives in these kinds of museums as more obvious than in, for instance, those devoted to art and technology, since historical or local anthropological museums are drawn necessarily into a definition of the conception of nationality (or regionality, or locality) that underpins these museums' own history and present. Museums devoted to history, cultural history and ethnography were and are now platforms of national self-representation. This is a quite contemporary issue. Klas Grinell (2010: 178), curator of the Museum of World Culture in Gothenburg, has drawn attention to the way in which very many nationalist projects are being re-evaluated, and museums themselves possess very few all-embracing representational powers, thanks to the growing ethnic and cultural diversity of society.

Our research is based on a wide-ranging analysis of relevant literature from the social sciences, contemporary history and cultural and museum studies, supplemented by a selective media analysis of the planned European museums, which are reviewed in chapter 1. In addition we visited and analysed a total of ninety-five relevant museums and exhibitions in twenty European countries. Most of this work was focused upon Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Great Britain and Norway; but we also included institutions in Northern and Central Europe (Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Austria and Switzerland), South-western Europe (Spain) and South-eastern Europe (Slovenia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Serbia, Greece and Turkey). In these museums and other institutions we conducted semi-structured interviews with museum directors and curators, representatives of various museum organisations, academics (mostly historians) and politicians. This amounted to a total of sixty-eight interviews, listed in an appendix along with a second appendix with the museums and exhibitions visited and analysed for the project. The interviews were directed to general themes in the Europeanisation of the museal field as well as to the particular topics dealt with in the individual chapters.

Upon this basis we seek to discuss the 'silently advancing, but fundamental transformation' (Mazé 2008: 110) of Europeanisation in the museal

field. We ask what happens when processes of musealisation run up against processes of Europeanisation. ‘The process of Europeanisation is looking for a museal form’, as Claus Leggewie (cited in Assmann at al. 2008: 78) has stated. Georg Kreis has expanded upon that (2008: 9): ‘That had to come – a museum for Europe!’ That this ‘had to’ come about has to do with political, economic and cultural integration since the Second World War, which formed a challenge to the concepts and categories of the nation state and in part superseded it. This is especially true of the museum, an institution central to the public self-representation of European (nation) states. Since the idea of the nation state and that of the museum are closely related both historically and structurally (Anderson 2000 [1983]), it seems only logical that different actors participating in Europeanisation processes would turn to, and seek to instrumentalise, the museum as an ‘identity factory’. But as Susan Pearce (1992: 2) made clear when the Maastricht Treaty was ratified, it is also the museum that reacts to, or is supposed to react to, political and economic integration: ‘As the Europe of the Single Act comes into being, with its new legal, commercial and cultural climate, museums must be in the forefront of interpreting we [*sic*] Europeans to ourselves’.

This declaration does not so much look back on the history of the museum as a product of the European Enlightenment (Nielsen 1993; Pomian 1987) but is instead more of a *declaration about the future*. And in this book, this is how we understand the museum as a cultural institution – something that can be so varied (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998) – primarily as an arena for the negotiation of future social orders. This perspective enables us to place the processes of Europeanisation and musealisation in a productive analytic relationship. The public position of the institution of the museum has been strengthened by its historically acquired credibility, and also, since the 1980s, by the so-called museum boom (Baur 2010; Towse 2007; Korff 2007b). This has placed the museum in a position from which it gives the impression – or should convey the impression – that it can resolve social problems. Steven Conn (2010: 9) has observed that ‘[museums] have a responsibility to fix the situation’, referring chiefly to those situations in which museums seek to mediate daily politics. Museums, instead of providing a point of reference in changing times to compensate for the losses of industrialisation and modernisation (Marquard 2001; Lübke 1989), have themselves become actors in change. Processes of Europeanisation influence this transformation in and around the museum; they accelerate it, catalyse it or bypass it.

In this book we wish to investigate the reciprocities between the discursive practices of Europeanisation and its materialisation in museums, exhibitions and collections in Europe. Both elements – the analysis of Eu-

ropeanisation and, more importantly, museal practice – require an interdisciplinary perspective. Museums are complex cultural and aesthetic fields. Gottfried Korff (2007a: ix) is convinced that ‘there is hardly any other field in the cultural and historical sciences which is more internationally networked, or which is more open to public scrutiny, than the activities and theories of museums’. But while regional, national and global perspectives are common in museum studies, especially in works on industry and world exhibitions (Färber 2006; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006a), study of the link to Europe in the museum has been quite marginal to date. In this spirit we also seek to stimulate greater cooperation among the disciplines involved in the study of Europe and also between these and the work done in museums. This book is intended as both a theoretical and an empirical contribution to this end.

Our interdisciplinary approach builds upon existing work and writing in different disciplines, although certain specific limitations apply with respect to our interest in the processes of Europeanisation and of musealisation. The historical sub-discipline of contemporary history can provide some support for understanding the processes of Europeanisation in a transnational and global context. As Jan Palmowski notes (2011: 656f.): ‘It is difficult to see how contemporary history could be written without a clear notion of how the contemporary nation-state and its localities are entangled with outside influences in the spheres of politics, law, commerce, consumer society, finance, communication and the environment’. Up until now contemporary history has contributed little to the study of Europeanisation from this perspective. Comparative historical study in modern history has long addressed itself to the study of self-contained nation and welfare states, making structural comparisons. Only recently has research into the phenomenon of cultural transfer (Espagne 1999) opened modern history to a transnational perspective, though the initial focus was on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Middell 2000; Paulmann 1998).

From the very beginning, the history of integration was itself strongly coloured by a normative proximity to ideas of integration and federation, and was moreover financially dependent upon grants from the European Commission and member states such as Luxembourg (Varsori 2010). To this day it receives little attention in research conducted by contemporary historians. But their work has recently opened up a transnational perspective on European integration since 1945 (Kaiser and Meyer 2013; Kaiser and Varsori 2010; Kaiser, Leucht and Rasmussen 2009; Patel 2009). And the broader field of contemporary history features an emerging emphasis upon the divergent spaces of memory across the continent, especially in respect of the twentieth century (Leggewie 2011; Ostow 2008; Jarausch and

Lindenberger 2007a). This more recent work takes a strong interest in the comparative and cross-border dimensions of the (contemporary) history of Europe as a transnational history (Conway and Patel 2010; Patel 2008).

Even if we see political science as linking the phenomenon of Europeanisation too strongly to public policy research, it has nonetheless opened up relevant questions of convergence. Of course, convergence in the cultural practice of the museum can at most be encouraged, given the merely subsidiary competences of the EU in cultural politics (Schwenke 2010). Here European grant programmes can play a role, but this says nothing about the success of such financial promotion (Vos 2011). Ultimately, it is the sociologically inspired political science research that offers conceptual and analytic ideas of interest for our book. This relates above all to research on networks (Kaiser 2009; Sørensen and Torfing 2007), which has also proved very useful for analysing exchange relationships in historical perspective (Kaiser, Leucht and Gehler 2010). These networks often initiate new lines of financial support for projects requiring European cooperation, or major new museal projects. The concept of (transnational) networks is compatible with that of the field of the museum. In our work, the concept of network is applied to cross-border relations of exchange between individual and institutional actors; meanwhile the concept of the museum field emphasises the common, often contested construction of the object 'Europe' through individual and institutional actors, and in so doing enables us to question it.

Since the mid-1990s, sociology and European ethnology, together with social and cultural anthropology, have discovered processes of Europeanisation and made it their own research field. In so doing they have reacted to the formulation and practice of a European politics of culture and identity, noticeable since the 1970s and reinforced since 1992, when the Maastricht Treaty put an end to the external presentation of the EU as nothing but an economic and political project and shifted the emphasis to an 'unprecedented and successful social and cultural project' (European Commission 2007) that could look back on a series of cultural-political initiatives, conceived in the broadest sense. Since Maastricht the EU has pursued a cultural policy whose central building block is the claim that there is one shared European culture and history. The source of this unity, from which Europe draws its identity, is allegedly the variety of cultures.

The political snares in such a construction of European cultural unity, although they have been thoroughly criticised by cultural studies and anthropology, are there for all to see in the plans for national museums that countries such as France, the Netherlands and Poland have developed or are now developing. Former French President Nicolas Sarkozy conceived



his idea of a national historical museum in response to the French crisis of identity that he and others have diagnosed; the purpose of the new museum was 'to reinforce national identity' (Chrisafis 2010). In 2004 the Dutch social democrat Jan Marijnissen argued similarly when suggesting the foundation of a national historical museum for the Netherlands as a counterweight to the loss of social cohesion (Interview Byvanck).

In his analysis of the cultural-political and symbolic interventions in Europe since the 1980s, Cris Shore (2000: 50–53) identified three particular features of the new European iconography. Firstly, it is teleological and thus indebted to the historical imagination of the nineteenth century. Secondly, the symbols of the new Europe simply replicate those of the old nation-states. Thirdly, they lead into a paradoxical situation in regard to the construction of a European cultural unity, which both already exists and has yet to be created. Susan Sontag (cited in Morley and Robins, 1995: 88) once said of this process that it involved 'the Europeanisation not of the rest of the world, but ... of Europe itself', in which a common European culture and history becomes both condition and aspirational result of EU cultural policy. In addition to the features noted by Shore, there is the danger of implicitly excluding specific ethnic and social groups (such as migrants or religious minorities) through a possibly ethnocentric conception of European history and identity (Balibar 2005; Eder 2001; Str ath 2000; Bhabha 1998).

'Unity in diversity' – the EU motto reflects the circularity of the European self-image. Whoever today writes about, exhibits or analyses Europe deals at the same time with the EU. The contemporary construction of *homo europaeus* (Schmale 2001) in this sense cannot be evaded, as cultural studies and anthropology have lucidly demonstrated. Since the concept of Europeanisation has to operate with historical ideas and historical images of Europe to legitimise the current processes of future transformation of the political and economic organisation of member states, the reasons, course and aims of Europeanisation cannot be separated analytically (Beck and Scholze-Irlitz 2010: 5, italics in original): '*Homo europaeus* here turns out to be a *self-creating archetype*, an imaginary construct, presupposing model European discourse, politics and knowledge while at the same time being impelled by these'.

John Borneman and Nick Fowler (1997) developed their analysis around this circularity, and an extensive literature in cultural studies and anthropology has emerged in response. It firstly investigates the processes of Europeanisation in the form of comparative regional studies in the context of European integration (Kaschuba 2008; Jöhler and Mitterauer 2002; Holmes 2000). Secondly, it goes on to adopt the analytic perspective em-

ployed in studies of everyday and consumer culture, examining how the processes of Europeanisation can be experienced in different social spaces and contexts (Hess 2005; Murphy-Lejeune 2002). Thirdly, it places the political field of the EU itself at the centre of its analysis, investigating for example European elites (Georgakakis and Weisbein 2010; Seidel 2010a; Poehls 2009).

Accompanying these developments, sociologists, together with sociologically inclined political scientists, have increasingly taken interest in the production and development of European identity (Risse 2010; Fligstein 2008; Favell 2005). Using a metaphor coined by Thomas Risse (2003: 491), this can be conceived as more of a 'marble cake' than a congruent unity: 'Europe and the EU become enmeshed with given national identities leading to rather diverging identity outcomes'. Recent research on European identity has a stronger constructivist perspective, which from our point of view is an advantage. This perspective no longer unilaterally presents the material advantages of integration as the catalyst for the process of identification with 'Europe' or the EU but is open to the influence of cultural factors.

Sharon Macdonald (2003) and Rosmarie Beier-de Haan (2005) have discussed the concept of transnational identity as a way to connect Europeanisation in the context of late (or second) modernity with current museal forms of presentation. They begin with the question of how (historical) museums react to the challenge presented by the emergence and development of transnational spaces. Whereas Beier-de Haan (2005: 92) leaves unanswered the question 'what could and should be the categories through which a transnational European perspective can prove itself in the future?', Macdonald draws attention to the dangers of new ideologies of identity, whether *migratory* (Clifford 1997), *multiple* (Turkle 1997) or *hybrid* (Modood and Werbner 1997): 'One problem that has been is that the notion of "hybridity" (as with related conceptions such as "syncretic" or "creolised" identities) seem to presuppose pre-existing "pure" or "non-creolised" cultures' (Macdonald 2003: 9). Ayse Caglar (1997: 180) has proposed a possible methodological way to keep from constructing new or old myths via their deconstruction, by adopting a clear apprehension of the museal object: 'By plotting the networks of interconnected practices surrounding objects, and the sentiments, desires and images these practices evoke, we can avoid the need to define collectivities in advance'. In studying the materialisation of Europe in museums, exhibitions and collections, this practice could well sharpen our understanding of the cultural processes of Europeanisation.

Sociology, anthropology and ethnology are central to the attempt to make Europeanisation intelligible as a reciprocally instituted demarca-

tion between local, national, transnational-European and extra-European spaces and practices, self-descriptions and descriptions by others. Analysis of migratory processes is especially important for cultural and social anthropology and European ethnology, since migration as a political practice highlights the extent to which Europe needs an 'outside', an 'other' to define and conceive itself (Hall 2003). At the same time, migration – understood as an ideal-typical shorthand and independent of whether it is migration *within* Europe or migration *to* Europe – represents a model for the process of European integration. Ideally, migration creates what is required of *homo europaeus*: mobility, interculturality and changing identities.

The present book, chapter by chapter, crosses the above research perspectives on Europeanisation and musealisation. We expect the concepts and literature drawn upon in the following chapters – from political science, sociology and anthropology to contemporary history and cultural and museum studies – will help clarify present processes of Europeanisation in the field of museums.

Chapter 1, 'Musealising Europe', on the concept and history of musealisation, devotes special attention to the elevation and organisation of institutions in the course of nineteenth-century national integration processes. We consider three planned museum projects (only some of which have been partially realised) that seek to explicitly represent the history of European integration – the Musée de l'Europe in Brussels, Bauhaus Europa in Aachen, and the Museum of Civilisations from Europe and the Mediterranean in Marseilles – and examine the extent to which Europe as a museal theme is used to productively sidestep nationalist, essentialist and homogeneous imputations.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the Europeanisation of the museum field as a central precondition for Europeanisation as cultural practice. Chapter 2, 'Governing Europe', investigates how various state actors influence European cultural and museum policy. In contrast with social science research's strong orientation to Brussels, this chapter makes clear that various EU institutions, such as the European Commission and the European Parliament, operate with different ideal models and pursue different strategies of cultural integration. Institutions of member states and sub-national regions also play an important role in the Europeanisation of the museum field.

Chapter 3, 'Networking Europe', again extends our survey of actors contributing to the Europeanisation of the museum field. We argue that existing research has focused excessively on the state. Using different examples, we show that societal actors launch many initiatives that contribute to long-term cultural integration. These are not always dependent on

state support, though they may benefit from it in different ways. In this chapter we investigate the role of nongovernmental organisations, historians, museum practitioners, museum organisations, many structural and functionally very diverse networks, and cultural entrepreneurs in the Europeanisation of the museum field.

Chapter 4, 'Collecting Europe', links Europeanisation as a cultural practice to current collection strategies in cultural, historical and ethnological museums. Whatever shape Europe might assume, it has to be collected before it can be exhibited. Right at the beginning of the chapter, we show that there currently is no 'European' collection policy. Hence we direct our analysis to the manner in which Europeanisation as a cultural practice intervenes in arguments over the status and treatment of objects and collections. Using the concept of relational objects, this chapter covers all the processes of imputation and interpretation that, by making it possible today for museal objects to represent moments of participation, movement and exchange, become templates for Europeanisation processes. In this chapter the idea and conception of relational objects lead to an extension of the notion of actor: borrowing from Bruno Latour (2001), we treat museal objects as acting subjects in a network that produces meaning. The lack of canonised European objects makes it difficult for museums, exhibitions and collections to narrate European history up to the present as a common history.

Chapter 5, 'Narrating Europe', considers the form European narratives take in new grand projects such as the House of European History (HEH) in Brussels, and the ways diverse aspects of the history of European integration are inscribed in museums and exhibitions. In this chapter we demonstrate that a museal narrative of European history is academically defensible, and plausible from the perspective of the visitor, only if new master narratives are eschewed. Grand projects such as the HEH have in any case only a limited scope. Much more important for Europeanisation as a cultural practice of historical narration is the selection of those aspects of European history that can serve as a common history: how they are selected, and how they are inscribed in national, regional and local museal narratives. A variety of options come into play here, among them a resort to biography: the histories of so-called founding fathers, or citizens of the EU who are still alive, recounting their transnational experiences.

Chapter 6, 'Crossing Europe', turns to an issue that marks present-day European societies, involves a crucial EU policy field and represents a significant trend in the European museal field. Exhibitions devoted to migration connect migration to mobility in the ongoing process of Europeanisation. In this respect, the exhibitions we deal with do not necessarily

make any explicit connection to Europe and the EU, but they all address the relationship between the physical and geopolitical borders of Europe and the symbolic differentiation of one's own from the foreign. Migration here appears to be less an exception than a social constant. A Europe of nation states based upon the idea and norms of settlement seems of dubious merit. The exhibitions on migration offer an image of Europe that consists precisely in the wiping away of older ideas of Europe and the symbolic geography of the continent.

The conclusion brings the volume's central aspects and arguments together, taking up the questions prompted by the research and suggesting possible issues for further work. Quite fundamental to this is that we, as authors of this book, count our own transnational experiences as part of the processes of Europeanisation that we analyse. Our book is itself a product of Europeanisation as a cultural and interdisciplinary practice. Because processes of musealisation and of national integration are historically so closely connected, and because at present many actors use European cultural and museum policy as a means to strengthen the legitimacy of the EU, it seems important to us to maintain a clear view of the normative pitfalls of our perspective on Europe in the museum.