

ANU Centre for European Studies Briefing Paper Series

EU Analogical Identity – Or the Ties that Link (Without Binding)

Pablo Cristóbal Jiménez Lobeira



Vol. 1 No.2 (September 2010)

ISSN 1838-0379

ANU COLLEGE OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES

EU Analogical Identity – Or the Ties that Link (Without Binding)

Pablo Cristóbal Jiménez Lobeira

***Abstract:** From the political point of view, European Union (EU) integration implies some kind of unity in the community constituted by EU citizens. Unity is difficult to attain if the diversity of citizens (and their nations) is to be respected. A thick bond that melts members' diversity into a 'European pot' is therefore out of the question. On the other hand, giving up unity altogether makes political integration impossible. Through a meta-theoretical analysis of normative positions, this paper proposes a composed notion of European identity that links without binding. It contains four facets – cultural, political, social, external – with nuances, expressed in three binaries, that cut across all of them – history-project, ethos-achievement, commonness-uncommonness. I will submit that a workable European identity (and the related concepts of unity, polity and citizenship) can be better conceived as analogical – a mid way between blending unity and irreconcilable diversity.²*

***Keywords:** analogical, diversity, EU citizens, EU political community, European identity, facets, nuances, unity³*

In a previous article I alluded to Europe's soul searching and analysed tentative, competing positions regarding what that soul – European identity (EI) – ought to be. My goal was to show how the notion of EI had been used in political discourse and in academic writings by representative authors. I suggested that the notion of EI might not lie in *only one* of the competing positions, but maybe in a harmonious combination of several of them: they appeared to be compatible with each other as different aspects of a single concept (Jiménez 2010:12-4). That paper was mainly focused, however, on explaining the different positions. The task of showing how they could be harmonised in a richer concept (called there 'composed EI') was signaled as requiring further research (Jiménez 2010:15-6). This is the task I intend to follow now.

To that end, I will point out pertinent traits (or 'facets') respectively proposed by each position as well as common patterns (termed 'nuances') that emerge in all of them. After that I will attempt to show how all those elements can compose one comprehensive concept, analogical in character.

A multi-faceted soul: positions on EI

Romano Prodi (2000:40-49) used the term 'soul' to describe the glue that holds the EU together. The concept is difficult to express and almost any similar term can be misleading. Renan (1882) faced a similar problem when defining national identity: after discarding options like race, language,

territory, common benefit and religion he would say that a nation *was* a soul, a spiritual principle⁴. 'Soul' might be conceived also as a vital principle or core of something, what explains it and gives it unity. Arguably, the EU can (continue to) be a polity (of sorts) if it finds, possesses and fosters, a source of unity that links or binds its citizens: that source of unity is the referent of EI.

In the first article I explained how five positions emerged from Walkenhorst's research (Jiménez 2010:3-4). My choice of the authors sustaining each perspective came about after a lengthy literature review on the subject, trying to find thinkers that were both prominent in their respective fields of research and specifically interested in EI.

I named the five positions on EI 'cultural', 'deliberative', 'social', 'international' and 'post-modern' (Jiménez 2010:4-12). Here I will call them, respectively, 'cultural', 'political', 'social', 'external' and 'cosmopolitan', to express their meaning better – the content is the same. Exponents of those positions were, correspondingly, Joseph Ratzinger, Jürgen Habermas, Anthony Giddens, Ian Manners and Gerard Delanty. Since the positions have already been described in my former paper, here I will only present a summary of each in order to recapture the discussion.

Ratzinger (2006, 2007) argues that two essential parts of EI are the cultural traditions of the Bible (Judaism and Christianity) and the Enlightenment. He deems both traditions complementary and foundational for the success and prosperity Europe has achieved today. He perceives a danger in stressing only one of those elements (more often the Enlightenment) in detriment of the other (the Biblical tradition). Denial of one of these components from the collective memory can only be damaging to the EU political community, which was founded and developed in no small part thanks to that common moral background shared by leaders and citizens alike in the second half of the XX century. Recognising those essential traits of their culture will help Europeans not only to better remember who they are and maintain their so-far successful project, but also to receive, understand and interact with immigrants and new citizens with very different cultural (and moral) backgrounds.

Habermas (& Derrida 2003; 2006) advocates for an EI based on the laws that EU citizens can give themselves as deliberative consociates and obey under conditions of equality. Though he sees the law as sufficient ground for the founding and working of the political community, he nonetheless relies on some memories when looking for a common background from which European values derive, and which can foster collective identity and civic solidarity. Those memories have to do mainly with the cultural and moral heritage springing from the Enlightenment. He uses the contrast

between Europe and United States to stress the singularity of the former as peace-seeking, power-moderated, colonially-reflective, market-controlling and religion-suspecting.

Giddens (2007) describes EI by means of the concept of the 'European Social Model' that implies a way of life based on a peaceful society, democracy, human rights, market economy and generous welfare. The paragon of these achievements would be Scandinavia. The social model has given Europeans influence to promote democracy, the rule of law, environment responsibility and other similarly desirable outcomes in neighbouring countries and in the world. He advocates for clear borders for Europe and a limit to expansion in order for EU citizens to afford the way of life they have achieved.

Manners (2008) focuses on the external image of the EU citizens' political community as their source of identity. The face of such political community is that of being a normative power, which is example and promoter of peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance. He contrasts the EU with United States, Russia and China - 'significant others' – as a way to make his point even clearer. The normative power of the EU relies on international law, negotiation and the ethics of universally accepted values and principles.

Finally, Delanty (2005, 2010) depicts EI as a cosmopolitan dialogue transcendent of the limits of Europe alone and in constant transformation in the interaction with diversity and plurality in a globalised context. He sees EI as a mode of recognition and discursive rationality which is decentred, not uniquely European and open to differentiation and diversity.

Common parameters: nuances of EI

Having summarised each of the positions, I would now like to take some of the terms hinted at in the former paper (Jiménez 2010) and clarify them further. In this section I deal with common or general parameters that are present in all of the positions and shade them in a balance between binaries of nuances contained in each parameter.

The first and most generic binary is given by the Individual-Collective (or person-group) nuances. When we speak about EI, whose identity do we mean? Though there are many studies attending to the personal identities of many Europeans, here the focus is rather on the identity of Europeans taken as a collective. Or, to be more precise, the identity of EU citizens considered as a political community.

The second binary can be described by using the nuances Subject-Object. The former is the experience of the EU citizens in the form of belonging, solidarity, attachment, and allegiance, usually based on the perception that the members of the political community are a collective 'one' in a certain way – share a degree of 'sameness' among them. The latter refers to the cause or source of that experience (the aspects or facets analysed in the precedent section).

The third binary shows the Janus-like, Heritage-Project nuances of EI, with one face towards the past and the other towards the future. Like other identities, EI has a determined or inherited component, which as such can be remembered, forgotten or denied, but not erased - Heritage. Memory and history are often viewed as elements of person and group identities. The past is given, and in that sense closed, immovable. That history can be interpreted in different ways and memory can be selective, does not change the past's determinacy.

But identity is not only what we have been, but also what we want to be, what we chose to become - Project. Failure to acknowledge history can lead to denial of an important quality of identity. Conversely, failure to see the future might cause unrealistic optimism (if the history is considered 'good') or to despair (if thought of as 'bad'). Project and construction are also parts of identity, uncovering its open, undetermined side – therefore susceptible of choice.

Omission of either of those faces causes shortsightedness and confusion, the impression of enslaving fixity or unlimited freedom. A balance between the two aspects brings a realistic conception of EI. EU citizens cannot understand who they are if references to the past are ignored, but that does not determine what they will become in the future, which is an open question. The power of the past is transcended by the freedom towards the future, but that freedom arises in the context of the past.

The fourth binary includes the nuances Ethos-Achievements. The community of EU citizens is likely to be proud of (or at least satisfied with) their results in terms of peace, democracy, human rights, social equality and generalised welfare – all of them Achievements. But how or why did they attain them? Was it, for example, thanks to their legal organisation, their moral virtues, or their cultural atmosphere? This is the foundational, Ethos nuance. Arguably, the good results can continue to be obtained if attention is paid to ensuring their foundations are kept and fostered.

The last and fifth binary is Commonness-Uncommonness. Identity is more easily perceived in the presence of contrast. Recognising what they do not have in common with other political

communities helps EU citizens to see what they do have in common among them. The commonness-uncommonness binary refers to what EU citizens perceive as familiar across different states, as well as to the way they think of themselves when they are abroad – in extra-European contexts. Many EU citizens may feel 'more European' when they live in a different region of the world, and find that, for instance, as Slovenians they have more things in common – they share more 'sameness' – with the Irish than either of them do with, say, Cambodians.

Now let us look at these approaches from the perspective of the parameters of EI described before. We could summarise their interaction as follows:

EI Nuances	Individual- Collective	Subject- Object	Heritage- Project	Ethos- Achievements	Commonness- Uncommonness
EI Facets					
Cultural	V	O	H/P	E/A	C/U
Political	V	O	P/H	E/A	C/U
Social	V	O	H/P	A/E	C/U
External	V	O	H/P	A/E	U/C
(Cosmopolitan)	-	-	P	-	U

All of them move in the Collective ('V') realm of the first binary, and concentrate mainly on the Objective ('O') part of the second binary. Nearly all of them place their ideas both on the level of History ('H') - the past - as well as of Project ('P') – construction, the future – differing only in the emphasis they give to each nuance of that third binary. The cosmopolitan position seems to stress only the Project nuance. Regarding the fourth binary, nearly all of them refer to the Achievements ('A') of the European project and recognise more or less importance to the Ethos ('E') that made them possible (except again for the cosmopolitan position). Finally, nearly all of them have an idea of Commonness ('C') – 'us' – and Uncommonness ('U') – 'them', with only the cosmopolitan position tending to blur the difference between these nuances.

Each binary of nuances, therefore, cuts across *four* out of the five facets of EI. Before showing how, I would like to suggest that the cosmopolitan 'position' – as exposed by Delanty at least – qualifies neither as a facet of EI nor a nuance that cuts across all of the facets. Cosmopolitanism is rather an *accent* within the 'Project' (third binary) and 'Uncommonness' (fifth binary) nuances. It accents the Project nuance by stressing (rightly) that EI is being constructed and as such is open, but denies

(wrongly in my view) the importance of the Heritage nuance, the given or historical side. It accents (rightly) the Uncommonness nuance in an effort to render EI inclusive, but at the price of denying (wrongly, I think) the Commonness nuance that every political community has – lest any delimitation becomes impossible not only at the real but also at the conceptual level (e.g. an ‘EI’ that is not European and does not identify).

The perspective adopted in my analysis takes only one nuance in each of the first two binaries (Individual-Collective and Subject-Object). This is convenient for a normative study in political philosophical perspective, but does not mean that it is the only possible approach. Other approaches might consider the 'Individual' and 'Subject' nuances in the first two binaries. A number of empirical studies, for instance, may be interested in how the political community is perceived and experienced by citizens (the Subject nuance): enthusiasm, apathy, and so forth. Other studies might concentrate on individual cases of multiple identities (Individual nuance): a woman born in Innsbruck who sees herself as Tirolean, Austrian, Central European, EU citizen... All of them would still be talking – validly - about EI but moving in different parameters of the subject.

Now let us see how nuances cut across facets. I will leave aside the first two binaries (Individual-Collective, Subject-Object) because they do not change from facet to facet in my analysis.

Nuances across facets

One way in which the Heritage-Project binary shapes each facet is by allowing a look to the past (heritage) in order to learn what Europe is (i.e., what it has been up to now). In cultural terms this includes, among other elements, the influence that Biblical and the Enlightenment morality and conceptions have had in the creation and unfolding of the EU. In the political area it is manifested in the progress of supranational, transnational and international cooperation and the development of democracy throughout the region. The political facet also relies on heritage aspects of EI related mainly to the Enlightenment. Socially, the Heritage nuance appears in aspects of equality, non-discrimination and welfare. Externally, it relates to the role the EU has already played as a 'normative-power', promoter of 'European values'.

The contrast of the Heritage nuance, that helps to balance it, is Project, which opens what EU citizens are living today and what they want to become. Culturally they have moved from the Christian to the Modern (Enlightenment), and then to a Post-modern (therefore also post-secular). Here the cosmopolitan accent is very important, because it reflects another phenomenon that EU

citizens confront today: globalisation to unprecedented levels. Peoples with very different cultural backgrounds have immigrated in large amounts to the EU. They are becoming citizens and are having children. The Project nuance points towards the future, which depends on how EU citizens – all of them – want to shape it. The political position, assuming that law is enough as foundation, concentrates on the open, Project nuance of EI (third binary) which it sees in the deliberative process of law-making and participation in the public sphere. Politically it presents EU citizens with decisions they will have to make regarding the polity (EU), its form or constitution, the degree of its integration and the ways to make it more democratic and at the same time more efficient. Socially Project means the new challenges of integration, cohesion and equality not only legal but also in terms of education, employment opportunities, and the future of welfare systems. Externally it means the negotiation of 'the limits of Europe', the accession processes, common immigration, foreign and security policies, and the international role of the EU *vis-à-vis* other 'powers' – both 'soft' and 'strong'. Here the cosmopolitan accent is relevant too.

The Ethos part of the fourth binary is manifested in culture in different ways. It can be seen, if we accept that the Biblical and Enlightenment traditions – taken in a broad sense – form an essential part of Europe's cultural background, in the virtues and attitudes that allowed the growing number of members of the EU project to build something together. Though the project about which we are talking was not intended as a cultural enterprise, there is no doubt of the role of Enlightenment culture – the inspiring core of Social Democracy – as well as of Biblical culture – brought inside the project, among other groups, by Christian Democrats – in the successful construction of the EU. Reconciliation, equality, separation of church-state, personal freedom, forgiveness, acknowledgement of crimes like those perpetrated by totalitarian regimes (including the Holocaust), solidarity, subsidiarity, cooperation, are all virtues that emerge from that background. Socially the Ethos nuance was manifested in virtues like tolerance, inclusion, non-discrimination, care for all sectors of society, integration and respect. Politically it was present in the willingness to deliberate and listen other parties, the emphasis on the promotion of democracy and accountability, the readiness to negotiate, request and concede in order to get unified decisions, and the quest for ever more legitimate and representative forms of participation. Externally the Ethos nuance has shaped positions and actions that EU countries have taken increasingly together and that reflect their internal (cultural, social, political) *Ethea*. Negotiation rather than force to attain solutions, respect for diversity, solidarity with developing regions, reconciliation and forgiveness as the bases for stable peace, the rule of law and democracy as ordinary ways in the political life are just a few examples.

The Achievement nuance in the fourth binary is present in every facet as well. Culturally Europeans have attained shared values and a morality that has become implicit in the way institutions and relations work. Bible and Enlightened values permeate all of the EU countries today. Politically the Achievement nuance is most evident in the presence of democratic regimes based on the rule of law and respectful of human rights in all member-states. Socially this nuance is patent in Giddens's explanation of the 'European Social Model' which has been explained before. Externally, the Achievement nuance would contain Manners' description of the positive influence and increasingly more significant successes of the EU as an actor in the global scene in terms of fair trade, environment protection, human rights, peace-making and global rule of law.

The Commonness-Uncommonness binary is present in different ways in every facet as well. Culturally the presence of new groups with different cultural backgrounds has led to the realisation (under Ratzinger's perspective) that Europe is not culture neutral and that it does have widely accepted moral values, desirable virtues and conceptions of life, which are more familiar or 'common'. The experience of what is – or has been so far – uncommon can only be digested and adopted positively if it is recognised in the first place. Socially the 'European model' is in general perceived as common, in contrast with other styles which feel uncommon.⁵ Externally Commonness would be perceived (again) in the foreign affairs style of negotiation to solve conflicts, emphasis on democracy and the rule of law, sustainable development, in contrast with Uncommonness made manifest for example with United States in the approach to the 2003 Iraq War or with China regarding human rights and treatment of minorities (for instance in Tibet).

Having described in the first section the facets of EI and in the second its nuances, the following task is to show how facets and nuances play out together in a comprehensive, composed notion.

Nuances and facets in interaction: a composed EI

EI in the way considered here - in its Collective (within the first binary) and Object (within the second binary) nuances – could be envisaged as a glue that binds, or rather a link that relates the EU citizens together in a community. EI makes them see each other – following the root of the term 'identity' – as 'the same' in a sense thin enough to allow them to keep their individual and collective (or 'sub-collective' or group) diversities (for example their language), but minimally 'thick' just enough to still keep them as 'one', as a unity, as *a* political community.

In the following paragraphs I will submit that EI, if it is to denote a principle of unity for the community of EU citizens, can be better conceived as the composition of facets and nuances explained before. Facets provide aspects of EI, whereas nuances shade them. The result is a composed EI.

The first element of a composed EI, following Habermas, is the foundation of the political community as such, the political facet. The political community is formed of citizens – a political concept - bound with each other by legal ties. The polity is built upon a constitution freely agreed by the citizens. They participate through deliberation and representation in the making of the laws which they will then obey. That the EU is a polity *sui generis* with a constitution of sorts (body of treaties) and the participation of citizens to a large extent mediated by their states makes the picture more complicated, but does not change the principle. The abundant literature concentrated on the EU's 'democratic deficit'⁶ attests to the importance of the political facet. Part of what binds EU citizens together must have to do with the way in which their polity is organised, the part they can play in its construction, their shared laws and the manner in which national sovereignty is preserved and at the same time checked by a supranational dimension.⁷

The political facet has both historical (Heritage) and constructed (Project) elements (third parameter). The liberal and republican traditions play an important role in today's conception of the EU. At the same time – and in harmony with those traditions – the EU is today an open project also from the political point of view. Some argue for a minimal integration, closer to an international organisation with a common market. Some others push for a 'fully fledged' polity (i.e. a federation). Still others feel inclined to an arrangement that improves – but does not substantially change – today's political form: a quasi-polity or, using a term coined by Bellamy & Castiglione (1997:441-445)⁸, a 'mixed commonwealth'. Habermas' intuition that an EI can be formed by the participation of EU citizens in the (EU's) public sphere proves insightful. At the same time, his reliance on the political democratic traditions that have developed in Europe and elsewhere (notably in the United States of America, though not only) is perfectly valid. History explains why we are here today: but that does not stop us from moving ahead. History and construction are both parts of the political facet.

Ethos and Achievements (fourth binary) nuance the political facet as well. Political or civic virtues have been and are necessary for the polity – especially a democratic one – to work adequately. Active participation, solidarity and engagement in open and rational discourse with other citizens are essential for the working of a political community and cannot be dictated by law. The

achievements of what today is the EU provide colour to the political aspect as well. Somehow there is a mixed (transnational and supranational) legal system that works, and though if it applied to become an EU member the EU would not meet the admission political criteria⁹, it still is a profoundly 'philo-democratic' institution in constant search for an increased legitimacy and a clear promoter of democracy in the whole region.

This idea leads to the nuances Commonness-Uncommonness (fifth binary). The political aspect has an implicit reference to the civic virtues the EU possesses in its member-states and citizens, and a different situation 'outside'. Formally at least, the 27 EU member countries are the space of Commonness. Defining what Europe is can be controversial, because it does not have clear-cut geographical limits, ¹⁰ and because there may be differences also between countries *within* the EU. But a sense of what is familiar (European) and what is foreign (non-European) does exist. The awareness of what the EU citizens have achieved in political terms and that is so difficult to conquer in other political communities, forms part of a composed EI.

Good governance, just and efficient political system, deliberative democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law, all part of the political atmosphere, bolster a climate for the appearance of the 'European Social Model', emblem of the second facet of a composed EI. Such way of life, so cherished by Europeans, reflects the social aspect of EI. Giddens captures it well. To be sure, European societies are far from being perfect, but there is no doubt that they are advanced.¹¹ Moral, political and economic freedom, equality, unemployment support, old-age pensions, moderated working weeks with the corresponding leisure to cultivate other areas of life, access to good education, efficient transport systems and a tolerant an open society are only some factors of that climate. Many EU citizens (as well as tourists and visitors) see this social climate as a very important feature of Europe.

The social aspect is shaded by the Heritage nuance (third binary) when the prosperity that has been conquered progressively in half a century throughout the region is considered. This becomes palpable in the analysis of rights that EU citizens enjoy today and that were not recognised just a few decades ago. The social facet contains also an open, Project nuance, because notwithstanding the good progress, there is still much to advance in terms of rights, benefits (and their sustainability) and equality from a trans-European perspective.

The Ethos or character (fourth binary) that inspired that way of life is part of this social facet, if not as evident as its Achievements. The practice of social virtues such as justice and equality, tolerance

and inclusion, hard work and care for the environment, for example, has helped to develop and maintain the European way of life with all its achievements. 'Economic virtues' like free enterprise, open markets and efforts for fiscal discipline (true, not always exemplary in all Member States), capital and labour movement and others, also account for the achievements in this area that, though named 'social', includes economic elements without which prosperity would have been unattainable.

As for the Commonness-Uncommonness binary, the stress when referring to the social way of life that EU countries have reached is on the collective self, but has as an implicit and very powerful background 'the other' or 'extra-communitarian' which is not always similar. We do not have to look very far, in other continents, where the contrast with Europe is pronounced: several countries today, even some among those applying for membership to the EU, have a very different social (and, for that matter, political) atmosphere.

For Ratzinger (2004) culture is 'the social form of expression, as it has grown up in history, of those experiences and evaluations that have left their mark on a community and have shaped it' (60-61). It is an attempt to understand the world and the existence of man within it. It shows us 'how to go about being human, how a man takes his proper place in this world and responds to it' by improving himself and living his life successfully and happily. It is a pattern that each one can walk only with the help of others, a question therefore also about the proper shaping of the community. Culture is therefore a perception that opens the way for practical action – of which values, morality and transcendence (or the divine) are an important part. European culture, if we accept this formulation, would be shaped – among other elements – by the metaphysical conceptions and the morality of the Biblical tradition (summarised in the Mosaic Covenant). In this sense the cultural aspect is also relevant to a composed EI.

The historical, Heritage nuance of this cultural facet is, drawing from Ratzinger's perspective, as evident as its Project, constructed side. European culture has been formed by the interaction between 'Jerusalem (Biblical tradition), Athens (Greek philosophy) and Rome (Roman organisation), but also by the interaction between Romance, Germanic and Slavic peoples, the Enlightenment, the experiences of totalitarianism and the Holocaust, and the post-War reconciliation and reconstruction. The interactions and transformations have not stopped there, they continue to happen today. Europe's culture is *both* Heritage and Project in constant evolution.

Ratzinger has outlined the importance within that culture of Judeo-Christianity and Modernity – the Bible and the Enlightenment – in a particular way with respect to questions of existential meaning

and morality for Europe and for the EU. These elements explain the Ethos that has helped to attain big achievements for Europeans. One of such Achievements could be, for example, an understanding of the political and the religious spheres as independent from each other in their own fields. Another could be the force of forgiveness and reconciliation among up to then adamant enemies in the construction of the first European Communities.

The cultural aspect of EI contains also nuances that regard the European (collective) self – Commonness – and the collective other - Uncommonness. EU citizens perceive their collective self as different from others which could alternatively be the United States, the Islamic world, China, Russia. The current and undeniable problems the EU is having today receiving and accommodating at least a good part of immigrants (and new citizens) is that they are perceived as 'culturally other'. Surprisingly, the biggest contrast of the newcomers is not mainly, if we attend to the moral core of European culture, with its Biblical tradition, but with that of the Enlightenment.¹²

If Delanty's cosmopolitan position offers alternatives to republicanism in the construction of the EU polity, it should become a nuance of the political aspect. If it refers to 'societal encounters' it should be included as a nuance of the social aspect. If it means 'a constant transformation of culture' then it should be placed a nuance of the cultural aspect. If it is referring to the role of the EU in the world arena then it should form part of the external aspect. In every case it stresses the construction, Project nuance in the third binary and the otherness, Uncommonness nuance in the fifth binary. Because of that cosmopolitanism, at least in the way presented by Delanty fits better as a desirable quality of other aspects than a facet in itself. Since it appears in at least two of the nuances, but is not substantially different from them, it seems not a different nuance but an accent to existing ones.

The external facet, however, is an essential element. It is under this perspective that an often thin but real shared identity among Europeans emerge. Even though Manners could be criticised for excessive optimism as ideals and aspirations are not always distinguished from actual accomplishments, it is true that work in the direction he points has been done and is important to EU citizens. They are – at least this is the implication that can be drawn from Manners' work – interested in promotion of peace, equality, development, the environment and international law as means to solve disputes at the global stage. And Europeans do appreciate – especially when they are out of their region - the social, cultural and political values (even if they are perfectible) that they enjoy at home. The idea that the EU is a totally other especially to the United States could be challenged – probably the differences are not as pronounced as some intellectuals would have them. But there is no doubt of the emulative power of the EU and its distinctiveness from other polities

and regions according to Manners' account. Even with all the things that need bettering, the EU has been capable of certain achievements and it exerts a global influence in the world – both in the vicinity of and far from its current borders.

The construction of the EU from its beginning as an international and supranational community, its structural evolution, the theorising about stateness and polityhood, the character of its legal entanglement, just to mention a few aspects, have not for nothing fascinated the attention of scholars from the most varied disciplines and politicians from the most different ideologies.¹³ The EU is seen with wonder and hope also in other regions of the world which have been suffering for decades tragedies similar to that of mid XX century Europe, but enjoy few of its achievements. The historical, Heritage nuance is evident; and so is the open, Project one. Nobody could regard the EU as something set in stone already. Precisely its indeterminacy in so many respects (starting from its definition: is it a polity, and if so of what kind?) stimulate fruitful debates and give the contributors the feeling of being part of a question that is by no means settled.

The external aspect has certain references to the Ethos and Achievement nuances, which become evident for example in Manners' mention of the use of community and international law to set, respectively, internal or external disputes. The cultural, social and political 'virtues' and values of the community constituted by EU citizens have helped them to become a positive agent in the world. The mostly beneficial influence of the EU, for example, on candidate (or aspirant) countries can be seen on the efforts of the latter to improve their records on human rights, democratic transparency, the rule of law and even settlement of long lasting regional disputes in order to attain membership. The EU's economic prosperity has reached faraway regions who receive help for development in different ways.

The external aspect contains also the idea of the collective self and the other – the Commonness-Uncommonness nuances – what EU citizens like about their community today and which is different from other collectives, what they perceive to be their styles, their ways of government, their social landscapes, their cultural traditions, and those of the external world in constant interaction – most eminently through trade and immigration – with the EU.

Composed EI as analogical: links without bonds

There is one last feature in the concept of EI that needs explanation (Jiménez 2010:16): its being *analogical*. This feature allows harmonisation of facets and nuances, and facilitates the explanation

of their interaction as a whole. The EU cannot be understood as just another political community: it is not a nation (rather, a group of nations) and it is not a state (at least not in the ordinary sense of the word). Viewers of the EU as an international organisation for economic purposes only, feel uneasy about the way in which the common market has become increasingly more entangled beyond pure trade relations. Similarly uncomfortable – but for very different reasons – have become those who would have the EU as a fully-fledged, 'real' polity (a federation for instance) but who instead witness a very complicated and vague political (and legal, and economic...) arrangement, difficult to define and coordinate, and even more difficult to legitimise on democratic grounds. The EU, meanwhile, remains at an impasse between the two options.

With Bellamy & Warleigh (1998) who propose a 'workable' model of EU citizenship for 'the messy polity of Europe', I would like to suggest that the apparent 'impasse' might actually be indicative of the wish of Europeans to move neither 'backwards' (to simple economic community) nor 'forward' (towards a federation). The impasse, provisional as it appears, may be saying something to which the European project's architects should pay attention. Bellamy & Warleigh advance wittily that 'there is virtue in living with mess if we can make it ours'. Maybe the 'mixed commonwealth' is a third option in its own right. What would it mean in terms of EU citizens' identity?

It would mean that a composed EI is better understood as 'analogical'.¹⁴ If the EU is a polity at all, it is certainly not an 'ordinary' one (a nation-state). EU citizenship is not of a 'normal' kind either. Because in this case the political community and its membership (citizenship) – both of sorts – coexist with other political communities and memberships which are such in a *proper* or more conventional way but that at the same time are neither completely similar nor altogether alien to each other¹⁵: the EU and Luxembourg are not the same polity, but they are not completely unrelated either, and the latter is a polity in a stronger sense than the former. The EU is a political community only in an analogical – weaker – sense, and so are the EU citizens. The analogical tone sets the apparent tension between the EU and its Member States, between EU citizenship and European national citizenships in a certain harmony. A composed EI is more fully apprehended in analogical perspective.

An analogical conception of EI would help to mediate and harmonise both the facets and their nuances. Deep inside, the reservations – often strong and not altogether unjustified – to speak about EI arise from the fact that one may be European but more strongly German and even more, Bavarian, for example. Inside EU Member States there are different regions, even national groups (like Galicians in Spain, Welsh in Britain or Swedes in Finland). There may be similarities between

European peoples, but that does not mean complete sameness (identity), but only an analogical one. EI's plasticity, captured by the analogical tone, acknowledges and eases the tension between the national and the European. The *price* of harmonisation is the renunciation of a strong or thick conception of EI, but the *prize* is a workable EI. Because the analogical tone explains better a multi-faceted and nuanced EI, I propose to call this conception of EI 'analogical'.

Analogical EI considers first of all the cultural, political, social and external facets as part of one concept, giving a place to each according to its own sphere and interconnection with the rest. Some social achievements for example can be worked out when grounded on a specific political organisation, to which a shared cultural atmosphere contributes. But an analogical EI would also help to see that, *stricto sensu*, there is no such thing as a *European* (or even less, *EU*) political (or cultural, external, social...) facet. That would be as adventurous as to say that the political systems in Portugal and Finland, Denmark and Bulgaria are equivalent – a serious nonsense. Or to say that Christianity and the Enlightenment in Poland and the Netherlands happened and were experienced in the same way. Or that the welfare system in Sweden is equivalent to that of the Czech Republic. Or that France and Britain favour exactly the same external image of the EU on the world-stage.

Analogical EI outlines the importance nuances have for the different facets, seeking a balance among parameters and within them. It is as relevant to see the Project nuance of identity as is to see the Heritage one, without cancelling either. Achievements are relevant as much as is their foundation in a certain Ethos. Openness to Uncommonness is as essential as knowledge and appreciation of Commonness. And each nuance binary plays out in a different way within the cultural, political, social and external facets, all of them relevant to a thorough understanding of EI.

Finally, analogical EI takes into account the character of the EU as a 'mixed commonwealth' and the corresponding ways of belonging: sub-national, national, European. The EU is an analogical polity and EU citizenship is an analogical way of belonging – accompanying, not substituting, the national realm. An analogical, composed EI, entails a conception of integration half way between total unity and absolute diversity, it allows for links to be established and kept without binding, reminding and reassuring EU citizens and Member States that they are, after all, in part similar and in part different.

References

- Baczynski, Jerzy (2007) 'The flaws in Europe's democracy' *Europe's World Policy Journal*,
Viewed on-line August 2010:
http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home_old/Article/tabid/191/ArticleType/articleview/ArticleID/20495/Default.aspx
- Bellamy, R & Castiglione, D (1997) 'Building the Union: the Nature of Sovereignty in the Political Architecture of Europe' *Law and Philosophy* (16):421-445 Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands
- Bellamy, R & Castiglione, D (1998) 'Cementing the Union: the Role of European Citizenship' TSER EURCIT project, University of Reading. Accessed April 2010:
ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/improving/docs/ser_citizen_bellamy.pdf
- Bellamy, Richard (2003) 'Sovereignty, Post-Sovereignty and Pre-Sovereignty: Three Models of the State, Democracy and Rights within the EU' *Sovereignty in Transition* N. Walker, ed., pp. 167-190, Hart. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1530445>
- Berglund, Duvold, Ekman & Schymik (2009) *Where does Europe End? Borders, Limits and Directions of the EU* Edward Elgar, Cheltenham (UK), Northampton, MA (USA)
- Beuchot, Mauricio (2004) *Hermenéutica, analogía y símbolo* ('Hermeneutics, analogy and symbol') Herder, Querétaro
- Beuchot, Mauricio (2005) *Interculturalidad y derechos humanos Siglo XXI*, México
- Beuchot, Mauricio (2008) *Perfiles esenciales de la hermenéutica* ('Hermeneutics' essential profiles') Fondo de Cultura Económica & Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
- Chrysochoou, Dimitris (2009) *Theorizing European Integration* Second Edition Routledge, New York
- Deely, John (2002) 'The Absence of Analogy' *The Review of Metaphysics* 55 (3) 521-550 Mar, accessed August 2010: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20131750>

Delanty, Gerard (2005) 'The Idea of a Cosmopolitan Europe: on the Cultural Significance of Europeanization' *International Review of Sociology – Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 15 (3) 405-421 Nov

Delanty, Gerard (2010) 'The European Heritage from a Critical Cosmopolitan Perspective' *LSE Europe in Question Discussion Paper Series* No. 19.

Democracy Audit World Audit.org Accessed August 2010:
<http://www.worldaudit.org/democracy.htm>

Eriksen, Erik (2009) *The Unfinished Democratisation of Europe* Oxford University Press, New York

Giddens, Anthony (2007) "Europa en la era global". (Translated from English into Spanish by Albino Santos Mosquera) Paidós, Barcelona

Habermas, J & Derrida, J (2003) 'February 15, or what binds Europeans together: a plea for a common foreign policy, beginning in the core of Europe' *Constellations* 10 (3)

Habermas, Jürgen (2006) *Time of Transitions* (edited and translated by Ciaran Cronin and Max Pensky). Polity. Cambridge

Human Development Report 2009 – HDI Rankings, United Nations Development Program.
Accessed August 2010: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Jiménez, Pablo (2010) 'Towards a Notion of European Political Identity' *Australian Association of Professional and Applied Ethics, 17th Annual Conference* (June), University of Sydney, Australia. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1626054>

Manners, Ian (2008) 'The Normative Ethics of the European Union' *International Affairs* 84: I (2008) 65-80

Morgan, Jardine & Franklin (1986) 'Analogy, Self-Identity, and Family Identity: Research in Progress' *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation* 11 (4): 584-586, Accessed August 2010: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1494590>

Prodi, Romano (2000) *Europe as I see it* (Translated by Allan Cameron) Polity Press

Ratzinger, Joseph (2004) *Truth and Tolerance – Christian Belief and the World Religions*
(translated by Henry Taylor) Ignatius, San Francisco

Ratzinger, Joseph (2006) *Christianity and the Crisis of Cultures* (translated by Brian McNeil)
Ignatius, San Francisco

Ratzinger, Joseph (2007) *Europe Today and Tomorrow. Addressing the Fundamental Issues.*
Ignatius Press, San Francisco

Renan, Ernest (1882) 'Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?' ('What is a nation?') Accessed July 2010:
<http://www.bmlisieux.com/archives/nation01.htm>

Walkenhorst, Heiko (2009) 'The Conceptual Spectrum of European Identity – from Missing Link to Unnecessary Evil' *Limerick Papers in Politics and Public Administration* 2009, No. 3, Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Limerick, Ireland

¹ Centre for European Studies & Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics - Australian National University

² I am very grateful to Dr Bruce Kent, Dr John Besemeres, Dr Matthew Zagor and Dr Vito Breda for their suggestions and comments to earlier versions of this article.

³ Acknowledgements to Diane Humphery, Luciana Panei, Marie Knight and all the personnel of the ANU Library who help me constantly to find very specific bibliography, often difficult to locate and get. I thank them for their prompt, professional and effective support.

⁴ And yet by mentioning Renan I am by no means implying that EI should be viewed as a *national* identity. Europe is clearly not a nation, but a community of nations. My interest is in how Renan attempted to address the problem of finding a *polity's* source of cohesion. Some nations are polities. The EU is a hybrid polity as well.

⁵ For example areas of Paris, Berlin and other European cities where a woman have to be careful on the way they dress on the risk of been abused, or where anti-Semitism is resurgent.

⁶ See for instance Eriksen (2009).

⁷ As treated by Bellamy (2003) among others.

⁸ For which they in turn feel indebted to Neil MacCormick.

⁹ In words of Timonhy Garton Ash: “Were the EU to apply for membership of the EU, it would not be accepted”, quoted in Baczynski (2007). See also Berglund *et al.* (2009):72

¹⁰ This distinction touches on the thorny issue of Europe’s borders, beyond which countries could not apply to become members of a *European Union*. For a very interesting discussion on this topic see Berglund *et al.* (2009):69-109.

¹¹ Consider for example the number of EU countries classified as having 'very high human development' (about two thirds, the other third appears in the 'high' category) in the *Human Development Report 2009*. Again two thirds of EU countries are considered within the first division in democracy and transparency, and the rest in the second division, with only Latvia, Bulgaria and Romania lagging behind in the third division, as shown in the *Democracy Audit*.

¹² It is only in these terms that problems like that of the head scarves in France can be understood as provoking so much turmoil.

¹³ See to this respect, especially in a political philosophy perspective, the very interesting synthesis carried out through several years by Chrysochoou (2009).

¹⁴ I am taking this concept from Beuchot (2004:13-31) who has used it extensively in the development of his philosophical position of analogical hermeneutics (see for instance Beuchot 2008), and applying it to the study of EU citizenship. Other developments of analogy in English have been made by John Deely (2002) and Morgan, Jardin & Franklin (1986). As in the case of Beuchot, they all refer for the use of the term (and concept) remotely to Aristotle and, more recently and closer to the English speaking world, to Charles S Peirce, who bases his concept of abduction on analogy (Beuchot 2002:91-100).

¹⁵ The essential trait of analogy as I am using it here is precisely its finding between two referents their being ‘in part similar and in part different’. This is the basis of a link that does not bind. It links because there is a point of similarity. It does not bind because there are differences as well. It provides a balance between complete unity and absolute diversity.