There has been a growing awareness in the social science of European integration that identity, culture and social movements do not always sit easily with nation-state policies of neo-liberal economics and democratization or of the Europeanization fostered by the European Union. In their continuing engagement with the political anthropology of the state and of the EU in Europe, anthropologists have begun to focus on how local communities and cultures resist or support various state and supranational initiatives to transform the economic, political and social structures of people’s lives, and are focusing in particular on the processes of Europeanization within the EU.

These actions are particularly evident in European borderlands, in part because practices which support or subvert states and their policies have always been found in border regions. The sources of such practices are many: some of them are the result of state initiatives, which seemingly by definition attempt to establish the sovereignty and the nation in clear and precise terms where the state meets its neighbors and its figurative others. Others are the result of long-term and short-term constructions of alternative nations and identities, where for instance border peoples share ethnicity or national
identity with those across the border line, but not with the majority populations of the metropole [such as nationalists in the NI borderlands, and ethnic Hungarians in Transylvania].

Anthropologists have recently and increasingly returned to the challenge of studying the state, as they have shifted their focus from small-scale localized communities to an emphasis on more encompassing and wider social and political formations. This is, in effect, a revitalization of theoretical and comparative perspectives pioneered in the 1960s and 1970s, perspectives which were put first into research action principally in ethnographic work conducted in Central, Eastern and Southern Europe [Hayden is one such pioneer; the work of John Cole and the continuing interest in Eastern Europe by the profs and students of U Mass Amherst].

In such work the state is no longer treated as some essentialized, unitary structure, an anthropomorphized actor just off stage whose face is never seen but who has the ability to constrain or enable the actions of others. Nor should the institutions of the EU be seen this way. Instead of being fixed and static, state-society relations are viewed as dynamic, processual, porous and permeable (cf. Hann and Dunn 1996). Borders provide especially good locations to examine these features of state-society relations. For state borders are often characterized by a tantalizing mix: they are somewhere the state is particularly keen to stress its presence and yet are simultaneously somewhere that this presence is most likely to be challenged (Paasi 1996; Baud 1992). State borders are also zones where the hybridity of culture and identity come up squarely against issues of sovereignty, security,
governance and state-society-Europe relations. As Martin Kohli has suggested, it is in the borderlands of Europe that we will see how and if the processes of European integration are really taking effect.

The end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet empire have re-focused scholarly and general political attention on changed borders, revitalized boundaries of identity, society and polity, and led to resurgent social and political movements. The expansion of the European Union (EU) to include the ‘new’ states of Central and Eastern Europe refocused scholars on European borders and boundaries, where it is clear that ‘many of these same conflicts over nation, region and ethnicity have been lurking just under the surface of what appeared to be a set of highly stable arrangements’ (Bucken-Knapp and Schack 2001: 14). In Central and Eastern European countries alone, approximately 8000 miles of new political boundaries have been drawn since the demise of the USSR (Foucher 1998: 235).

For anthropologists in particular this focus on European integration has taken a turn to the investigation of processes of Europeanization (Borneman and Fowler 1997; Harmsen and Wilson 2000), which includes the exploration of how new forces of political, cultural and moral orders and disorders are alternatively resisted, supported and accepted in the everyday lives of Europeans, whether they be in borderlands or cosmopolitan centers (see, for example, Borneman 1998a, 1998b).
Europeanization

Europeanization is a term which is increasingly being used in the scholarship on the European Union (EU), but there has been a distinct lack of coherence among the methods, hypotheses and theories which have been brought to bear in the name of Europeanization within EU studies. In fact the concept itself has been used in a variety of ways across academic disciplines. Anthropologists have examined Europeanization as a process which is much broader than political and economic adaptations to EU institutions and policies. As a result there is a small but growing social anthropological literature on ways in which Europeanization interacts with regionalism, deterritorialization, transnationalism and other movements to either strengthen or weaken state power, both within the EU and among peoples beyond its borders.

However, there have been few ethnographic studies to date which relate international and global forces to the everyday lives of local communities in the EU’s member states. I have been doing field research in a small village in South Armagh, on the Ireland-Northern Ireland (UK) border, over the last few years in an effort to demarcate some of the dimensions of what I am calling ‘European effects’ in localities of the EU (as part of a wider study of the Europeanization of the Northern Ireland borderlands, see Wilson n.d.).

What are some of these European effects?

Examples:

- farmers and their manipulation of local, national and European policies [sheep numbers]
• cultures of funding: through Community Initiatives, Interreg and Leader
• effects on the peace process: Peace and Reconciliation
• partnership principles
• tourism

These are both direct and indirect structural and behavioral effects, on political frameworks, economic relations, social values and cultural expressions and identifications.

They are related in various ways to

• political change in and through the European Parliament [Hume and the SDLP; Paisley and the DUP]
• providing new frameworks for the peace process in NI, especially in terms of the peace agreements (widely seen that the Belfast GF Agreement is a European document, in terms of its notions of consensus, parity, inclusivity, and minority rights).
• providing new territorial arrangements [strand 3, NO-SO bodies, and strand 4, a Council of the Isles].
• changing and expanding the political arena at home, within the devolution of the UK, in the European Council, in the Council of Ministers, and as a region in Europe, with its own lobbying office in Brussels.
This perspective on the frontiers of identity and Europeanization in European locales is still not the most common one in anthropology; the majority of anthropological ethnographers have done research within EU institutions themselves, and not on the impact of EU policy and practice in local communities, or of strategic moves on the part of local, regional and national actors to change their material conditions within the redefining political and cultural space which is the EU.

The most useful treatment of Europeanization outside of the disciplines of political science and international relations has been that of John Borneman and Nicholas Fowler, who while evading a concrete definition of the process, instead provide a virtual definition by discussing ways in which the process is a force for the transformation of European society and culture, and one which has various historical and contemporary dimensions. They describe Europeanization as a process which is ‘redefining forms of identification with territory and people’ (1997: 489), which they seek to disentangle from more essentializing notions of modernization, development, and European integration within the EU. In fact, in their conclusion they suggest that it would be more fruitful to consider Europeanization ‘as a spirit, a vision, and a process’, and the EU ‘as a continental political unit of a novel order’ (1997: 511).

This notion of the Europe of the EU is certainly an accurate one, in that it rings true I believe to most Europeans. While the EU is a political entity with no modern historical antecedent or model, its self-styled ‘project' has achieved much towards realizing an ‘ever closer union’ among its member states, including levels of economic and political
integration unimagined, except by a few, just a generation ago. This project reflects and reinvents Jacques Delors’ notion of it being an ‘unidentified political object’, as Marc Abélès has pointed out (see, for example, Abélès 2000). And Europeanization is most certainly a process of making things and people ‘more’ ‘European’, not least in those aspects of everyday life and culture which Borneman and Fowler identify: language, tourism, sex, sport, and money.

But Europeanization is also about directed political and economic change, and not just from the so-called ‘top-down’, i.e., from the halls of government in Brussels and national capitals. Europeanization is a process of strategic political and economic change on the part of political, civic, business and transnational groups and institutions who are motivated by the programs and ideas of the EU, and who are impelled by the need to adapt to the initiatives of others, in what is commonly known as a game of winners and losers. One intention of this paper is to problematize the anthropological dimensions to the study of Europeanization in European borderlands, but also by extension to the study of other spaces and arenas in Europe.

To return to Borneman and Fowler for a moment, their type of approach to Europeanization is one of the least utilized and understood in both European integration studies [largely dominated by political scientists] and in the jargon and other discourses of internationalization, globalization and European integration in the everyday lives of Europe. At least, this is how it looks to me from the perspective of local society in Ireland, and how it looked to my colleague Robert Harmsen and me when we attempted
to identify and compare the various definitions of Europeanization at work in the wider social science of the EU. Harmsen and I (2000) identified eight definitions of Europeanization; while today there is no time to review these definitions in detail, they seem to fall into four roughly-drawn categories:

1. **Europeanization as the emergence of new forms of European governance.**

   Europeanization in this sense is very much focused on the European Union. The emphasis here is placed on the ways in which European integration has led to redefinitions of the conceptions, relations and structures of power at both the national and the supranational levels. This usage of the term emphasizes the socialization potential of institutions - highlighting the extent to which participation in permanent institutional structures leads to longer-term redefinitions of actor interests and self-perceptions. Europeanization of this type draws attention to the EU's efforts at 'polity-building', and the extent to which the EU has been able to move beyond the formulation of joint and common policies to the creation of a genuine 'public space'. This, in turn, focuses attention on the emergence and development of an EU citizenship.

2. **Europeanization as national political and administrative adaptation.**

   Europeanization here refers to the adaptation of national institutional structures and policy-making processes in response to the development of European integration. Ladrech (1994: 70) has provided a widely cited definition of Europeanization in this vein as 'an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree
that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making' [see also Radaelli 2000: where Europeanization is a ‘set of processes through which the EU political, social and economic dynamics become part of the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies’]. The central questions of such studies wonder whether the domestic institutions of the member states are becoming more alike one another, and is a common European model of governance emerging?

Taken together these two types of Europeanization may be seen as the bottom up and top down approaches as suggested by Tanja Borzel and Thomas Risse, differences in emphases rather than substance in what is a feedback loop [APSA 2000 paper]. In their view it would be advantageous to examine the differential impact of Europeanization in political processes, policies and institutions. The key to recognizing and understanding such change is through the inevitable ‘misfit’ or ‘mismatch’ between European institutions, policies and processes and those of each state. As I am sure you can already ascertain, I wish to suggest that there is no better place to observe and approach such mismatch in a state than in its borderlands, zones of persistent messy fit, among peoples, ideas, products, etc.

3. Europeanization as modernization. [with specific reference to those countries that need to improve their economies in order to accept free market capitalism, that need to improve their democratic structures and attitudes, and that need to develop civil society and protect the rights of minorities]. Europeanization here is applied in the
context of the more geographically peripheral and less economically developed member states of the European Union, and to the adoption by candidate states of democratic institutions and market economies. It is taken to imply a series of structural transformations intended to bring these countries back into the European mainstream, defined with reference to the economic and political models which prevail in the more prosperous and influential 'core' countries. This approach to Europeanization might also include the notion of *Europeanization as 'joining Europe*', understood in the context of EU enlargement, but which is just as often perceived, among many of the states that just joined the EU, as ‘rejoining Europe’, in terms of an imagined Europe built on common values, histories and identities. It also concerns the development of administrative institutions able to bear the weight of participation in the highly complex and demanding European policy-making environment (see Ágh 1999).

4. The fourth type of Europeanization I wish to raise today brings us back to the more familiar anthropological interest in *Europeanization as the reconstruction of identities*. This is the broadest usage of the term and refers to the reshaping of identities in contemporary Europe in a manner which relativizes (without necessarily supplanting) national identities, and begs a consideration of the many identities which are in part dependent on national identifications, and that conversely contribute to the full meanings of a ‘national’ identity among its people.

In this sense *Europeanization is 'a strategy of self-representation and a device of power', which is 'fundamentally reorganizing territoriality and peoplehood, the two*
principles of group identification that have shaped the modern European order' (Borneman and Fowler 1997: 487). Europeanization from this perspective must focus on the issues of culture and identity, both in terms of culture as a European Union project (Shore 1993), and in terms of the ways in which EU policy has an impact on, and interacts with, local forms of political and cultural identification throughout the member states (Wilson 2000).

This last version of Europeanization also points us towards the strategic use of culture and identity in order for territorial and other political entities to have an edge in what is often perceived as a zero-sum game of funding and power brokerage. This game is played within both the umbrella institutions of the EU as well as the evolving political and social system of the EU and its member states. Culture and identity are now important terms in ‘Euro-speak’; we can use culture as a way to understand all types of Europeanization, whether it be in terms of institutional adaptation, the transformation of citizenship and identity, or the integration of transnational communities and social movements across national borders.

This is especially apparent when policy-makers also perceive culture and identity to be key means to effect social change, in order to better ‘Europeanize’ and better compete on the regional and national levels [example of the Belfast City of Culture fiasco]. This is what has been happening in the borderlands of Northern Ireland for some time, and what was happening in the borderlands of Hungary in the early and mid-1990s.
Examples of Europeanization from Hungary, drawn from research in 1994-6:

- Debrecen University, in bid to get resources from the national government, to fund a European studies institute

- County government and the university, to spark development and grant and consciousness-raising [speech to the council]

- Effects on cross-border cooperation and notions of the other, in terms of doing business [discuss Letavertes stereotypes of business culture, and Irish pubs, and the informal black economy, and Romanian-speaking villages…flag anecdote]

- Sex tourism and sex transnationalism, on the road arteries which traversed the Ukrainian, Romanian and Slovakian borders, and which were narrated to me by professors, grad students and local government officials in various terms of the undeveloped, barbaric, pauperized, immoral others of the Ukraine and farther East.

Further complicating yet highlighting the picture of borderlands in Europe are the forces of globalization and transnationalisation, which are clarifying for some the often discontinuous relationship between various notions of nation, citizenship and sovereignty. Globalization has played a part in the creation and proliferation of transnationalism in its various guises: as cross-border and international institution-building, as political and economic relations above and below the level of the state which have been liberated from certain forms of state control, and as the ‘transnational’ experiences of those people who move between more traditional notions of citizenship, migrant, resident, worker and tourist, whose everyday experiences demonstrate the ability
or the pressure to slip the bonds of past presumed constraints and definitions of the nation-state. Anthropologists have much to say about the intersection of these forces at the local level, and in particular about how local cultural production and identity in border settings map onto, diverge from or even threaten state and supranational understandings, perspectives and policies.

Many of Europe’s new and changing identities are due to new relationships to territory, institutions and narratives of moral and political order and disorder. Some of these transformations can be found, and are sometimes best studied, in the places and spaces in between the traditional structures of nation and state, which no longer seem to have the same importance in a Europe swept by global and transnational change. It is to this interstitial zone of anthropological discourse and investigation that we now turn.

**Territoriality and power**

The current exploration of identity, nation and state at international borders in political anthropology owes much to developments in social and cultural anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s, when processual approaches to politics began to supplant more traditional structural-functional and historical methods.

Eric Wolf in particular advocated using anthropological methods and models to investigate social and political networks in complex societies – including modern and Western nation-states – which often were at the source of asymmetrical and inequitable relations of power and economy. He sought to problematize social and political structures
which had been accepted uncritically in past anthropological research; chief among these for Wolf were the state and state sovereignty:

many organizations within the state generate and distribute and control power, in competition with each other and with the sovereign power of the state….the formal framework of economic and political power exists alongside or intermingled with various other kinds of informal structure which are interstitial, supplementary, parallel to it….The anthropologist has a professional license to study such interstitial, supplementary, and parallel structures in complex society and to expose their relation to the major strategic, over-arching institutions (Wolf 1966: 1-2, cited in Vincent 1990: 333-4; emphasis in original).

It is perhaps not surprising, that Wolf later, with John W. Cole, published the first comparative ethnography in Europe of national borderlands, national and local identities, and the intersections of economy and politics in everyday life (based on their fieldwork in an Alpine valley that had been part of successive empires and states, Cole and Wolf 1974).

However, borderlands cannot be studied in isolation from that which they separate, both spatially and culturally. Nor can we study in isolation that which exists and thrives or dies in the metaphorical and spatial dimensions between nation-states. Borders and the anthropology of borders both depend in large part on the relationships between people, institutions and territory, and are tied to the grand narratives so familiar to us all of
‘nation-’ and ‘state-building’ and ‘national sovereignty’. According to geographer James Anderson

Nations and states are specifically territorial entities...The nationalist ideal is that the two entities should coincide geographically in nation states: the nation’s territory and the state’s territory should be one and the same, each nation having its own state, and each state expressing the ‘general will’ of a singly, culturally unified nation (Anderson 1998: 127; emphases in original).

Borders are part of this ideal and contradictory mix, in their roles as the limits of state territory and sovereignty, as symbols and living memorials of the nation’s historical advances and retreats, and as the expressions of the state’s right to use legitimate violence [in the classic Weberian sense where a state is defined as a community which claims and utilizes the ‘monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’ (Guibernau 1996: 31].

Borders are simultaneously, and to some people confusingly, caught between and to some extent outside of the core areas and concerns of nations and states, yet are at the center of their self-definitions. The narratives about sovereignty and ‘their’ borders are part of the representational apparatuses which give nations and states meaning.

Politically demarcated territory almost always implies social relationships and cultural identifications, encapsulated in the term ‘territoriality’. Territorially-linked practices and
identities often provide some clear and comforting advantages. As Anderson (2002: 27) has summarized, territoriality simplifies issues of control, gives relationships of power greater tangibility, and provides symbolic markers of property, possession, inclusion and exclusion. But to Anderson these strengths of territoriality are ironically also its weaknesses.

While giving greater tangibility to power relationships, it de-personalizes and reifies them, obscuring the sources and relations of power. It sharpens conflict and generates further conflict as its assertion encourages rival territorialities in a ‘space-filling process’ (Anderson 2002: 27).

The contradictory nature of territoriality and the state is increasingly a concern in European borderlands, because of changing notions of states and their roles within an emerging European project, and with each other. Borderlands continue to function as limits to states’ and nations’ ‘space filling’ endeavors, which are simultaneously spaces of identity-making, of tangible sources and articulation of power, and of symbolic and other processes of marking and displaying social and political order and disorder.

As a result, it is often difficult to conceive of a state and a nation without reference to the processes which make their borders and borderlands significant, and conversely border regions and their peoples often take great comfort or great sorrow from their historical and contemporary relationships with ‘their’ states or nations. It is also difficult to conceive of the European project as something other than a territorial arrangement, of an
entity modeled on the national state, and thus one that must pay particular and specific attention to its borders, rather than their borders in the sense of a Europe of nations and peoples.

Thus, in a recent collection published in the Dutch journal *Focaal*, Hastings Donnan and I concluded that social and cultural change in borderlands cannot be studied on its own, because all borderlands are interstitial, and are arenas wherein most ‘interstitial spaces’ of contemporary states are defined and discernible. There is perhaps no better place to study the metaphorical and concrete intersections of territory, identity, culture and power than in borderlands, where everything, including state structures and policies, and notions of Europeanness, seem to be on the edge, or ‘in between’.

In Europe the comparative study of borders may help to put to rest the stereotypes of polity and society, such as the persistent belief that Western nations are civic and Eastern European nations are ethnic, which function still to present a case for modernization which in some instances obscures processes of exclusion, ethnic conflict and racism at home, in the core countries or original members of the EU, and also distances the Europe of the EU from its neighbors farther east, in Russian and Eurasia.
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