



LUND UNIVERSITY

“Europe Starts Here!”

*A Cultural Discourse Analysis of the European Heritage
Label*

Ingeborg Frouwke de Vries

Master of Applied Cultural Analysis
Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences
TKAM02 - Spring 2017

Supervisors
Lars-Eric Jönsson

Abstract

“Europe Starts Here”: A Cultural Discourse Analysis Of The European Heritage Label

Ingeborg de Vries

This thesis analyses the discourse of cultural heritage by taking the European Heritage Label (EHL) as a case study. The European Heritage Label is an organization established in 2011 by the European Union (EU) and created an application process for historical and cultural sites to be labelled as “European Heritage”. This thesis aims to critically analyse heritage as a concept that is used and produced for specific purposes, in an EU context. I question how the European Heritage Label is using and producing cultural heritage, and what the contemporary use is of such. I also research what effect this has on its discourse within EU context by using Smith’s (2006) authorized heritage discourse theory and Hartog’s (2014) historical authenticity concept to aid in achieving this. By means of a critical discourse analysis and netnography, I study material such as the legislative document establishing the European Heritage Label, heritage sites as case studies, online webpages, and other visual aspects such as postcards. I have found that through the European Heritage Label the term heritage is appropriated by giving historical and cultural aesthetics and narratives a European aspect. This is done to point out the EU’s influence and to create a certain imagined community. Thus, the discourse of heritage as a contemporary concept experiences a lot of influence from authorized institutions which results in biased selection and exclusion.

Keywords: heritage; culture; European Heritage Label; EHL; cultural analysis; discourse analysis

Abstract (Dutch)

“Europa Begint Hier”: Een Culturele *Discourse* Analyse van het Europees Erfgoedlabel.

Ingeborg de Vries

Deze scriptie analyseert de huidige voortgang van cultureel erfgoed door het Europees Erfgoedlabel als case study te gebruiken. Het Europees Erfgoedlabel is een organisatie die is

opgezet in 2011 door de Europese Unie (EU). Het hanteert een aanmeldingsprocedure voor historische en culturele locaties die daardoor gelabeld kunnen worden als “Europees Erfgoed”. Deze scriptie richt zich op het kritisch analyseren van erfgoed als een concept dat wordt gebruikt en geproduceerd voor specifieke doeleinden in een Europese context. Ik onderzoek hoe het Europees Erfgoedlabel cultureel erfgoed gebruikt en produceert, en hoe dat er op dit moment uitziet. Ook onderzoek ik welk effect dit heeft op de voortgang van cultureel erfgoed waarbij Smith’s (2006) theorie “authorized heritage discourse” en Hartog’s (2014) “historische authenticiteit” concept helpen om dit te bereiken. Door middel van een kritische *discourse* (voortgang) analyse en netnografie bestudeer ik de volgende materialen: het wetgevende document ter oprichting van het Europees erfgoedlabel, erfgoed locaties als onderzoeks-voorbeeld, online webpagina’s, en andere visuele aspecten zoals ansichtkaarten. Ik heb geconstateerd dat via het Europees Erfgoedlabel de term ‘erfgoed’ toegeëigend wordt om op die manier historische en culturele locaties en verhalen een Europees aspect te geven. Hiermee probeert de Europese Unie haar invloed uit te oefenen en een soort van ingebeelde gemeenschap te creëren. Hierdoor wordt de voortgang van cultureel erfgoed als een hedendaags concept beïnvloed door bevoegde instanties. Dit resulteert in bevooroordeelde selectie en uitsluiting van cultureel erfgoed.

Trefwoorden: erfgoed; cultuur; Europees Erfgoedlabel; EHL; culturele analyse; discourse analyse

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank everyone who is part of the MACA programme at Lund University; teachers, staff, and my amazing MACA15 classmates. Studying in Sweden has been a fantastic experience, and I am so grateful that I got to be part of it. Thank you to Lars-Eric Jönsson for being my supervisor and being so patient with me. Also, a big thanks and hug to Silja and Renee who have been my study buddies at LUX and have become good friends of mine. Thank you to Katarina for being such a good classmate and lovely friend, I love our cooking and drinking days together. I would also like to thank Iris and Eline for always being there for me, and my parents for their support and getting to explore Sweden together. Lastly, I would like to thank my colleagues at the Ironbridge International Institute for Cultural Heritage (IIICH) at Birmingham University for having me as an intern and being an inspiration to my thesis and the field of cultural heritage.

Lund, 2017-08-21

Ingeborg de Vries

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Figures	v
List of Abbreviations	v
Introduction	1
Aim and Research Questions	2
Previous Research	2
Theoretical Framework	5
Methods and Materials	8
Limitations	11
European Institutions.....	11
Overview of thesis.....	13
Part One: The European Heritage Label	14
Legislative Decision Establishing the European Heritage Label	14
European Heritage Label Media	15
It's Unique: How The European Heritage Label Tries to Distinguish Itself	23
Part Two: Adding Value to The Mix	26
For The Sake of Europe: Other Heritage Initiatives	26
Added Value.....	27
A Complementing Factor	30
A Contributing Factor: European Added Value.....	32
The Panel of Experts	33
Part Three: The Heritage Labelling Tool	37
What is labelling?.....	37
Process of labelling by the European Heritage Label	38
Imagined Heritage Community	39
Rejected Sites	40
European Heritage Label Sites.....	43
Conclusions	49
Applicability	51
References	53

List of Figures

Figure 1: Scan of postcards retrieved from lecture at Birmingham University, October 2016.

Figure 2: Logo downloaded from EHL Communication Toolbox, retrieved from

https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en.

Figure 3: Scan of postcards retrieved from lecture at Birmingham University, October 2016.

Figure 4: A print screen retrieved from

<http://www.mkn.mhz.hr/en/education/for-children/the-neanderthals/>.

Figure 5: Scan of postcards retrieved from lecture at Birmingham University, October 2016.

Figure 6: Logo downloaded from EHL Communication Toolbox, retrieved from

https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en.

List of Abbreviations

AHD: Authorized heritage discourse

CoE: Council of Europe

EC: European Commission

EHL: European Heritage Label

EU: European Union

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

“Heritage is a verb related to human action and agency. It is a process concerned with the legitimization of the power of national and other cultural or social identities”.

(Harvey as cited by Smith, 2006, p.44)

“Europe Starts Here”: A Cultural Discourse Analysis of The European Heritage Label

Introduction

By the end of the 20th Century, authorized institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union (EU) turned their long-term political and economic gaze to culture. Cities are being named Cultural Capital for a year, and every year the European Heritage Days are organized. There are prizes and labels for heritage sites such as, for example, the UNESCO World Heritage List. Also, 2018 will be the European Year of Cultural Heritage, and in March 2017 a G7 summit explicitly on culture took place in Italy.

Another example and topic of this thesis is the European Heritage Label, abbreviated as EHL. This institution was established by the European Union in 2011 and works to appoint and label sites or objects as European heritage within the borders of the currently twenty-eight member states of the EU. These have, according to the EHL, an important European narrative to share with all the citizens of those member states. This institution appoints such heritage sites by giving them a legal label under EU law, as well as a visual label with an EHL logo plaque.

In this thesis, I investigate the contemporary concept of cultural heritage by means of a discourse analysis with the European Heritage Label as a case study¹. I argue that cultural heritage is used to practice influence and create a sense of European solidarity, identity and future. It is a relatively new institution, as it was established in 2011; therefore, its discourse shows the contemporary perspectives and uses on the concept of cultural heritage in a European context.

This type of heritage discourse is important to study because an authorized heritage discourse (Smith, 2006) and European hegemony influence the way cultural heritage is used, produced and perceived. I argue that, through the process of labelling, cultural heritage is a concept that becomes limited and exclusive, leaving out different or wider perceptions of what may be regarded as cultural heritage on other (social) levels.

¹ The reason for choosing the EHL as a case study is a work placement at an academic heritage institution in the UK, where I first learned of its existence.

With examples of the European Heritage Label media content, its legislative decision, and its labelling process, I investigate how this particular form of cultural heritage is used and produced to represent authoritarian status and influence and build a common European identity for the future.

Aim and Research Questions

The aim with this thesis is to research a contemporary discourse of heritage and, therefore, how heritage is used and produced by the European Heritage Label. I further aim to critically analyse heritage as a concept and authorized tool for political purposes in the European Union. Investigating aspects such as media content, language, and labelling processes helps to reveal contemporary use and intent of heritage with the European Heritage Label as a case study. By investigating the contemporary discourse of heritage, I want to contribute to academic work that already critically questions the use and production of heritage. This investigation should enlighten heritage and other cultural institutions on their practices. To accomplish this investigation I ask the following three research questions:

- How is the European Heritage Label using, understanding and producing heritage?
- What is the contemporary use of ‘cultural heritage’ in Europe through labelling by the European Heritage Label and its listed sites?
- What affects does the act of labelling have on the discourse of this particular form of heritage within EU context?

Previous Research

As heritage is a broad topic, it also received many different perspectives of research over the past decades. As such, I cannot address everything written about heritage, thus, the following examples are ones that best suit this thesis. In this section, I will review previous works that focus on changing terminology, the use of heritage on a global perspective, the use of heritage within the European Union, and the use of heritage as a social construction. Such are topics of research related to my investigation.

An interest in culture has been present among scholars since the eighteenth-century up to present day. According to cultural historian Anne Eriksen, this interest knows a shift in terminology. In her book *From Antiquities to Heritage: Transformations of Cultural Memory* (2014), she argues that such a shift started with collecting *antiquities*; to establishing

museums; to preserving world *heritage*. She argues that present ideas about heritage and its preservation do not offer more responsible attitudes towards cultural goods, “Even this terminology, and the set of ideas it communicates, is first and foremost the answer to concerns and challenges specific to our own era” (Eriksen, 2014, p.5). She also discusses a shift of the way people thought about cultural goods in the way they did value certain artefacts while disregarding others. Much was related to Romanticism, a focus on more natural and old-fashioned ways, and a conservation ethic. Eriksen indicates that because of a change in terminology, the way people thought of the past had changed. Another aspect which can explain such change is historicity (historical authenticity) regimes as coined by French historian François Hartog. As this term will function as one of the main theories in this thesis, it will be discussed in the following theoretical framework section.

Eriksen (2014) refers to heritage as a concept, which can “be seen as the expression of a specific relationship between past and present, characteristic of our time” (Eriksen, 2014, p.20). Archaeologist Laurajane Smith also addresses interesting notions of heritage as a contemporary concept. In her book *Uses of Heritage*, she argues that the current concept of heritage emerged in Europe during the rise of modernity and nationalism in the nineteenth century. She looks at heritage as “a cultural practice, involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings” (Smith, 2006, p.11). Smith actually argues that “there is no such thing as heritage”; rather, it functions in a hegemonic discourse that tries to “constitute the way we think, talk and write about heritage” (Smith, 2006, p.11). I argue in this thesis that the European Heritage Label might indeed also be a form of hegemony which tries to constitute the way we value culture and heritage in Europe, as well as what should be regarded as European heritage. I investigate this by the use of Smith’s theory of authorized heritage discourse, which will also be discussed further in the following theoretical framework section.

As for studies on the use of heritage within the context of the European Union, ethnologist Lars-Eric Jönsson (2016) also points out the shift of a focus on archaeology and conservation to the value of heritage in and for society. Jönsson discusses how cultural conventions aim for inclusion and everyone’s right to engagement with cultural heritage, but questions whether that meant choosing which pre-selected heritage one wants to relate to or actually choosing what one personally considers as heritage. In my thesis, the analysis of authorized influence will show how little inclusion of society on local and individual level there is and how experts shape a collective understanding of what is heritage.

In addition, ethnologist Valdimar T. Hafstein (2012) argues that heritage is a category that does not describe the world but changes it, saying “Heritage is about change” (Hafstein, 2012, p.3). Hafstein cites Barbro Klein who notes that “the term heritage is not innocent” as we live in “an era in which the modern boundaries between the cultural field, the political field and the market are blurring” (Hafstein, 2012, p.4). He continues to argue that “heritage lists are a convenient object for administrative logic” and that they are politically charged as governments can claim success in the cultural field when tangible or intangible culture is listed by internationally accredited organizations such as UNESCO’s World Heritage List (Hafstein, 2012, p.5). Finally, Hafstein perceives the act of labelling a practice or site as heritage as an intervention, “it reorders relations between persons and things” (2012, p.9). In this thesis I argue that in the modern era the term heritage does indeed struggle within the fields of culture, politics and marketing. Especially in the combination of culture and politics, heritage is used as a tool to practice power and create a European identity and future.

Lastly, another relevant study by a master student, which also focused on the European Heritage Label, is *The EHL and the Symbolic Construction of the EU* by Andreas Gahleitner (2012). He used the European Heritage Label as a case study to analyse the construction of the European Union with regards to cultural policy and symbolism. To analyse this construction, he focuses on aspects of symbolism, according to the ideas of Ian Manners. In addition, he focuses on the theory of neofunctionalism, which is described as “assuming that economic and legal integration automatically create the desire and provide legitimacy for political and social integration” (Gahleitner, 2012, p.27). Another point that Gahleitner communicates is that cultural policy means crisis policy. He explains this by stating that when there is a perceived crisis of European integration, the EU will play its cultural policy card. With his research, he wants to shed light on the role of different European, transnational and national actors that shape the construction of the European heritage sites’ symbolic value. The EU and member states play a dominant role in creating European cultural policy. Therefore, Gahleitner states that there is much more time needed to accomplish a sense of belonging to the Union among European citizens and also says that the EHL could lead to a more substantial involvement of the EU in cultural policy (Gahleitner, 2012, p.48). Gahleitner’s research has an interesting take on symbolism and cultural space and policy. It questions the influence that different actors within the scene of the European Heritage label have. It has a critical perspective of the use of culture by the EU to try and shape European integration and identity. Gahleitner also tries to grab the essence of “symbolic value” upon which the EHL puts so much emphasis by analysing symbols as

emblems, order, representation, and domination. My research can relate to these critical aspects but will, however, dig deeper into how the European Heritage Label constructs heritage and will analyse aspects of cultural policy with the use of cultural analysis.

Theoretical Framework

The contemporary concepts of cultural heritage and how it is used by an authorized institution such as the European Heritage Label can be analysed and understood through Laurajane Smith's theory on authorized heritage discourse (AHD). Furthermore, to understand heritage in a contemporary sense, I use the notion of historicity regimes coined by François Hartog as interpreted further by Anne Eriksen. After discussing these theories, I will share Smith's, Eriksen's and my own understanding of the term heritage.

Laurajane Smith (2006): Authorized Heritage Discourse. The use of heritage within authorized institutions, and within the case study of the European Heritage Label, can be understood by the authorized heritage discourse (AHD), as presented in Laurajane Smith's book *Uses of Heritage*. With this theory, she criticizes how heritage is appropriated and confined by national authorities that leave out different or wider interpretations of such, as well as excluding people from the discourse of heritage. Such national authorities can include national governments or governmental organizations such as the United Nations or the European Union. First of all, she points out that the authorized heritage discourse "focuses attention on aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places/landscapes that current generations must care for so that they may be passed to future generations for their education, and forge a sense of common identity" (Smith, 2006, p.29).

Smith notices a focus on the materiality of heritage and its use for both educational and identity purposes in present society. Smith points out several consequences of the authorized heritage discourse, which include that it defines who the legitimate spokespersons for the past are such as historians and archaeologists. Furthermore, it shapes the idea of saving something for future generations, and that heritage is innately valuable meaning that whatever it may entail, it is a good and important aspect of the past (Smith, 2006, p.29). Smith argues that the nation and a sense of nationalism are supported by "edification of the people" to "'remind' the public about the values and sensibilities that should be saved or preserved as representative of European national identities" (Smith, 2006, p.23). Another point is noting that the past is being used to navigate issues and needs of the present. Smith predicts that traditional authorized understandings of heritage will remain and would,

therefore, like to change several things about the authorized heritage discourse. Such changes include reflecting on where we are now with heritage and challenge traditional heritage practices to create new understandings of what that includes. She wants to build on the existing structure and strengthen it with new definitions and values. She also pleads for inclusivity on communal, individual and familial level to spark debate at a grass-root level. Furthermore, she would like to see heritage re-defined and have narratives of heritage play a greater role.

I use the theory of authorized heritage discourse to understand why the European Heritage Label was created within the framework of Europe and the European Union and how it functions. With reflection on authorized discourse, I investigate why the EU is using heritage and labelling in a contemporary setting. The authorized heritage discourse shows a dominance in the cultural political space, where the EHL is both defining and limiting the discourse of heritage within the EU. Through the eyes of the AHD, the practice of labelling sites as heritage as well as obliging sites to go through a criteria process may be seen as bureaucratic and excluding. I also consider the fact that Smith's theory is dated, so the way she wrote about the heritage discourse may have undergone some changes in the meantime, as it may have shifted to less traditional or aesthetically focused practices.

François Hartog: Historicity regimes, as presented by Anne Eriksen (2014). In her book *Antiquities to Heritage*, Anne Eriksen presents the term historicity regime, as coined by French Historian François Hartog. Within historicity (historical authenticity), what is considered worthy to preserve from the past depends on the present framework of needs and values in communities and national policies. Eriksen reflects upon the shifts of terminology and the kind of change it reflects, such as that from antiquities to heritage.

They might not simply stem from an interest in new kinds of old objects but also express changing ideas about why and in what ways the past is important to the present: ideas about the structural relationship between past and present are changing. Such changes can be seen as expressions of different regimes of historicity. Each regime of historicity is the outcome of a different way of experiencing the temporal aspect of the human condition, hence acquiring its own expressions in culture as well as in historiography. (Hartog as cited by Eriksen, 2014, p.2)

Thus, what people value from the past and the way they value it depends on today's societal and national values and needs. They take from the past only the events or narratives that have

significance for current national or societal frameworks or future educational purposes. Yet in the case of the EHL it depends on the values and needs of the EU. Eriksen further explains the current historicity regime of heritage with the example of an international trend, the ‘year of cultural heritage’ 2009 in Norway. This year was introduced to highlight everything that represents Norwegian culture, including daily life themes, as heritage. Such heritage years have become an international trend because they are also used by the EU with concepts such as ‘European Capital of the Year’ and the ‘European Year of Cultural Heritage’. Besides these examples, the European Heritage Label also represents a certain ‘experience of the temporal aspect’, thus, representing a particular aspect of current cultural and historiographic values and needs. In addition, a certain current regime that Eriksen (as coined by Hartog) discusses is “presentism”, which is the need to collect and preserve everything that is made in the present or close past.

With the theory of historicity regimes, I argue that the EHL fits in a current historicity regime as it embodies aspects of society, which are valued now such as expressing authoritarian power and use of labels. I also use it to investigate how value of heritage is established by the EHL and within European Union context. By use of historicity, I investigate the kind of sites that are selected and seen as important and the act of labelling itself. Although Eriksen notices a sense of presentism, within the context of the European Heritage Label that is not so much the case and could perhaps play a bigger part in the future of its selection and labelling process. In the legislative decision establishing the EHL, it is, indeed, mentioned that present or contemporary heritage is welcomed, but with regards to the current listed sites, they are not including nor focusing on such heritage.

Defining heritage. As heritage can be viewed in many different ways – a term, a concept, a tool – and in political, touristic or academic settings, I share here how the authors Eriksen (2014) and Smith (2006) perceive it because I relied heavily on their work. In addition, I define how I perceive heritage in this thesis.

Eriksen (2014) looks at heritage as a change in terminology when talking about cultural aspects of society and what they value or not. Heritage plays a role according to concerns and challenges specific to our own time and community. Eriksen argues, that aspects such as identity, belonging, and roots are the main concerns of today when speaking of heritage (2014, p.4). Therefore, according to Eriksen, heritage is a contemporary concept that is subject to change of terminological designation and societal purposes.

Smith (2006) looks at heritage as set of values and meanings, a cultural practice. She believes it is rather hegemonic as she sees the current discourse of heritage as regulating the way people think, talk, and write about history and culture.

I want to note that in this thesis I, much like Eriksen, see heritage as a contemporary concept. It reflects the cultural values and behaviour of western society as well as bureaucratic/political use of culture. In this study I take a much more critical standpoint towards heritage as there is indeed much more to it than tangible and intangible remnants from the past. By doing this I mean to unfold the, rather normalized, practices of labelling and add to different ways of interpreting cultural heritage. This is important because I believe that the way cultural heritage is used and perceived needs to constantly be developed and reconsidered, as it is no longer just a concept for the higher class of society but is also becoming a more integral part of all levels of society. Therefore, new interpretations of what is and includes cultural heritage are crucial to the conservation of cultural and social identities across all levels of national, regional, and local societies.

Methods and Materials

In this section I discuss the methods, empirical materials, and limitations. The methods used for this thesis include a critical discourse analysis (CDA) and netnography. I conclude with a description of the institutions that will be mentioned throughout the thesis.

Methods

Critical discourse analysis (CDA). The critical discourse analysis functions as the main method in this thesis because I want to focus mostly on analysing texts and media content related to the EHL in order to understand the discourse of this particular form of cultural heritage. Like in the aforementioned sections on previous research and theoretical framework, Smith comes into play here as well, as she thoroughly discusses the use of critical discourse analysis within the field of heritage. She notes that a CDA includes recognizing the existence of “competing and inter-relating discourses” (Smith, 2006, p.15). I analyse the discourse of this particular form of heritage in a political context, that of the European Union, and try to find what directions and effects that discourse has. Smith notes (as cited in Marston, 2004) a concern in “the way discourses become intertwined with the legitimation and maintenance of power” (2006, p.15). She further says that “In legitimizing and naturalizing the ideologies and a range of cultural and social assumptions about the way the

social world works (as cited in Fairclough, 2003), discourses can have a persuasive power in maintaining and legitimating hierarchies of social relations” (Smith, 2006, p.15). Smith’s notion of how power and legitimization can have significant influence on a discourse is relevant to this thesis’ critical analysis. It aids with putting the EHL in a different light than simply an institution verified by the European Union, which labels and lists heritage sites in Europe. The critical discourse analysis takes the researcher backstage, where one can find many different aspects that make up and drive the European Heritage Label.

Netnography. In addition, to achieve such a critical analysis, empirical data was gathered via netnography. Netnography is the use of Internet sources such as websites, online communities, social media, blogs and so on, as empirical data for ethnographic analysis. Rokka (2010) discusses netnographic inquiry to observe consumers online by viewing it “as a more naturalistic and less obtrusive way to collect consumer data” (p.383). He describes a four-step process to acquire netnographic data and analysis which, summarized, includes sampling sources, identifying and analysing practices, collecting practice data, and, ensuring trustworthy interpretation and ethical conduct as is what I have done with my study, with the importance of the fourth step in mind. Rokka mentions (as cited in Moisander and Valtonen, 2006) that “quality measures of netnography must include those of any rigorous cultural analyses: insightfulness and relevance, methodological coherence, sensitivity to phenomenon, trustworthy interpretation and ethical conduct” (2010, p.385). He says, according to Kozinets (2006), “immersion into the online research phenomena through long-term engagement is crucial in allowing the netnographer to ‘speak with authority’ when making interpretations and conclusions” (Rokka, 2010, p.385). A thorough investigation of what is heritage and a strong connection to the topic was of central importance to conducting netnographic research and analysis. That meant starting to immerse myself in the world of heritage by doing a work placement, attending lectures, and, thereafter, intensively reading European Heritage Label website information, legislative documents, watching corporate videos, and making comparisons. This kind of netnographic immersion helped me to get an all-round perspective and dig deeper into the empirical data.

Materials

Legislative Decision document. An example of material that shall be subjected to the critical discourse analysis is the document named *legislative decision establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label* (Official Journal of the European

Union, 2011). I unpack and refer to this document intensively in the analysis and, therefore, I mostly refer to it as legislative document or legislative decision. This document represents a so-called legislative act, which was passed by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. The process of passing an act through Parliament and the Council means that the European Heritage Label is thereafter officially recognized under the rule of EU law.

The document consists of the preamble and articles. The preamble has eighteen paragraphs, which can be understood as a sort of introduction, stating the purpose, aims, and justification of the legislative act. The preamble is followed by twenty-one articles that subdivide all the rules and descriptions that shall include the formation and management of the EHL. I use this document by focusing on terms that are mentioned several times and seemed to be of particular interest to the legislators (the Parliament and the Council). By taking a closer look at these terms I apply the critical discourse analysis and discuss the underlying meanings they signify in the discourse of cultural heritage through the EHL. This investigation comes to light throughout the analysis parts.

Work placement lecture. During my work placement at an academic institute for cultural heritage in the United Kingdom, I attended a lecture given by Benedicte Selfslagh (2016). As an employee for the European Heritage Label, she explained the work that is done and why the EHL was established. The contents of this lecture are an important part of my empirical data as it provides a direct link to my case study (the EHL), and allows me to add another perspective to the critical discourse analysis.

Online video interviews. Part of the collecting empirical data through netnography was an investigation of the European Heritage Label website, which includes videos of interviews with labelled heritage sites' managers, directors and other relations (EHL Website, n.d., Selected Sites). The interviewees tell the viewer about their heritage site and why its European aspects are so important to heritage of Europe and the European Union.

The following video interviews of labelled heritage sites are used and examined in the thesis; the Archaeological Park Carnuntum in Austria and Camp Westerbork, in the Netherlands (European Heritage Label, 2014-b and -c). They serve as an example in order to contrast labelled and rejected heritage sites that applied for the European Heritage Label.

Postcards. The European Heritage Label provides a communication toolbox for its heritage sites, which includes flyers, posters, postcards and other branding elements. Each postcard features a photo and textual information, corresponding to a labelled heritage site. I use the postcards to analyse their visual features, the fact that they are used as a

communication tool, and to dig deeper into their cultural meaning and what they say about the discourse of this particular form of heritage.

Limitations

As mentioned above, I only use methods that observe but do not interact. I am limited to information that I gathered from online sources, to analysing a discourse according to academic theories, and to one-sided reception of lecture content.

Personal contact. I focus solely on discourse analysis, netnography, and work placement experiences. I, therefore, will not include any interviews or other personal communication. Although an interesting aspect of the European discourse of heritage would have been the views and opinions of managers of heritage sites, I decided to focus on the heritage discourse through analysing the European Heritage Label within the timeframe I had for writing.

Economic aspects. I investigate aspects of value, symbolism, young people and Europe. I do so because these are of main focus in the legislative decision and other materials and, thus, parts of the discourse which I study. Another aspect that plays a part in the current discourse of cultural heritage is economic value. I will, however, not go into this as it would make up a whole different side of heritage as well as an entirely different direction of this thesis. Thus, the economic value of heritage is an existing aspect, but one that I shall leave to future research.

European Institutions

A description is given on the various European Institutions, which are referred to throughout this thesis.

The European Heritage Label (EHL). The focus of this study lies on the European Heritage Label. This is an institution established by the European Union in 2011. It works to appoint sites or objects within the borders of the currently twenty-eight member states of the EU (European Union, n.d., EU Member countries). It appoints such sites or objects by giving them both a label recognized under EU law as well as visual labelling tools, such as a communication toolbox. The focus of these heritage sites lies on a shared European past among citizens of the European Union.

The European Union (EU). The EU is a community first established in 1950 as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) by six countries including Belgium, France,

Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and, the Netherlands. A few years later, in 1957 it changed to the European Economic Community (EEC) focusing on a common market. Over the years the Union experienced many events and changes, including the adaptation of the Schengen Treaty, which allowed for free movement of people and goods, and the new currency Euro. The European Union now consists of twenty-eight member states (European Union, n.d., The History of the European Union).

The European Commission (EC). The European Commission is the EU's executive arm. It takes decisions on the European Union's political and strategic direction. The European Commission is divided into departments that develop policies for specific areas. Each department is headed by commissioners. The commission is led by twenty-eight commissioners, known as 'the college'. Every five years, a new college of commissioners is chosen. The different departments in the Commission develop, implement and manage EU policy, law and funding programmes (European Commission, n.d.).

The Council of the European Union (the Council). The Council negotiates and adopts EU laws, coordinates member states' policies, develops the EU's common foreign and security policy, concludes international agreements and, adopts the EU budget. It negotiates and adopts legislative acts in most cases together with the European Parliament through the ordinary legislative procedure, also known as "codecision". The Council legislates on the basis of proposals submitted by the European Commission (The Council of the EU, 2015).

The Council of Europe (CoE). This institution is often confused with Council of the European Union. The Council of Europe, however, is an independent institution, separate from the EU. It can be seen as the guardian of human rights, democracy, and rule of law. It includes 47 member states, of which 28 are members of the European Union. All 47 member states have signed the European Convention on Human Rights, a treaty that was created to protect those three aspects of human rights, democracy and rule of law (Council of Europe, n.d.).

UNESCO. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization established in 1945 for the purpose of developing universal values and improvement of the living conditions of people around the world. It tries to do so through those aspects of education, science, culture and communication (UNESCO, n.d.).

Overview of thesis

This thesis consists of a cultural analysis of the European Heritage Label as a case study, which is divided in three parts. In part one, I analyse the European Heritage Label legislative decision document and its media channels, which sets the stage for the rest of the analysis and presents critical perspectives of the use of language.

Then in the second part, I analyse examples of two other heritage initiatives, and I tie that into an investigation of the term “added value” to analyse how the European Heritage Label further positions itself with heritage.

The third part investigates the labelling process through legislative criteria and case studies of rejected and selected heritage sites. Then follows a conclusion of the analysis and the applied aspects that this thesis has brought about, especially for the European Heritage Label management and, also, for heritage and culture organizations and sites in general.

Part One: The European Heritage Label

This part will first give a short introduction on how the European Heritage Label was established, including the legislative process and participating countries. It will further investigate media aspects of the Label, going into depth on its slogan, postcards and logo with the help of terms from the legislative decision document. A discussion will follow on what characterizes the European Heritage Label.

Legislative Decision Establishing the European Heritage Label

In 2011, the European Union established the so-called European Heritage Label. It was a response to the earlier formed ‘intergovernmental initiative’ among European member states in 2006 that liaised to create a stronger bond between heritage sites. In 2008, the European Commission submitted a proposal to the Council of the European Union for the creation by the Union of a European Heritage Label. It was indicated that the intergovernmental initiative was of value but could do with further help to reach its full potential. Thus, the European Parliament and the Council established the Label as a “European Union action”. The first selection of heritage sites took place in 2013 and the following two years, and is continued every two years thereafter. The selected sites will be subdued to monitoring and in 2018 the first evaluation of the EHL is scheduled (Official Journal of the European Union –hereafter cited as OJ L 303-, 2011, p.9).

This legislative decision was recorded in a document, which counts twenty-one articles and touches upon many different aspects of the established Label (OJ L 303, 2011). Besides the reasoning for establishing such, one can also find objectives, participation rules, criteria, a management system, site definitions, monitoring regulations and financial provisions. Basically, by establishing the EHL, the European Union is aiming at bringing together the people in Europe by making them aware of the “common cultural heritage” while “respecting their national and regional diversity” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.1). Also, a “better understanding and appreciation of shared heritage” should “strengthen the sense of belonging” and should “reinforce intercultural dialogue” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.1).

As mentioned before, the EHL started labelling sites since 2013 and so far there are twenty-nine sites that have been assigned the label. These sites can be found in sixteen different European countries including: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal,

Slovenia and Spain. They vary from natural landscapes, to castles, city districts, a cemetery, and libraries (EHL Website, n.d., Selected Sites).

European Heritage Label Media

In addition to the official legislative document, the European Commission (EC) has a special webpage dedicated to the EHL. It is a more reader friendly and easily comprehensible platform, where one can get to know the institution, its goals and labelled sites. The European Commission takes executive decisions on behalf of the European Union, to guide its political and strategic direction. On its official website is a section called ‘Creative Europe’, which is the European Commission’s “framework programme for support to the culture and audio-visual sectors” (Creative Europe, 2017). Under the header *Initiatives*, the EHL has its own designated web space.

Within the webpage is a tab called ‘Apply’, which says that “European Union member states which confirmed their participation in the initiative” qualify to submit sites for the EHL (EHL Website, n.d., How to Apply). These actually include twenty-four countries, adding Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania, Slovakia to the sixteen above mentioned countries. There are currently twenty-eight EU member states and the States who have not yet confirmed participation, but can still do so if they wish, are Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom². Thus, not all EU member states have some of their national heritage sites listed by the EHL. In part three of the analysis, I further investigate the process of labelling national heritage as European heritage and why some applicant sites were rejected.

Besides stating the aims of common cultural heritage, respecting diversity, and reinforcing intercultural dialogue, there are other intentions in the legislative document that are worth taking a closer look at. By means of media examples, I investigate several specific terms from the legislative document more closely. The term “young people” is tied to the example of EHL postcards, and the term “symbolic value” is investigated with postcard text as example. Furthermore, I analyse the EHL website’s textual and visual content, the slogan and the logo. What is the EHL trying to communicate through its media channels and tools? What role does heritage play? This investigation will help to peel away the first layer of the

² This possibility may change for the UK in the future, considering Brexit 2016.
<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-uk-after-referendum/>

EHL and dig deeper into the understanding of how heritage is used and produced in this authorized European context.

Europe Starts Here. In October, 2016 I attended a lecture given by an employee from the European Heritage Label at the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom. In a large auditorium, she presented information about the EHL's goals and listed sites to an audience of students and lecturers in the field of heritage. What caught my attention was the EHL symbol paired with a slogan that reads: "Europe Starts Here!" After the lecture I picked up what seemed like an information folder but turned out to be a postcard 'ladder' of several postcards attached to one another in a vertical column. Several listed sites have their main 'feature' on the front with their name and country stated on the side.



Figure 1 EHL Postcard front side, Europe Starts Here!



Figure 2 EHL Logo

As seen on the picture above, the first postcard just reads: Europe Starts Here!

What the lecture and the postcards tell me is that apparently Europe starts at the Hambach Castle in Germany or at the Krapina Neanderthal Site in Croatia or with the Charter abolishing the Death Penalty.



Figure 3 EHL Postcard Hambach Castle, front and back

How are these sites both European ‘heritage’ and a certain ‘starting point’? The European Heritage sites are things and places from the past but apparently carry valuable learning moments that should be taken up in present values and ideals. Their historical rhetoric may play an important part in the ‘start’ of one’s understanding of Europe, but how much do the aesthetics do so? A castle somewhere in the south of Germany may not indicate common values nor necessarily bring European citizens closer together. Although it is indicated on the EHL webpage that sites are selected for more than just their aesthetics – they are selected to share their European narrative and history behind it – it might have been more fitting to have a slogan such as Europe *started* here. It may indeed make more sense to use a slogan in present tense, rather than past tense. Yet, ‘starts here’ may indicate to its reader a starting point for the present rhetoric of Europe, one which young people can identify with because it is part of their childhood and daily lives. Others may also feel more affiliated with a present narrative because that may be part of their career or daily interactions on social, cultural or political level.

The ‘starting point’, however, when looking at the currently labelled sites, can be seen as historical, geographical or related to past European narratives. The EHL sites are indicating objects and places with historical aspects, which indicate that the institution wishes Europe to start with/at the past. For example, the lecture in Birmingham featured the title: “A European Future for our Past?” (Selfslagh, 2016). Thus, this title suggests that “our past” is something shared among all European citizens, and that there is a “future” for this past within a “European” dimension. This indicates a certain wish to shape what the future should be like for European citizens and doing so by starting with the past but giving it a European twist. Not only does this show how the past is given a new perspective but also how it is used for the need to build a European identity. Such indication, however, is not clear from the slogan alone, and looking at it with past tense ‘started’ aids much in understanding the underlying meaning and intention of the slogan and what it is that the European Heritage Label is communicating. As such, “Europe Starts Here!” indicates a new starting point of Europe by use of heritage narratives with a European twist.

Furthermore, it is worth noticing that the EHL created postcards as a marketing tool when one of its main goals is to target young people. That is a rather peculiar tool to choose as a young person nowadays, as social media is much faster, engaging and interesting to them than postcards. Especially, when the majority of them own a smartphone or have access to the Internet. Perhaps, the people working at the EHL are of an older age than their target group, which could explain the fact that the EHL communication toolbox consists only of

postcards, leaflets and posters (EHL Website, n.d., Managing your labelled site). This is why, as mentioned earlier, I will analyse the term “young people”.

Young people. In the legislative decision document the term “young people” is mentioned various times, but it is never defined what that includes or excludes nor why they are the main target group. Why are they so specifically addressed? What does that say about the EHL’s use of heritage? When an individual or peer group is regarded as young might also differ among cultures within EU member states. The European Heritage Label legislative decision mentions “young people” as follows:

A better understanding and appreciation, especially among *young people*, of their shared yet diverse heritage would help to strengthen the sense of belonging to the Union and reinforce intercultural dialogue”. And “strengthening European citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union, in particular that of *young people*, based on shared values and elements of European history and cultural heritage, as well as an appreciation of national and regional diversity.

(OJ L 303, 2011, p.1&3)

From these legislative passages it can be interpreted that the EHL targets “young people” in order to create among them, a certain personal connection to the European Union as an institution and to the history, culture and member states of that Union and of Europe.

In the EHL monitoring folder of 2016 labelled sites have to evaluate the management of their site according to the Label’s criteria. Two points within the monitoring form address:

- “Organising educational activities, particularly for children and *young people*, to increase the understanding of the common history and heritage of Europe”, and
- “Privileged access for *young people*” (EHL monitoring form, 2016).

Furthermore, several European Heritage Label sites have an educational section on their websites, which is in accordance with the criteria. What can be found in the monitoring form and the websites, however, is the notion of both terms “young people” *and* “children”. For example, the Krapina Neanderthal Site in Croatia targets children and youth through educational programmes such as summer schools and interactive workshops as well as an imaginary Neanderthal character named Pep.



Figure 4 Krapina Neanderthal Museum Webpage

This character takes youth through the perspective of Pep's daily life in his community, but it is also mentioned that one will be able to learn how other Neanderthals lived in other parts of Europe, indicating that European twist in the narrative (Kraneamus Krapina Neanderthal Museum, n.d.).

Another example is The Peace Palace in the Netherlands, which has an audio tour for children and a drawing contest (Vredespaleis, n.d.). Also, the Lieu d'Europe in Strasbourg even has school presentations and games on learning about what makes up the EU, such as its history, flags, and countries. Some are specifically aimed at young people, ages 13 and up (Strasbourg l'Européenne, n.d.). Thus, young people as a target group includes both children and teenagers. The fact that the EHL has national heritage sites express their European dimension to such a young target group actually looks like a very strategic way of reaching out to young people and add that wanted European aspect to their education.

Young people may not relate to nor feel a sense of belonging through EU economic and political actions, thus, cultural heritage and the European Heritage Label is supposed to be another way of creating support for the EU among its younger citizens. However, a sense of belonging and sharing values is also something that ties back to the authorized heritage discourse, as it is the EU's authority which creates an imagined need for belonging and uses heritage to do so. Then it ties heritage sites and narratives to European perspectives to educate young people not only about original events at the sites but also to make them see a

larger European relation. Targeting young people has an authorized educational dimension to it, or as Smith calls it, “edification of the public”, which can be to “remind the public about the values and sensibilities that should be saved or preserved as representative of European national identities” (Smith, 2006, p.23). Besides creating a future for the EU through its youngest citizens, the targeting of young people through cultural heritage can also be explained according to current affairs such as the Brexit, the migration and asylum seekers in Europe, and possible future enlargement of the EU. These current examples play a role in the need for educating people about European values and creating a sense of belonging. As the EU’s political and social situation and stability constantly changes, it tries to hold a grip on the situation through heritage and education.

The study of the slogan “Europe Starts Here!” and the term “young people” will now be followed by an analysis of the term “symbolic value”.

Symbolic value. On the first EHL postcard the following text can be found: “The European Heritage Label links *highly symbolic* heritage sites which have played a significant role in the history and culture of Europe or in the development of European integration”.

The term symbolic value is also expressed several times in the legislative document. Therefore, I shortly investigate the link between symbolism of heritage sites and European integration, and what symbolic European heritage entails within the context of the European Heritage Label. For example, symbolic value is mentioned



Figure 5 EHL Postcard, back side

in the legislative document as: “Candidate sites for the label must have a *symbolic European value* and must have played a significant role in the history and culture of Europe and/or the building of the Union” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.4).

It may be interpreted that symbolic heritage and symbolic value in this case do not depend on aesthetics but, rather, on the narrative they represent, according to the “significant role in the history of Europe” and “the building of the Union”. However, Gahleitner (2012) argues that symbolic value is, ultimately, constructed and, therefore, such value depends on interpretation. From Gahleitner’s argument, it can be interpreted that the symbolic European value of a heritage site depends on “the social context of those experiencing the symbol”

(Gahleitner, 2012, p.30). As established earlier, the EHL's aim is to use cultural heritage to create a future and European identity for the EU's citizens. Furthermore, Gahleitner quotes from French politician Jacques Delors: "economic and legal integration is functional, but it is by means of symbols that the European Union acquires meaning and becomes comprehensible for the European people" (2012, p.29). Thus, when a heritage site is interpreted as symbolic by EU officials, it embodies a message that shows which European values the European people ought to take as their own. The symbolic European heritage sites might not have an actual graphic symbol that represents European history, culture and EU building, but the narrative of the site and what it represents makes up the symbolic value. Such symbols can carry values, which the EU wishes to see in sites labelled as European heritage. This, therefore, shows how symbolic value is constructed and also forms a certain European hegemony.

For example, the labelled sites on the postcard of Image 1 include the Hambach Castle, the Charter of Law of the Abolition of the Death Penalty, the Ligt Ferenc Academy of Music, The Mundaneum, the Peace Palace, the Residencia de Estudiantes, the World War I Eastern Front Cemetery no. 123, and Kaunas of 1919-1940 (EHL Website, n.d., Branding-Postcard 3). How do these sites symbolise European integration? According to the text on these postcards, these sites embody values such as equality, fundamental human rights of the EU, the right to education and intellectual freedom, peace and justice, and intercultural relations. Symbolic European heritage, thus, reflects European integration in the way that all citizens of the European Union should be able to experience the same kind of treatments in political, legal, social and educational circumstances. These values and ideals are shared through cultural heritage sites as selected by the EHL to reach the European people as the meaning becomes comprehensible to them through symbols.

Logo. A symbol for the European Heritage Label is its logo. As seen below, it is made of a white star surrounded by several coloured patches and below a blue square with a circle of stars, which signifies the EU flag. I investigate what this logo stands for and what the connection is to heritage.

First of all, the white star can be seen as a reflection of the EU flag which has the circle of twelve golden stars signifying unity, solidarity and harmony among the peoples of Europe (European Union, n.d., The European Flag). The use of stars as a symbol for the EU



Figure 6 EHL Logo

even ties back to the 1950s when the Council of Europe began to use it as their flag and later encouraged new European Institutions to do the same.

According to the EHL graphic charter, the shapes that form the star represent different elements such as leaves, flowers, and rocks which ought to evoke symbols of stones, petals or footprints and should reflect the depth and breadth of European heritage. Both shapes and colours are supposed to represent the diversity, which lies at the heart of Europe (EHL Website, n.d., Branding-The graphic design charter).

Although the graphic charter does not specifically mention the meaning behind the different colours of each shape, they can be looked at as each representing their own aspect within that depth and breadth of European heritage. Taking into account the EHL's visual material – videos, folders, leaflets, posters – it can be interpreted that the colours represent monuments and places of remembrance, archaeological and natural places, buildings, cultural objects and intangible heritage associated with a particular location, museum or cultural landscape.

Furthermore, when the logo is used in video material, the star is shown pulsing, which makes it look like a beating heart. In the human body, the heart is the centre, pumping the blood through the veins and supplying the body with oxygen. This pulsing of the logo can be understood as European heritage being a living concept that breathes life into Europe, the EU and its intercultural side. It can also be understood as a concept that gave life to the existing Europe of today. Furthermore, in relation to the slogan “Europe Starts Here!”, the star pulsing as a heart signifies European heritage as the centre and starting point.

Thus, the logo tries to evoke certain feelings or imaginations because part of it is quite abstract and open to an individual's interpretation. Such abstract visuals can account for inclusion because it allows the imagination to run free. On the other hand, they account for ignorance because the visual aspects are accompanied with text, which provides for enough

information to comprehend what the logo represents and allows the reader to carry on and dismiss the other aspects of the logo.

The star, the heart pulse, the coloured shapes, and the EU flag indicate a certain diversity that lives in the heritage sites of Europe according to the EU. This diverse nature of Europe's history ought to unite the people and citizens of the European Union.

It's Unique: How The European Heritage Label Tries to Distinguish Itself

The EHL webpage starts with explaining what makes their organization unique and how they are different from the UNESCO label through three key differences:

- European Heritage sites bring to life the European narrative and the history behind it. They are about much more than just aesthetics.
- The focus is on the promotion of the European dimension of the sites and providing access to them. This includes organising a wide range of educational activities, especially for young people.
- European Heritage sites can be enjoyed singly or as part of a network. Visitors can get a real feel for the breadth and scale of what Europe has to offer and what it has achieved.

(EHL Website, n.d., What is it?)

After establishing the European Heritage Label under EU law, the European Commission already acknowledged the existence and work of UNESCO and apparently saw the necessity to explain to its audience what they do differently with the EHL. On this webpage it is not further explained why it should be different from UNESCO, only from the legislative decision can it be understood that with the Label the EU wishes to add to and complement the work of, among others, UNESCO's World Heritage List. This indicates a need to justify its [the EU] actions in comparison to other heritage organizations to its audience, perhaps, to point out what it does differently, avoid misunderstandings and clarify the EHL's assumed uniqueness. Furthermore, this might even indicate a need to justify their actions to themselves; the European Commission, Parliament and panel of experts. By explaining why they are unique, they indicate a kind of justification for applying and practising EU authority in the cultural sector.

To see whether EHL sites have applied for more than one label, I compared them with the World Heritage List. I compared the twenty-nine listed EHL sites with the UNESCO list, and there are, indeed, two sites that are also listed by UNESCO. These two include The Heart of Ancient Athens in Greece and the General Library of the University of Coimbra in Portugal (UNESCO has the whole University listed). Two other sites are partially part of UNESCO's list: the Great Guild Hall in Tallinn, Estonia was listed specifically by the EHL whereas UNESCO listed all of Tallinn's historic centre and the Franja Partisan Hospital in Slovenia is listed by EHL but has been on the UNESCO tentative list, which means it has been waiting for approval, since 2000. The EHL has stated that it wants to add to the work of established heritage organizations; thus, this overlap analysis clarifies that such can include sites which are also listed by other initiatives and that the EHL leaves its sites free to apply for other labels as well.

Noted in the second key difference above, the EHL aims to focus on the European dimension of heritage. The EHL wants to set itself apart from others with that European aspect and considers such its core strength. Whether such focus truly makes it unique in relation to other heritage organizations is questionable because in all other aspects of their organization they may be doing the exact same. Selfslagh (2016) mentioned that the labelled sites are "committed to highlight their European dimension because in many countries the National narratives are still the norm in history teaching and cultural heritage interpretation and there might be a danger of isolationistic approaches becoming the norm again" (42:25). From such a mention, it can be interpreted that heritage sites need to show their European links to the visitors, not only to be eligible for the Label but also to engage the national audience in a wider cultural perspective to prevent strong nationalistic ideas or narrow-mindedness.

The way the EHL tries to distinguish itself can also be understood from its main aim. As mentioned above, in the legislative decision, it is stated that the aim is to bring together the people in Europe through making them aware of the "common cultural heritage while respecting their national and regional diversity" and a "better understanding and appreciation of shared heritage" should "strengthen the sense of belonging" and "reinforce intercultural dialogue" (OJ L 303, 2011, p.1). Although this aim has nuanced quite a bit on the webpage, it still carries the same message. On the webpage and postcard, the aim is described as labelling European heritage that has contributed to the "creation of today's Europe". Those sites function as a celebration and symbolization of "European ideals, values, history and integration". "Their symbolic value, the role they have played in the European history and

activities they offer that bring the European Union and its citizens closer together” are criteria upon which the sites have been selected (EHL Website, n.d., What is it?). This aim indicates that symbolic heritage played a significant role in the creation of Europe as one may know it today. Also, in the 2015 panel report, the main aim is stated as: “the aim of the European Heritage Label is not to bring a ‘traditional’ national narrative to a European audience but to contextualise and interpret their cultural heritage in a broader European geographical and historical context, thus beyond the national borders” (EHL Panel, 2015, p.15).

In summary, this analysis answered the questions: What is the EHL trying to communicate through its media channels and tools? And, what role does heritage play? Through its media channels, symbols, and aims, the EHL wishes to communicate a greater awareness of common and shared heritage, as well as a sense of belonging in an intercultural environment. A new starting point for heritage is created through the slogan “Europe Starts Here!”, using past narratives and aesthetics by giving them a new European twist. This is a way of getting an authorized grip on the EU’s position and status among citizens, especially among younger generations. Furthermore, the European narratives of heritage sites are put at the centre of European hegemony.

Another aspect, which, according to the EHL, distinguishes it from other initiatives is “added value”. In the next part, two examples of such other initiatives are given after which the term “added value” is analysed on different levels to examine what it actually entails and how the EHL positions itself.

Part Two: Adding Value to The Mix

As mentioned in part one, the European Heritage Label has pointed out how it is different from UNESCO and that it wants to add to and complement the work of other heritage organizations. It has become clear that a more explicit European dimension of heritage sites should be the norm. The EHL, however, is not the first and only organization to look at cultural heritage with a European perspective. The Council of Europe and European Union have both undertaken other European heritage related initiatives. The two examples of other initiatives are given to put the EHL in a wider context and point out the authorized heritage discourse in a European hegemony. Furthermore, the EHL expresses its difference in yet another way, by focusing on something it calls “added value”. I question what “added value” entails in this context and how the EHL positions itself through such use of term.

For The Sake of Europe: Other Heritage Initiatives

The EHL is not the first internationally authorized tool to label heritage. Besides UNESCO’s World Heritage List, another predecessor to be working with heritage on a European basis is the Council of Europe (CoE), with the Cultural Routes. In 1987, the CoE launched the Cultural Routes with the aim of demonstrating “how the heritage of the different countries and cultures of Europe contributes to a shared and living cultural heritage” (European Institute of Cultural Routes, n.d.-a). These routes are meant to promote the values that the CoE wishes to uphold, namely “human rights, cultural democracy, cultural diversity, mutual understanding and exchanges across boundaries” (European Institute of Cultural Routes, n.d.-a). Much like the European Heritage Label, the CoE uses these routes as “channels for intercultural dialogue and promote a better knowledge and understanding of European history” (European Institute of Cultural Routes, n.d.-a). Countries wishing to have their cultural route certified as a “Cultural Route of the Council of Europe” must also go through an application process. It is even mentioned that an advantage of becoming an official ‘Cultural Route’ is being able to use that term as a ‘label’, as well as using the CoE’s logo. A few examples of the existing 32 Cultural Routes are The Hansa, The European Route of Jewish Heritage, Destination Napoleon, The Viking Routes, and The European Cemeteries Route (European Institute of Cultural Routes, n.d.-b). This organization shows quite an inclusive selection by its wide arrange of route subjects, and it is not restricted to sites that are already labelled as heritage (e.g. on the World Heritage List). The Council of Europe’s selection process, however, still fits right in the authorized heritage discourse.

Another example is the World Heritage Journeys in the EU, which was established in 2016 through cooperation between UNESCO, National Geographic, and the European Union. This project focuses on connecting UNESCO World Heritage Sites within the European Union with themes such as Ancient Europe, Royal Europe, Romantic Europe, and Underground Europe (UNESCO World Heritage Convention, National Geographic, EU, 2017). Besides these journeys being a tool for showcasing the history and cultural diversity within the EU, the project is actually designed to attract markets from the United States and China to Europe. Although this project also wishes to support sustainable tourism, one might question how attracting more international visitors to European heritage sites aids in sustainability. Similar questions apply for the objective to encourage spread of visitors to less visited areas. Such dispersal might prove problematic as visitors who have come all the way from China or the United States are usually keen to visit the popular and well-known heritage sites.

The World Heritage Journeys project is funded by a Directorate-General of the European Commission and involves stakeholders such as “the European Travel Commission (ETC), national tourism administrations, heritage management authorities and organisations, tourism boards, hospitality industry stakeholders, local communities, sustainable tourism experts and corporate partners” (UNESCO World Heritage Convention, National Geographic, EU, 2017). The World Heritage Journeys are, thus, quite exclusive and entirely restricted to World Heritage Sites. Also, there is no transparent selection or labelling process, as the project is created by authorized institutions and officials within the cultural heritage field.

There is a notable difference between the focus and objectives of each initiative. The EHL is moving the focus more on the European narrative of heritage rather than its preservation. The CoE’s Cultural Routes focus more on inclusivity, international connections and diverse range of heritage, while the World Heritage Journeys project simply tries to connect existing labelled UNESCO WHS and use them for the benefits of tourism. Nevertheless, they all play a role in the authorized heritage discourse where connoting the European perspective plays the biggest part.

Added Value

Part of a critical discourse analysis is questioning the use of language, hence the reason for investigating a deeper cultural meaning behind the use of added value, within the

context of the European Heritage Label. I question what the term “added value” entails in the context of the legislative decision establishing the European Heritage Label, and how they position themselves through such use of term.

The term is used in the legislative document throughout various parts of the preamble: “the Union could provide it with a *clear added value*”, “the label should *seek added value*”, and “demonstrate a *European added value*” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.1&2). In the document, the multiple mentioning of this term is supposed to indicate,

- (1) Union involvement; the European Commission saw something of value in the existing intergovernmental initiative and decided that when made an official part of the EU rule of law the initiative would gain some sort of prestige or respect.
- (2) Complementing others; the established Label should regard itself as an addition to other existing initiatives that work with cultural heritage. It shall differentiate itself by focusing on European historical and cultural narratives only, as well as a focus on educational purposes.
- (3) Joint sites; sites that wish to indicate a joint heritage connection when applying for the Label can do so by showing the shared European historical or cultural link.

There is, however, more to added value than indicated in the legislative document; it is interesting to note the use of the words “added” and “value”. Hence, an analysis of value in the context of heritage and the EHL is necessary. Further, more is hidden behind the term added value when it comes to complementing other heritage initiatives; UNESCO uses, for example, the term outstanding universal value (OUV) to appoint heritage sites. To investigate further what the EHL and its sites are complementing, I compare the two terms. Besides added value there is also the notion of “European added value”, but who decides when a site has such value and how?

Why value? According to Oxford Dictionaries value can have various definitions: “to estimate or regard as having a certain value or worth”, “worth based on esteem; quality viewed in terms of importance, usefulness, desirability, etc.”, and, “such worth or estimation regarded in relation to an individual or group” (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.). These various definitions describe value as something of worth, a quality, a tool to measure or compare one thing to another or as something that is relevant in the eyes of a person or community.

An academic perspective on the use of value in the heritage field is that of Anne Eriksen (2014), who discussed how in the nineteenth century the ways people thought and talked about material remains from the past were changing: “New kinds of old artefacts were valued, and they were valued by new and other groups of people. Public collections grew and

preservation of monuments and the building of large museums became important national tasks” (Eriksen, 2014, p.7). Smith also discusses the nineteenth century ways of thinking in relation to Romanticism, and the “conservation ethic” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, whose purpose was to spread the values and meaning of historic buildings and monuments to “ensure greater conservation awareness and appreciation of a nation’s cultural heritage” (2006, p.19). Although in that time “it was only the well-educated who had the necessary cultural literacy to understand grand social and national narratives that were inherent in the fabric of such monuments” (Smith, 2006, p.21). Romanticism was a reaction to urbanization and industrialization, wanting to recall the rural idyllic image, which meant that most of the conservation focus turned to churches and homes of the rural elite.

These public collections and conservation ethics are an example of how value in the field of heritage was once established within society in this particular timeframe, namely the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Hartog (as cited in Eriksen, 2014) explains this shift of value systems in society as ‘historicity regimes’, or historical authenticity, which means a change of terminology and perspective over the course of time: “Each regime of historicity is the outcome of a different way of experiencing the temporal aspect of the human condition, hence acquiring its own expressions in culture as well as in historiography” (Eriksen, 2014, p.2). This means that the terminology and perspectives of culture change, depending on how people in, for example, a certain decade live and experience their environment and society. Eriksen continues by arguing that age and value are entangled, the value of objects “comes from the memories that are attached to them, from the stories that are told, and from the social and cultural reality they reflect” (Eriksen, 2014, p.3). Thus, each regime has different needs, norms and values in daily life and society.

Historicity regime explains that value in the field of heritage can depend on the contextual worth and timeframe, which in the case of EHL is a twenty-first century setting within a large European Union. Also, the contemporary need for bonding through culture intensifies the valuation of heritage and the use of it as a concept.

In his book on value theory, Francesco Orsi argues that “sometimes, evaluative words are used to register other people’s evaluations” (Orsi, 2015, p.1). The same can be said for registering value of heritage by society. The EHL plays the role of the “other” by evaluating something as important or valuable to European heritage; heritage sites, visitors, and any other interested parties will register and use that evaluation. This results in a belief, by those heritage sites, visitors, and other parties, that a site or object is, indeed, valuable as significant heritage to Europe and the EU. In this respect, value can be viewed as something

institutionally constructed, yet has to be accepted socially because value only exists when people acknowledge it.

In the legislative document, it is also noted that the European Union involvement *provides* the European Heritage Label with added value and quality. The European Union's influence, status and authority allows for such provisions but can also be seen as an interference of rule of law and control. It is an interplay within the authorized heritage discourse as the European Union provides the EHL a tool for getting ahead in an authorized heritage field and, at the same time, influences the concept of heritage and the way it is used and perceived.

Thus, the use of the term value, in addition to when and how societies value heritage is considerably influenced by past contributions of the well-educated population of society, present political frameworks and authorities.

A Complementing Factor

A second notion in the preamble in the legislative document, is that added value is also a complementing factor, as it is supposed to contribute to, among others, UNESCO's World Heritage List. UNESCO's purpose with heritage is mostly to safeguard and protect the labelled sites across the world. The EU's purpose with heritage (and, consequently the EHL's) is to emphasize European history and culture, the institution of the EU itself and the values they embody as to unify European citizens. Also, the EHL considers heritage as "sites that celebrate and symbolize European ideals, values, history and integration" (EHL Website, n.d., What is it?).

UNESCO uses the term outstanding universal value (OUV) to point out which heritage is eligible to make the World Heritage List (2017). UNESCO created the World Heritage List in 1972, which includes sites such as the Great Chinese Wall, the Pyramid Fields in Egypt, the Kronborg Castle in Denmark, and the Hanseatic Town of Visby in Sweden. Since 2003, it also added an intangible heritage list as to allow for more inclusion of heritage that has no specific aesthetics. The sites must be of outstanding universal value and meet at least one out of the ten established criteria. The definition of OUV is written in the Operational Guidelines of 2016:

Outstanding universal value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

(UNESCO & Intergovernmental Committee, 2016)

An attempt has been made to define what OUV means yet remains rather vague, which is why one must refer to the list of ten criteria. Something can have outstanding universal value when it is rare, has highly educative aspects, and is regarded as something worthy for generations to come. While it can be interpreted that UNESCO tries to include sites of significance to *all* cultures in the world, whether that is feasible or not remains a question. Smith mentions that “the whole discourse of universality is itself a legitimizing strategy for the values and nature of heritage that underline the AHD” (2006, p.99).

Cleere (2001) also has a critical view on “universality” of cultural heritage and mentions that it has been argued that “the concept of ‘universality’ in relation to the cultural heritage is paradoxical, and logically applicable only to the earliest phases of human cultural evolution, and perhaps also to the global culture of the late twentieth century” (p.24). Cleere is referring to the earliest forms of mankind such as the *Homo erectus*, and to globalization where nations around the world share the same or very similar cultural and economic aspects. He exemplifies this by stating that the “cultural value of the Romanesque Duomo of Modena (Italy)” may not be recognized as such by those who value “the wooden Buddhist temple of Horyu-ji (Japan), while to indigenous societies in Australia or New Guinea both would be no more than piles of stones without aesthetic or spiritual significance” (Cleere, 2001, p.24).

Cleere’s critique on universality is similar to use of added value, as an added European dimension to national or transnational heritage sites does not mean that people will identify with sites, such as the Abbey of Cluny in France or Kaunas of 1919-1940 in Lithuania. Also, Selfslagh (2016) mentions that it is not the current norm to teach history with a European perspective in schools. Thus, the added value is not really valuable or complementing in the sense that it must be preserved for mankind as with OUV. Instead, added value is an added aspect to the concept of heritage, used to create a common European identity and future in a European hegemony.

A Contributing Factor: European Added Value

A following notion in the preamble is that the European Heritage Label should *seek* added value and that, “Its added value should be based on the contribution made by the selected sites to European history and culture, including the building of the Union, on a clear educational dimension reaching out to citizens (...)” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.2). Furthermore, sites that wish to apply jointly must seek “European added value”. Thus, the history and culture of Europe, the building of the European Union, and their educational facets are central to seeking that added value. This section examines these three aspects, with a special focus on European history and culture.

The building of the Union is, for example, represented in the labelled heritage site of the European District of Strasbourg in France. This is a very distinct example of how the EHL functions within an authorized heritage discourse, where it uses and produces heritage for its own purposes. The European District of Strasbourg includes the Council of Europe with the European Court of Human Rights and the European Union with its Parliament, embodying all the aspects which the EHL values. I do not criticize the district itself or the valued aspects; however, the fact that authorized institutions are pointed out as heritage is very interesting and significant to a European hegemony. It shows that this form of heritage includes not only historical narratives and aesthetics but also fully functioning political and law institutions.

The educational aspect, of both the building of the Union and the European history and culture, is something that refers back to young people as studied in part one. The EU wishes to target these people, mostly children and teenagers, to have them identify as being European and, therefore, create a future for its own existence.

Thirdly, the candidate sites that apply for the European Heritage Label must be able to point out how they have played a significant role in European history and culture. Yet, what includes European history and culture is not specified in the legislative document and may refer to a wide range of events. While I examine what includes European history and culture in the context of the EHL, I consider it to be part of an authorized heritage discourse. It is part of the societies within the continent of Europe that have formed an overarching allegiance since 1950 when the European Coal and Steel Community was created (European Union, n.d., *The History of the European Union*), eventually leading to the European Union. European history and culture is also influenced by the time of modernity and the signing of

the Athens Charter from 1931 and Venice Charter from 1964, which defined and framed conservation and heritage management (Smith, 2006).

In nineteenth-century modernity, as Smith discusses, “enlightenment rationality and claims about the possibility of objective truth had overturned medieval religious ideas about the nature of knowledge”, and, “Europeans believed themselves to be representative of the highest achievements of human technical, cultural and intellectual progress” (2006, p.89). Such a turn in mind-set must then have influenced the way Europeans looked at the past, as they believed themselves to be high achievers, so too must have what they considered significant events, sites, and objects from the past.

In the twentieth-century, Europeans who worked in both governmental and non-governmental heritage organizations started to look at objects from the past with an even more official eye. For example, the Athens and Venice Charters, which defined and framed conservation and heritage management, mostly aimed at the historical importance of sites. Furthermore, the Charters were both of international nature, but the committee that drafted the latter was still largely comprised of Europeans (Smith, 2006). Naturally, there are other sources and experts who define what is European history and culture, but, in the discourse of heritage institutions, such charters have practiced much influence on implementing legislative decisions related to heritage and on the conservation of European cultural and historical sites.

Thus, a change in the way Europeans thought about themselves, their history and achievements, as well as an increase in legal framing of what is worth conserving and managing as heritage, has contemporary effects on what may include “European history and culture”.

The Panel of Experts

Who decides what is European history and culture? In the case of the European Heritage Label, what is allowed to be labelled as part of European history and culture is decided by an independent panel of experts. According to the EHL, these independent experts are: “Individuals with substantial experience and expertise in relevant fields; designated by the European Parliament, Council, and Commission, (four members each) as well as the Committee of the Regions (one member); and, appointed for three years” (EHL FAQ, 2013). They make up the jury at EU level and, as a rule, they may only select “a maximum of one site from each country” (EHL Website, n.d., Your Questions; How are the sites selected?). Smith argues that “the vagueness of the past, its mystery and hard to pin downness,

immediately works to render it subject to the judgements of experts”, which exemplifies how it has been an expert’s task to clarify what components of the past are worth highlighting (2006, p.29).

The EHL panel members are active in fields such as cultural heritage consultancy, international heritage organizations like ICOMOS³, a national commission for UNESCO, a National Ministry of Culture, and Universities. Although they are all deemed experts in their fields and suitable for the position in the panel, they still have to follow the EU guidelines set in the legislative decision.

Besides being allowed to pick only one site per country every two years, the panel must also assess the proposed sites according to three other criteria. In brief, those include symbolic European value, a project highlighting the European dimension and demonstrating organizational capacity, which will be further addressed in part three. Although the panel is supposed to consist of a diverse group of members and use a democratic way of appointing sites for the European Heritage Label; what is considered “European history and culture” is largely already decided upon by EU authorities and legislative documents. One could see the panel of experts, therefore, as a sort of façade and the decision process as a rite of passage before a site can be labelled as European heritage. The three criteria are written in the legislative decision establishing the EHL, and are, therefore, bound by EU law. Since the panel cannot influence that, they practice their job solely to tick marks on the list and make up a façade for the EU to hide behind. The panel is another example of authorized heritage, which shows that the EU uses a long decision process, with a façade of experts, to stay in control of managing their goal to produce *European* heritage.

I analyse another aspect of the panel, which is that of individual or societal involvement. For example, Lars-Eric Jönsson (2017) discusses the Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society in Faro, Portugal in his article about the Council of Europe’s use of the concept of heritage. In this Convention, the parties involved “wished to emphasize the concept as a resource for a sustainable society and quality of life in a society in development. They wanted to involve all citizens in the definition and treatment of cultural heritage” (Jönsson, 2017, p.8). In the preamble of the Faro Convention, as Jönsson mentions, it was expressed that there should be “a right to engagement with the cultural heritage of their choice” (2017, p.8). “Their” refers specifically to everyone who is part of a Member State of the Council of Europe. Jönsson questions whether that meant if everyone had the right to

³ International Council on Monuments and Sites, <http://www.icomos.org/en/>

choose to relate to a *specific* heritage or could everyone choose what he or she *considers* cultural heritage?

This example is relatable to the European Heritage Label's panel system and to the way they expressed to whom the cultural heritage is important. In the legislative decision on the establishment of the EHL, it is not mentioned that everyone should have the right to engagement with the heritage of their choice. Their guideline is rather, to give access to Europeans, especially 'young people', and to spread awareness and common heritage. So, the right to engagement with heritage is still there, but not necessarily that of an individual's or community's choice. Thus, if only experts are allowed to be a part of the decision process, they are leaving out what is considered and valued as heritage by European citizens on local levels.

In the preamble of the legislative document, it is written that, "For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common values, history and culture (...)" (OJ L 303, 2011, p.1). Adding to that in article 3 is the "increasing European citizens' understanding of the history of Europe and the building of the Union, and of their common yet diverse cultural heritage (...)" (OJ L 303, 2011, p.3). If European citizens should understand each other's heritage, they should also be able to point out that which is meaningful to them and that which they wish to share with other Europeans.

Add Some More Value. To conclude, the explicit use of the term "added value" can be interpreted in various ways besides the obvious stated in the legislative document. I noted that value can be looked at as something institutionally constructed, yet has to be accepted socially because value only exists when people acknowledge it.

I also analyse other parts of the preamble related to added value, specifically the complementing and contributing factors. I compared added value with UNESCO's outstanding universal value, and while both have a seemingly different purpose, they are similar when it comes to the essence of "universality". It was pointed out that added value is a legitimizing strategy within the authorized heritage discourse and a paradoxical one because it is impossible for every individual in the European Union to identify with all heritage sites.

Heritage sites under the European Heritage Label are also supposed to show added value by contributing to the narrative of the European Union itself, European history and culture and education of young people. The analysis of what is European history and culture in the context of EHL, can be interpreted as a change in the way Europeans thought about themselves and their history and achievements, as well as an increase in legal framing of what is worth conserving and managing as heritage.

Lastly, I found that the EHL's panel of experts, who decide on the selection and labelling process of heritage sites, are a fitting piece of the authorized heritage discourse. The panel functions as a façade for control by the European Union and may also be the cause of exclusion.

Part Three: The Heritage Labelling Tool

In the previous two parts, I investigated what the European Heritage Label is, how it positions itself and how it contributes to an authorized heritage discourse. Media aspects, terms from the legislative decision, and European aspects were also analysed. One final and crucial aspect of the EHL is its process of labelling. As I only touched upon the three criteria in part two, in this part I investigate the criteria and labelling process in-depth with questions such as: What is labelling and why are places and objects labelled as heritage? Through what process do sites have to go that apply for the European Heritage Label? Why are some applicant sites rejected? Why is a label something that can be awarded? And why did other applicant sites receive the label?

What is labelling?

Placing a label on something is to give it a certain meaning or significance. Such a stamp can be put on heritage through a logo or official plaque. Labels inform people what something is or signifies, but also works to organize certain aspects of our lives or society, on daily and long-term basis. Labelling is used, for example, to label food as Fairtrade, label people through stereotyping and put places or objects in categories such as heritage. In case of the European Heritage Label, heritage can be labelled as 'European'.

Hassan & Rahman (2015) argue that one labels for the purpose of branding, creating awareness and promoting tourism. They also mention that sites given such status gain much more media coverage which helps creating an identity and reaching potential visitors. For example, from their fieldwork at the Maritime Greenwich site in the United Kingdom, listed on the UNESCO World Heritage List, Hassan & Rahman found that when respondents were asked about the significance of the WHS, the majority replied that "the acknowledgment was highly significant, in terms of branding and it influenced their coming to the site" (2015, p.216). The fact that this site is listed as such was one of the main reasons for visiting the place. Hassan and Rahman noted that they "got the impression that the WHS status helped to reinforce the image and popularity of the sites involved" (2015, p.216). Thus, their research at the Maritime Greenwich site showed that a label does indeed influence how people perceive heritage and whether they consider it worth learning about or, even, visiting the site. As such, having a European Heritage Label may certainly contribute to the branding and promoting of its labelled sites. It may actually be the first and foremost reason sites apply for the label, that is, to gain awareness rather than explicitly wishing to express their European

aspects. To get a better understanding of labelling, I investigate the European Heritage Label's process of assigning and denying heritage sites the label.

Process of labelling by the European Heritage Label

Criteria. As mentioned in part two, the EU set up three criteria, which an applying site must meet in order to receive the European Heritage Label. I study these criteria and the reasons that some sites did meet them and others did not. I look at the legislative document again and also at the reports of the panel of experts.

The criteria, as set up by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union and set out in Article 7 of the legislative decision, include quite a series of demands. First, the "Candidate sites for the Label must have a symbolic European value and must have played a significant role in the history and culture of Europe and/or the building of the Union". Such is what was mentioned earlier in the analysis, when the use of the terms "symbolic value", "European added value" and "the history and culture of Europe" was examined. To fulfil this criterion, candidate sites must demonstrate: "(i) their cross-border or pan-European nature; (ii) their place and role in European history and European integration; (iii) their place and role in the development and promotion of the common values that underpin European integration" (OJ L 303, 2011, p.4). Thus, a heritage site must show a shift from national to transnational intentions and influence.

The second criterion lays down the rule that candidate sites must submit a project. This project should include things such as raising awareness of the European significance of the site; organising educational activities especially for young people, increase the understanding of the common history and shared yet diverse heritage which strengthen the sense of belonging to a common space, promoting multilingualism, taking part in the activities of networks of sites awarded the label as to exchange experiences, raising the profile and attractiveness of the site on a European scale, among other things, by using new technologies and digital and interactive means (OJ L 303, 2011).

The third criterion states that candidate sites must submit a work plan to carry out the project, which includes eight different elements. In short, these revolve around demonstrating a strong organizational capacity; for example, ensuring the quality of facilities and appointing special attention to young people (OJ L 303, 2011).

Article 7 ends with , "as regards the criteria laid down in points (b) and (c) of paragraph 1, each site shall be assessed in a proportionate manner, taking into account its

characteristics” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.4). Point (b) and (c) refer to criteria two and three, submitting a project and work plan, which are, thus, open to wider interpretation. Criterion one, however, must then not be open to such proportionate assessment. Although the first step of selecting a site is taken by authorities on national or regional level, the final selection on European Union level must be assessed according to that first criterion without wider interpretation. As the first criterion is all about European aspects such as history and culture, integration, and international European connections, it shows that it is another aspect within the authorized heritage discourse and of a European hegemony; i.e. the assessment must go according to set out legislation. This will become clearer when I analyse several rejected sites below.

Thus, sites must be of European significance, in various possible ways, but, also, have a well-established management which can deliver a project and work plan. According to Selfslagh (2016), the project and work plan are an intrinsic part of added value, which means that these two criteria are crucial for sites to be able to demonstrate their added (European) value.

Imagined Heritage Community

In this section, I dig deeper into the process of labelling by taking some examples of sites that were put forward as candidates but did not receive the label. What can sites that were denied the label reveal about the contemporary discourse of this particular aspect of heritage?

Of the twenty-four EU member states who have shown interest in the EHL, these have labelled sites: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain. Meanwhile, the following have not: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania, and Slovakia.

In the European Heritage Label Panel Report of 2013, only four sites were given the label. The other five did not meet the criteria, and the panel noted “the need to clarify some key concepts of the EHL”, continuing with “Most applicants had not understood the objectives of the new initiative or taken note of the criteria” (EHL Panel, 2013, p.9). Thus, they provided a clarification of the criteria with the aim to help future candidates make stronger applications. In 2014, the panel once again made a clarification of key concepts because not all candidate sites had understood the objectives or criteria of the EHL, one of

the reasons being “many applicants failed to convey the European dimension of their site” (EHL Panel, 2014, p.21). In the report of 2015, the panel noted that the quality of the applications has improved and that the clarifications of the previous years had a positive effect. Still, according to the panel more guidelines were needed to avoid repetition and, therefore, “submitted some recommendations to the European Commission to simplify the application form to be used for 2017 and following years” (EHL Panel, 2015, p.15). Thus, several sites did not receive the label because they either did not understand the criteria or did not successfully show their European dimension.

The EU’s objective with establishing the EHL is to improve European integration and common values among citizens through cultural heritage, doing so by creating a label that heritage sites have to *apply for*, which also means they can be denied. When appointed the label, project and management criteria are imposed. This is a rather curious and time-consuming system in order to achieve that objective. What one can partly understand from analysing the labelling process is that this way the EU can show how important and influential it is. This way it can control what it sees fit to be European heritage and what it wants citizens to identify with. In the book *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson (2006) discusses nationalism or “nation-ness” and defines a nation as “an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (p.6). In present light, the EU might not be considered as a nation but, certainly, falls under the description as an “imagined political community”. Through formation of the European Union, political influence and the use of logos and labels, the Union tries to create an imagined community. However, all the member states have different national languages and local dialects, which can divide people. Furthermore, most of the EU citizens will never meet each other, let alone visit one another’s country. They all have different perspectives of the past and what aspects of it are deemed valuable as their heritage. Yet, through example of the European Heritage Label, the EU attempts to share an image of communion that should live in the mind of each citizen and bring them closer together.

Rejected Sites

Over the course of those three selection years (2013, 2014, 2015), 34 sites had been denied the label. I selected three sites that were denied the label and are from countries that have no site listed (yet) as European heritage. To exemplify what kind of sites were denied and why, I look at Carlsberg (DK), Schengen (LUX) and Kourion (CY).

Carlsberg (DK). In 2013, Denmark proposed Carlsberg as a candidate site for the EHL. Carlsberg is a family-owned beer brewery in Copenhagen. It is described as being an important part of heritage tourism, showing the brewing process as an ancient part of global and European culture. It played a role in European industrialisation, as the brewery supported research and technology transfer around Europe by freely sharing anything that was discovered in the lab (Carlsberg, n.d.). Yet, the European aspects and value of this site were not identified clearly enough, according to the panel. Carlsberg presented a strong project but lacked in expressing how it could “promote the common values that underpin European integration” (EHL Panel, 2013, p.13). The same counts for the work plan; apparently, it was very strong with a focus on young people, sustainable tourism, and a good communication strategy. The final judgement, however, stated the application was not centred on promoting the European values.

The Carlsberg brewery is, thus, meaningful heritage within Denmark and to its national and foreign visitors, but failed to present that key European aspect. In the eyes of the EU, it cannot use this site to bond European citizens or teach them about the history of Europe or the creation of the Union.

Schengen (LUX). In 2013, Luxemburg proposed Schengen as a candidate site for the EHL. Schengen is a village located on the border with France and Germany. The Schengen Agreement was signed there on a boat on the river Moselle in 1985 and signified the start of eliminating border controls that allowed for greater European integration. Today, 26 countries are part of the agreement. According to the panel, the site has “strong symbolic European value”, but failed to provide a project and work plan with the application and, therefore, did not receive the EHL. Why Schengen failed to do so was not mentioned in the report, but it could be, as mentioned above, because the guidelines were not clear enough yet. As for now, the EHL webpage shows a smooth, 3-step process for the application: read the guidelines, contact the national coordinator, and complete the application form. The application form itself is also quite extensive and triggers the candidate site to reflect on its current management and on its future strategy. Thus, one can in fact look at the village of Schengen as heritage, both cultural and European. It is merely not identified as such within the authorized heritage discourse because it could not meet bureaucratic criteria.

Kourion (CY). In 2014, Cyprus proposed the archaeological site of Kourion, an ancient city-kingdom in Cyprus whose construction partly initiated by Roman Emperor Trajan. The city also played an important role in economic exchanges in the Mediterranean. Many antiquities from this site are already shown in museums around the world and there are

various academic publications on it as well; from 1963 onwards, Vassos Karageorghis published multiple academic books on archaeological excavations in Cyprus (Cyprus Department of Antiquities, n.d.). The site based its project on improving its communication vehicles, focusing on the European dimension through conferences, academic articles, and electronic games or interactive activities to include the younger audience. Still, the panel concluded that the site does not demonstrate enough European significance with its narrative being unclear and the focus too much on academics. Also, the work plan was based too much on scientific publications and the organisational capacity was not sufficient enough for the label.

Although Kourion shows a strong links to the Roman Empire, and is already seen as archaeological site, which is an acknowledged aspect of heritage in contemporary society as well as authority, this site did not manage to receive the European Heritage Label. All three candidate sites, Carlsberg, Schengen, and Kourion, exhibit a certain significance as heritage to their corresponding national identities, the sites, however, failed to point out the specific links to European history and culture or to that of the establishing of the European Union. Therefore, the panel could not see sufficient ‘proof’ or future plans that are in line with the criteria of the label.

Candidate sites might actually have the wrong hopes and expectations from this label, and, therefore, make incomplete applications according to the laid down criteria. Even so, through labelling and accepting or rejecting sites, the EU is confining heritage to its own purpose, leaving other, wider, interpretations out: “The process of listing is an act of heritage management that is itself an act of heritage in which a sense of universal ‘human identity’ is created” (Smith, 2006, p.99). In the case of the EU and the EHL, it is not focusing on creating a ‘universal’ identity but a European identity. Still, stating that the labelling process is an act of heritage itself is very interesting and shows the EHL in a different light. Within this European authorized heritage discourse, heritage is confined as Smith says, “stuck in a traditional way, heritage should get more inclusive” (Australian National University TV, 2014, 0:55).

As mentioned before, the communication toolbox only exists of postcards, leaflets and posters, and the understanding that a site can be rejected the label on the basis of its management standards shows a rather passive interaction from the EHL’s side. As it means leaving everything up to the sites themselves instead of helping them improve their European dimension, communication channels and possibilities, as well as educational perspectives. This slows down the selection process and limits the inclusivity.

European Heritage Label Sites

The label shall be awarded. It is interesting to note that the term “awarded” is used in both the legislative decision and video interviews of the labelled EHL sites. First mentioned in the preamble is: “It is crucial that the label be *awarded* on the basis of common, clear and transparent criteria and procedures, including during the first two selection years when transitional provisions should apply” (OJ L 303, 2011, p.2). Mentioned often as well is: “the label shall be awarded...”, and “each site awarded the label...” (OJ L 303, 2011). Interviewees in the EHL’s online videos said: “It is really important that we gain that kind of *awards* because then it's possible to learn about this country” or “Now this new *award* gives us an opportunity also to be more linked with the Western European Heritage Sites and Museums” (European Heritage Label, 2014-a, 2:20-3:08) (see video), and another: “We proposed the *awarding* of the European Heritage Label” (EHL Website, n.d., Sites, 0:42) (see video).

An award is usually for recognizing a job well done or special achievement, as most heritage sites existed before receiving an awarded label, it sounds strange to 'award' such a place with a label. One can understand the awarding, in this case, rather as recognizing the achievement of a well-managed site in the way they showcase the site and its European and historical narrative. The label is not just for the aesthetics or historical narrative the site represents; besides the European dimension, it is also for the management success and contemporary influence the site has on EU citizens. I argue for this because of the second and third criteria of the labelling process, which require a project and work plan and such means that the heritage site in question must have a strong and capable management to fulfil the criteria.

When a site decides to go through the EHL’s application process, one may expect that the site aims for the possibility of receiving an award. Applying for the EHL means that a site may have *a chance* at being awarded the label and becoming acknowledged as European heritage. Although one may question if applicant sites are not already heritage because they are managed as such, and most likely, seen as a place or object of significance to local people. The ‘awarding’ and ‘having a chance’ shows certain narrow-mindedness when it comes to how heritage is used and produced in the authorized discourse. It reflects, as mentioned earlier, the EU’s imagined community because through awarding it can display its authoritative influence and, at the same time, creates and regulates an image of Europe and heritage that should live in the minds of European citizens.

Labelled Sites. To get into the perspective of the actual EHL sites, I analyse the content of two videos, which the EHL created together with the management employees of each site. In the videos, employees are interviewed about the site that they work at, and why they think it has an important relation to Europe's history and culture. I also take a look at the panel report of the corresponding year and see why the panel chose to select that particular site for the label.

The two sites I discuss are the Archaeological Park Carnuntum in Austria (European Heritage Label, 2014-b) (see video), and Camp Westerbork in the Netherlands (European Heritage Label, 2014-c) (see video). Out of the twenty-nine sites, I chose these because they tell different narratives, on the Roman era and on World War 2 and post-colonial times. The two sites will also be analysed in-depth; therefore, such analysis on twenty-nine sites would become too lengthy.

Archaeological Park Carnuntum. The Archaeological Park Carnuntum in Austria, appointed the label in 2013, was an ancient Roman City with about 50.000 inhabitants. The city was located at the crossroads of the main trade routes, among which the amber road leading from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Sea. (European Heritage Label, 2014-b). Besides being an archaeological site, the park also offers three rebuilt typical Roman houses and a yearly festival of art, which centres around Roman and Greek theatre. Mr. Piero Bordin, the founder and director of the International Art Carnuntum World-Theatre-Festival, mentions that: "We should not forget again, that the ancient drama and the drama and theatre is one of the biggest inventions of European culture" (European Heritage Label, 2014-b, 2:32). Also Dr. Markus Wachter, the general manager of the park, talks about how much we have learned from the Romans: "They introduced the free movement of people and goods, a justice system upon which our modern system is based, and the Latin language which is a base for many European languages" (European Heritage Label, 2014-b, 2:42-3:19).

What can be interpreted from this video is that crossroad trade in the time of the Romans has been significant to today's trading relations. Also, ruins from that time tell us what the city looked like and, therefore, makes it acceptable to try and 'rebuild' such houses. What is also worth noting is that the founder and director, Mr. Bordin, says, as pointed out in the quote above, "we should not forget", seemingly pointing out that the drama and theatre we know today must also not be taken for granted as it was 'invented' by the Romans and contributed to the current European culture. Recognizing that such inventions started in the days of the Romans is one thing, but why should Europeans "not forget" or rather *remember* this fact? Apparently, trade routes and relations, architecture, theatrical culture but, also, the

justice and language systems narratives at this Roman archaeological site are of key importance to the European history and culture.

In the EHL panel report from 2013 (EHL Panel, 2013), three points were raised per nominated site: European significance, strengthening the presentation of the European dimension, and organisational capacity. Similar to the Carnuntum's employees in the video, the panel points out the significance of the city as a crossroads of trade routes as well. An Emperors Conference in 308 AD and an apparent consideration "by some" of the Roman Empire as predecessor of Europe also weighs in the panel's decision on the significance. Furthermore, considering the strengthening of the presentation and the organisational capacity, the site uses a museum and exhibition in order to reach different target groups and, therefore, tries to increase the awareness of Carnuntum's story. Carnuntum's use of digital technology, the hosting of a world theatre festival and plan to provide information in several languages seemed to be a valuable point to the panel as well. As this would apparently "offer an opportunity to focus on the strong message carried by the site itself and its archaeological remains" (EHL Panel, 2013, p.7). The panel deemed the overall management as "solid" and "sustainable" because, among other things, it saw a strong focus on "holistic visitor experience" and a "robust communication strategy" by using a branding theme named "Carnuntum- Reborn City of the Emperors" (EHL Panel, 2013, p.7).

Thus, according to the panel the site already had a steady management and good future educational and marketing goals, which made it a worthy and stable site to be given the EHL. Also, the tools it was already using and planning to use in the future were of significant note because they helped in reaching and educating people. Putting to the forefront ancient trade routes and Roman culture, as well as recognizing a well-managed archaeological park site, can be attributed to the current historicity regime and to a European hegemony. As mentioned before, the label represents not just the heritage narrative or European dimension, but also the management's capabilities and its influence on EU citizens. With the example of Carnuntum, it certainly confirmed that this is something the EHL panel very much values when processing applications.

Camp Westerbork. The second example of a labelled site is Camp Westerbork in the north-east of the Netherlands, which is now a museum and memorial centre and was appointed the label in 2013. Originally it was a refugee camp in 1939, where persecuted Jews from Germany, Austria, and other European countries had fled. Later, they were deported to Auschwitz, Sobibor, and Mauthausen (European Heritage Label, 2014-c).

In the video, Dirk Mulder, the director of the Westerbork Memorial Centre, says, “There clearly is a double-edged connection with Europe” (European Heritage Label, 2014-c, 1:14). He refers to how the camp has been used for various purposes after World War 2, such as internment camp for collaborators and colonial integration camp. Mulder adds to that by saying, “Every year thirty thousand children come here on a school trip. It’s a way for them to learn about the history of the camp and to understand what that history means in the present” (European Heritage Label, 2014-c, 1:52). A survivor of the war, Rudie Cortissos, says in the video,

When I started testifying during the Munich-Demjanjuk-Sobibor Trial (in 2009), I started to see that the world did not learn anything. In spite of this, I still give these lectures at school because I think that every testimony, every word that can tell them about the experience, are hope for avoiding these kind of situations.

(European Heritage Label, 2014-c, 2:27)

It can be interpreted from this video, that the importance of this site lies in the dark side of its aesthetic and historical narrative, referring to WWII, religious prosecutions, genocide, and the ill-treatment of immigrants. Visits to such sites is also called dark tourism, which relates to death and suffering (Isaac & Çakmak, 2014). However, Isaac and Çakmak’s study reveals that visits to Camp Westerbork Memorial Center are not explicitly made because of the dark side, they are made rather because, “visitors wanted to visit Westerbork with the hope that such a horrific occurrence may never happen again. They were also wondering about the place and wanted to see with their own eyes what had happened there in the past” (2014, p.169). The findings also reveal that curiosity plays a big role as a visitor’s motive to come to a heritage place such as Westerbork (Isaac & Çakmak, 2014).

Moreover, the European Heritage Label regards “dark” heritage sites, such as Westerbork, as educational destinations for new generations and, thereby, attempts to prevent such events from happening again in the future. Such heritage serves as a perfect example of European heritage, in order to target the young people, which is so explicitly set out in the legislative decision. Consequently, the aims of both Camp Westerbork Memorial Center and the European Heritage Label are similar and, therefore, the site was labelled as *European* heritage.

However, Mulder also thinks that, “it is very important that the European Union indicates the message that these places, no matter how bleak they may be, also play a role in

Europe's history. Even more, they constitute a strong basis precisely for European cooperation" (European Heritage Label, 2014-c, 3:06).

What is interesting is that Mulder finds it important that "the EU indicates the message" of those events and the camp. He seems to value the EU's influence and power and, therefore, its role in the heritage discourse. He seeks recognition of authority in order to get the narrative across to people but, also, appreciates the label as an aid in the number of visitors. Mulder is an example of Orsi's (2015) value theory that was discussed in part two, where he registers the evaluation of the EHL, believing in its judgements. Mulder accepts the European Union's influence and authority; thereby, he contributes to the concept of cultural heritage being institutionally constructed and perpetuates the authorized heritage discourse.

With regards to the panel report of 2013 (EHL Panel, 2013); under 'European significance' the panel points out how Camp Westerbork has become an important memorial site. According to the panel, the memorial presents the historical events by taking visitors along the process of circulation, how people were brought to the camp by train, then sorted and sent off again; by showing "photographs of individuals, describing their fates and leading visitors through an emotional walking trail" (EHL Panel, 2013, p.8). The panel describes the "participation and mobilization of all senses, a true achievement" (EHL Panel, 2013, p.8). Under 'strengthening the European dimension', the panel notes that the EHL will bring "added value" to the project of Camp Westerbork Memorial. Through connections and partnerships the site should get recognition in a "wider European context". Thirdly, under 'operational capacity', the panel praises the management of the site and notes that the EHL "will contribute to raising awareness of the site's significance and of the necessity to keep memory" (EHL Panel, 2013, p.8).

Again, the panel chooses a site that has a well-functioning management and educative yet interactive visitor experience. The panel believes the label can bring added value to this site because it has a strong management and also because the management believes in the European dimension and spreading the narrative to all citizens. It is clear that the EHL is using its influence and status to increase the awareness of a heritage site, its sustainability and emphasis on the European narrative. Gahleitner (2012) argues that the EHL is "the offspring of crisis", for after the rejection of a European Constitution in 2005, there was a seemingly lack of a sense of belonging and European integration (p.26). Gahleitner quotes Cris Shore who stresses that, "even today European integration is mainly perceived as an elite driven, technocratic process" (2012, p.28). These arguments point out that the EU had to find other

ways of connecting with the European citizens, which is why the EHL was created; to use culture as a gateway to a European identity.

In his study, Gahleitner points out the role of symbolism in European integration and that (as quoted by Cris Shore, 2000), “in order to gain political control, one has to establish one’s own conception of the world as hegemonic. This entails the use of strategies to promote the preferred meaning of symbols as dominant” (2012, p.30). It can be interpreted that heritage sites with European narratives function as symbols for European integration, and the EHL is the strategy to promote them. Nevertheless, by simply lending some of its influential status to selected heritage sites, the EHL seems to have a rather passive role, for it does not aid much in the creating of well-managed and sustainable European heritage sites. Not only is the EHL’s role passive, its actions are shaping this particular authorized discourse of heritage, with European narratives as hegemonic, because of its demanding criteria and selection process, as well as its bias through exclusion of sites and European countries outside of the EU.

Finally, the two examples of the Archaeological Park Carnuntum in Austria and Camp Westerbork in the Netherlands from the European Heritage Label list indicate that heritage means free movement of people and trade, freedom of religion, cultural creativity and human rights. Heritage is treasuring what was once not normal or not taken for granted, but is now. Heritage is also learning from the past, in order to understand what certain actions might lead to and possibly to prevent them from happening again. Heritage is appreciation and education. This is what heritage is according to its discourse within EU circles. One could look at it as Smith suggests, “heritage is a cultural process that engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present, and the sites themselves are cultural tools that can facilitate, but are not vital for, this process” (2006, p.44). In addition, by looking at the discourse within EU circles one can get the impression that the contemporary concept of heritage is a tool to communicate a message to the European citizens and visitors of a heritage site. Heritage is, therefore, not something definite; rather, it can be used and understood in different ways and is subject to authoritative and societal interpretations.

Conclusions

This thesis aimed to understand the discourse of cultural heritage in Europe, using the European Heritage Label as a case study. Using Smith's notion of authorized heritage discourse allowed me to critically analyse the discourse of this particular form of heritage. In addition, Hartog's theory, as noted by Eriksen, on historical authenticity helped to put the European Heritage Label, as an organization, into perspective. The study was supported further by three main research questions, How is the European Heritage Label using, understanding and producing heritage?, What is the contemporary use of cultural heritage in Europe through labelling by the European Heritage Label and its listed sites?, and, What effects does the act of labelling have on the discourse of this particular form of heritage within European Union context?

The study examines the European Heritage Label and empirical data throughout three parts of cultural analysis, by looking at legislative and media aspects, by unfolding the term "added value" in order to understand how the European Heritage Label positions itself, and by investigating the labelling process to gain a more critical perspective of heritage as a concept.

The results of the analysis reveal that the European Heritage Label excludes various factors, as not all member states of the European Union confirmed participation with the Label and, in addition, non-EU states in Europe are not allowed to participate. Furthermore, only one site per member state, every two years, can be selected and labelled, which results in a very small overall amount of sites and represent a slow selection process. Besides, if they do not meet the specific application criteria, the chances of getting recognized as European heritage are even smaller. The criteria focus mainly on the strengths and future plans of a site's management, and, therefore, only well-organized heritage sites that hand in a well-prepared application have a real chance of receiving the label of European heritage.

Furthermore, the findings reveal that through bureaucratic rules and practices this particular form of cultural heritage is stuck in an authorized heritage discourse. This means that what should include European cultural heritage is hardly open to interpretation and selection, and decision processes are practised by a select group of people (the panel of experts), excluding individual and local participation. It also means that heritage which may be important to some European citizens as part of their European identity, is not regarded as European heritage by the European Heritage Label.

The slogan "Europe Starts Here" and the lecture title "A European Future for Our Past?" both point to an imagined community (Anderson), as it reveals that the European

Union wishes to stimulate European integration and create a European identity through cultural heritage. Heritage, thus, becomes a tool to communicate European values and enables the European Union to position itself as a source of solidarity and influence.

With the European Heritage Label, the European Union lets the European aspects of national heritage come to the forefront and, thereby, shows an authorized grip on the discourse of cultural heritage within the European Union, which is central to a European hegemony. Moreover, assigning European aspects to national heritage sites and naming it *European* heritage, reveals that only those sites that can show their role in the history and culture of Europe or the building of the European Union are considered before being given the label. Also, the fact that applicant sites must *apply* for the label in order to be regarded as European heritage and, once passed through the decision process, are then *awarded* the label is another display of the authorized heritage grip.

It is interesting that Selfslagh, an employee of the European Heritage Label, argues in her lecture that, “We have difficulties in convincing the leaders of our country and in European organizations that heritage is so important because they look at heritage rather as a tool to achieve other objectives – economic and social objectives” (2016, 44:50). From the analysis in this thesis, it is clear that such is exactly what the European Heritage Label is doing too, using heritage as a tool for social objectives such as European integration and European identity for citizens of the European Union. This quote is quite contradictory and interesting because apparently the European Heritage Label as an institute, and therefore the European Union, are aware of the use of heritage as a tool but do not consider their work with the European Heritage Label as just that.

To conclude, in the contemporary discourse of this particular form of heritage, the case study of the European Heritage Label reveals that it is used as a tool for communicating institutional values to create an imagined community in a European hegemony. This thesis contributes in-depth information of a heritage labelling organization (the EHL) and a wider perspective of its practices, in order to add to a more critical stance of the use and appropriation of the concept of cultural heritage. The discourse of cultural heritage within the European Union finds itself positioned within an authorized heritage discourse, which restricts further interpretation, inclusion, and participation on other levels.

Overall, the intentions with the European Heritage Label are positive because of the educational and integrational aspects, which allow for greater understanding among citizens of one another’s culture and values, but the manner in which this is done can be criticized. Future authorized heritage practices should be challenged, to make way for new

understandings of cultural heritage with a focus on narratives and intercultural relations, but less on labelling, restricted interpretation of the concept of heritage and bureaucratic processes.

Applicability

The analysis presented here is firstly applicable to the management of the European Heritage Label and its sites. Further, it may especially be applicable to the management teams of cultural heritage organizations that label sites and to the heritage sites themselves. It should help to provide those involved with cultural heritage to obtain a broader mind-set of their field and workplace.

The analysis in this thesis revealed various aspects that can be applicable in European Heritage Label context. I presented that heritage is used as a tool to meet objectives, which are stuck in an authorized environment and are not only the cause of appropriation of cultural heritage but, also, of exclusion. Further, the EU's objective with establishing the EHL is to improve European integration and common values among citizens through cultural heritage, and does so by creating a label that heritage sites have to *apply for*, which also means they can be denied. When appointed the label, project and management criteria are imposed. The fact that the selection process is heavily based on a site's management's success and contemporary influence on EU citizens should be more clearly stated by the EHL. Another option could be to try an entirely different approach in order to get out of that authorized environment. The EHL can instead list all places of importance to the history, culture and unity of Europe, giving such sites the option to be removed from such a list while, also, keeping an open-mind to sites that wish to be added. Such a process would make it much easier and faster to point out the historical and cultural dimension of Europe and bring Europeans closer together and improve their common values, instead of going through lengthy and administrative processes of applications, assessments, approvals and denials. The EHL will have to change its criteria to allow for inclusion and a smoother acknowledgement and awareness raising process of European heritage sites and narratives.

Furthermore, exclusion of contemporary heritage is also an issue in the discourse of this particular form of heritage. Although, the main "aim of the European Heritage Label is not to bring a 'traditional' national narrative to a European audience but to contextualise and interpret their cultural heritage in a broader European geographical and historical context, thus beyond the national borders", it still fails to recognize that there are current or everyday

creations that make today's Europe (EHL Panel, 2015, p.15). Historic aspects of sites are valued, but contemporary heritage sites may bring people even closer together than the heritage that is labelled now. Again, the EHL can achieve its objective better if it were to change the criteria to allow for more inclusion and engagement.

The EHL could also distinguish itself more by actually pointing out their main aims from the legislative decision and explaining them in general on their website and, specifically, per site. According to my results, it seems that one of the aims – to inspire intercultural dialogue – may need more attention and improvements. The panel of experts and the labelled heritage sites really seem to be the only parties aware of the existence of the EHL and its work. There needs to be a better connection of European culture and history, like how it is heritage, educating young people and inspiring intercultural dialogue and values. By not just leaving everything up to the sites but pointing out really well what it is the EHL is about and what they want to achieve, it will come across in a more engaging, accessible manner.

In addition, if the EU really wants to make European history and culture interesting and engaging for young people, it may consider more age appropriate and effective means to do so. Rather than postcards, the EHL could choose to use modern technology such as smartphone applications with interactive heritage guides or games.

This discourse analysis gives managements in the cultural sector a critical view of the use of cultural heritage as a concept. It helps to realize what consequences lie behind their actions, how they can influence how heritage is used and produced and that they are based on many rules and exclusions. With this realization, they can change their attitude towards heritage, the way they influence its discourse, and change decision processes to provide for more inclusivity or different approaches of listing and labelling.

To complement the research in this thesis, one would need to contact several labelled and rejected heritage sites and ask for their experiences and opinions in order to get a larger overview of the contemporary discourse of this particular form of heritage in the EU. To get both sides of the story, contacting a spokesperson of the EHL and asking for their thoughts and opinions would make such complementing research complete.

References

- Anderson, B. O. (2006). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London ; New York : Verso, 2006.
- Cleere, H. (2001). The uneasy bedfellows: universality and cultural heritage. In R. Layton, P.G. Stone & J. Thomas (Eds.), *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property* (pp. 22-29). London (UK), USA and Canada: Routledge.
- EHL Panel. (2013). European Heritage Label 2013 panel report. European Commission and Directorate General Education and Culture. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/apply_en
- EHL Panel. (2014). European Heritage Label 2014 panel report. European Commission and Directorate General Education and Culture. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/apply_en
- EHL Panel. (2015). European Heritage Label 2015 panel report. European Commission and Directorate General Education and Culture. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/apply_en
- Eriksen, A. (2014). *From antiquities to heritage : Transformations of cultural memory* New York : Berghahn Books, 2014.
- Gahleitner, A. (2012). The European Heritage Label and the Symbolic Construction of the European Union. In: *Hamburg review of social sciences*, Vol. 6 (3) & Vol. 7 (1), pp. 25-51.
- Hafstein, V. (2012). Chapter 26 Cultural Heritage. In: *A Companion to Folklore*, First Edition. Pp. 500-519. Edited by Regina F. Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Published 2012 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hassan, A and Rahman, M. (2015). "World Heritage site as a label in branding a place", In: *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 5 (3),

pp. 210-223, doi:10.1108/JCHMSD-01-2014-0002. Permanent link to this document:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-01-2014-0002>. Retrieved on: 03 April 2017.

Isaac, R.K. & Çakmak, E. (2014). Understanding visitor's motivation at sites of death and disaster: the case of former transit camp Westerbork, the Netherlands. In: *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17:2, 164-179, DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2013.776021

[Jönsson, L-E. \(2016\). "A Dangerous Country": The Council of Europe in Search for a Common Heritage.](#) In K. Kowalski, & B. Törnquist-Plewa (Eds.), *The Europeanization of Heritage and Memories in Poland and Sweden*. (pp. 59-72). Krakow: Jagiellonian University Press.

Official Journal of the European Union. (2011). [OJ L 303]. Decision No 1194/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label, 2011. Strasbourg. Retrieved February 13, 2017 from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32011D1194>

Orsi, F. (2015). *Value theory* New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Oxford Dictionaries. (n.d.). *Value, n/v*. Oxford Living Dictionaries Online, English. Oxford University Press. Retrieved: Web. 1 March 2017.

Rokka, J. (2010). Netnographic inquiry and new translocal sites of the social. *International Journal Of Consumer Studies*, 34(4), 381-387. doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00877.x

Selfslagh, B. (2016). *A European Future for our Past?* [PowerPoint slides & Audio] Retrieved from the University of Birmingham, and Panopto:
<https://bham.cloud.panopto.eu/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=c7e4db2e-0ec7-483d-9cfb-31615d71ae27>

Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage* New York : Routledge, 2006.

UNESCO & Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and

Natural Heritage. (2016). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of the world heritage convention / intergovernmental committee for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*. Vilnius, Lithuania. Retrieved from:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>

Internet Sources

Australian National University TV. [ANU TV]. (2014, November 27). *Australia's Heritage Strategy: What should the future hold?* [Video file]. Retrieved June 28, 2017 from:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CfMOY4pyU4Y>

Carlsberg. (n.d.). *Pioneers – Open Source Ante Litteram*. Retrieved Aug 9, 2017 from:

<http://www.carlsberg.com/#!carlsberg-pioneers|carlsberg-pioneers/1451-open-source-ante-litteram>

Council of Europe. (n.d.). *In brief, Who we are*. Retrieved June 15, 2017 from:

<http://www.coe.int/en/web/about-us/who-we-are>

Creative Europe. (2017). European Commission. Retrieved May 26, 2017 from:

https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/node_en

Cyprus Department of Antiquities. (n.d.). *Publication- List of Cyprus Antiquity Department Government Publications*. Republic of Cyprus. Retrieved Aug 9, 2017 from:

http://www.mcw.gov.cy/mcw/da/da.nsf/DMLpubl_en/DMLpubl_en?OpenDocument

EHL FAQ. (2013). European Heritage Label: Frequently Asked Questions. European Commission. Retrieved May 26, 2017 from:

http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-1068_en.htm

EHL Monitoring form. (2016). *Monitoring of Designated Sites*. [Excel file]. European Commission. Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en)

[europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en)

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Branding – Postcard 3* [PDF file]. European Commission. Retrieved June 12, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/ehl-postcard-3-web_en.pdf

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Branding – The Graphic Design Charter* [PDF file]. European Commission. Retrieved June 12, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/files/graphic-charter_en.pdf

EHL Website. (n.d.). *What is it?* Par. 1 & 2. European Commission. Retrieved May 25, 2017 from https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label_en

EHL Website. (n.d.). *How to Apply*. European Commission. Retrieved May 25, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/apply_en

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Managing your labelled site*. European Commission. Retrieved May 26, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/managing-your-labelled-site_en

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Selected Sites*. European Commission. Retrieved May 25, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/sites_en

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Your Questions, How are the sites selected?* European Commission. Retrieved May 25, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/frequently-asked-questions_en

EHL Website. (n.d.). *Sites, Charter of Law of Abolition of the Death Penalty, Lisbon, Portugal*. [Video file]. Retrieved April 4, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/heritage-label/sites/portugal-death-penalty_en

European Commission. (n.d.). *Organizational Structure, How the Commission is Organised*. Retrieved June 16, 2017 from: https://ec.europa.eu/info/about-european-union/organisational-structure/how-commission-organised_en

European Heritage Label. (2014, April 7-a). *Great Guild Hall, Estonian History Museum*.

[Video file]. Retrieved April 4, 2017 from:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HqDweKu9DLY>

European Heritage Label. (2014, April 7-b). *Archäologischer Park Carnuntum*. [Video file].

Retrieved April 4, 2017 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZfODH52XS9g>

European Heritage Label. (2014, April 7-c). *Camp Westerbork*. [Video file]. Retrieved April

4, 2017 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tXjMVDCNEE>

European Institute of Cultural Routes. (n.d.-a). *Cultural Routes*. The Council of Europe and

The European Union. Retrieved 15 June, 2017 from: [http://www.culture-](http://www.culture-routes.net/cultural-routes)

[routes.net/cultural-routes](http://www.culture-routes.net/cultural-routes)

European Institute of Cultural Routes. (n.d.-b). *Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe*. The

Council of Europe and the European Union. Retrieved 15 June, 2017 from:

<http://www.culture-routes.net/cultural-routes/list>

European Union. (n.d.). *EU Member countries*. Retrieved July 26, 2017 from:

https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries/member-countries_en

European Union. (n.d.). *The European Flag*. Retrieved June 10, 2017 from:

https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/flag_en

European Union. (n.d.). *The History of the European Union*. Retrieved May 26, 2017 from:

https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history_en

Kraneamus Krapina Neanderthal Museum. (n.d.). *Education*. Retrieved June 6, 2017 from

<http://www.mkn.mhz.hr/en/education/for-children/>

Strasbourg l'Européenne. (n.d.). *School presentations*. Retrieved June 6, 2017 from:

<http://en.strasbourg-europe.eu/school-activities,2645,en.html>

The Council of the European Union. (2015). *What does the Council of the EU do?* Retrieved June 16, 2017 from: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/>

UNESCO. (n.d.). *UNESCO wereldwijd*. Retrieved July 16, 2017 from: <https://www.unesco.nl/unesco/unesco-wereldwijd>

UNESCO World Heritage Convention, National Geographic, European Union. (2017). *World Heritage Journeys in the European Union* [PDF file]. UNESCO World Heritage Center. Retrieved from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/875/>

Vredespaleis. (n.d.). *Bezoek, Evenementen*. Retrieved June 6, 2017 from: <https://www.vredespaleis.nl/bezoek/evenementen/>

World Heritage List. (2017). UNESCO and World Heritage Convention. Retrieved June 21, 2017 from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

Endnotes

¹ The reason for choosing the EHL as a case study is a work placement at an academic heritage institution in the UK, where I first learned of its existence.

² This possibility may change for the UK in the future, considering Brexit 2016. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-uk-after-referendum/>

³ International Council on Monuments and Sites, <http://www.icomos.org/en/>