

*Paper prepared for the Euroacademia International Conference
Identities and Identifications: Politicized Uses of Collective Identities*

Zagreb, 18 – 20 April 2013

*This paper is a draft
Please do not cite*

A ‘Greater Europe’ – Constructions of a Collective Identity in the Council of Europe

Wiebke Hohberger, M.A., PhD Candidate, University of Hamburg (Department of History)

Abstract:

European identity as a social construction, as a ‘contested concept’, has been surveyed in academic research primarily in reference to the European Union (e.g. Guisan 2012; Öner 2011; Talani 2012; Thiel 2011). Thereby, most studies, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, focus on current perceptions of different ‘Europes’, its different identities as well as its politicized uses.

The notion of a collective common, however, is older than the European Union itself. After World War II the Council of Europe was built as the first European organization in order to secure long-term peace in Europe. From the outset, the deputies underlined their common interests as European citizens while searching for characteristics of their ‘Europeanness’ at the same time.

This paper essentially addresses Europe’s process of self-discovery in the Council of Europe during its first years of consultation, from its founding in 1949 until the establishment of the European Economic Community.

By means of a historical analysis the different discourses constructing a collective identity have been investigated. The Consultative (*later Parliamentary*) Assembly’s minutes of the meetings provide a solid basis for this post-structuralist survey.

Key findings referring to the definition of the self and the other(s) are the following: The perception of a ‘greater Europe’ in contrast to an imagined ‘little Europe’ has been dominant since the beginning which is clearly apparent in the cultural and geographical discourse. Further, the communist Soviet Union as the dominant ‘other’, particularly in the political and economic discourse, facilitated Europe’s self-identification in defining the common ‘threatening stranger’.

In addition, this paper reveals that the politicized use of European identity is first of all visible in the context of the Cold War but also used as an instrument to achieve closer cooperation in the economic, political-institutional and cultural-scientific sphere.

Key words: European identity, Council of Europe, historical analysis of discourses, ‘Europeanness’, self/other perceptions

I. Introduction

“Travel the universe of Greater Europe” (CoE 2008, 1) – under this title a children’s picture book edited by the Council of Europe (CoE) tries to explain the organization’s work and what it means to be part of this “Greater Europe”. While flying through the galaxy consisting of different stars – symbolising the diversity of Europe, the different languages, religions, nations, ethnic groups and more – , finally the question of a collective identity is illustrated with the following explanation: “Identity through diversity, now do you understand this galaxy’s message? All in all, if there wasn’t a multitude of contrasts in Europe, it wouldn’t be Europe!” (CoE 2008, 9).

This, at first glance, rather simple attempt to define Europe’s identity joins a never-ending number of efforts to create one collective identity within Europe. The different constructions of European identity – based on the perception of identity as a social construct – have been surveyed to a large extent in the humanities and social sciences, primarily in reference to the European Union (cf. e.g. Guisan 2012; Öner 2011; Talani 2012; Thiel 2011).

The search for a collective common, however, is older than the European Union itself. It has already challenged the representatives of the Council of Europe since its foundation in 1949: After World War II the European Movement had initiated the foundation of an organization, the Council of Europe, with the objective to safeguard sustainable peace throughout the process of unification. Besides a governmental Committee of Ministers, a Consultative Assembly (CA) was set up as a second organ, in which representatives of at first twelve member states were asked to advance the European integration process.¹

The Council of Europe, however, has not been subject for analysis in comprehensive empirical studies with regard to collective identity constructions so far. Although it offers – as the oldest European organization – the opportunity to investigate debates at a time when Europe, as a ‘contested concept’, had to (re)create itself – which suggests fruitful discussions about the perception of ‘being European’ and the borders of Europe in former times. This gap of knowledge shall be filled, at least partly, by this historical study in addressing the following central question:

To what extent is a collective European identity constructed in the Council of Europe at the beginning of consultations?

This pivotal question includes further demands, for example: How do the deputies of the Assembly perceive ‘the Europe’ they represent during that time? What is their common ground in their eyes? Or in one deputy’s words: “What do we bring into the common pool?” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 234). Moreover, in which contexts can politicized uses of these identity constructions be observed?

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to shed light on Europe’s self-discovery process within the oldest European organization while having a closer look at the different discursive constructions of a collective identity and its politicized uses.

The theoretical approach underlying this research on European identity is based on a post-structuralist perspective which views identity as constructed in discourses as well as through difference. The perception of different ‘others’ is therefore constitutive for the definition of the ‘self’ (cf. Connolly 1991).

The focus of this historical analysis is on the investigation of the verbatim discussions and speeches of the Assembly’s representatives with regard to statements defining Europe’s ‘self’ as well as Europe’s ‘others’ within different discourses. Discourses, with reference to Michel Foucault are here observed as practices, which organize statements in a certain thematic field.² In this survey, statements talking about characteristics of Europe are organized into four main discourses which are the geographical, the political value-based, the cultural and the economic discourse.³

The period of investigation primarily comprise the first 18 sittings of the Consultative Assembly in August and September 1949. Furthermore, at some points it seemed to be reasonable to add certain sittings of the CA of the year 1957, especially in the economic discourse, bearing in mind that in this year the European Economic Community was established.

The verbatim reports of the Assembly’s sittings, published as the “Official Reports of Debates”, provide a solid and comprehensive basis for this investigation. Additionally, the “Documents and Working Papers” of the Assembly complement these protocols, containing for example written declarations, motions or committee reports.⁴

All in all, these historical sources contain a lot of statements constructing or searching for a collective identity in the context of either the geographical, the political value-based, the cultural or the economic discourse.

II. The geographical discourse

From ten to 47 member states – a brief survey

Before observing the perceptions with regard to the belonging to Europe geographically in the Council of Europe, it is reasonable to give a brief overview of the composition of its member states from the beginning. The ten signature states of the Treaty of London – the Statute of the CoE – in May 1949 were France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Ireland, the Scandinavian countries Denmark, Sweden and Norway as well as the Benelux states Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.⁵ Only a few months later, Turkey and Greece joined the organization and took already part in the first sitting period in August and September in the same year. Contrary to the current debate about Turkey’s general belonging to Europe, especially with respect to its accession to the European Union, the country’s ‘Europeanness’ seems to have not been asked in consideration of the fact that the CoE admitted her directly.⁶

One year later the Western part of Germany became a member, after the CoE had agreed that it would be the best solution for Germany’s recovery as well as for the general peace in Europe to include it institutionally as soon as possible. In the next decades Austria, smaller countries in the central and Western area as well as the South-Western states Spain and Portugal followed after the end of their dictatorship.

Finally, in the course of the collapse of the Soviet Union as well as the breakup of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, a huge amount of then officially independent countries joined the Council of Europe, such as countries from Eastern Europe, the Balkan region, the Caucasus, the Baltics as well as the Russian Federation in 1996. Since 2007, composed of 47 member states (Belarus and Kosovo are the last blank spots on the map⁷), the Council of Europe’s prospect of a ‘greater Europe’ seems to be implemented.⁸

The first years of consultations

A closer look at the geographical discourse during the time of the first consultations in the Consultative Assembly reveals one dominant factor since the first sitting: The Eastern European countries, during that time to a large extent under Soviet control, have to be part of the CoE as soon as possible. The common sense is that it will only be a question of time until the Western and the Eastern part will finally be united again and until then it is one important duty of the Council of Europe to signal them their mental solidarity and their hope for their soon liberation (cf. CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 6).

To symbolise that visually, already in the first session they decide to leave empty seats in the assembly. Emotional words explaining this symbol can be found in different ways, e.g.: “Our European brotherhood does not stop at the iron curtain. It includes those invisible brothers whose hearts are with us. The empty seats bear witness to the fact that these peoples would be welcome.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 194).

Thus, it is absolutely clear to everyone in the Assembly that the borders during that time are not the borders of Europe, but the borders between free and oppressed Europe.

In a similar way they perceive the Mediterranean countries ruled by authoritarian regimes, like the French politician⁹ Philip points out during the debate about the political structure of Europe in the fifth sitting:

“This Europe that we wish to set up does not begin as a federation of Western Europe, it is a federation of all the free peoples of Europe. If there are some who are not among us to-day, it is not the fault of the peoples. If there are some who are absent from us here, it is because beyond the Pyrenees and beyond the Elbe there are political régimes existing which do not respect the rule of law or the fundamental liberties of the individual. We must ourselves, nevertheless, affirm here from the beginning that our doors remain open to those who are, for the present, absent from among us.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 142).

An additional, completely different topic for discussion is how to handle with European overseas territories outside the European continent. For that purpose, the representatives of the Consultative Assembly decide to create a special “Committee of Overseas Territories” given the task to study questions of any kind regarding these territories (CA 1949 Documents, Doc. 2g).

Remarkable in this context – especially with a present-day critical look into the colonial past – is the following statement within the debate about the political structure of Europe:

“I think it is very fortunate that Europe, right from her beginnings, and thanks to Great Britain and to the French territories overseas, is not confined within the frontiers of the Continent itself. The problem of relations between continental Europe and the overseas territories is one of balance between rights and duties. I myself find no difficulty at all in admitting that one day the political organisation of the European peoples shall also include political representation of the overseas territories.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 314).

Here it is clear that Europe is perceived as being able to include territories outside the geographical European continent. In this context, however, Europe is constructed rather as a political than a geographical space.

In general, the search for the geographic borders of Europe is not the most controversial field in the process of Europe’s self-discovery. Therefore, it is not surprising that it is often emphasized that Europe is not only a geographical concept but also a political and ideological one. Two Scandinavian representatives for example claim that “Europe is not only a geographical organisation; it is as much, or even more, based upon ideological collaboration” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 216), or in other words, Europe “is not primarily a geographical and geopolitical or strategic conception, but a Europe with a common spiritual basis in its views on man, his dignity and his rights” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 418). As a consequence, this perception of Europe as a primarily not restricted geographical concept, offers the opportunity of constructing a wider or a ‘greater Europe’. The effects of this dominant perception within the CoE are best seen today with, for instance, the Caucasus States Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia as one of the 47 member states.

III. The political value-based discourse

Within the political value-based discourse, compared to the other discourses existing in the Council of Europe, one can find the most dominant aspects defining ‘Europe’s Self’ and ‘the Others’ – those aspects which decree Europe’s collective identity internally as well as externally.

According to the Assembly’s representatives the most important characteristics in this context connecting the nations of ‘their Europe’ are freedom, democracy, the rule of law and human rights.¹⁰ ‘Their Europe’ means ‘free Europe’ in opposite to the Eastern European countries. As mentioned above, they hope, however, that ‘the other Europe’ will also be part of ‘free Europe’ one time. As a consequence, observed as the ‘real other’ here is the Soviet Union as the oppressor of the Eastern European States.¹¹

Different attempts to define the fundamental values of ‘free Europe’ in detail can be observed in many speeches. In this context, a Danish deputy, for example, tries to define the CoE’s understanding of democracy in claiming that its “conception of democracy implies freedom of criticism, and consequently the right of opposition” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 276), while a Swedish representative gives the following definition:

“Fundamental to every true democracy is the right of all citizens, not only to have different opinions upon political matters, but to join with other citizens in order to promote the realisation of those opinions. [...] The principle of free, secret elections [...] is another of those rights.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 426).

Thus, democracy for them contains, *inter alia*, freedom of expression and association as well as the guarantee for free and secret elections.

One of their colleagues from Belgium continues to introduce the term “patriotism of freedom”: Instead of substituting “a European patriotism for national patriotism” they should better seek a “patriotism of freedom” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 430).

Presumably, he contributes to the construction of a collective European identity in underlining that freedom is a fundamental value they really can be proud of and which they, as Europeans, should defend all over Europe. Another approach in finding specified characteristics of the value-based 'Europeanness' is a moral, philosophical one. One speaker tries to find an answer in this respect by pointing out his thoughts as follows:

"What, in fact, does European civilisation stand for in our eyes? What is it that we defend in this Assembly, when we speak of Human Rights? What have we in mind when we compare European civilisation with other forms of social life? Quite simply, it is the dignity of the human being, the conviction shared by us all that every man is worthy of respect, that every man has the right to live in safety and dignity, that no man can be a subject of indifference to us however weak or however near to death he may be." (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 438).

With these words, eventually he advocates the fundamental right 'Human dignity is inviolable' as the basis of a European community of values.¹² This estimation of the dignity of the human being, he mentions, is a special European attitude with which every attendant country can identify itself and which has to be defended all by European citizens.

Overall, while discussing and highlighting the meaning of human rights, including freedom in different fields, as the most relevant common European maxim, the members of the Assembly start to create the European Convention on Human Rights, which finally entered into force in 1950 and is therefore the first common Convention of European countries, based on the collective attitude to be one community of values.¹³

In contrast to the aforementioned common values – freedom, democracy, the rule of law and human rights – which the representatives appreciate unanimously as the most significant common characteristics and the values' compliance as the most important duty of the CoE, debates about the organizational structure of a European political union are more difficult and more controvertible, because of the different views in this regard – the perception of a European federation on the one side and an intergovernmental collaboration on the other side. As a simple consequence, the communication and identification with the common fundamental values is useful to achieve a closer bond but has its borders at giving up national sovereignty which, of course, would be necessary to establish a political union.¹⁴

Nevertheless, creating a democratic European institution remains a long-lasting subject of debate in the Consultative Assembly. Especially in the context of spreading the "European idea" – that of a Europe "built not by the Governments but by the peoples who will have to become aware of their interdependence" (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 1070) – it is emphasized that European citizens should be able one day to elect deputies who present their interests in a future European Parliament (cf. CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 1070). Subsequently, the advocacies of a political union construct a concept of a collective European idea – a Europe perceived not only by governmental elites, but also by the European peoples, whose common interests should be represented democratically. According to them, this idea should become reality in creating a political union with a democratic elected parliament.¹⁵

Moreover, the politicized use of a constructed collective identity is also obvious with regard to the Cold War: Europe, united as a moral community, is able to play a more powerful role in opposing communism, as, for example, one British representative underlines Europe's possible "moral leadership" (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 1113) in resisting communism as follows:

"The close ties which we have formed must be cemented and forged together. In this way, I feel certain that we can do a tremendous lot towards resisting the Communist infiltration and other Communist methods which I have mentioned. I think that is our role for the future, and it is a very important part indeed which we have to play." (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 1113).

Thus, communism, presumably in first line with regard to the Soviet Union, is observed as the 'threatening Other' in contrast to 'the moral Europe'. The perceived necessity of becoming powerful Europeans in the Cold War is also visible in the following words:

"Between the two giants rising in the world, there is no room for a family of dwarfs. The new Europe must come into being, the peoples must become conscious of their character as Europeans, a European conscience must be born." (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 190).

IV. The cultural discourse

It is reasonable to divide the cultural discourse into two parts with regard to contents. The first sort of statements concerns the search for common cultural characteristics which causes to constructions of a European culture as part of a collective identity. The second sort of debates deals with opportunities to improve the cultural cooperation between the member states.

With regard to the first category, what is clearly given as one common ground is that every member state identifies itself as a part of a unity with an old history and a cultural heritage going back to the ancient world. Expressions like the following are proudly presented and listened to:

“The common heritage of Europe is the culture which was produced by grafting Christianity on Greek logic. I say Christianity but, as you know, Islam is Christianity's brother in spirit and in origin.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 754) and: “All the States of Europe can be proud of an old and illustrious history. This history will always be honoured as the expression of the past and will represent a precious spiritual legacy.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 218). Noteworthy are different points: on the one hand the including of Islam as “Christianity's brother” which can be seen as an open minded view instead of emphasizing Christianity as the exclusive single religion within the European heritage; on the other hand the accentuation of the spiritual legacy of a rich intellectual history. The latter even sets them apart from the United States of America (which in other fields they are not able to do in this period, shortly after the end of World War II), as a French representative remarks after listing advantages of the American continent:

“However, America has not been able, in two centuries, to acquire the same experience that Europe has accumulated in 2,000 years. (...) There is not a single European who is unaware of what our peninsula owes to Antwerp, Brussels, The Hague, and Rotterdam. What would Europe be without Oxford and Cambridge, without Munich and Vienna, without Madrid and Lisbon? How impoverished we would be if Rome, Florence and Venice had not existed! As for Athens, she was the mother of them all.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 764).

Besides the emphasis of the ‘glorious intellectual past’ as a common European heritage of which they are proud of, they also allude to the negative common past, in first line the two World Wars. However, exactly in this context, it is possible to stress the meaning of the cultural heritage which nobody can take them, as an Italian deputy, for example, points out in saying: “In the midst of the destruction of capitals and riches of all kinds brought upon Europe by two wars, the cultural and scientific heritage is perhaps the only one left to us.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 772).

Another dominant notion, which appears regularly with regard to the construction of a European culture, is its diversity, the richness of traditions, languages and historical developments. Similar to the current motto of the European Union “United in diversity” this specific characteristic is underscored, as one deputy, for instance, underlines in expressing that “unity without diversity would be contrary to Europe's peculiar genius, which is dynamic.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 756). Another deputy stresses the individuality of every country in communicating the following statement: “We cannot be faithful to our European heritage when we unite in economy, security and spiritual matters, without maintaining at the same time our individuality, which has been developed through our history.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 420). In sum: “European culture, which is the product of a long tradition, is at one and the same time a synthesis and the source of diversity.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 750) as it is written in a draft declaration of the Assembly, or as one deputy observes: “Diversity in Europe contributes to the richness of collective European civilisation and life.” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 228).

In conclusion, a collective cultural identity is constructed in highlighting the common cultural heritage on the one hand and at the same time in stressing the diversity, the richness of European culture which can be shortly labeled as ‘individuality in a collective’ or ‘unity in diversity’.

With respect to the second point – concerning a closer cooperation in cultural questions – considerations are made in different fields such as establishing a European Cultural Centre (cf. CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 756; CA 1949 Documents, Docs 59, 78), a European Press and Publishing Centre (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 762) as well as a Cultural Fund (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 974). These plans, in turn, construct a European culture as part of a collective identity in taking the existence of a European culture as a given (whatever its characteristics are).

In a similar vein the existence of a ‘European idea’ is constructed with regard to the educational and scientific sector in which this ‘European idea’ should be spread. Especially in higher education they discuss new forms of cooperation between the universities with the following motive: “The idea is to encourage a sense of the European idea in education, more particularly in the social sciences, economics, philosophy and law, all of them subjects which should be taught in a European spirit.” (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 961). In favor of that, their aim is to extend the – until then only partially existing – exchanges of teachers and professors, adjustments of university curricula, equivalence of degrees and “the introduction of special curricula in those fields where the problems and the development of European integration provide a new subject for research and specialised teaching.” (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 962).¹⁶

In sum, in the cultural-scientific discourse a ‘European spirit’ as part of a collective cultural identity is constructed and used to justify the establishment of closer cooperation, through which, however, it is possible to spread this perceived collective European spirit.

V. The economic discourse

Within the economic discourse one object is obvious from the beginning of consultations: It is necessary to establish an economic collaboration as the only way to save the economy all over Europe.

Similar to the cultural discourse, two sorts of questions are visible in the debates in the Assembly: First, what do they have in common economically which connects them on a basis of social identity, and second, in which economic fields – and especially how – they can intensify their cooperation to reach an economic boost.

One meaningful collective common, which affects every country of the CoE to varying degrees in 1949, is the heritage of the Second World War – destroyed national economies and the dependence on the American aid in the form of the European Recovery Program, the so-called Marshall Plan.¹⁷ As a result, “living under an artificial regime in a temporary state of well-being” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 8) connects all parts of Europe and the aim to ‘survive’ after the end of the American aid in 1952 is a common concern.

Consequently, the present and future economic situation of Europe is part of the social construction process of a collective identity. In talking about specifically a “European economy” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 252, 260, 486, 494) and stating the economic problems not as national but as “European economic problems” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 140) it is reasonable that as a further step these collective problems only can be solved in common, respectively “the economic unification of Europe is the only means of avoiding a general lowering of the standard of living and a social crisis of extreme gravity, when the Marshall Plan comes to an end.” (CA 1949 Documents, Doc. 12), as it is emphasized in a motion to the Committee of Ministers achieving a “European Economic Union” (CA 1949 Documents, Doc. 12).

To clarify the existence of joint “European economic problems”, for example, “there is the problem of European transports, the problem of electricity, the problem of the ports” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 142) and as one French representative requests already in the first session of consultations: “Nothing will be accomplished unless we are able to set up a certain number of economic organisations, themselves coordinated by a European political authority capable of taking decisions by majority vote” (CA 1949 Reports 1st session, 140). Thus, the emphasis of collective economic problems is not only used to advance economic unification but in some degree also to promote a political union.

A few years later, in 1957, six of the CoE’s member states establish the European Economic Community, the so-called Common Market, which shall emerge later, together with the European Coal and Steel Community and Euratom, into the European Union.¹⁸ Hence, the objectives of the aforementioned representatives in the Consultative Assembly are achieved for the most part. The following evaluation of one Italian representative concerning the European unification demonstrates also its perceived significance, but additionally with respect to the borders of Soviet power as a consequence of economic unification: “There can be no doubt that the North Atlantic Treaty and the unification of Europe have been the deciding factors in preventing the Communists’ economic policy from leading to a world war.” (CA 1957 Reports 8th session, 1050).

VI. Conclusion

As shown in this paper, the social construction of European identity is not only visible in debates within the European Union, but has also been a constant subject of debate in the Council of Europe from the very beginning of consultations in 1949.

After analysing the constructions of a collective common within four discourses – the geographical, the cultural, the political value-based as well as the economic one – , key findings to the central question of this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. The geographical borders of Europe are observed as not being determined naturally. On the whole, Europe is perceived less as a geographical space; rather the search for identification attributes seem to be more relevant within the other discourses. At the same time this image of ‘open borders’ can be seen as the beginning of the creation of a ‘Greater Europe’, the Council of Europe specifically stands for until today.
2. Explicitly, Europe is constructed as a community of values. Freedom, democracy, the rule of law and human rights are perceived as the common fundamental values of Europe. The strong identification of the member state with these values, eventually causes in the fast creation of the European Convention of Human Rights in 1950.

3. Furthermore, the created concept of a European culture is first and foremost characterized by 'unity in diversity'. The emphasis of a common heritage of an old and intellectual history as well as the accentuation of Europe's diversity – the richness of different traditions, languages, historical developments et al. – are the main contributions to the construction of a collective cultural identity.
4. The economic situation of destroyed Europe due to war, including the dependence on the US, causes to a closer collective identification with each other.
5. Politicized uses of collective identity constructions could be observed in different fields, as for example to define and strengthen Europe's position in the context of the Cold War as well as to achieve closer cooperation in the economic, political-institutional and cultural-scientific sphere.
6. Different 'others' obviously help Europe to confine itself: first of all the Soviet Union in economic, geographical, cultural as well as political context, as a second other to some degree their history full of conflicts and wars, finally ending in two world wars as well as to some degree the USA as a young creation in contrast to Europe's old and spiritually and culturally rich history.

As a final remark, the results demonstrate that in the Council of Europe as the first organization after World War II, built up to safeguard peace all over the continent, different characters of a collective identity have been constructed already in the first consultations. These constructions, as observed, were primarily created while searching for methods of a closer cooperation between the states of Europe through which their politicized use on the other hand becomes clear.

Based on the available results of this rather small study – limited to a short period of time – , recommendations for future investigations are to trace the further development of identity constructions in the Council of Europe and its politicized uses in different discourses. Such analyses would reveal the historical changes within the construction process of European identity discourses over a longer period of time.

Biographical Note of the Author

Wiebke Hohberger is a PhD candidate at the Department of History at the University of Hamburg, working on her doctoral thesis 'Constructions of European Identity in the Council of Europe: Turkey as 'the Other'?'.

She holds a Magister degree in Modern and Contemporary History, Political Science as well as Islamic Science from the Westphalian Wilhelm University of Münster and also studied International Relations at the Marmara University in Istanbul.

In her academic research she focuses on the relations between Europe and Turkey, constructions of European identity, the Council of Europe as well as on Turkish Republican history and politics, particularly its Europeanisation process and its foreign policy.

Contact address: wiebkehohberger@gmail.com

Bibliography

- Bond, Martyn. 2012. *Council of Europe. Structure, History and Issues in European Politics*. London [et al.]: Routledge.
- Connolly, William E. 1991. *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*. Minneapolis: University Minnesota Press.
- Council of Europe Directorate of Communication. 2008. *Travel the Univrese of Greater Europe. An Adventure Story*. Available online: http://www.coe.int/AboutCoe/media/interface/publications/Voyage_dans_lespace_en.pdf.
- Foucault, Michel. 1969. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Guisan, Catherine. 2012. *A Political Theory of Identity in European Integraiom. Memory and Policies*. London: Routledge.
- Hogan, Michael J. 1995. *The Marshall Plan. America, Britain and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. Cambridge [et al.]: Cambridge University Press.
- Öner, Selcen. 2011. *Turkey and the European Union. The Question of European Identity*. Lanham, Md. [et al.]: Lexington Books.
- Talani, Leila Simona, ed. 2012. *Globalization, Migration and the future of Europe. Insiders and Outsiders*. London [et al.]: Routledge.
- Thiel, Markus. 2011. *The Limits od Transnationalism. Collective Identities and EU Integration*. New York [et al.]: Palgrave Macmillan.

Primary Sources / Documents

- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. 2000. Available online: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf (accessed 28-03-2013).
- Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. 1949. *Documents and Working Papers. 1st session (sittings 1-18)*, Strasbourg.
- Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. 1949. *Official Report of Debates. 1st session (sittings 1-18)*, Strasbourg.
- Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. 1957. *Official Report of Debates. 8th session (sittings 30-38)*. Strasbourg.
- Council of Europe. European Convention on Human Rights. 1950. Available online: http://www.echr.coe.int/NR/rdonlyres/D5CC24A7-DC13-4318-B457-5C9014916D7A/0/Convention_ENG.pdf (accessed 30-03-2013).
- Statute of the Council of Europe. 1949. Available online: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/001.htm> (accessed 28-03-2013).

Notes

¹ Those representatives have been appointed by the national parliaments; their respective number depends on the size of each country. For more details concerning the history and structure of the Consultative Assembly, which has been renamed Parliamentary Assembly in 1974, see e.g. Bond (2012).

² The discourse-theoretical considerations of Foucault can be primarily found in his work *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, cf. Foucault (1969).

³ The author is conscious about the fact that this is not possible without interpreting the statements at the same time.

⁴ “Documents and Working Papers” contain as main documents written declarations, questions to the Committee of Ministers, motions for a recommendation or resolution and Committee reports. Details concerning the different types of documents are given on the official website of the CoE: http://assembly.coe.int/ASP/Doc/DocumentGuide_E.asp (accessed 29-03-2013).

⁵ The CoE was created by the Treaty of London which was signed on the 5th of May 1949 and entered into force as the Statute of the Council of Europe on the 3rd of August, 1949.

⁶ The case of Turkey as a member of the CoE concerning the question of its ‘Europeanness’ is a question the author of this paper is working on within the framework of her doctoral thesis.

⁷ Reasons for their non-membership are simply the following: Belarus is governed by an authoritarian regime and therefore not compatible with the values of the CoE; Kosovo still is a de-facto regime, waiting for being internationally recognized as an independent state by every state of the United Nations.

⁸ For more details concerning the history of the CoE and its integration process see e.g. Bond (2012).

⁹ The nationalities of the representatives do not play any role in this analysis of certain statements in discourses. Therefore, it is not a question of ‘who said what’ but solely ‘what was said and how’. If nationalities are noted nonetheless, then without assessment or hidden agenda.

¹⁰ The Council of Europe’s primary aim still is to ensure respect for its fundamental values: human rights, democracy and the rule of law, see the CoE’s official website: <http://www.coe.int/aboutCoe/index.asp?page=nosObjectifs&l=en> (accessed 30-03-2013).

¹¹ During that time Yugoslavia is not mentioned in this context.

¹² Decades later, this canon was adopted at European level by the EU in 2000 as Article 1 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf (accessed 28-03-2013).

¹³ A few years later, in 1959, the European Court of Human Rights was built, which today presumably is the most famous organ of the Council of Europe. For more details see e.g. Bond (2012) or <http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/The+Court/Introduction/Information+documents/> (accessed 30-03-2013).

¹⁴ As one can see in the complete process of European integration until today. Within this study it is not reasonable to go into detail at this point, because it does not enrich the central question.

¹⁵ The Assembly of the CoE has never been directly elected. Within the European Communities, however, the European Parliament has been directly elected since 1979. See <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/009cd2034d/In-the-past.html?jsessionid=10BBA7D946AD946B4B894B7A1DDBEE37.node1> (accessed 28-03-2013).

¹⁶ Already in 1949 some of these ideas are communicated, but without detailed schedules how to implement them, cf. CA (1949) Reports 1st session, 750.

¹⁷ For detailed information concerning the American Marshall Plan to recover the European economy see e.g. Hogan (1995).

¹⁸ For a short summary about the history of the EU see its official website, http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm (30-03-2013).