BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

Is Europe Losing its Identity?

BACHELOR THESIS

Bratislava, 2013   **Dária Slamová**

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

Is Europe Losing its Identity?
Struggles of building a European identity after the Second World War

BACHELOR THESIS

Bratislava, 2013   **Dária Slamová**

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this bachelor thesis is my own work and has not been published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and cited in references.

Bratislava, 30 April 2013

Signature: _____

Is Europe Losing its Identity?

Struggles of building a European identity after the Second World War

Abstract

Key Words: European identity, Legacy of Second World War, Communism, Iron Curtain, Euopean Union, Solidarity

The aim of this work is to find out what the European identity is and how it can be determined. It will also show how the identity is threatened by various influences, such as differently developing parts of Europe, crisis coming from outside of Europe and aslo the economic-political crisis inside of Europe. Why is it important to have a common identity and call ourselves Europeans? This thesis will work with the assumption that Europeans had to face various difficulties while they were trying to build a common European identity after experiencing the cruelties of the Second World War.

The concept of identity and the creation of unified Europe is not just a case since the creation of the European Union. The idea of common Europe has strong historical roots and because of this the core of the thesis will cover the situation of post-war Europe. It was a historical cut and the point in history that was leading to a new understanding of Europe, Europeans and human beings itself. What was happening in the concentration camps, trenches or at the front is unforgettable, but also

inconceivable for many of us. It is something people from this century can hardly imagine and perceive, but on the other hand everybody knows it is something we do not want to experience anymore. Thus the Second World War will always be a strong part of Europe and its identity.

The thesis will then continue with the upcoming problem Europe had to face after the end of the war, with the establishment of new regimes, precisely with Communism, which brought Europe a new order – East and West. How could Europe hold together and build the continent and identity when it was not united? Europe had and has to deal with the difficulties emerging out from the times of Communism, its attempts and failings in uniting Europe. The iron curtain could not be removed within one moment, it took time, and we can still experience difference between Eastern and Western Europe. This is been shown not only in economic perspective, but also in social, political and cultural as well.

As for the final part, the paper will examine new problems Europe is facing, connected with the phenomenon of globalization and emerging power of the European Union. On the one hand, the strong nation states are standing, while on the other, there is the European Union. There is a huge debate about the sovereignty and power of the countries, but also the level of influence Brussels should take is questionable. The thesis will touch a problem of lack of solidarity within Europe in the last part. It is a new problem emerging between European countries which has its reason and hopefully also solution. The European Union is mainly seen and described in economic terms which can be a serious threat in the upcoming years, because once the economic cooperation and aid disappears, Europe will have to look for new values that hold Europe and the EU together. Are there any non-economic values left for Europe that can bind its citizens together?

Is Europe Losing its Identity?

Struggles of building a European identity after the Second World War

Autor bakalárskej práce: Dária Slamová
Názov práce: Is Europe Losing its Identity? Struggles of building a European identity after the Second World War
Názov vysokej školy: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts
Meno školiteľa: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc.
Vedúci komisie pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.
Komisia pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD., Matthew Post, MA, prof. Silvia Miháliková
Miesto, rok, rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2013, 51 strán, 16 890 slov
Stupeň odbornej kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc.)

Abstrakt

Kľúčové slová: Európska identita, dedičstvo Druhej Svetovej vojny, Komunizmus, Železná opona, Európska únia, solidarita

Cieľom tejto práce je zistiť čo Európska identita je a ako by sa dala špecifikovať. Práca taktiež znázorní ako je identita ohrozená rôznymi vplyvmi, ako napríklad rôzne sa rozvíjajúce časti Európy, kríza ktorá prichádza mimo Európy ale taktiež ekonomicko-politická kríza ktorá vznikla vo vnútri Európy. Prečo je vlastne dôležité mať spoločnú Európsku identitu a nazývať sa Európanmi? Moja práca bude vychádzať z predpokladu že Európania museli čeliť rôznym ťažkostiam v procese budovania spoločnej identity, a to hlavne po prekonaní ukrutností ktoré sa diali počas Druhej Svetovej vojny.

Koncepcia identity a snaha o vytvorenie spoločnej Európy nie je primárne v záujme len Európskej únie. Idea spoločnej Európy má silné historické korene a práve preto jadrom tejto práce bude zmapovanie situácie hlavne povojnovej Európy. Práve Druhá Svetová vojna sa označuje ako určitý míľnik v histórii Európy ktorá viedla k novému vnímaniu Európy, Európanov a chápania ľudskej bytosti. Čo sa dialo v koncentračných táboroch, v zákopoch alebo na fronte je nezabudnuteľné, ale taktiež pre nás mnohých nepredstaviteľné. Pre ľudí v súčasnom storočí je to niečo ťažko

predstaviteľné a pochopiteľné, ale napriek tomu všetci z nás vedia že je to niečo čo už nikdy nechceme znova zažiť. Práve preto bude Druhá Svetová vojna a jej dedičstvo navždy silnou súčasťou Európy a jej identity.

Práca bude následne pokračovať s analýzou problémov ktorým Európa čelila po vojne, teda zriadenie nových režimov, najmä komunizmu ktorý priniesol pre Európu nové usporiadanie – Východná a Západná. Ako mohla Európa držať pokope a vybudovať si znova kontinent spolu s identitou ak nebola jednotná? Európa musela a ešte stále musí čeliť ťažkostiam ktoré sa postupne vyvíjali vďaka komunizmu hlavne čo sa týka snahe o zjednotenie Európy. Železná opona nemohla padnúť mihnutím oka, trvala istý čas a my dodnes môžeme byť svedkami čo nám zanechala – rozdiel Východnej a Západnej Európy je stále badateľný. Rozdiel vnímame nie len v ekonomike, ale taktiež v spoločenskom, politickom a kultúrnom živote.

Záverečná časť práce sa zaoberá súčasnými problémami Európy spojenými s fenoménom globalizácie a narastajúcej moci Európskej únie. Na jednej strane stoja silné národné štáty Európy, pokiaľ na druhej Európska únia. Veľká debata sa rozvinula o suverenite a sile krajín, ale taktiež je otázne aký postoj má zaujať Brusel a do akej miery by mala siahať moc ovplyvňovať krajiny Európskej únie. Záverečná časť práce sa bude taktiež zaujímať o problém solidarity v rámci Európskej únie. Je to nový problém vznikajúci medzi členskými štátmi EÚ ktorý má svoje opodstatnenie a dúfajme že aj riešenie. Európska únia je v súčasnosti vnímaná skôr ako ekonomická jednotka, čo môže byť seriózna hrozba v nasledujúcich rokoch. Ak sa raz ekonomická spolupráca a ekonomická pomoc naruší a nebodaj vytratí, Európa bude nútená hľadať nové hodnoty ktoré budú môcť držať Európu a EÚ pohromade. Otázkou zostáva, či existujú ešte nejaké neekonomické hodnoty ktoré budú schopné spojiť občanov Európy.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc. For the guidance, encouragement and advices he has provided during the writing of my thesis.

Table of Content

Introduction

"We need to talk about the European idea and the European spirit so that the text can encourage the citizens of Europe to think about how we came together, why are we staying together and what we want to do together" (Michalski, 2006).

While walking on the streets of Europe among people, how can one know who is European or not? How does it feel to be European, why do people want to be or not be Europeans? Would the common identity lead to peace among all countries of Europe and guiding them to more cooperation and understanding among people of various nations? We live in Europe, therefore we want to be a part of it and because of this we are aiming in having a common identity. The question of common Europe has been constantly debated in the world, it has been posing questions but also doubts. This thesis deals with the problems and struggles Europe was facing while building an identity and examines the position Europe is standing now.

Europe was for years failing to unite itself; therefore it was struggling in creating a common identity. The Second World War shaken Europeans in the deepest sense and in order to forgot they had to start from nothing. While they could start from nothing, they had to face another hostile situation – Communism. Instead of unification division came. This division throughout the years created separately developing parts of Europe and again, Europe could not build something that was necessary – a common unity. With the fall of the regime in 1989 there was another chance to make a common Europe by unifying it. But Europe is still experiencing how the West is pulling the East to balance and reach unity. In doing so, there are factors that make it maybe even more difficult.

Where does Europe standing now and where it was standing in 1945? Did Europe make step forwards of backwards? Were the Europeans fighting in overcoming the obstacles or were they giving up? Is Europe facing a crisis and losing an identity that ultimately maybe Europe never had?

The thesis contains three chapters. The first chapter discusses the term identity, its forms and uses from various perspectives. It is important to make clear how the word

"identity" can be seen and used, how it could differ from various viewpoints and what does it mean to the European nation. There are various influences, norms and values which are contributing to the formation of identity therefore all these aspects will be mentioned in the first chapter. European identity as a key term of the thesis has to be properly defined and explained in order to understand the core of the work. The second chapter of the thesis touches the problems of post-war Europe. It covers various problematic situations Europe was facing and fighting after the end of the Second World War. This chapter is important in a sense of nation building processes, but more importantly in a building of a common European nation. It shows how successfully or unsuccessfully was Europe able to unite its citizens and nations. Post-war era was a very deep point of the European history and it gave birth for many new viewpoints and orders. It has been many times said that the Second World War gave new birth to Europe, therefore I have decided to include the post-war era as the core of the thesis. The third chapter of this thesis brings the problem of solidarity between the European states. It can be seen as a rather new problem but it has also strong historical roots. Solidarity can be seen nowadays as a very important part of European states which should aim at mutual assistance. However, solidarity same as identity can be perceived in various aspects and also can have different influences on states and nations. The third chapter shows what need to be done in order to make the tights between the European states stronger and what are the things which has to be done to create a feeling of belonging that is lacking in Europe.

As it is said by Michalski in the above mentioned quotation, people should talk about the spirit and idea of Europe. We live together as European people and the creation of the European Union shows we suppose to unite. The pain and blood we share from the history is the same for the most nations of Europe. The way we developed, came together and created states can be also seen very similar. If our destiny is to stay together, why to chose then different paths? The thesis tries to show that however the nations of Europe are diverse; we can be "united in diversity". There are so many reasons to stay united and take advantage of such a long common history that can be our strength. Despite of hostile situations like wars and different regimes the European people always found paths to each other. The thesis touches the adverse situations where Europeans could not develop in the same way, but ultimately we can witness how the people of Europe overcame such obstacles. Why and how could they

do it? Maybe because of our common destiny and the path we suppose to walk all together.

Chapter I: Definition of identities

Identity, Europe has been forming

There are various questions and remarks about the importance, relevance and need of identity. What is it, why do we need it, why do we want it or do not want it? Does Europe have an identity, has it ever created or will it ever create? There are many unanswered questions on which the answer is mostly depending on the standing point, feeling and experience of an individual. For the significance of identity, I would say, it is important because it leads to common solidarity and it is leading towards peace, which is the key condition to maintain since the end of the Second World War. Whether Europe had an identity, whether it has or will ever have, depends on its citizens and the epoch we live in. Some could not even think about identity in medieval times when survival was the aim for most of the people, and they did not care and did not precisely know who they are. The peasants knew their positions, they knew their work and family, but whether they belonged to a certain group of people, or even to nation, became important only in the nineteenth century. The kings who were fighting for more power and were conquering more lands seemed also not being interested in a creation of something common with others; they were rather aiming at their own needs and interests. When we think now about the medieval times, what is the most striking in our eyes is the religion - and all the things emerging from it. Churches, popes, wealth, believers, inquisition are the most connected terms to Christianity. Whether it created something that is called today identity is again the matter of the viewpoint. If it is seen as something striking that only Europe experienced, what was creating an image of a continent, that was the reason of many wars, it can be perceived as a common identity of Europe. The wave of revolutions in the nineteenth century that caused the emergence of nationalism is also one of the events that are bounding Europe together. Every epoch had something remarkable. If we try to look for it deeper, we will always find an event, person, invention, belief, war that was creating something within Europe that made it remarkable in the eyes of others - therefore it can be perceived as a common identity. There are discussions about a common identity of "us" Europeans, but who is perceived as the "other"? As it had been many times said, in order to create a common identity –a common idea,

we need to create a common enemy, or the notion of the "other". To create a feeling of belonging where people can call themselves "us", provides people with the feeling of safety and solidarity. It creates a certain identity, where the particular "member" of this identity knows where is his place and who are the people with whom he is in one boat. For Europeans, this feeling was important because of pragmatic reasons and also idealistic. Europe had been often driven by idealism in many fields, so it is an inherent element of the Europe today as well. However, one of the most important reasons to unite Europe and create a feeling of belonging among Europeans was to ensure the peace in Europe. After the centuries of devastating wars, the constant tensions between France and Germany, the revolutions and movements for self-determination of nations and after the world wars that plundered Europe, Europe needed time to recover – it needed long-term peace.

Values and Norms that bind Europe

The end of the Second World War brought some kind of emptiness, destruction and distress to Europe. The states, nations and politicians knew there has to come to discussion and dialog between them to solve the problems left by the war. In order to prevent further genocide, war, violation of human rights and human dignity, several organizations and groups had been formed: United Nations, Council of Europe and the predecessor of the EU - European Coal and Steel Community. It was necessary to create a new order in Europe based on new norms and values. It was mainly fear and hope that was driving people to create the new order and to integrate into Europe. The fear from another war, the legacies of the wars before and a hope, that the newly emerged conflicts could be solved without any use of military force. A notion of human dignity was becoming one of the most used phrases in terms of politics, law and society itself. It appeared in constitutions of countries like Germany and Italy, which was undoubtedly "an answer" for the inhuman crimes committed during the Second World War (Habermas, 2011). Human dignity became a primary value for Europeans. There are four categories of law derived from the human dignity which states - that the basic rights could just fulfill the moral requirements and protect the human dignity only if they are functioning in all categories evenly. Habermas is

listing the so called "basic rights" that are tied to democratic principles which are ultimately derived from the liberal rights and freedom. The basic rights can properly function only when the social and cultural rights are ensured. These rights are helping to maintain the social equality and preventing the creation of bigger social differences among classes and people (Habermas, 2011). Human dignity became indivisible from the basic rights and it was included also in the democratic law – it is a part of a law which is leading to respect among people that are equal and free in a society. Not only human dignity became so much important for the society, but also the human rights in general. Ernst Bloch says that human rights are a realistic utopia, to the extent that they no longer pretend socio-utopian painted scenes of collective happiness, but enshrine the ideal goal of the just society in the very institutions of constitutional states (Habermas, 2011). The voices of people calling for human rights had been heard since the eighteenth century, but it truly became widespread only after the Second World War. From that time, the declaration of human rights is an unconditional part of the democratic constitutions and should be adhered in any country to all human beings. Since the establishment of Human rights, and the UN itself, it meets problematic tensions and constant criticism of inefficiency. On the one hand the UN is talking about the spread of human rights and its significance, on the other it is misusing its competences in the power politics. Institutions established by the UN, interventions and peacekeeping efforts had many times failed and proved to be inefficient. Ultimately, it can be said that it was in Europe, where the notion of human rights and human dignity became important and were spreading to the world. It not only brought European states and nations together, as they felt it is their duty to ensure any human being its dignity, but it also connected the world itself.

Aspects of Identity

"Identity is not an idea or a cultural given, but a mode of self-understanding that is expressed by people in ongoing narratives; moreover, the boundaries between identities are fluid, negotiable and contested. All identities are constructions, regardless of whatever kind they are" (Delanty, 2003). In order to understand or even define the term "identity", it is important to see its aspect where it can occur. Delanty says the term itself had been rarely clarified and therefore it has been leading to confusing debates. Identity can be seen in many ways or forms, in connection to

16

something, in connection to people and various nations. It had been changing anytime in history during social, political or geographic changes. For these confusing reasons, Delanty created the following aspects of identity:

- ➢ occurring in connection with social action
- ➢ performative and public aspect of identity
- ➢ relation to the social actor - group or individual
- ➢ collective identities, various identities relating to each other

The creation of identity is, as it can be seen, always in a connection to people either individuals or groups. Identity is something that has been long forming, and it is never created just by a single act of an individual or a group. It cannot be formed by one social movement, it needs development and a kind of self-recognition, that can although, change by time as the actors are changing as well. The public aspect of identity is the stories people telling each other in order to be recognizable, to make others know about their existence. Identity has been starting to be created by an individual or by a group that are the subject of the identity. Collective identity is a mixture of identities and has more stages. Various types of identities, such as political, cultural or social are depending, relating or are connected and fused with each other. This fusion is more visible in individual identities, where a person can be a member of an ethnic, regional, political and national identity while relating to each other in various aspects (Delnaty, 2003).

Another important distinction has to be made while talking about identity, which is the division to the collective and personal. The formation of these two types of identities is varying from each other. Delanty explains collective identity as a "self-understanding of a particular group", where this group can be any social or ethnic group and does not have to be necessarily tied to some personal identity (Delanty, 2003). Some development of national identities can be compared to the identity of Europe. In order to create or maintain a group identity there has to be some project that is bounding the participants of a particular social group together. The problem of the national and also European identity could be that they are leaving the debate on the level where the answer simply cannot be found. Collective identities can also be further divided and are usually confused. There are cultural categories, such as an Italian identity or black identity that are contributing to the formation of collective

identities, but these cultural categories cannot be alone called an identities (Delanty, 2003). Delanty uses a term "diasporic identities", that means a bigger group of people who does not necessarily live in one country or in one area, but can include a whole society living separately. He is giving an example of the British identity which includes the Scottish, the Welsh, the Northern Irish, the Anglo-Irish, the English but also other ethnic groups, where can also be added the identity of the Republic of Ireland. Emile Durkheim calls it "collective representations, the ideas that symbolize the identity of a society" (Delanty, 2003). In whatever situation or way anybody tries to see identity of Europe, the first most important step is to define it by finding terms, aspects and models of defining it. An identity is a process and also a development, it is seen in a movement as something changeable. European identity and the national identities of Europe are usually seen in connection to each other, where they are shifting or overlapping.

Is There a European identity?

It has been long questionable to define Europe geographically, culturally or politically and therefore the question of the emergence of European identity had been debated. The following thoughts will deal with the problems occurred in Europe in the last decades:

- ➢ ☐ How is the European identity go together with other identities (national)
- ➢ ☐ Content of European identity
- ➢ ☐ Europe and the EU – psychological existence of the EU
- ➢ ☐ The EU and identity change

Although Europe as a continent is consisting of many nations, people feel as a part of their national identities but also European one. Whether they have to feel only as a part of a national identity or as a part of European, are not questions anymore, because they can feel to be a part of both. However, the national and European identities can end up in a conflict. There is a clash between a "Europe" that has to be built against the strong nation-states, and on the other hand is the public opinion that supposed to

overcome "old-fashioned" nationalism. There is a current debate to what extent should EU influence the states, and to what extent should the nation subordinate to the wishes of EU. Thomas Risse is claiming that Europe and national identities can go together. He is mentioning three possibilities how can identities differ: Identities can be nested, cross-cutting and separate. The nested identity means that an individual can feel Europe as boundary of his identity, while his own nation (state) forms the core which is the inner part of his identity or the other way around. According to European survey data the most of the European inhabitants considering their national or regional identity as the primary one and the feeling of "Europeaness" comes as second. The cross-cut identity means an overlapping identity, feeling of belonging to group and to Europe. An example can be the Members of the European Parliament, who feels the belonging to Europe but to their party as well. It is a model of a multiple identities, which can also be compared to the European and national identities. There are people who identify themselves with their nation as well as with Europe. A separate identity means to be a part of two different groups that are not overlapping. A politician is a member of his party, but on the other hand he can be a part of a swimming club, whereas his two memberships are not overlapping. Risse sees a problem in making such concepts about European identity because of the content of "what it means to identify with Europe" (Risse, 2003). Europe can be seen as an empty category, which people can fill in by their own views and interpretations, says Breakwell. In the case of Germany, Europe means to get through their problematic past that is characterized by raising nationalism and militarism. For example French elites built the understanding of Europe on the French values of Republicanism, enlightenment and the civilizing mission that was the essence of colonization. British perceived Europe as a kind of contrast into their nation – the "English nation", which means they did not see it particularly as a part of their nation, compared to German and French who did (Risse, 2003).

Europeans, but mainly people living outside Europe are facing a problem how to define Europe and Europeans. Is Europe simply the EU? Are the European nations no more existing without the European Union, or can they be still seen as sovereign nations that are just a part of the Union? For some people there is no difference, because nowadays the EU is mostly an embodiment for Europe in the eyes of many. However, people might feel a sense of belonging to EU, but do not feel the belonging

to Europe, or other way around. An interesting examples are "Schengenlad", Eurozone, or the Council of Europe. Country like Great Britain, who has been a member of EU for decades, is still not a part of Eurozone, neither Schengenlad, while on the other hand, Norway, which is not a EU member, is a member of Schengen. European Organizations like The Council of Europe or OSCE are even broader. Russia and Ukraine are parts of the European Council, and OSCE has among its members Canada and USA. Risse is also mentioning the negative stereotypes that are still part of the EU, more exactly among Eastern and Western Europe. This negative stereotype is mostly because of the different regimes East and West were developing in. We can say that it is the legacy of Communism that left traces and it is the reason why are some Western nations skeptical about the small East countries of Europe. Risse claims in order to overcome such a stereotype, communication among the two entities is inevitable. "The more citizens identify with Europe, the more they will be tolerant and sympathetic to fellow Europeans" (Mummendey, Waldzus).

In the recent times when the European Union is getting larger, some pose a question to what extent do the European institutions "create a feeling of belonging". There are two ways of explaining it: the rationalist and the constructivist. The rationalist examines the identity in the institution building process, claiming that institutions had little impact on the formation on identities. On the other hand, the constructivist view claims that the relation between institutions and the identity is tight and the institutions became part of the formation of identity (Risse, 2003).

North vs. South - what do they have in common?

As Europe had been changing through the centuries, every nation was formed by some different values and cultural backgrounds. How can one think of the Baltic countries and the Iberian Peninsula as people who share the same identity? At the first glance it may seem that the cultural, economical and social differences between Southern countries and Northern countries of Europe are too big to share a common European identity. How can this be proved to be wrong? How can one think of a compatibility of different traditions? One of the possibilities is Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory of family resemblances, by which he is stressing that there are similarities which are important to consider, by which with deducing one can come to the

conclusion of similarities and connections between people, nations or countries. If we would take the example of Northern and Southern Europe, making way from Portugal to Norway, we would go in the following line: How is Portugal tight to Spain, how is Spain tight to France, how is France connected to Germany, how is Germany connected with Denmark - and we have already arrived to Scandinavia, and there would be no difficulty to find resemblances among Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Wittgenstein says: "For if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that. To repeat: don't think, but look!" (Wittgenstein, 1963). To look at a Norwegian and Spanish man, it would be quite clear that they are completely different in appearance. While on the other hand, compared to African and Asian people, one could see them rather similar than different. It is the circumstances and the comparison that is dividing or connecting two European countries.

European identity according Vaclav Havel

I wish also to include some notes and thoughts of Vaclav Havel who created the Charter of the European Identity. In his essay about Europe and Identity, Havel writes his thoughts about the formation of Europe, its tradition, values, ideas and historical events that had been crucial in the formation of Europe's identity. He admits that he posed a question about his linkage to Europe itself, and about his feelings being European, only in the last years. The explanation for this is that he, as many others, did not have a feeling to ask such a question, because being European was something granted. It is important to talk about the feelings of people and their awareness because such acts are contributing to a person's self-awareness. According to Havel, Europeans did not have a common impulse to create a common identity because they were convinced about their superior position in the world. To characterize Europe or to reflect upon it, it is important to make it based on the historical background, set of values, ideas and thoughts. Surely, these values and thoughts could be seen in both, positive and negative connotation. Havel claims the very important unification of Western Europe started after the end of the Second World War because of the fear of spreading the totalitarian regime. It was not only the fear of Communism that was bounding Western Europe together, but also the nightmares of the World Wars and a fear from national conflicts to emerge. Havel sees the values and principles based on

which Europe, and later European Union, was formed. "It consists of respect for the unique human being and humanity's freedoms, rights and dignity; the principle of solidarity; the rule of law and equality before the law; protection of minorities; democratic institutions; separation of legislative, executive and judicial powers; political pluralism; respect for private ownership and private enterprise, and a market economy; and the furtherance of civil society" (Havel, 2010). If someone wants to define what it means to be European, what is Europe, and what has Europe contributed to the world, double-edged nature has to be considered. It was in Europe, where the Holocaust happened, but on the other hand Europe introduced and taught people about human rights. Industrial and informational revolutions took place in Europe that brought contamination of nature with it. Havel is talking about the evils and promising events that happened in the 20th century in Europe, towards which Europe contributed mightily. Among the evils he is listing World Wars, Fascism and Communism and to the promising events he includes the end of colonial rule, the fall of Iron Curtain and the European integration (Havel, 2010).

Chapter II: Development of European identity after the Second World War

1945: Stunde null – Zero hour

The devastating power of the Second World War left Europe and Europeans destroyed, exhausted and empty. Although the next steps of the countries, the decisions of politicians were sometimes unclear, all the inhabitants of Europe knew one thing – never again. It was a time to build, to start, to try. The time when it is better to look ahead than behind. The nations of Europe had to come together to solve the problems caused by the war and try to find a common way to continue. The attempts of unification of Europe had been few already in its history, but now was "the time". There is the so called concept of European integration which had been leading Europe to closer cooperation. The main reasons for the attempts for integration were mainly the fear and hope. Fear from wars and hopes that Europe after such devastation will be able to solve problems without force. However, one of the pragmatic reasons to create a union of European states was to ensure the peace among one of the biggest enemies in Europe – France and Germany.

What had the war left to Europeans? Why is its legacy still lingering even nowadays? Some viewpoints can be seen a bit ironically, but the World War II gave Europe a new birth. "World War One destroyed old Europe, World War Two created the conditions for a new Europe" (Judt, 2010). Unfortunately it was not simply the war years that brought huge depression, devastation and humiliation; also the years after the war were marked by fear, deprivation, poverty and violence. The total destruction of many European cities and the damage of the environment were far not the only visible causes of the war. The suffering of the whole communities of people was far worse. The war brought not only changes on the map of Europe, but also to its inhabitants when there were millions of them deported from countries to countries (Judt, 2010). According to available data there had been no such precedence in history, where so many people were killed in such a short time. The causes for death were several: death on the battlefield, mass murders, work camps, diseases, bad nutrition, bombs, slave laborers etc. Sadly, the killings and deaths have not ended with the war. "Surviving the war was one thing, surviving the peace another" (Judt, 2010).

Even though the war ended, the suffering of people faded only very slowly. There were several problems regarding housing, clothing or feeding. Caring about mainly old people, kids, refugees, displaced people, criminals became a daily part of life. What was worse, the behavior of Red Army during its liberation of occupied countries was just hardly acceptable. International community had to deal with the problem of displaced people, refugees and most importantly – with the survivals of concentration camps. The sad fact about those who survived the terror of concentration camps is that 4 out of 10 died within the upcoming weeks, since the medical knowledge of the West was not sufficient to save their lives (Judt, 2010).

Another important fact to mention is the "ethnically clean" states that had been created after the displaced people were send to their homes. Anne McCormick writes that there is no precedent in history how badly the Germans – as the losers and the ones causing the war, were treated when it came to their expulsion from various countries. Ultimately, 13 million Germans were integrated into Germany (Judt, 2010). The situation in Eastern Europe was not much better either, since the Soviets forcefully exchanged the population in several countries, mainly between Poland and Ukraine. Another exchange of population happened between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, where the Hungarians were treated as the allies of Germany which meant as the losers of the war. Hungarians were also forcefully dragged out from Czechoslovakia, same as Germans, although with a bit more human way. Various transfers took place also in Balkans, where the northern parts of Yugoslavia had been inhabited by people from its southern parts. The most affected were the Jews, among whom the most of them were either killed or gone. However, ironically said, there was a quite large group of them who returned to Germany (Judt, 2010). Various Aid Organizations were established for the rehabilitation of Europe. To list the more important ones and the most effective ones regarding the help to displaced people and refugees, two are mentioned: UNRRA- United Nation Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and IRO- International Refugee Organization. UNRRA itself spent during the years 1945-47 around 10 billion dollars. During the period of transformation or changing of the population, a group of people had emerged who "were willing to go anywhere on Earth except home" (Flanner, 1948). It was mostly the inhabitants of Baltic region, Soviets, Polish, Romanian and Yugoslavian citizens who were usually feared to go back to their countries because of the regime. The

question remained, which country would take them? Only in rare occasions, like for example Belgium and France took some Easterners providing them with work, mostly in mines. Destroyed Europe required strong male workers, but single women were also welcomed as maids in houses. Survivals of the war from Eastern regions who were unwanted in West were forcefully expelled by Allies to the countries of their origin where some of them were immediately shot after crossing the border. According to the Soviet rule, anybody spending time in the West was collaborator, so their destiny was pre-written. Many Croats, Polish and Romanian was reluctant to return to their countries because of the Communist regime and strong impact of the Soviets (Judt, 2010).

The long way to cooperation, integration and unification of the European states

When the Second World War ended in Europe, the guilty party had to be found, punished and made sure nothing like the war would ever happen again. Many blamed the strong nation states as the cause of the war; therefore, a new order was necessary. European states started to cooperate more openly between each other in order to avoid any further discrepancies between the century-long enemies France and Germany. But this was not the only reason. As the iron curtain was falling on Europe, Western countries wanted to ensure their positions and strength against the upcoming threat of Communism. This was the beginning of a new phenomenon that was dividing Europe to East and West, a new identity Us-and Them. When a person wants to clearly state who is he, what is his identity, he makes a distinction between him and the other. So did the European states. The identity was emerging from the experiences of war, when there was US- who did not want the force as a solution to problems; and Them – who were using force and intimidation as solution. Later in the fifties it became the distinction to US- who respects the democratic principles versus them, who do not, who are Communists.

How did the way from the crisis looked like? First of all, a big debate emerged between the leftist and rightist in Europe in order to find out who to blame that Europe was able to decline morally so deep. This was not the only case politicians

were concerned about. There was also appearing a question who would be able to lead Europe out from the decline and crisis. István Bíbó sees the leftists more active, logical and military, on the other hand he thinks the rightists are more empirical and quiet, however more self confident (Bibó, 1996). Leftist parties claimed that the tolerance of the right – its bearing and support for Hitler was ultimately the cause of the catastrophe in Europe. Right parties see the cause of the war in revolutionary ideas and violence, claiming that any revolution is a demonstration of the harm itself. This debate between the two parties became irrelevant in the moment, when a person realized what the essence of fascism is. We can witness the clash of the opposite ideas: tradition and progress, where the former is in favor of well-established methods and the later of change and revolution. According to Bibó, the power of fascism lies in the fact, that it relies on traditions where the emotions play an important role in a sense that they emerge from the fear of the past. It is becoming a mass feeling in the moment when the progress they are trying to implement is hitting the society that is unprepared and without any experiences. Ultimately, both left and right parties are considering fascism as an evil, leftist for its reactionary and the rightist for it revolutionary inclination. But since fascism contains both, the debate between left and right is absolutely irrelevant because it is not leading anywhere, especially not to aid to rebuild Europe (Bibó, 1996).

Bibó outlines the possible ways Europe can follow after the end of the Second World War and he came to the idea that there are three most likely factors: conservative, progressive and static. The conservative perspective is represented by the army and church; the progressive by organized workers and the static by bureaucracy and peasantry. When it comes to the discussion about the role of church, there are always pro-contra opinions, so it was the same in the years after the war. There was a group of people who were totally rejecting the role of the church because of its dogmatic approach that is breaking the development of the freedom of humans. Another group of people was not completely against the role of the church in the rehabilitation of Europe, however they had some remarks. They did not like the pure fact that church had too much influence on politics, too much power in economics as well and was establishing connections with political parties. They claim that because of this reason the church had been unable to fight against inhuman behaviors. Although even in the case of the church, a certain change had happened. The French, German and all the

churches of the occupied countries had given up all the influence that was mentioned above (Bibó, 1996). The role of the army is also very dubious in the rehabilitation of Europe. The reason for this was the "strong military spirit" of the army and, more importantly, the claim that the army had a huge role in the birth of the crisis Europe was facing after the war. Bibó does not see the necessary connection between army and militarism, claiming that militarism is mostly the "pathology" of the society, but not of the army. Further he claims that a country does not became military orientated because of the way the army thinks about the war but because of the way the society thinks about the army (Bibó, 1996). The only progressive factor Bibó mentions is the group of organized workers, who ultimately contributed lot to the development of the masses and were able to oppose the elites. The class-struggle played an important role in the formation of the organized workers. This emergence of the organized workers needs to have a new definition as well as the definition of class struggle should be changed – as the changes in Europe were happening. However, he does not mean it in a way that the workers should be less enthusiastic, less brave or that they suppose to make more compromises, but he means the change in the psychological perspective, more precisely, that the workers should have more clear understanding. Surprisingly, in the fight against violence and suppression of freedoms, the workers found lot of allies, even among those groups who would supposedly stand on the other side (Bibó, 1996).

There had been a big fight among Bolsheviks, anti-Bolsheviks, Orthodox Marxists, Marxists or various orthodox and revolutionary ideas of groups. They mostly claimed that the fighting position and persuasion of the socialists – working people, is just a pure tactics. With the upcoming formation of socialist, a new opposition started to emerge: the party of the mass. After the First World War, it was mainly the social democrats and communists who were the most influential, although, the "new" followers of socialism cannot fit to any of these groups. The system that ultimately swallowed Eastern Europe was Communism. Bibó belonged to one of those Hungarian intelligent who became a "victim" of this regime, and therefore he did not have a positive view about it. He talks about Communism as a regime consisting of two elements that are not overlapping: the first is a100% socialism and the second is the 100% revolutionary tactics (Bibó, 1996). The revolutionary attitude is a rather romantic left-over from the age of revolutions from 19th century. It is characterized by

a constant power, change of power, a zeitgeist that had been changing every decade – all this is useful for the consciousness and realizing of the values and norms that should be permanent in order to ensure constant development. Is that what Europe needed? To finish the three factors that are likely taking part in the postwar development of Europe, we have to mention bureaucracy and peasantry. According to Bibó, in order to successfully restore Europe, a coalition of the church, army and the workers is needed. In this system, bureaucracy could take the role of the executive and the peasantry the role of defender. However, the roles and coalitions could change depending on the situation, but the balance supposes to be always ensured. Bureaucracy is a European phenomenon because of its traditional functioning of administration, controlling and formation. It is sometimes characterized as an exhausting hard work, where you have to work more, where you can lose easily favor of others, where you could stuck for years on one position. When the expectations are absurd, brutal or chaotic, you have to transform them into acceptable and respectable by people. The most passive and static of all the factors mentioned above is peasantry. This factor is coming to consideration in places where the peasantry still exists. To make it more precise, the peasantry as a specific factor have survived only in places where the development in this field has not yet come. As an example, Bibó is indicating the small east European countries, where the power of peasantry had been still important and distinctive because it was still a certain life-style (Bibó, 1996).

Step by step towards the triggering of the Iron Curtain

With the end of the war, the conferences were taking place where one of the debates was considering the division of power in the occupied territories. Every victorious country wanted to implement its own system in the territory it had been occupied and later liberated. At this moment, the faith of Europe was already sealed. Soviets, the ones who were willing to sacrifice a huge number of people in the war were claiming the territories they liberated to become their satellites. The division of Europe was starting and the coming of the cold war was irreversible.

"Coalitions were the route to power for Communist parties in a region where they were historically weak" (Judt, 2010). In states where there were no strong Communist parties, Stalin decided to create coalitions out of Socialists, Communist and anti-

Fascist parties in order to get rid of the previous regime and gain control over the country. Control is the word that describes the best the aim and actions of Stalin in the East European nations. Communists were claiming they want to finish the revolution of 1848, which means to redistribute property among people, ensure equality and freedoms and give democratic rights to people. In whatever way was Stalin trying to persuade people of Eastern Europe, using various ways of persuasion, he realized soon that Communist would never take power through elections (Judt, 2010). For this reason the only possibility left to him was to use force and terror. Politicians and people who were not part of the Communist party and were in any sense threatening the victory of Communist parties were threatened, beaten, dragged out, arrested or even killed. It was not so easy to get rid of the members of the Social Democratic parties as Stalin imagined, so he decided to make for them no other choice than to join the Communists. "The Social Democrats in Eastern Europe were in an impossible position" (Judt, 2010). Since they had no other option than to join Communists, the resistance would not be a clever decision, because probably they would lose anyway. Even some Westerners were supporting this idea of Stalin in the naive belief that both could benefit or that the Communist would finally calm down when they reached their goal. Unfortunately, none of this became truth.

In the last two years of the forties, the power of Communists were raising as they were constantly abolishing any other opposition. But even their constant, however slow, rise was not sufficient to stop to use terror. The more radical policy, purges, intimidation, constant state control, collectivization, effort to destroy the middle class, punishments for uncomfortable persons were on the daily basis in East Europe directed from the USSR. "For all the rhetoric of Socialism, the transition from authoritarian backwardness to Communist "popular democracy" was a short move and an easy one" (Judt, 2010). Honestly said, the regimes in the East Europe had been for long doubtful, back- warded and for long times ruled by one person without any notion of democracy. The position of Communists in Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary or Poland was not really strong, which meant there was couple of countries where Stalin had to focus on. It was many times a Peasant or Agrarian party that was in a leading position, and however, Communists parties were slowly getting more support, without Stalin, they would have never came to power. Although there were some hopes for democratization of the East, taking into account its traditions without barely any

notion of democracy or liberalism, the way it ultimately turned out was less surprising (Judt, 2010). Czechoslovakia welcomed the Soviets and Communism because they considered them as the liberators after the cruel decision of Munich dictate. Whatever strong the positive inclination towards Soviets was from Prague, the "Prague coup" took place in 1947. The policy of Stalin was changing mainly because of its bad relations with Yugoslavia. As Stalin was expecting to gain more influence though the liberated territories by the Soviets, for Yugoslavia, this was not applicable. Even though the Communist dictator Tito was elected in elections without any help from the Soviet Union, Stalin was expecting him to follow his ideas of ruling. It was not only that Tito was not respecting the way Stalin wanted him to rule, or rather being his puppet; Tito was open to West, whether in debates or cooperation. From the perspective of Stalin, Yugoslavia was an embarrassment of Communism, but also for Soviets itself since he could not force them to follow his way of ruling or to say better, to subordinate themselves to Soviets as the rest of East Europe did. Ultimately, it was the Yugoslav Communist party that came to power without any aid from Soviets, as the only one in Europe. "The Yugoslav Communist Party was condemned as a gang of spies, provocateurs and murderers and barking for American capital" (Judt, 2010). As it was expected, Stalin abolished any connection with Yugoslavia because he was feared that the Soviet satellites could try to follow the Yugoslavian pattern of ruling.

Another problematic situation occurred with Germany, more precisely, with Berlin. Berlin was divided into four power zones, from which three parts were under the rule of USA, Great Britain and France. Western countries were planning to create a separate Western Germany and they started they plan by announcing the new currency – Deutsche Mark. As expected, this was a thorn in the eyes of Stalin who could not accept such an act from the West. This conflict ended up in Berlin airlift, lasting 11 month until May 1949 (Judt, 2010). Stalin decided to blockade Berlin, expecting the Allies to leave the city or give up their plans for establishing a West German state. At the end, none of this took place. We can talk about three important outcomes of the Berlin crisis. The first was the establishment of two separate German states. The second was the permanent presence of the USA military groups, since Britain and France would probably not be able to cope with the situation alone. The third was the rethinking of the military calculations of the Western Allies, which

means they had to count with the possibilities of stronger military presence than it was expected.

The presence of the troops in Western Europe was inevitable to help in rehabilitation of Europe, but also in maintaining of peace and keep the line – defend West Europe from East. In the summer of 1948 an important secret discussion took place in Washington between USA, Canada and the UK regarding the defense of Europe. This secret meeting was a beginning in the Establishment of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), which was officially signed in the upcoming spring. NATO was seen by Americans similarly as the Marshall Plan (financial aid to Europe after the war), to help Europeans in managing and surviving after the war, while in the case of Marshall Plan it was economical aid and in the case of NATO it was military. Lord Ismay, who was the Secretary General of NATO said: "The purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was to keep the Russians out, the Americans in and the Germans down" (Judt, 2010). As Europe was witnessing the spread of Communism, or better to say, the dictatorship of Stalin, Westerners were feared of the spread of Communism therefore they had to keep the line that was dividing East Europe from West. Obviously, for this purpose the help of the US troops was inevitable, since it is just hardly imaginable that the British and French could handle it alone. Germany stayed the only strong country in Europe that was still not allowed to armor. However, it soon turned out as an impossible wish. In order to complete, or make the West European defense stronger, was unimaginable without rearming Germany. It seemed a bit ironic that the country which had to be defended from Soviets – the Germans, could not contribute to its own defense because of the abolishment of rearming. The representatives of NATO knew that the eventual rearmament of Germany could not be in favor of the Russians, but this was not the time when the feelings of Russian suppose to be taken into account anymore. The first discussion about German rearmament took place in 1950, but as expected, France took it as a rather offensive attempt and ultimately they managed to postpone the rearmament until 1954 (Judt, 2010).

East and West – where is the best/threat?

When the rehabilitation of Europe started, the most of its inhabitants expected a way better and easier life. However, such an expectation did not turned out to be truth. As the years after the war were passing people still had to deal with postwar and pre-war problems. "Life changed surprisingly little after the war", says David Lodge (Judt, 2010). The time when the nations of Europe were supposed to hold together, ultimately became the time of constant survival. To say it more clear, the cooperation was formally fulfilled, but it had only a small impact on the daily life. Many people in Western part of Europe were working hard manual works, for example in mines or factories, buying daily groceries because of the lack of fridge; waking up early mornings to make fire; pupils sitting in a schools heated by pot-bellied stoves and having only cold running water. This description is made by an author from Belgian, Luc Sante, who continues, that if someone thinks this was just the image of few postwar years, is in mistake, because such conditions lasted for decades. The life also did not change in former peasant families where the use of horses and cows were still normal, and the vegetables had been picked up by pure hands. This shows us how hard life was, and that although the war ended the expected development did not go so fast. The poverty was widespread throughout Europe, whether in East or West. For instance only very few families in Italy had indoor toilets or running water. In some villages there was only one fountain for all the inhabitants (Judt, 2010). The devastation was huge, either in the sense of ruined towns and cities, or in the sense of ruined lives of people. It was truly hard to develop to higher levels. The aim was to survive.

 It is very hard to imagine that some people could think of their identities and their sense of belonging, while they had to fight for their lives. Searching for deep thoughts or for some identity building process among Europeans is just hardly imaginable, while they were preoccupied with the idea of survival. However, to look for a common denominator of Europeans at this time -could be the idea of re-building of Europe and to forget the cruelties of war and try to live a normal life again, whatever

ironical it sounds. What was worse, the cold war was not just knocking on the doors anymore; it was a present threat, something already in a process. World War Two has not even ended yet, its legacy was still present, but suddenly, Europe and the world was facing another war – cold and silent, an even more terrifying one.

The life in the Western part of Europe had been already outlined in the previous chapter, so now is the time to say something about the other side of Europe – the one behind the Iron Curtain. Stalin was ruling with an extremely firm hand, and after his death in 1953, many people felt relief – or fear. USSR proved very quickly that the death of the dictator is not threatening their power. The period after the death of Stalin is called desalinization, and even though the rule of Stalin was more and more criticized after his death, the practices of Communist changed only slightly.

"And so it was necessary to teach people not to think and make judgments, to compel them to see the non-existent, and to argue the opposite of what was obvious to everyone" (Pasternak, 2003). This quotation from the book Doctor Zhivago interprets the thinking and the way of life people lived behind the Iron Curtain. The satellites of USSR had to follow the regulations from Moscow, otherwise the Soviets made it clear once again who is in charge. The dictatorship of Communism can be seen as a totalitarian regime. For the description of totalitarian regime I decided to use the interpretation of Hannah Arendt. Arendt sees in totalitarianism something new and terrible, something incomparable to the regimes employing tyranny in the times before. The main principles of the new totalitarianism according to her are lawlessness, implementation of terror, strong influence of ideology, crimes and human conditions like isolation and solitude. Laws are completely applied into the society, whether they are fitting or not, and their aim is to produce the human beings according its principles. The totalitarian lawfulness is believed to establish the only just rule on the Earth, and it believed to transform the human beings into an active part of the law (Arendt, 1958). Terror was the most important element in totalitarianism, basically can be called a key part. The dictator or the leading Party could implement various forms of intimidation by using terror and it was the tool through which they kept the power. Terror as a realization of law which is aiming at the good of the majority, and is willing to sacrifice a single human being, in order to achieve the good of the majority, as in the case of Soviet Union it was the unit. Totalitarian regimes were aiming at the transformation of human beings into

thoughtless followers and believers of the regime and for this aim they were using terror and ideology. Ideologies assume that it is enough to have only one idea which is able to explain everything, without any need of teaching. Crime had its importance also. In totalitarianism a person could be easily condemned as a criminal. They were infamous mainly in the USSR. Arendt is quoting Trotsky, a Soviet politician, who says: "We can only be right with and by the Party, for history has provided no other way of being in the right" (Arendt, 1958). The most important in these cases were to punish the crime, not to find the real criminal. It was not relevant who had committed the crime, but the important was to have somebody who confessed to be a criminal. The sad thing was that in USSR anybody could be a criminal, at any time, in any position. The "magic" power of these regimes is that through the tortures and interrogations, people go so crazy and mindless and they start to believe in the ideology of the totalitarian regime. Human conditions like isolation and solitude were very common during totalitarianism. Isolation is a condition when a person is unable to maintain any contact with other people, which was very important in terms of being unable to form any opposition to the leading Party. Solitude, on the other hand, is a condition that a human being can feel even being among people. It is a feeling of fear and mistrust towards people around you who can betray you any time (Arendt, 1958).

Communism was a system where it was important that it worked in theory and "on paper", but when it came to outcomes and practice it was not important anymore and this was the reason why it ultimately fell. The years of Communism can be divided into the period of Stalinism, after his death to destalinization, then to normalization and the last to the "perestrojka" – the period of Gorbatschow. Although it can be divided into the mentioned periods, the system was more or less the same – the satellites of USSR had to follow the wishes of "big Brother" and in the case of having some different ideas, the Soviets made it very soon clear what they did not like. As an examples the year 1956 in Hungary can be mentioned or the year 1968 in Czechoslovakia. The biggest victims of Communism were mainly among intellectuals – scholars, journalists, students and writers (Judt, 2010). As for instance, the uprising in Hungary in 1956 started as a student revolt against the puppet regime in Hungary and later turned out to be one of the most influential uprisings during the Cold War in Europe. It bounded the Hungarian intelligence so much that it turned out to be a national holiday later. It was a very important step to show the disfavour towards the

Soviet control even if it failed. As the Soviets intervene in the case of Hungary, also they did in the case of Czechoslovakia, where the reason was although a bit different. The unacceptable situation for the Soviets in the case of Czechoslovakia was the "too soft" rule of the leading party, which let also some influence of the West come into the country. In both cases it was a military intervention of the armies of Warsaw Pact – a military organization of the countries of USSR and its satellites. The demands of the leaders in Hungary and Czechoslovakia were mainly to increase the human and civil rights of the people (Judt, 2010). It was not only the abolishment of freedoms and rights of people that was widespread during Communism, but the threat of a high pollution became important in the eighties and seventies, when the environmental catastrophe was threatening some countries because of a huge industrial boom. There is another important feature of Communist regimes regarding the writers. Many of the writers were "unapproved" by the regime because of their "non Communist" thinking, and were forced to either flee the country, or stop to publish in Communist countries and also many times to do forced labours. However, there was a possibility for them to publish in abroad that was called Samizdat. Such books became famous mostly after the fall of regime, so it happened often that those writers were already dead or very poor at the time when their books became famous.

The last period of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe is called "perestrojka" which means the reorganization of the system. It was already seen at this time that such a regime is not only difficult to hold, but rather impossible. Even Gorbatschow admitted that at the beginning of his rule nobody truly understood how deep problems were the Soviets facing. The newly elected president after Gorbatschow, Boris Yeltsin said: "Our country has not been lucky. It was decided to carry out this Marxist experiment on us. In the end we proved that there is no place for this idea – it has simply pushed us off the path taken by the world's civilized countries" (Judt, 2010). There were various factors why the Soviets could not anymore rule as they expected and as they were used to. Anything the Soviets built (or they thought they did) fell down as a house from cards. It was a system working only in theory but nobody wanted to truly face the problems and was pretending that they do not see the problems, hoping with closed eyes that the downfall would never happen – ultimately it did. It was like a huge balloon filled with violation of rights of people, forcing people to do things and believe in certain ideology, to not let people get out to West,

to see the West as a threat, and what is worse – the economic system, the plans that could have never worked out for long – it all once burst. The unbearable pressure from outside and from the inhabitants themselves were stronger than anything. In 1989 it all fell down as a domino in a non violent revolution that received respective attribute – velvet.

During the years of Communism, Europe was never seen as a whole unity, obviously it could not. Anytime someone mentioned Europe – it directly received a name of which part is one talking about. While pulling the Western part by Americans and the Eastern part by the Soviets, it was obvious that Europe could not be built in one unit. What was bounding West Europeans was the common hatred and fight against Communism. On the other side, some East Europeans who were fighting against Communism were creating various associations secretly. These attempts can be seen as a certain identity building process in Europe during the Communist rule. People living on the West were preoccupied with the idea of the big threat from the Soviets while on the Eastern part of Europe people were separated by huge walls from the West. The development of divided Europe went in the opposite direction and we sadly live in its legacy until nowadays. Easterners' had been always seen as the poor part of Europe, the ones who were captured by the Soviets, ruined their economy by the Soviets and also seen as the servants of the Soviets. Quickly developing Westerners' supported by the USA, living freely and moving freely, having capitalism were seen by the Easterners' many times as the "Gods" and as the Older Brother who they suppose to follow after the fall of Communism. Because the East Europeans are perceiving the West Europeans as the role model, and seeing them as the ones who were doing the right things and were obviously jealous of them – with these acts they have been allowing the Westerners' to see the inhabitants of East Europe back-warded even until nowadays. Is it in the nature of the East Europeans to constantly think about West as the way more modern and developed trying to follow their pattern? Or is it just the stereotype of Easterners' since they had been living in this feeling for decades? Can this "Western pattern" work out for the East? Will the imaginary iron curtain between East and West once disappear forever?

Chapter III: Solidarity within Europe

This chapter covers the reasons why is it important to create or to keep some level of solidarity between European states. It also shows the fluctuating level of solidarity between Eastern and Western Europe. How differently could solidarity be defined and various approaches and opinions are going to be mentioned also.

As it had been said and written many times, people should still learn from historical precedence and it could move people forward in various life situations. Krzystof Michalski sees this example also regarding Europe and solidarity. He says the solidarity that was emerging in Poland in the eighties could offer an experience to Europe today. The solidarity was bounding people in the Eastern countries of Europe together and it ultimately lead to vital reform ended up in the velvet revolution in 1989. Michalski says it was all led by the dreams, expectation and wishes of people and we could now see its power that was leading to the "project of free society". "Today, that project might be Europe itself" (Michalski, 2006). But, why would Europe need to take example from history? I think it can be said and also seen that the last decades in Europe were somewhat frustrating. Lot of events were going on after the velvet revolution and Europe could witness more attempts of integration, mainly a try for stronger cooperation between East and West. There is an example interesting to mention. In the spring of 2002 Romano Prodi as the president of the European Commission asked to set a group of Europeans who would contribute to the process of European unification based on the common values of Europe (Michalski). Prodi was asking basic question relating to the people of Europe as "Who are we? What roots the Europeans share that is holding them together?"He was aiming at the basic principles and values Europeans could share as the citizens of the European Union that was slowly enlarging. True foundations of an identity cannot be artificially created; they need to lie on common values, shared cultural and historical background and common interests, ambitions and challenges (Michalski, 2006). "The desire for European Unity was encouraged by the common threat emanating from Communism and the Soviet Union" (Michalski, 2006). As I explained in the previous chapters, the creation of a European unity, precisely the unity of the West, was encouraged by the threat they felt from the Soviets. However, this created cooperation on the Western

part, but on the other hand, the true European cooperation and creation of common Europe including of its Eastern part was ruled out. This ended up in the creation of NATO and later in various European organizations such as the European Coal and Steel Community that we know nowadays as the European Union. There were many other organizations as EUORATOM or European Economic Community that were uniting the Western part of Europe, while the East was getting further and further from the horizon. This division has still its impact on Europe and it can be seen even today that the people of Europe would have to live in different living standards and prosperity in the upcoming years.

Solidarity and its contribution to European unification

Böckenförde sees solidarity as „a certain attachment among people and reliance upon one another, because human beings cannot lead meaningful lives alone" (Böckenförde, 2006). Solidarity can be seen in various aspects, such as political, cultural, individual or social. The definition of solidarity mentioned by Böckenförde can be applicable to the countries of Europe and the European Union. The Union can mean the attachment of countries that came together for various reasons of cooperation and mutual help. When problems occur, they suppose to be reliable and prepared to help the other in need. To say that a country could not survive on its own – as the human could not live meaningful lives alone does not have to be necessarily true. But to say it more precisely, a country choosing to stay away from the other, having no cooperation or mutual treatises with other countries could just hardly survive alone. As well as people need companions, countries need other countries too. Böckenförde says to simply talk about solidarity is impossible; it has to be always seen in a concrete ways. For example, how the goals of European integration are seen in terms of solidarity? There are several reasons why the countries of Europe have decided to cooperate with each other and form a union. It can be economic, social, developmental, cultural and many other aspects of cooperation and solidarity. Today, the EU can be perceived as a strong political and economic unity opposing to the strongest countries of the world such as China or the USA. "The sense of belonging" is an important element when it comes to solidarity. It is significant in terms of a formation of a community, where people are willing to help each other, participate in the community and being aware of the process. An example can be seen in Italy

which is developing differently in its Southern and Northern part, but despite of it, the Italians feel a sense of belonging to one common nation even though they have huge economic differences within the country (Böckenförde, 2006). At the end of his essay, Böckenförde is posing a question what has to be done in order to create a feeling of belonging among Europeans. As the first step, he highlights the shared view of history among peoples of Europe. Secondly, he lists European national awareness which should develop also with the support of national identities, but only to the extent while the national identity "embraces" and not absorbing the feelings of people. Thirdly, he proposes an establishment of a union where political goals are supported (Böckenförde, 2006).

Grabbe sees solidarity as togetherness and a will to help each other that's why there has to be among the members a common purpose they all aiming at. Grabbe came to conclusion after her analysis of situation in Europe in economic, social, foreign policy, and historical background. She suggests that regarding the budget within the EU, the member suppose to not focus on previous years and rather take a different approach when dealing with new plans, where they should take into account economic and social cohesion. After the biggest enlargement of the EU in 2004, the most of the new member states were seen as the poor countries bagging and waiting for financial aid from the big brothers. Grabbe explains that the situation of the new poorer members cannot be like this. Solidarity for the poor states of the EU should not be explained as a kind of exploitation of the richer countries regarding financial aid. The poor countries of the union have the same duty to contribute to the EU which ultimately does not have to be only in economic terms. There is a certain amount of EU money they can spend and everybody is expecting from them to spend it wisely and take an example from the countries they did so years ago (Grabbe, 2006). Immigration has become a hotly debated topic in the past years. It found its supporters and opponents as well. Immigrants are contributing to the demographic changes in Europe which does not have to be perceived in a negative way. For many countries it is unimaginable that the economies could run properly without foreign workers. The immigrants play an important role not only in economic terms, but social and cultural as well, and this has to be explained for the public. However, the immigration policy should develop more security for illegal newcomers and also to stymie the human trafficking. "Solidarity begins at home", says Grabbe (Grabbe, 2006). There is a big

dilemma countries are facing: to what extent should they subdue themselves to the EU? It is a very hard task to find balance between the nation and the EU. On the one hand, every country works on its own affairs, but on the other, they have to find some cohesion with the other members of the EU. Nowadays, when there is no war in Europe and seems to be also no communist threat, Europeans have to find another reason to "come together". The example from the post-war years as the Western part of Europe could unite is a very nice one, worthy of memorizing. Grabbe sees this reason in common destiny nowadays. She says all the countries will once find stability, but in order to find it, they need to cooperate with their neighbours in the spirit of solidarity (Grabbe, 2006).

When the war ended and the high representatives of the countries decided to form a Union, the main reasons for it was to preserve the borders of Europe after the end of Second World War, also ensure peace between France and Europe and to gain economic benefit. Nowadays, when the first two important tasks seem to be done; the economic sector seems to be problematic when it comes to cohesion and solidarity of Europe. "Now, what is still absent is that Europe might not be able to define its future shape and identity in non-economic terms" (Abrahám, 2012). What I see problematic in Europe in the last years is its absolute concentration on economy in any way. It feels as if there would be no other values than economic. Many countries were joining the EU mostly because of the vision of the economic growth and economic aid in the last years; therefore such countries are very much disappointed when it comes to crisis. Unfortunately, this seems to be applicable mostly to the smaller east European countries; however, the ones who are having economic problems recently are the southern countries of Europe. There still remains a question about the need of European identity. The EU was created basically for economic and political purposes and we can ask ourselves whether some common identity of Europeans could fit into this pattern. Abrahám argues that the crisis Europe has been facing can be seen as a "positive challenge", since after the enlargement in 2004, the European leaders knew that the economic prosperity could no longer be seen as the main source of unity within the EU (Abrahám, 2012). Positive challenge in a sense, that Europeans have to find now some other "source" of togetherness than economical. According to Abrahám, such source of togetherness could be found in the bases that formed Europe's historical identity. As first he lists philosophical and political ideals and

values, which can be today seen in liberal-democratic regimes that are ensuring to the citizens justice, democracy and freedom. The second point he mentions is art "whose richness and diversity make European civilization unique" (Abrahám, 2012). Third aspect is the common religious roots which is represented by the Judeo-Christian civilization. Europe is lacking spirituality in the last decades and the religion could be still one of the aspects that can bind Europeans together. Religion could contribute the stability of society, but in order to do so, the church and the politicians would have to find a path to each other.

"What once upon a time was the "unification of Europe" has turned into the enlargement of the EU" (Michalski, 2006). Nowadays, it is just hardly distinguishable when some speaks about Europe and the EU. There are several overlapping events where there is no EU without Europe and no Europe without the EU. Ivan Krastev says the problem of Europe and the EU today is not its unification or the enlargement but the solidarity it lacks. He says the EU is a construct made out of politics. The soul of Europe is the current political issue in Europe today. There are various groups that have been formed to find out or to contribute to the creation of Europe's identity, or to its "soul". One of these groups is the already mentioned Reflection Group initiated by Romano Prodi. According to the Reflection Group, Europe needs "political cohesion, politically grounded solidarity and common interests" (Krastev, 2006). Krastev claims Europe lacks solidarity and culture can be one of the most important elements that can bring Europeans together. The level of solidarity is not low only on institutional level, but sadly also on individual. People who believe the EU is not simply a common market or a security space should be bothered about the lack of solidarity. Krastev talks about three main sources that were bounding Eastern states together and are not present anymore which means East Europeans states are facing even bigger "solidarity crisis" than the Western ones. He lists three sources of Eastern Solidarity: "communist state they opposed, economy deficit and sense of national dignity" (Krastev, 2006). Krastev claims the debate between church and politicians should be very important in a sense of building a common European project. The reason for this is that from historical development, Europe cannot be seen simply without religion which still plays a crucial role. He continues that such a debate could be very difficult, because the European Left highlights the secular character of Europe as one of the corner stones for the definition of the new European identity (Krastev, 2006).

However, as Islam is rising in Europe, the significance of religion is changing its character. This can be one of the reasons for the strengthening of the Church and also increase of its followers.

Conclusion

The task of this thesis was to find out how was the European identity developing after the Second World War, what were its difficulties and how do people perceive Europe's identity recently in the globalizing world. I was working with the assumption that the World War II put Europe down on its knees very deeply and in order to recover, it needed a strong will of all people of Europe to hold Europe together and build it up again. However, it seems that Europe is challenged by the question of its identity until nowadays when globalization has brought changes which are influencing the relations between the inhabitants.

The first chapter of the thesis shows various definitions of the term identity and describes it from various viewpoints. It is important to include such part in order to show the term "identity" is not so easy to define and understand. The types of identities have indicated that a certain feeling of belonging to some group does not have to be necessarily determinate specifically but that it could fuse with other, already existing, identities. This is very significant in a sense that the people of Europe are not forced to define themselves in a single term or nation anymore. The inhabitants are not forced to specify their origin as it was important decades ago when even a double nationality could cause problems. People are free to be part of more than one nationality and also have a feeling of being true Europeans without shame.

The second chapter of the work shows the difficulties Europe was facing and ultimately the result of these. I have decided to include quite strong historical background of the post-war era because I have seen the corner stone in these years regarding the development of Europe. As it was said by Tony Judt, the Second World War gave Europe a new birth, therefore this epoch is one of the most important in the recent history of Europe and has still indispensable echo. The division of Europe to Eastern and Western block was a very serious one, mainly because of the opposite development of the blocks which resulted in some cases in trauma. Such a development was pushing both blocks on the different edges and the unification of Europe seemed to be unthinkable. However, what is more important is the contribution of such event to the cohesion of people. It is very interesting to see the

power of the fear that was emerging in both blocks. There was the fear from Communism in the West block which led the countries to form various unions and increased the cooperation between the states. It created a certain Western identity with capitalism and liberalist values. While on the other side of the iron curtain the firm hands of Stalin and his successors were trying to build a strong Soviet block using the Marxist and socialist ideals. Different development in the Eastern block created mistrustful and doubtful feelings in its inhabitants, mainly in scholars and artist who were often forming secret associations. A certain identity building process could be seen in such secret associations but also in the way of how people think. People living in the East Europe, behind the huge walls and barbed wires, were eager to cross these obstacles. These wishes and hopes for better life created incredible feelings and trust among people which bound them together and slowly built up a unity which was ready to make a change. The long-awaited wind of change came and blew out the walls and wires which had been separating families and friends. The paradise, as the West was long seen by East European people, opened and come with new hope for cohesion. From this time a slow process of integration can be seen between the former blocks which culminated in the accession of the eastern countries into the European Union. Sadly, there are still many prejudices present in Europe and it can be observed that the iron curtain has not vanished totally. However, I think we can witness now that the poorer east countries, as the members of the EU, are proving year by year their slowly growing power.

The last part of the thesis deals with the problem Europe and its states are facing, lack of solidarity. This can be seen in the mistrust towards the EU and the unwillingness to help the other members in need. People are not that enthusiastic about the EU anymore, doubting their position in the EU and some member states started to lead more national oriented politics. Globalization has brought changes in system and in many fields of everyday life which results in the inability of the people to cope with it. The EU was primarily seen as an economic union in the last decades. Unfortunately, it has failed at some point to fulfil this belief. Due this reason it is necessary to find other values than economical to bring people of Europe back together and create cohesion. To be sympathetic to others means to help the other in need. This is what Europeans did after the war, during depressions and threatening situations. It is the same East Europeans did in their fight against the aggressor in order to succeed.

People of Europe could come together in any deep and hostile situation and fight the enemy. However we can not talk about any dangerous enemy nowadays, it seems the feeling of belonging is seriously threatened and Europeans would have to find again the way out from the tunnel.

What is the European identity? It is the will, the power, the courage, the hope, the strength, solidarity and kindness of the people of Europe to unite and create a way they would walk together. It is also the common values all the people of Europe share, the blood they have left on the battlefields, the tortures they have resisted, the hostile situations they have faced and the strong will to come together. It was not a single French, English, Italian, Spanish, Belgian nation who suffered in the post-war years, who built the houses again and helped to save others. It was a cooperation of the nations, of European nations. It was not a single Polish, Czech, Slovak or Hungarian nation who contributed to velvet revolution. It was the nations of Europe. The strength of Europeans lies in the fact that they can come together and become very strong. It is the identity of Europe. The ability to do so. To unite and have enough willingness to change things and lead events to the successful end. It is also the power of the people who yesterday fought against each other but they are capable to fight on the same side today. Anybody can have these attributes but not everybody have the courage and willingness to use them. I do not think Europeans have special attributes, but I was trying to show that after such terrifying and bloody history the people of Europe formed a unity that is enlarging and are able to stand on one side. I tried to show the situation in Europe was maybe more special and unique than in the other parts of the world. The identity of Europeans can be seen from many various perspectives, in negative, neutral or positive. This work tried to bring the strength of European identity and sees it in a progressive positive way to prove that Europeans built their identity on the very strong basis.

Resumé

Moja bakalárska práca sa venuje otázke Európskej identity a aspektom ktoré prispeli k jej formovaniu, alebo naopak, k jej úpadku či dokonca kríze. Je viacero dôvodov prečo som sa rozhodla písať práve o Európskej identite. Po prvé, je veľmi dôležité aby sme poznali históriu svojho národa, ktorý nekončí výlučne štátnymi hranicami ale siaha oveľa ďalej. Sme súčasťou Európy a dovolím si tvrdiť že posledné dekády nemôžeme túto súčasť vnímať len zo zemepisného hľadiska. Už samotná existencia Európskej únie ktorá sa rokmi rozrastá, prispieva k tomu že sa z nás Európanov stáva jedna veľká rodina. A tak ako každá rodina, aj štáty Európskej únie sú ako na jednej sínusoide, raz hore inokedy dole. Keďže za posledné roky môžeme byť svedkami rôznych nezrovnalostí v rámci Európskej únie, dokonca niektorí tvrdia že Európa čelí kríze identity, rozhodla som sa napísať prácu o vývoji Európskej spolupatričnosti a skúmať vývoj a silu Európskej identity.

Úvodná kapitola bakalárskej práce sa zaoberá termínom identita. Na úvod je veľmi dôležité zadefinovať si základné pojmy, teda v tomto prípade identitu, pre ujasnenie si základných pojmov. Pojem identita je opísaná a vysvetlená z rôzneho uhľa pohľadu a rôznymi definíciami a práve týmto sa dokazuje rôznorodosť tohto pojmu. Vývoj identity v Európe bol silno podmienený základnými hodnotami a normami, ktoré sú vysvetlené na základe chápania hodnôt Jurgenom Habermasom. Habermas vysvetľuje potrebu a význam ľudských hodnôt a základných práv človeka ktoré sa stali nevyhnutnou súčasťou každej demokratickej krajiny a teda prispeli aj k formovaniu Európskeho ducha. Pojmom identita sa zaoberá aj Gerard Delanty ktorý tvrdí že práve tento pojem bol len zriedka presne vysvetlený a práve preto viedol mnohokrát k nejasným debatám. Delanty vidí neustále prepojenie identity z niekým či niečím, či už s ľuďmi, skupinami alebo organizáciami a pomenúva rôzne aspekty identity. Keďže väčšina krajín Európy je už súčasťou Európskej únie, vzniká otázka či je možné vytvoriť si popri národnej identite aj Európsku bez toho, aby sa ľudia museli vzdať svojej národnej identity. Thomas Riise ponúka viacero možností ako takáto fúzia identít môže nastať. Riise tvrdí, že národná identita a Európska môžu existovať paralelne, že človek môže pociťovať tak národné cítenie ako aj Európske. Riise vidí skôr problém v ponímaní a chápaní Európy. Európa môže predstavovať pre každý

národ niečo iné a jej význam sa môže taktiež meniť. Európu vníma Riise ako niečo prázdne, ako kôš, ktorý sa napĺňa tým čo doňho ľudia hodia. Ďalší problém v chápaní slova Európan môžeme pozorovať pri rôznorodých črtách jej obyvateľstva. Človek sa môže opýtať čo už len jeden Španiel a Fín môžu mať spoločné. Odpoveď na túto otázku možno hľadať v tvrdení Ludwiga Wittgensteina, ktorý hovorí že nie je nutné hľadať rovnaké črty a charakteristiky spoločné všetkým, ale skôr sa zamerať na podobnosti a vzťahy ktoré sa vytvárajú. Je to jeho teória rodinných podobností ktorá sa dá aplikovať aj na rôzne národy Európy, medzi ktorými je vytvorený istý reťazec podobností a vzťahov ktorými sú prepojené.

Druhá kapitola sa venuje historickému vývoju Európy po druhej svetovej vojne, a zároveň tým vysvetľuje ťažkosti ktorým Európa a jej obyvatelia museli čeliť. Napriek tomu že vojna v Európe skončila, povojnová éra priniesla ďalšie ťažkosti a tí ktorí sa tešili že prežili vojnu si ešte stále nemohli vydýchnuť. Dôvodov bolo mnoho: choroby ktoré sa šírili, nedostatočná hygiena, zlá výživa, nízka úroda, mnohé rozbité rodiny, vojaci vracajúci sa z frontu a chaos medzi utečencami a ľuďmi ktorí prežili hrôzy koncentračných táborov. Európa bola takpovediac na kolenách a bez zahraničnej pomoci by sa len ťažko zvládala postaviť opäť na nohy. Akékoľvek ťažkosti povojnová éra priniesla, Európania sa vedeli zhodnúť v jednom – ďalšiu vojnu už nechceli. Druhá svetová vojna priniesla tie najhoršie skutky aké sa v dejinách ľudstva stali, ale môžeme povedať že práve tým priniesla aj nový začiatok. Povojnová Európa bola érou budovania „novej Európy", kde nenávisť a násilie nemalo miesta. Táto kapitola taktiež obsahuje názory a prognózy ako sa povojnová Európa mohla, alebo mala vyvíjať. Pre toto vysvetlenie som použila názory pána Istvána Bíboa, ktorý tvrdí že najvýznamnejšie faktory ovplyvňujúce povojnovú Európu budú konzervatívne, progresívne a statické. Konzervatívny pohľad je reprezentovaný armádou a cirkvou, progresívny robotníkmi a statický byrokraciou a roľníckou triedou. Ďalej kapitola opisuje blížiacu sa studenú vojnu a následné rozdelenie Európy na Východnú a Západnú a zároveň ťažkosti ktoré toto delenie prinieslo. Zahŕňa aj proces rozširovania komunizmu vo Východnej Európe a vysvetľuje ako Stalin dokázal využiť svoju moc natoľko, že ovládol celú Východnú Európu. Práve toto rozdelenie Európy a rôznorodý politický i sociálny vývoj jednotlivých blokov prispel k obrovskému rozdielu medzi krajinami Východného a Západného bloku ktoré sú badateľné dodnes.

Tretia kapitola sa zaoberá problémom vzájomnej solidarity medzi Európskymi krajinami. Solidarita hrala veľmi dôležitú úlohu napríklad pri nežnej revolúcii, keďže dokázala spojiť ľudí a národy aby úspešne bojovali za jeden určitý cieľ. Poľský filozof Krzysztof Michalski si myslí že práve táto solidarita ktorá spájala Východnú Európu počas nežnej revolúcie by mohla byť príkladom pre dnešnú Európu. Posledné roky sa v Európe niesli hlavne v duchu spolupráce a rozširovania Európskej únie, ale taktiež môžeme konštatovať že bola badateľná silná frustrácia a napätie medzi krajinami. Solidarita môže byť charakterizovaná v rôznych politických, kultúrnych, individuálnych či sociálnych aspektoch. Základom solidarity je vzájomná pomoc. Tak ako ľudia nevedia viesť zmysluplný život sami, ani krajiny ktoré sa dištancujú od ostatných a nespolupracujú s ostatnými krajinami len ťažko dokážu fungovať normálne. Aj krajiny Európy sa rozhodli vytvoriť istú úniu, ktorú dnes poznáme pod názvom Európska únia. Dnes je Európska únia považovaná za jedna z najznámejších únií, ktorá dokáže čeliť najsilnejším krajinám sveta. Avšak práve solidarita a spolupatričnosť medzi krajinami EÚ sa v posledných rokoch stáva čoraz viac diskutabilná. Pri niektorých vážnych rozhodnutiach krajín EÚ môžeme byť svedkami ich nejednotnosti a zároveň pocitu odmietania pomoci iným krajinám. Mnohí známi filozofi, sociológovia či politológovia sa pýtajú a zároveň snažia nájsť odpoveď na otázku: Čo je nutné urobiť aby sa posilnila vzájomná spolupatričnosť medzi krajinami EÚ? Vážnou chybou ktorú krajiny a ľudia robia že vnímajú EÚ zväčša len v ekonomickom svetle. Každý sa začal spoliehať na finančnú pomoc od Únie a keď zrazu prišla kríza a niet toľko peňazí na koľko sme boli zvyknutí, depresia prišla v pravom slova zmysle. Hodnoty ktoré sme si vytvorili mali príliš silný ekonomický základ a pritom sme zabudli na ostatné dôležité hodnoty. Podľa politológa Samuela Abraháma by Európa mala čerpať nové hodnoty zo základov ktoré formovali Európsku identitu v histórii. Symbolicky sú to tri aspekty ktoré predstavujú reťaz Atény- Jeruzalem- Paríž v zmysle filozofia- náboženstvo a umenie.

Záver práce opisuje jednotlivé kapitoly a stručne vysvetľuje dôvody a dôsledky ku ktorým kapitoly dospeli. Obsahuje taktiež záverečnú myšlienku ku ktorej práca dospela. Ňou je práve Európska identita a jej vývoj v spoločnosti. Európska identita je v závere práce charakterizovaná ako vôľa, sila, odvaha, nádej a solidarita Európskeho ľudu vďaka čomu sa Európania dokázali zjednotiť a vytvoriť cestu po ktorej dokážu spoločne kráčať i dnes. Súčasťou Európskej identity sú aj hodnoty ktoré jej ľudia

zdieľajú, všetky nepriateľské situácie ktorým čelili, vojny ktoré prekonali a práve sila ktorá ich vždy dokázala spojiť. Sila ktorá dokázala spojiť aj tých najhorších nepriateľov a vôľa ľudí zabudnúť na nevraživosť a hnev a vytvoriť spojenie. Práca sa snažila ukázať túto silu a ochotu Európskeho ľudu a ako jedným z dôkazov by som uviedla Európsku úniu ktorá sa neustále rozrastá. Práca sa snažila taktiež dokázať že vývoj identity sa niesol aj v progresívnom pozitívnom duchu a Európania si postavili svoju identitu na pevných základoch.

Bibliography

Abrahám, S. (2012). *A Crisis of European Identity.* Bratislava: IRIS.

Arendt, H. (1958). Ideology and Terror: A Novel Form of Government. In H. Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (s. 460-479). New York: Meridian Books.

Banke, C. (2009). *The Legacies of the Holocaust and European Identity After 1989.* Coppenhagen: Vesterkopi AS. Dostupné na Internete: DIIS Working Paper.

Bibó, I. (1996). Cesta z krízy. In I. Bibó, *Bieda Východoeurópskych malých štátov* (s. 120-144). Bratislava: Kalligram.

Böckenförde, E. (2006). Conditions for European Solidarity. In K. Michalski, *What Holds Europe Together?* (s. 30-42). Budapest: Central European University Press.

Delanty, G. (23. November 2003). *Is There a European Identity?* Dostupné na Internete: Global Dialogue: www.worlddialogue.org

Grabbe, H. (2006). What Hope for Solidarity in the Enlarged Union? In K. Michalski, *What Holds Europe Together?* (s. 42-54). Budapest: Central European University Press.

Habermas, J. (2011). *K ústave Európy.* Bratislava: Kalligram.

Havel, V. (21. Jun 2000). *Is There a European Identity, Is There a Europe?* Dostupné na Internete: Project Syndicate: http://www.project-syndicate.org/

Judt, T. (2010). *Postwar.* London: Vintage Books.

Judt, T. (2010). Rethinking Post-War Europe. *IWMPost*, 4.

Krastev, I. (2006). Europe's Solidarity Deficit. In K. Michalski, *What Holds Europe Together?* (s. 143-145). Budapest: Central European Unviersity Press.

Krastev, I. (2010). Europe: A Retired Power. *IWMPost*, 5.

Lloyd, J. (2005). Old Europe, New Europe, Core Europe: Transatlantic Relations After Iraq. *Democratiya*, 29-40.

Michalski, K. (2006). *What Holds Europe Together?* Budapest: Central European University Press.

Risse, T. (2003). *European Institutions and Identity Change: What Have We Learned?* Berlin: Department of Political and Social Sciences.

Wittgenstein, L. (1963). Philosophical investigations. In L. Wittgenstein, *Concepts* (s. 171-174). Massachusetts: Bradford.

Wittgenstein, L. (1963). Philosophical investigations. In L. Wittgenstein, *Concepts* (s. 171-174). Massachusetts: Bradford.