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Michał Krzyżanowski, Anna Triandafyllidou and Ruth Wodak

The European Public Sphere: debates in academia and EU politics

Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, we have witnessed a significant growth of academic interest in complex issues related to the public sphere (Wodak and Koller, 2008). Significantly fostered by the first English translation of Jürgen Habermas’ seminal work on The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (Habermas, 1996), research on the public sphere has provided a variety of theoretical approaches which either postulate the imminent demise of the public sphere in (late) modern democracies (see Calhoun, 1992; Crossley and Roberts, 2004), or relate the evident crisis of the (national) public sphere(s) to the growth of global tendencies rooted in the emergent transnationalization of media production and reception (Fraser, 2003).

It was particularly the second of the post-Habermasian approaches that influenced the debates on the European Public Sphere (henceforth EPS) which were initiated when the public sphere-oriented academic disputes reached Europe and became tied to the then-ongoing (predominantly normative, political-scientific) debates about the crisis of the European Union as a democratic, supranational constellation (see Majone, 1994; Moravcsik, 1998; Weiler et al., 2005). In what followed, a number of theoretical discussions about the need for creating a strong EPS were developed against the background of a claim that, without the EPS which could link the EU with its citizens/demos, no actual democratization of the EU could take place (Habermas, 2001a; Trenz and Eder, 2004). It was also argued that the then-state-of-the-art of the EPS did not allow for any prediction of its imminent development (see Grimm, 1995; Kielmansegg, 1996) or any prompt achievement of its ‘strength’ and ‘quality’ (see Langenbucher and Latzer, 2006; Splichal, 2006). In particular, Splichal (2006) posed the relevant questions of whether the EPS is quasi ‘imposed’ and ‘essentialized’ by the EU or the researchers involved in trying to investigate it; and whether media analysis
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is the best and only way to investigate a possibly existing EPS, or whether other data or other theories should be drawn upon.

The academic debates on EPS, however, were, if not results of, then at least parallel to the new discussions on the public sphere in political discourses at the supranational level. The European Commission’s *White Paper on European Governance* (2001) already pointed to a ‘widening gulf between the [EU] and the people it serves’ (see also Wodak and Wright, 2006, 2007). It was emphasized that not only does the EU suffer from a *de facto* inability to act, but the bloc is not even given credit when it actually undertakes appropriate actions. This results from the fact that ‘Brussels is too easily blamed by member states for difficult decisions that they themselves have agreed to or even requested’ (European Commission, 2001: 7–8). Taken together with the phenomenon that many people simply do not understand the mechanisms of the institutions, these issues lead to disenchantment and a lack of trust. An analysis of the situation suggests that, while these problems are not entirely of the EU’s own making and are not always fair, they are primarily the result of insufficient knowledge and communication and a ‘closeness deficit’. The problems arising from the ‘closeness deficit’ between the EU and its citizens underline the fact that the bloc can no longer derive legitimacy solely from its ability to improve trade and complete the internal market: ‘Its legitimacy today depends on involvement and participation’, and thus ‘the linear model of dispensing policies from above must be replaced by a virtuous circle, based on feedback, networks and involvement from policy creation to implementation at all levels’ (ibid.: 11). The proposals in the *White Paper* are thus underpinned by five principles of good governance – openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence – which are said to reinforce two further basic principles: proportionality and subsidiarity. Clearly, the communication deficit and the need to improve European governance as regards participation, accountability and openness, among other principles, are questions closely related to the existence and functioning of an EPS (see also Graham, 2008; Koller and Wodak, 2008; Wright, 2008).

However, while the European Commission’s 2001 *White Paper* was signalling the likely development of the EU’s problems due to its lack of openness to, and closeness with its citizens, the ensuing events of the post-Nice process showed that what was once predicted in the *White Paper* was now becoming part of the reality. By 2005, the failure of almost all major EU ‘democratization’ projects had become obvious, which, defined jointly as the EU Constitutional Reform (see Krzyżanowski and Oberhuber, 2007), definitely reached their end with the radical rejection of the draft EU Constitutional Treaty in France and the Netherlands in 2005. In the aftermath of those failures, the EU (or, strictly speaking, the European Commission), invented a new ‘project’ called the ‘European Communication Policy’. Resulting in diverse types of policy documents which describe strategies of how to recommunicate Europe to the public and reconnect the former with the latter
Introduction

(see European Commission, 2005a, 2005b, 2006c), this new agenda culminated in a White Paper on European Communication Policy (2006a) which claims that ‘Europe’s communication with its citizens has not kept pace’ (European Commission, 2005a: 2) and that a large-scale debate on means and strategies of communicating Europe to the public must be initiated in order to ‘close the gap’ (ibid.). However, while using more or less the same set of ‘gap’ arguments as the 2001 White Paper on European Governance (see above), the White Paper on European Communication Policy goes further and devotes a whole section of its Part I to the explicit clarification of why and how to construct the EPS. As suggested in that section:

[M]any of the policy decisions that affect daily life for people in the EU are taken at European level. People feel remote from these decisions, the decision-making process and EU institutions. There is a sense of alienation from ‘Brussels’, which partly mirrors the disenchantment with politics in general. One reason for this is the inadequate development of a ‘European public sphere’ where the European debate can unfold. (European Commission, 2006a: 4)

Moreover, we learn from the White Paper on European Communication Policy that the EPS should occur at a national rather than supranational or international levels. Based on the premise that ‘people learn about politics and political issues largely through their national education systems and via their national, regional and local media’ (ibid.), a proposal is hence put forward that constructing the EPS necessitates that Europe ‘needs to find its place in the existing national, regional and local “public spheres” and the public discussion across member states must be deepened’ (ibid., p. 5). However, as it later becomes clear, what the European Commission has in mind in its White Paper is what could be defined as a (rather questionable) ‘deficiency-model of an EPS’. The latter should be constructed by adding a European dimension to the national debates and, by highlighting deficiencies in national governance, should foreground the advantages of EU policies; ‘that is why national public authorities, civil society, and the European Union institutions need to work together to develop Europe’s place in the public sphere’ (ibid.)

Aims and focus of this volume

As the backdrop to these scholarly and political debates, several empirical studies (see Downey and Koenig, 2006; Eder and Kantner, 2002; Gerhards, 1993; Koopmans and Erbe, 2003; Risse and van de Steeg, 2003; Statham and Grey, 2005; Trenz, 2004) attempt to show how, mainly through the progress of the so-called ‘Europeanization of national media’ or through the rise of common or similar ways of referring to and interpreting specifically European occurrences, an EPS was already ‘in the making’. However, these empirical
approaches share several characteristics: they are all rather ‘incidental’, synchronic case studies of isolated EU-specific or EU-rooted events (e.g. the 2000 Austrian ‘Haider Crisis’) and employ solely quantitative methods (content analysis and frame analysis). Additionally, all of the empirical approaches to the EPS to date have clearly disregarded the historical aspect of the development of the EPS (for example, the impact of the Cold War), and assigned a unique role to the EU as a crucial point of reference on the basis of which the EPS could or should be created.

This volume, in contrast, hopes to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies of recent empirical research on the EPS, from both an interdisciplinary and a critical point of view. It thus presents an empirical and longitudinal study of how, if at all, a European Public Sphere was created in the national media of several European countries at various critical times of post-war European history. The book illustrates how various disruptive moments in the history of Europe after 1945 (i.e. various ‘crisis events’, see below) caused a differentiated representation and negotiation of ‘Europe’ and Europe-oriented notions (e.g. ‘European values’, ‘European identity’ and the like) in the domestic public spheres of several European countries (see also Krzyżanowski, 2009; Krzyżanowski and Wodak, 2006a). Unlike earlier studies on the EPS, our approach is diachronic/longitudinal and predominantly qualitative. By studying the diachronic development of the EPS from a discourse-analytical perspective, we are able to show how different EPS-constitutive media discourses changed over time and in different contexts. We thus avoid (over-)generalizations (at the level of theory and analysis), typical of quantitative research on the EPS. By analysing different discursive patterns of ‘talking about Europe’ in the national media over time, we capture the qualitative and changing features of discursive constructions of Europe and the nation-state at different times of crisis. Thus, we adopt an abductive and retroductive approach (‘back-and-forth procedure’; see Reisigl and Wodak, 2001, 2009) which allows continuous mediation between theoretical exploration and empirically grounded and methodologically rigorous analysis (see below). This book is a follow-up and further development of our own contributions to the recent debates on the EPS, i.e. a set of critical discourse-analytic studies (see Kovács and Wodak, 2003; Oberhuber et al., 2005) and a set of diachronic perspectives on how Europe, as a social and political concept, has been constructed in national media (see Stråth and Triandafyllidou, 2003).

Our research aims to escape the normative and, to an extent, deterministic perspectives on the EPS proposed so far (see above). The first crucial feature of our approach resides in its novel, open, yet historically conditioned way of defining and exploring the potential existence of an EPS. Thus, we define the EPS as a transnational arena of communication where social, political, institutional, cultural and economic actors voice their opinions and ideas which are then discussed, distributed and negotiated with reference to different (crucial) events. Such a transnational public sphere is European in three distinct and
interrelated ways. It is European from a geographical perspective, defining Europe as the geographical area between the Atlantic and the Urals, the North Sea and the Mediterranean. It is European from the point of view of intellectual traditions in that it bears within it ideas and conceptions of European history, culture and modernity (see Stråth, 2000a, 2000c). And thirdly it is European in that it is a common arena where the existence, shape and scope of Europe and Europeanness, European unity or conflict, similarity or diversity, are discussed and contested. Thus our working definition of the EPS is not merely tied to geographical or geopolitical – seemingly neutral or objective – definitions. It recognizes the power games and struggles within the very definition and historically situated character of what Europe is or might be (Wodak and Weiss, 2007).

Within our conception of the EPS, we ascribe a unique role to the (national) media as the key carriers of the ongoing negotiations of different ideas and different actors’ standpoints. Although the EPS may be seen as constructed at all times, one can observe a unique acceleration of its explicit/implicit constructions at disruptive moments in history, at times of international ‘crisis events’ (such as those studied in this book). During crises, perceptions and definitions of political objects of reference (such as Europe or the nation-state) are contested, negotiated, reformulated and reorganized. Our perspective on the role of different actors in creating the EPS also carries a significantly novel feature. We do not a priori ascribe a particular (crucial) role to different actors in the creation of the EPS (as was the case with, for example, the unique agency of the EU and its representatives/institutions in recent EPS-oriented empirical studies and political debates) but we attempt to discover which individual and collective, social, political, institutional, cultural and economic actors were indeed crucial for the diachronic construction of the EPS.

In our view, the construction and functions of an EPS involve a continuous interaction and intertwining between different (nationally and transnationally incepted) ideas/viewpoints and various ethical notions, that are central to the negotiation and legitimation of different forms of (collective) identities. Therefore, we argue, the analysis of the construction of the EPS must not only consider the ways in which different ideas are portrayed or represented in discourse, but it also entails the analysis of how these discursively formed ideas are related to ethically charged notions (such as different values, see also below) and how the latter are mobilized to construct various forms of (intra- and/or inter-)national or pan-European sameness/collectiveness or difference (Gemeinschaftlichkeit or Fremdheit; see Giesen, 1993). Hence, in our discourse-historical analysis of the construction of the EPS in the national media, we study how different values are discursively constructed and negotiated so as to legitimize different viewpoints debated in/through the public sphere and the media (Wodak et al., 1999, 2009).

The existence of a transnational public sphere, such as the European one, involves common issues debated at the same time by a variety of actors
and located in different places which virtually recognize and interact with one another (see Schulz-Forberg, 2005). For a common transnational public sphere to exist these debates must have a common focus on different values and the questioning of these values. A transnational, and for that matter trans-cultural, EPS thus requires shared debates questioning certain values. In order to investigate and assess this feature of the EPS, we explore whether and how Europe is debated in national media as an ethically charged notion and also whether and how national ethics and values have been explicitly Europeanized or domesticated (i.e. reappropriated/recontextualized for specifically national purposes), during selected crisis events.

We claim that moments/events of crisis are crucial for the ethically based negotiation of Europe and/or the nation(-state). It is within these crises that values are sometimes violated (e.g. values of freedom, or human rights) while different actors also use those crises to express (in/through the media) their defence of other values (e.g. democracy, social justice or peace) with a view to legitimizing their ideas about the existing social, political and economic order (see also Stråth and Wodak in this volume). It is within those crises, understood here as disruptive moments of history, that sensitive perceptions of different common objects of reference (e.g. ‘Europe’, ‘nation-state’ and relations between them) become particularly salient and vibrant, and open for a context dependent (re-)negotiation and (re-)appropriation. By the same token, the diachronic examination of the context-specific negotiations of different values at times of crisis allows us to assess whether Europe still remains the sole ‘invention of nation-states’ (Malmborg and Stråth, 2002) or whether it has already become a concept for post-national ways of thinking and talking about Europe (Krzyżanowski and Oberhuber, 2007).

Finally, an important and novel aspect of this book is its emphasis on the links between discourse, media and history in the study of the EPS. In this book, discourse is seen as a strictly historical construct which is based on the ongoing negotiation of concepts and ideas developed in both synchronic and diachronic dimensions (Wodak, 1996). It is in those different historically specific contexts that various social and political concepts (in the understanding of the German Begriffsgeschichte or ‘conceptual history’, see Koselleck, 1979, 1985) are negotiated. These concepts may be recontextualized and redefined (Wodak, 2001) both in a historical/diachronic and in a synchronic dimension (discourse-historical approach). In this perspective, our key concept of ‘Europe’ is also seen ‘as a discourse…under continuous negotiation and re-negotiation’ (Stråth, 2000c: 14). Thus, different ways of understanding ‘Europe’ in different contexts change in discourse over time, creating ever-newer ways of understanding Europe as well as its media-negotiated, EPS-specific semantic fields (Ifversen, 2003; Koselleck, 2002) and its neighbouring- or counter-concepts (Nebenbegriffe or Gegenbegriffe, Koselleck, 1979).
Methodology

The empirical studies presented in Part II of this volume focus on how Europe, as an ethically charged idea, has been negotiated during selected periods of crisis in: (a) national public spheres of selected countries and (b) in a transnational EPS. Thus, by presenting a set of case studies of media discourses on the key crisis events of post-war European history, we illustrate in detail the difference between the two phenomena – i.e. national vs. transnational/European public spheres. We investigate whether the media-negotiation of crisis events of post-war European history gave rise to the elaboration of different (European) values, to the construction of different conceptions of Europe (and of the related notions of Europeanness and European identity), and whether and how discourses on Europe and values were linked in media discourses as well as how they might have changed over time.

Our case studies of media discourse analyse the media coverage of the following crisis events in post-war European history:

1. The revolution in Budapest and the following intervention of the Soviet troops in Hungary in October and November 1956 (Chapter 4);
2. The definite separation of East (i.e. Soviet-controlled) and West Berlin through the building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 (Chapter 5);
3. The student and public protests in Paris in May 1968 (Chapter 6);
4. The political reform in Czechoslovakia and the subsequent invasion of the country by the Soviet-controlled Warsaw Pact forces in August 1968 (Chapter 7);
5. The imposition of the ‘State of War’ in Poland by the Soviet-obedient and military-controlled Polish government in December 1981 (Chapter 8);
6. The opening of the border between East and West Berlin and the ensuing ‘fall of the Berlin Wall’ in November 1989 (Chapter 9);
7. The invasion of Iraq by the United States and its allies and the outbreak of the Second Gulf War in March 2003 (Chapter 10);
8. The debate on the publication of the Mohammed cartoons in several European countries in February 2006 (Chapter 11).

These eight crisis events form a coherent thread running through contemporary European history (largely parallel to the history of the European integration processes) and represent some of the major political challenges faced by European countries in the post-war period (see also Kaye in this volume). The selection of these events gives this book a unique historical perspective coupled with an emphasis on the context at the time of each event and on the comparative media analysis between several European countries.5

To provide a maximally international perspective on the analysed events, each chapter investigates their media coverage simultaneously in several