European identity through multicultural and multinational prism: Questions of Perceptions and Perspectives

Neeta Inamdar and Praveen Shetty

It is natural that the European scholars claim an upper-hand over others in understanding the intricacies of the European identity as majority of the work on the process comes from their end. It is also welcome as the Europeans are known to be open to self-criticism and the reflections that are brought out are often genuine and objective. What they miss out however, is a view from outside the "fortress". The present paper, therefore, intends to look at the European identity from an Indian perspective. An understanding of this identity creation process through the prism of multicultural experience of India would provide interesting insights into the idea and policies of European Union.

By virtues of diversities that they possess and portray, if both India and Europe are multicultural, why does one proudly and boldly postures it before the world as the other seems to suspiciously look at its own "web of cultural complexities" and struggles to bring in an idea of collective identity for self. The paper aims to understand, through a comparative study, the principles on which the European Union and independent India are formed and the references and emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism in the communication policies of both regions.The paper would make an attempt to analyse the factors that enabled or hindered the two regions in developing a strong 'identity' that they set to form as their objective.

In current times, the concept of identity carries the full weight of the need for a sense of who one is, together with an often overwhelming pace of changing surroundings, social contexts-changes in the groups and networks in which people and their identities are embedded and in the societal structures and practices in which those networks are themselves embedded (Howard, 2000). The efforts of EU to create a pan-European identity that transcends the issues of nation-state and to provide a sense of commonality in the midst of diversity make the concept of European Union an interesting phenomenon at the global stage.The notion of European Union as a distinct entity involves complex layers of unification of discrete identities and a concerted effort on the part of

the Union to unify the apparently-diverse forces. The process inevitably demands a meticulous political and communication policy aimed at creating a socio-cultural fabric that identifies itself with the European Union.

The *White Paper on A European Communication Policy* (2006) states that the 'public sphere' within which political life takes place in Europe is largely a 'national sphere' and there exists a void in terms of a strong European identity. Interestingly, India as a nation, in spite of its vast religious, linguistic, regional and ethnic diversity has managed to uphold and even thrive on its acceptance of multiculturalism as a way of life and has been able to instil a sense of 'identity' that transcends the multitude of differences quite akin to the differences that exist within the European Union.

Going to the larger globalized world, an Indian carries a national identity rather than his linguistic, regional or community identities which exist strongly outside and independent of the national identity. However, a European still carries his national identity to the outer world. In Europe, a complex interaction takes place between the institutions of EU and the institutions of separate nation–states. (Dijkstra, Geuijen, Ruijter, 2001). The questions concerning immigration, exclusion and attempt to find commonality complicate the 'identity' within the imagined community of EU , whereas India seem to have formed an 'identity' with ease within its vast diversity of region, language and religion due to its historical formation as a nation state. Certainly, the idea of multiculturalism demands a new way of life in a society where positive accommodation of group differences is required through a concerted effort of the society as a whole, and would be complicated when it is imposed from the above.

History shows that trade, language, religion, and regional or ethnic identities were the basis for national solidarities. Karl Deutsch (1966) has explored this issue. The central problem of modern society for Deutsch was how it would be that occupational and class groups who controlled society could convince those who had less income, wealth, and status that in spite of these inequalities, everyone could be unified by a common cultural identity. To attain this identity, groups higher up in status had to find organizational means and forms of communication to create a horizontal community united by these goals. Nationality is one kind of community that can be created by communicating common values and creating a sense that people share a

common culture. But in order to attain this, there has to be an alliance between the members of disparate social groups. Deutsch places the problem of communication and culture at the center of his theory of the emergence of a national identity. A nation-state will come into existence when a national 'story' exists and once in existence, the state apparatus will be used to reproduce the nation (Fligstein, 2008).As such, it is essential to have an appropriate communication policy in the process of identity creation so that the people involved in the process find a sense of belongingness to the 'cultural identity'.

Deutsch's theory helps us make sense of what has and has not happened in Europe in the past fifty years. A European identity is first and foremost going to arise among people who associate with each other across national boundaries. As European economic, social, and political fields develop, they cause the regular interaction of people from divergent societies. It is the people who are involved in these routine interactions who are most likely to come to see themselves as Europeans and as involved in a European national project (Fligstein, 2008). In order to achieve this people participation, it is imperative to include an opportunity for social interaction of divergent groups on one level, and provide an outward image of oneness on the other.

Europeanism and Identity

Europeanism is defined as the attitude which sees the well-being, destiny and institutions of the major European states as so closely linked by geographical and historical circumstances that no cogent political action can be successfully pursued in one state without some reference to, and attempt to achieve integration with others (Scruton, 1996). Though it looks like an ideal situation, it is not easily achievable despite the optimism of neo-functionalists.

The continuously evolving geographical boundaries of Europe make it difficult for people to define Europeanism. Probably, Europe remains an only entity which has its map redrawn more often than any other in the last century. Every change in its contours influences identity dynamics of Europe to an extent. The efforts of EU to create a pan-European identity that transcends the idea of nation-state, includes the complexities of transnational and immigrant problems, and involves the necessity to find a commonality in the midst of diversity(Neeta, 2012).

The rise of the EU has added a new dimension to the challenge, obliging us to think of the inhabitants of the region not just as Spainiards or Belgians or Poles or Latvians, a macro-integration has been accompanied by a micro-level loosening of ties as national minorities in several countries – such as the Scots in Britain, the Catalans in Spain, the Flemings and Walloons in Belgium, and multiple nationalities in the Balkans - express themselves more vocally, and remind us that European identity is being re-formed not only from above but also from below (McCormick, 2011).

However, the idea of pan-European identity is fraught with complexities and limitations. The repeated reordering of territorial lines over the centuries has bequeathed to almost every European state a multinational society, and has left several national groups – such as the German, the Poles, the Basques and Irish – divided by national frontiers. Many states have also seen large influxes of immigrants since the 1950s, including Algerians to France, Turks to Germany and South Asians to Britain. Not only is there no dominant culture, but most Europeans rightly shudder at the thought of their separate identities being subordinated to some kinds of homogenized Euroculture; at least part of the resistance to integration is generated by concerns about threats to national cultural identity (McCormick, 2011).

European Union and India-Notes of Parallelism in Process of Identity Creation

It is interesting to note a number of issues in the formation and sustenance of European Union and India as democratic units run parallel. There are too many striking similarities that it would be surprising to ignore them for anyone who is interested to study the differences.

To begin with the historical context of the formation of European Union as a political entity and India as a nation falls into the same period. Both have similar number of units "today" (27 member states in EU and 28 states in India) with geographical area in terms of size, not being very different. The idea of European Union started initially as a deterrent to the looming threat of World War was conceived in the 1950's with just six member states. Since then, with a number of important treaties and policies, it has grown into 27 member states that cover most of the European countries. India, on the other hand, as a nation is a product of the anti-colonisation movement and the desire of the people to live in a democratic set up. It is stated that there were

about 565 Princely states in India before independence, and all these were fused into an idea of a nation (some princely states were part of Pakistan) through the sustained efforts of the national leaders of the time. It is worthwhile to observe that, quite similar to the history of EU, in India too, the idea of Republic Nation took shape in year around 1950.

Both India and EU have had strong, rich historical backgrounds and have withstood turbulence caused by battles and wars and religious sentiments that swayed now and then. Despite these odds, both regions witnessed exuberance of art, literature, sculpture, music, dance and exploration of other aesthetic domains.

Linguistic Diversity is another note of parallelism between EU and India. Most member states of European Union have a distinct language of their own apart from having a number of variations within that language as dialects. This holds true in the case of India as a nation as well. India with its 28 member states boasts of the presence of more than 400 languages and a number of dialects taking the total number of languages used to thousands. This diversity of language is respected by the constitutions as a basic trait of multiculturalism. Interestingly, most of the languages in Europe have borrowed from Greek and Latin and most of them in India from Sanskrit; meaning, there are commonalities in languages despite all the differences.

The other prominent point of similarity between EU and India is that of religious accommodation. Many European countries have large and growing Muslim minorities. This is particularly true for the countries of Western Europe that have experienced influxes of Muslim immigrants over the last several decades from a variety of Middle Eastern, African, and Asian countries, as well as Turkey and the Balkans. In India, on the other hand, majority of the people follow Hinduism as their religion. However, there exist substantial number of Muslims, Christians and practitioners of a few other religions. The idea of safeguarding the rights of minorities is a major issue in both EU and India and conscious efforts have been made towards this in both the region. It would be interesting to analyse the efforts and their results in these two regions in order to understand the idea of multiculturalism and its contrasting nature.

European Union and India- Points of Divergence in the Process of Identity Creation

However, there are distinct notes of divergence that leads a careful observer to surmise the reasons as to why the process of identity formation took contrasting shape in the case of India and EU.

Political Integration of European Union:

The European Union is a direct result of a determination among European politicians to prevent future violent conflicts in Europe after World War II. Gradually with the entry of more number of member states and through a series of policies and treaties an effort is made to create an 'imagined community' of European Union which would provide a unique identity to its citizens irrespective of their nationalities. The underlying fact of the idea of European Union is that it is created by the policy makers to ensure the smooth functioning of economic and political activities within the region. The idea of social and cultural integration of European Union is an initiative fused into the policy at a later stage to broaden the horizon. However, here too it was a 'top-down' approach which is expected to involve the public and not the movement from grassroots that transformed the policy decisions.

Process of Political integration in India:

This has been a unique process with differentiation and integration happening at different times in the history. India has been largely dominated by kings having absolute control over their kingdoms and regions. Only a few among them were able to annex other regions and build empire that brought under one rule, the major parts of India and other regions that are out of Indian geographical contours today. These attempts of integration were thwarted by the ambitious small kingdoms that created enough room for invasions and then the colonization. However, it was under the British rule that the anti-colonizer sentiments that brought people of India under one umbrella though the kings did not aspire for it. Hence, we can say, the unification that happened during independence was not a policy-makers-driven but led by the people of the country. Interestingly, the then policy makers of India did not retain and recognize the areas held by princely states as administrative units or states but reformed them on linguistic basis and renamed them. Though it faced considerable criticism, it meant creation of new

identities rather than reinforcing the existing identities that would have otherwise led to disintegration on past experiences.

One more interesting point to note here is that the integration process for India was to happen once in time during the period it achieved independence whereas, for the EU, the process continues with its borders getting redefined with every new member added to the list. This new member brings along the cultural components that generally go unattended by the political and economic elite driving these integration efforts.

Concept of National Identity

It is difficult to compare the identities held by Indian states and EU member states. Identities that Indian states have are of recent origin and basically "given" to them rather than obtaining them historically. Contrarily, EU member states have had these identities over centuries and for them to adapt a newer larger identity is like forfeiting the national identity built strongly on centuries of experiences with each other. The idea of nation that evolved over a period of time for these regions is difficult to dissolve in the larger identity of the Union. Moreover, the union is mainly based on monetary and economic considerations rather than social or cultural.

In the case of India, the identity is formed newly to a diverse group of people that allowed them to obtain a unified recognition that never existed. Moreover, the states in India formed on linguistic basis provided a new sense of belongingness to a group people whichallowed them to form an identity of their own while retaining an ability to align it to a larger identity of 'nation'. Further, it enabled the group to fuse its other difference such as religion and race into an identity of a particular region , which in turn is a part of the entire nation'India'.

It is striking that both EU and India are the result of a concerted efforts towards political integration. After 60 years of these efforts both have almost similar number of members. However, what distinguishes India from EU is the fact that its member states are not separate nation states as in the case of EU. This certainly makes a clear difference since in spite of

retaining distinctness of their own, these states align and identify completely with the nation state. Further, the public in general of these states are actively involved the national decision making process and are aware of the policies formed at the national level. This is significantly different in the case of EU where the member nations have a strong independent identity of their own in spite of being a part of the larger unit called the EU.

The relative advantage of identities

As mentioned earlier, when there is choice, the rational human mind adapts an identity that provides a relative advantage over the other. For an Indian, it is difficult to carry his regional identities even if he wishes and therefore, the national identity comes in as advantageous. For a European, however, the national identities that are achieved by them over years are still a matter of pride and provide advantage. For example, a German would like to identify himself by his national identity and so also a French or a English. Is it the same with a Bulgarian, a Romanian, a Latvian when they come out to the world? It is not known as much. Probably, they would prefer the collective identity over their lesser-known national identities.

Recognition of identities by the world – identity projection

This is largely dependent on the recognition of the identities by the outside world as well. An Indian prefers to carry his national identity over regional mainly because the outer world acknowledged that identity rather than his regional. His regional identities are not known to outer world despite his making presence felt in small ways of his community living even within the Indian diaspora in other parts of the world. In general the identity projection of a person from any state of India is that of the larger identity 'India'.

It is exactly the otherway round for the European. EU has not been able to communicate about its existence to the world in the same way the nation states have done and therefore lacks awareness in the minds of the people about its existence. Therefore, a European would more often than not like to recognise himself with his national identities. Certainly, EU needs to exert more efforts in external communication and make conscious effort on the outward projection of its identity.

Cultural identities

It is not only national identities that matter in case of Europe but also the cultural identities. According to Gannon and Pillai (2010) who have developed cultural metaphors for several nations of the world to understand and describe cultures, Germany is identified with symphony, France with wine, Britain with its houses, Norway with Sauna etc. etc. . .Curiously, the same researchers struggle through to identify one cultural metaphor for India. Their confusion is evident and understandable when they come out with two metaphors for India going against the very idea of metaphorization. They try to describe it in terms of Dance of Shiva and Kaleidoscope, neither of sufficiently describing the Indian diversity.

Though the idea of metaphorizing could be new, the cultural constructions around each of nation states and the extent to which they describe them hold true since ages. The metaphors do conjure up the characteristics specific to nations and to an extent provides 'cultural identity' to geographical areas. The fact that India transcends the idea of single metaphorisation is evidence enough to assert its ability to fuse the regional differences, yet make the people believe in a supra-identity beyond the geographical location. European nations on the other hand rigidly stand firm with their cultural identity and transcending them to create a supra-idenity is certainly not feasible through a top down approach

Minority Issue and Identity Formation

The issue of accommodating minority mainly immigrants from Muslim countries is a dominant discourse in European Union. Over the last several years, European governments have stepped up their efforts to improve Muslim integration. These have included introducing new citizenship laws and language requirements, promoting dialogue with Muslim organizations, improving educational and economic opportunities for Muslims, and tackling racism and discrimination. At the same time, European governments have also sought to strengthen security measures and tighten immigration and asylum policies.

In India, on the hand, tensions involving minority , mainly Muslims, do create uneasiness as it happened in the case of Ayodya and a few other communal riot instances. However, it is to be seen in the overall existence of harmony in the society for nearly sixty years. The eruptions of communal disturbance have not led to the suspicion on any one particular community in process

of integration as a whole. This ability to attain harmony as a whole has its roots in the fact that minority was never viewed as an outsider in India. It is true that the constitution of India has enough provisions to safeguard the rights of minority; however, it is not the idea of assimilation that dominates the mindset of the people in general. The idea of accommodation of immigrants is a major issue for EU as the immigrants are the 'other' who have moved in from other countries mainly due to economic reasons and need to be assimilated to the host culture. The process of assimilation required conscious efforts on the part of the policy makers. India , as a political unit, had to tackle the issue of minority in a different way. The 'others' moved in many years before the emergence of ' nation- state' as invaders than as immigrants. What is remarkable to notice is that these ' others' (mainly Muslims) were accepted as a part of host culture by the masses much before the policy makers of modern India. As such the new identity of India which is formed after the independence had no problems of assimilating the 'others' for the minority had already dissolved into new identity.

Communication Policy, Media and Process of Identity Creation

Moreover, as pointed out in the White Paper on a European Communication Policy (2006) the 'public sphere' within which political life takes place in Europe is largely a 'national sphere'. The media remain largely national, there are few meeting places where Europeans from different member states can get to know each other and address issues of common interest. Yet many 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. Despite exercising the right to elect members of the European Parliament, citizens often feel that they themselves have little opportunity to make their voices heard on European issues. Efforts like Eurobarometer, Europe by Satellite, and others tried to bridge the gap that exists between the public and policy makers of EU in communication. However, it is stated that the institutional communication policy, though steadily improving, has not been sufficient to break the boundary of nations and create a pan-European identity.

National identities which were acquired by people historically continue to overpower a newly created identity. True that the rational human minds would ultimately make a choice that is wisebased on relative advantage that one identity would provide them over the other. It is

precisely at this point that EU should intervene with its policies that speak loudly and clearly about the relative advantage of the new identity(Inamdar, 2013). Communication policy that aims at creating a larger identity across the states in India, on the other hand, is largely people driven. It is the mass inolvement in the national issues such as border conflicts, programs such as educational drives or frenzies such as cricket that drives the policy makers and not vice versa.

In this context, the study of how multiculturalism as an idea in India is distinct from that of EU seems a necessary step in understanding the process of identity creation.

Viewing EU through the Multicultural Experience of India

It is striking that both EU and India are the result of a concerted efforts towards political integration. After 60 years of these efforts both have almost similar number of members. However, what distinguishes India from EU is the fact that its member states are not separate nation states as in the case of EU. This certainly makes a clear difference since in spite of retaining distinctness of their own; these states align and identify completely with the nation state. Further, the public in general of these states are actively involved in the national decision making process and are aware of the policies formed at the national level. This is significantly different in the case of EU where the member nations have a strong independent identity of their own in spite of being a part of the larger unit called the EU. What distinguishes EU and India is the different approach adopted by the policymakers in terms of projection of 'identity'. India makes use of the presence of diversity as a case of unity whereas EU tries to accommodate the diversity by imposing a unifying identity. Further, the approach is inward looking in the case of EU and it is totally outward looking in the case of India.

A multicultural society cannot be stable and last long without developing a common sense of belonging among its citizens. Although equal citizenship is essential to foster a common sense of belonging, it is not enough. Citizenship is about status and rights, belongingness is about acceptance, feeling comfort and welcome, a sense of identification. The unique idea of India's multiculturalism essentially aimed at this through a series of conscious measures. It succeeds in providing opportunities of participation to every section of the society in its political life so as to reduce the sense of alienation. The Indian polity deliberately and strategically ensures inclusiveness opportunities for building trust among different linguistic, religious and social

groups (Ramakantan, 2008). The major strength of India lies in its success in instilling a sense of belongingness to the truly diverse cultures. It is achieved through well planned political and communication strategy.

One of the central problems that Deutsch(1966) recognized at the core of founding a nation was the problem of dealing with inequalities of wealth, status, and income. He felt that this problem could be solved in one of two ways. First, higher- and lower-status people could mix in certain kinds of institutional settings (such asschools, administration, churches, and the military), thereby bonding them together. In the case of Europe, there are no such mechanisms in place to bring people together across social classes. Indeed, the class basis of European social arenas closes opportunities for this to happen (Fligstein, 2008). Moreover, the presence of strong national identities among the different states made it difficult for the less educated, elderly and rural people of Europe to voice their opinion in the policy of European integration. As rightly pointed out by many researchers, it is always the elite, educated and the urban middle class that participated in the process of social interaction. India on the other hand presents a completely contrasting picture of social integration through well planned policies on dealing with social inequalities.

The major political effort towards integration of the socially excluded groups in India is found in the idea of federal states. The Indian government consciously chose to follow the idea of decentralization and devolution of powers in order to achieve political participation and mobility of diverse groups (Ramakantan, 2008). The national policy decisions percolate through states to the public. At the same time, every effort is made to see that the states have enough powers to provide voice to the public through federal structure that in turn would have its impact on the overall decision making process of the nation.

Further, decentralization process started in the early 1990's in India paved the way for establishing a multi-tier political institutional set up and a new system of public administration in India. Apart from the Centre and State governments, the local governments were given powers to participate in the national development policy. The provision for devolving financial resources to the local governments enhanced their capacity to manage areas of their jurisdiction and functional domain. The most significant factor in these constitutional amendments is the

reservation of seats for women (33 per cent i.e. one third of the total seats) and scheduled castes and scheduled tribes (in proportion to their population in the state). This has aroused the political awareness of the people of all sections including the socially excluded groups. This has also considerably contributed for strengthening their political organizations and capacity for effective bargaining for better delivery of goods and services. Decentralization and democratization is aimed at strengthening the capacity of the people of all social sections including the marginalized and socially excluded to make the political system at all levels accountable and responsive to the needs (Ramakantan, 2008).

Moreover, in the case of India, this process of the search for the identification of the core values of the 'identity' was effectuated by a constitutional provision of equality of all faiths and the commitment of the post-independence regime to this principle. India made every effort to acknowledge the salience of individual rights to freedom of religion and equality before the law, and group rights to cultural and religious practices in its charter of fundamental rights. The freedom to practice one's religion and follow one's faith mentioned in the fundamental rights is a direct effort by the state to maintain multicultural fabric of India. The post-colonial state thus made attempts to accommodate both the fact of the existence of several religions which played a salient role in the social life of her citizens and to assuage the apprehension of non-Hindus of a possible Hindu majoritarian dominance. This created what can be termed a fuzzy notion of multiculturalism, to distinguish it from radical multiculturalism which required the state to explicitly acknowledge the existence of plural identities in the public sphere, and from various forms of mono-culturalism which promotes the culture of one social group to the detriment of others by putting its language, religion and status to a hegemonic position within the structure of law and administration (Mitra, 2001).

The efforts of EU, on the other hand, to create a sense of belonging that transcends religion, language, region and ethnicity is largely limited to educational policy, economic mobility and interactive groups across nations. Though these measures have their impact to an extent, they do not reach the mass as a whole to convince them of the idea of one identity. Managers, professionals and other white-collar workers have taken advantageof their chances to travel by setting up European organizations where they meettheir counterparts across national borders to talk about common issues. Managersand professionals have founded many organizations on a

Europe-widebasis, particularly in response to increased social interaction in the wake of theSingle Market.The education elite across national societies have been in the forefront oftrying to push the creation of a larger, more all-encompassing European societyand identity.. Universities are now pushing forward aproject to create a European Higher Education Space. However, these measures do not have the overall people participation, uuntouched by pan-Europe developments are the vast majority of people. They do not belong to European associations or work in positions where they travel across Europe. Most of the European college students do not choose to engage in college exchanges and only 2–3 per cent of Europeans are working in other countries (Fligstein, 2008). The idea of oneness in spite of pertinent differences as experienced in India stems from the bottom where people are sure of their opportunity to be part of the process irrespective of their religion, income or region.

Communication Policy and Popular Culture India and EU:

The second mechanism that might produce a shared identity is common culture. Here media of all varieties could play an integrativerole.An overt communication policy by EU in its efforts on identity creation and a succinct use of the popular culture to create a mass identity in India present contrasting nature of identity formation process.

Action Plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission brought out on July 20, 2005, made communication one of the strategic objectives for its term of office, recognizing it fully as a policy in its own right. Commission decided to proceed in two phases: First to adapt an internal Action Plan with concrete measures to be taken within the Commission and Secondly, to draw up a White Paper to engage all stakeholders, setting out the policy vision and the initiative to be undertaken in the medium and long term, in cooperation with the other institutions and stakeholders.

It also focused on presenting a single face to evolve towards a unified Commission presentation through contact centres for public awareness purposes under a few, if not a single umbrella. The Plan also sought to identify target audiences, and to understand the country through direct contact with national, regional and local decision-makers and authorities through regular media monitoring, and through public opinion polls. Awareness that creation of European public sphere

was a necessity to generate dialogue and its audience to have any idea of belongingness set a new way-forward for identity creation efforts.

Changes happened in quick succession since then. On October 13, 2005, a communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee on the Regions was brought out with an idea of Plan D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate as Commission's contribution to the period of reflection and beyond (Inamdar, 2013).

Plan-D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate

Commission believed that debates should go beyond the political leaders, the traditional stakeholders to involve "civil society, social partners, national parliaments and political parties" and also found added value in listening to specific target groups, such as young people or minority groups that were not reached during the referendum campaigns. It also recognized the importance of engaging with the mass media particularly television and Internet for stimulating debates.

With this, there was a shift from listening to further involvement. The objective of the Commission was to stimulate debate and seek recognition for the added value that the European Union could provide. Plan D set out a structured process to stimulate a public debate making it a two-way process: informing people about Europe's role through concrete achievements and projects and listening to people's expectations about what should be done in the future and also introducing a feedback process.

However, in all these efforts, there was no evidence of focus on creating presence of EU in the external world. Even at the stage of Plan D, it appeared EU was still focusing on collecting information from its key stakeholders than actually coming out with solutions or actions for creating European public sphere. Though Plan D comes across as an interesting proposition, it was observed during an international conference on European Studies that a sizable number of delegates had not even heard of it. With all its emphasis on information gathering, listening to diverse voices and recognition of public sentiment, EU loses its way of instilling a sense of oneness to the multiple notes as an identity to the outside world. This probably is the problem with most of EU's initiatives that they get lost among loads of information that "flow from Brussels" (Inamdar, 2013).

Apart from the official communication policy, it is the popular media that plays a major role in the process of identity creation. A comparative analysis of popular media of EU and India in this regard throws interesting light on the aspect of identity.

Neill Fligstein,(2008) points out that an overview of European popular culture suggests a complex interplay of popular culture in Europe. An overwhelming American presence in movies, television, and music, means that people across Europe are exposed to similar cultural content presented to them by large media conglomerates. A second important conclusion is that national languages continue to be the idiom for some popular culture, particularly in music, books, and television. At least half of prime-time television broadcasts across Europe on the main 'free' television networks are produced for the national market in the national language. There is evidence that where the media conglomerates are involved, they do sell the same content across Europe. But they also are sensitive to the national language and culture and where possible tailor their products to local audiences. There are nationally owned media outlets that continue predominantly to record pop music and sell books written for national audiences.

The main conclusion is that popular culture remains nationallyoriented with some elements of shared culture. There is some evidence thatnational media do cover European affairs and politics in a fashion that mightproduce more solidarity, but they are as likely to cover a European story from anational perspective rather than one that expresses solidarity with Europe. 'Average' people do not consume international media on a systematic basis, but instead read national newspapers with national stories. Either by interest or cost, national markets for TV, films, music, and books persist. To the degree that there is some convergence in popular culture, it is at least partiallygenerated by the use of American content in films, TV, music, and books. This does not mean that Europeans do not share some common popular forms of culture or are not aware of what people in other countries are like. What it does mean, is that a European identity and interest in the popular media is much shallower and more fleeting (Fligstein, 2008). In essence, there is no concerted effort to create a pan-European identity by the popular media across Europe.

Contrastingly, in India media policies are effectively used by the government to bridge the communication gap among the diverse groups. The idea of ' Doordarshan' as a national channel which has its regional variation in every state is a classic example of media policy towards integration. The language differences are accounted for with the presence of regional channels while the program composition on these channels is designed to suit the national aspirations. The case is quite similar in the case of All India Radio where idea of 'oneness' in differences is achieved through the presence a vast number of regional channels catering to the diverse cultural sensitivity.

On the cultural front as well a number of efforts were made to ensure that a sense of oneness prevails among the seemingly vast diversity of the nation. One such significant effort is the popularization of the national integration song choreographed using the official language of all the states of India. Popularly known as '\Mile Sur MeraTumara', the song depicts the culture of every state with emphasis on variation in attire, food and art form. Yet the underlying theme is that of oneness amidst differences and the lyrics of the song echo it throughout. This simple song is able to catch the attention of the diverse nation for every part finds its place in the whole. A similar effort was made through the patriotic song of VandeMatharamthat projects the idea of oneness to the outside world while making the regional identities as an integral part of the overall image of India.

 Of course, the integration efforts are not limited to these efforts alone, even in the awareness campaign the government launches either on education or healthcare, efforts are made to show the diversity. It is through this depiction of diversity the message is conveyed that there is unity. Non-governmental initiatives in India have played a greater role in the creation Indian identity as a multicultural unit. The film industry across India is a major force that shapes the perception of average public. The regional films by retaining their cultural uniqueness address the national issues. As a whole the public could share the national concerns through the regional media and at the same time is able to forefront its problems at the national level. The fact that the government of India awards the regional movies for its cultural sensitivity and perception proves that India as a whole exists in its parts. This holds good in the case of national awards to regional literary works as well. In other words, there is a forum for the part to make its presence felt in the whole. Add to this the pattern of Bollywood movies that churns out movies on the idea of religious and

regional differences and attempt to show the beauty that exists in transcending them. These efforts have certainly instilled a stronger sense of pan Indian identity in a less perceptible way.

Conclusion

Multiculturalism has been held up as a desired value for the appreciation, acceptance or promotion of multiple cultures, that exist in the demographic make-up of the human societies ,particularly at the organizational level within the nations (Mahapathra B, 2011). In a rapidly changing world multiculturalism is certainly a reality that cannot be ignored. It is true that acceptance of multiculturalism as a way of life involves complexities and measures of its own for any political set up. The integration efforts and institutional policies need to be combined with proper public participation. It is in this interaction of the policy makers' decision and public response to it, the identity of the individual as well as the whole involved in the process gets redefined. European Union in its integration efforts and acceptance of multiculturalism as a policy is trying to provide a European identity to its citizen. While India in its acceptance of multiculturalism as a way of life and active participation of the public in policy decisions of integration has evolved an identity of its own, EU is still in process of creating this larger identity.

Further, an inward looking approach alonewill not help EU at this point as the newly created identity needs recognition, acceptance and approval of the outer world. EU's efforts need to be broadened in these directions. Though enough attention is paid to internal dynamics of integration, understanding global contexts in which to function becomes imperative.

The European states can no longer be seen as a community that can itself determine who citizens ("we") are and who are not ("they"). The European Union does invest in the establishment of new common traditions ("invented traditions") in order to become a community ("imagined community"), but this has not yet led to a European nation. Creating a nation does not operate upon command. Despite all the information and propaganda, despite EU symbols including a flag, an anthem, a passport, a currency, the European dimension in education through the Erasmus programme, the activities of citizenship such as the right of petition and voting rights for the European Parliament, despite the introduction of a legal European citizenship through the

European Union treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam, despite all this the ideology of European "nationalism", has not yet caught on(Dijkstra, Geuijen, Ruijter, 2001). The experience of India in creating a sense of identity among its multicultural mass through seemingly less perceptible but effective policies could provide beneficial insights to the policy makers of Europe.

Reference:

- Deutsch, K. W. 1966 (1953). Nationalism and Social Communication. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.

- DijkstraSteven,GeuijenKarin, RuijterArie de2001,   ' Multiculturalism and Social Integration in Europe', *International Political Science Review Vol.22, No. 1*, pp. 55-83

- Fligstein, Neil, 2008, *Euroclash- The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*, Oxford University Press, New York.

- Gannon M J and Pillai R. 2010, Understanding Global Cultures, Sage Publications, California.

- Howard, Judith A. 'Social Psychology of Identities',*Annual Review of Sociology.* Vol.26, 2000: 367-393. Web. http://www.jstor.org/stable/223449

- Mitra,Subrata K 2001, 'Constitutional Design, Democratic Vote Counting, and India's Fortuitous Multiculturalism', *Heidelberg Papers in South Asian and Comparative Politics,* Paper 4.

- MohapathraBiswajith, 2011, "Multiculturalism, Democratic Governance and Empowerment : Sharing India and Canada's Experiences for Building up Negotiation Mechanisms for the Future", Web.

<*http://www.academia.edu/1123740/Multiculturalism_Democratic_Governance_and_E mpowerment_Sharing_India_and_Canadas_Experiences_for_Building_up_Negotiation_ Mechanisms_for_the_Future*>

- Ramakantan   N , 2008, 'Federalism,   Decentralization and Democratization in a Multicultural Polity: Some Critical Issues in the State of Federalism in India', *IFF Summer University*–Paper 2

- Scruton, Roger, 1996, A *Dictionary of Political Thought*, 2nd edn, Macmillan,London.

- McCormick, John, 2011, *Understanding the European Union*, 5th edn, Palgrave Macmillan, United Kingdom.

- White Paper on a European Communication Policy 2006, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels.

- European Commission. "White Paper on a European Communication Policy" Web.1 Feb 2006

  http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52006DC0035:EN:NOT

- European Commission. "Action Plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission".Web. 20 Jul 2005.

  <http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/communication_com_en.pdf>

- European Commission. "Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions".Web. 13 Oct 2005.

  <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0494:FIN:EN:PDF>

- European Commission. "Communication to the Commission. Communicating about Europe via the Internet: Engaging the citizens". Web.20 Dec

  07.<http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/docs/internet-strategy_en.pdf>