Europe in Discourse
Identity • Diversity • Borders
1st International Conference

Book of Abstracts

1st International Conference
Europe in Discourse: Identity, Diversity, Borders

Book of Abstracts

Compiled by:

Stefanos Basigkal
Antonia Chouvarda
Themis Kaniklidou
Gerasimos Kontaxis
Aggeliki Tzigkou

HellenicAmericanUniversity

citoyens de part et d'autre de la Méditerranée. Installés en masse, avant et après la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les musulmans, venus des anciennes colonies, se sont vus confronter à des modes de vie et de pensées totalement distincts des leurs. Mais génération après génération, ils ont réussi, plus ou moins, à assimiler la langue, la culture, les sensibilités des pays d'accueil. Une assimilation qui demeure asymétrique eu égard aux politiques d'immigration des pays d'accueil, aux propriétés d'acculturation de chaque communauté, aux origines sociales des individus, etc. Implanté un peu partout en Europe, l'islam et donc les musulmans, à l'image d'une Europe multiculturelle, multiconfessionnelle et multilingue, demeure intrinsèquement pluriel. Maghrébin dans les espaces francophones, indien dans les espaces anglophone, turc dans les espaces germanistique, etc. Assujetti donc à ses communautés, l'islam demeure, selon les cas, traditionaliste, piétiste, fondamentaliste ou islamiste, voir dans certains cas, radical ou extrémiste. Toutefois, et ce, dans la majorité des cas, lorsqu'il n'est pas athée, il est soit sunnite ou chiite, scindé ensuite en des courants de pensée pluriels. Au sein d'une Europe multiculturelle, multiconfessionnelle et multilingue, qu'elle est la place de l'islam et des musulmans originellement européens ou qui le sont devenus plus tard ? Quel est l'impact qu'ils ont au sein de l'espace européen, tant dans la forme que dans le fond, et quel est l'impact de l'Europe sur l'islam et les musulmans dans le sens inverse ? Autrement dit, pourra-t-il exister, demain, un islam européen, et dans ce cas-là, quel visage aura-t-il ? Ou alors, dans un cas contraire, réussira-t-il à cohabiter et à s'épanouir en toute quiétude dans une Europe plurielle au sens large du terme ? À travers une démarche globale, nous allons dessiner, non sans précision, un panorama le plus large possible, en creusant des pistes de réflexion qui permettront d'anticiper la place et l'avenir de l'islam au sein d'une Europe désormais pluraliste, aujourd'hui et demain.

Aleksandar Ignjatovic

Paradoxes of a Cultural Divide: European Identites and the Appropriations of Byzantine Architecture in the 19-20th Century

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, many Western European nations have been historicized through a variety of disciplinary regimes—from political and cultural history, to archaeology and architectural history. This happened simultaneously with the construction of what is widely believed to represent a common European cultural identity. Regardless of the complexity and diversity of changeable political systems and phases of development of each European nationalism, historiography had a major role in a dual process of distinguishing particular national identities and establishing notions of European cultural borders. This universal phenomenon was based on a controversial and often dubious process of selection and invention of suitable pasts, which consequently provided a framework for perception of different national groups as being both culturally

diverse and unified in a common European cultural framework.Architectural history had a major role in this complex identity-constructing process across the continent. While the classical heritage of ancient Greece and Rome provided a ubiquitous ground for imagining borders of European identity, and while particular medieval architectures became crucial for forging notions of national distinctiveness, there was an architectural tradition which has remained absent in mainstream western European historiography. That is Byzantine architecture, a particularly telling example which simultaneously enforces and questions a supposed cultural divide that still dominates the perception of European cultural borders. Namely, Byzantium remained a commonplace for imagining a non-European otherness usually associated with its cultural inheritors—be they modern-day Turks, Russians or the Orthodox nations of the Balkans. However, the same Byzantine architectural legacy was simultaneously and reversely included in Western European historical imaginati on, becoming integral part of national heritage and acquiring a range of ideological functions and overtly political resonance. Paradoxically, Byzantine architecture has retained its unstable referential status, representing a symbol of a conspicuously non-Western identity, a kind national legacy—not only for the Balkan Orthodox nations, but also for many Western Europeans—yet rarely been associated with a shared European legacy and model of Europe's common identity.The primary aim of this paper is to examine how a number of national architectural historiographies in both the European East and West similarly reinforced the process of constructing national identities by employing the Byzantine heritage which is usually associated with only one side of the supposed East-West European cultural divide. From Russians and the French, to Christian nations of the Balkans, Germans, Catalans and British Catholics, a number of European nations were simultaneously employing the tropes of Byzantine cultural succession as a symbol of national identity. Furthermore, while rewriting national architectural histories these nations were erecting modern neo-Byzantine edifices that were springing up throughout modern European capitals to represent a kind of "inverted archaeology", failing to interpret Byzantium as a common European heritage. A paradox that lies at the heart of this pan European Byzantine discourse is that a heritage that was, and still is, u sually thought of as a symbol of the East-West European cultural divide, represented a common cultural treasury for creating architectural imageries of national identity and cultural exceptionalism.