

# EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Volume VII, No. 2 Spring/Summer 1994

# EGSA *Newsletter*

### **EDITORIAL**

ALBERTA SBRAGIA
ECSA CHAIR, University of Pittsburgh

The second World ECSA Conference, "Federalism, Subsidiarity and Democracy," was held May 5-6, 1994 in Brussels, Belgium. World ECSA is a coordinating body for all national ECSAs which hopes to create an international network of academics involved in the study and teaching of the European Union (EU). The Conference was a significant step toward that goal. More than 250 academics from over 20 countries attended panel and discussion sessions related to the Conference themes. I am pleased to report that ECSA-USA is perceived as an active member of the World ECSA community. The biennial ECSA-USA Conference is of great interest to many individuals beyond the U.S., as is the *Newsletter* and ECSA-USA's other publications.

While the internationalization of interest in EU studies was quite evident at the World ECSA Conference, it was also apparent that national research traditions are still very strong. Researchers of the EU are often concerned with how to better incorporate the findings of these many traditions in their own work. Language barriers and the limited circulation of many journals present obvious barriers to these efforts. This is particularly unfortunate as the research agendas of different nationalities seem to be concerned with particular aspects of EU studies, and therefore have a great deal to offer scholars in other countries. For example, it is not surprising that Italian and German scholars are particularly interested in questions of federalism. It is my impression, however, that American scholars rarely draw upon this literature. Similarly, the research areas and issues that scholars choose to pursue may determine the extent to which they are influenced by other national literatures. American scholars who are interested in policy studies tend to be more influenced by European literature than are their colleagues who study international relations. This is at least in part because the debate between intergovernmentalists and neo-functionalists is less dominant among scholars in Europe than it is in the U.S.

It is my hope that ECSA will be able to establish a research "bridge" of results published in other countries, and particularly in non-English speaking countries. The World ECSA Conference ably demonstrated the valuable insights that can be gained from this process. The biennial ECSA-USA Conference and the biennial State of the European

Community have made and will continue to make substantial contributions toward this goal by inviting the participation of scholars from continental Europe. When it is possible and appropriate, future issues of the Newsletter will include brief articles discussing recent trends in national literatures.

I am also delighted to report that the 1994 ECSA Workshop, "Immigration into Western Societies: Implications and Policy Choices," was a great success and benefited enormously from the large number of European scholars and practitioners in attendance. The Workshop, held May 13-14 in Charleston, South Carolina, generated much interest from a variety of disciplines and produced papers and panel discussions of high intellectual quality. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I wish to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to Donald Puchala and the Institute of International Studies at the University of South Carolina for so expertly organizing both the programmatic and logistic elements of the Workshop. ECSA was particularly honored that Ambassador Stuart Eizenstat, the United States Ambassador to the European Communities, chose to attend and actively participate in the Workshop. During his luncheon address, Ambassador Eizenstat gave an impressive overview of US-EU relations and stressed the continuing importance of transatlantic cooperation. A full account of the Workshop begins on page three.

Inside			
Conferences and Workshops	2		
Grants and Fellowships	7		
Program Announcements	9		
Teaching News	11		
Essays	12		
Book Reviews	18		
Publications	23		
Association News	24		

### CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

# **CALL FOR PANELS AND PAPERS**



# EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION FOURTH BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

May 11-13, 1995\* Charleston, South Carolina

The European Community Studies Association (ECSA) invites scholars and practitioners engaged in the study of the European Community/Union to submit panel and paper proposals for the 1995 ECSA International Conference. The Program Committee hopes to promote the broadest possible exchange of disciplinary perspectives and research agendas, and it actively encourages proposals from all disciplines concerned with the European Community/Union. Participation by graduate students is welcomed. A limited amount of funding for participant travel may be available.

Panel proposals should include: (1) the names, affiliations and addresses of chair, panelists, and discussant(s); (2) full paper titles and synopses; and (3) a short statement of the panel's theme. Individual paper proposals are also welcomed. The Program Committee will assign those papers to appropriate panels.

Proposals must be received by November 15, 1994. Please send proposals and direct inquiries to:

William Burros, Administrative Director European Community Studies Association 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260 Phone (412) 648-7635, Fax (412) 648-1168

Participants will be notified of acceptance by December 15, 1994.

The members of the Program Committee are:

David Cameron, Dept. of Political Science, Yale University, Chair Anne-Marie Slaughter Burley, School of Law, University of Chicago James Caporaso, Dept. of Political Science, University of Washington John Gillingham, Dept. of History, University of Missouri, St. Louis John Goodman, Harvard Business School and National Economic Council Lily Gardner Feldman, American Institute for Contemporary German Studies

<sup>\*</sup>The Conference date has been moved to May 11-13, 1995 to accommodate hotel scheduling.

## IMMIGRATION INTO WESTERN SOCIETIES: IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY CHOICES\*

A Summary Report on the 1994 ECSA Workshop

On May 13-14, 1994 seventy demographers, economists, sociologists, political scientists and public officials from nine countries and the European Union gathered in Charleston, South Carolina to assess the impacts of immigration into Western societies. This "Workshop on Immigration into Western Societies" was sponsored by the European Community Studies Association (ECSA), an academic organization which promotes research into problems affecting the European Union, and by the Institute of International Studies of the University of South Carolina (IISSC). Funding for the workshop was provided by the United States Mission to the European Union, the European Commission, ECSA and the IISSC.

Discussion at the workshop followed upon the presentation of twenty-one commissioned papers that respectively addressed the magnitude and composition of immigration flows into Western Europe and North America; the economic, political and cultural impacts of these flows; current public policy responses to immigration and their consequences; and policy imperatives in decades ahead.

While proceedings at the workshop evolved ultimately toward evaluating practical matters of immigration policy, discussions were overlaid by moral and philosophical questions. Among these was the question of whether liberal societies could justifiably close their borders to persons fleeing from tyrannical conditions elsewhere. There was also the issue of liberal economy: if free flowing goods, services and capital stimulate flows of labor, as they must under open market conditions, what justification is there for closing labor markets, while other markets are left open? With respect to welcoming asylum seekers and immigrants, as Westerners must do in fidelity to their liberal traditions, at what point does preserving liberal values in openness conflict with preserving liberal values in democracy? At what point does keeping societies open to immigrants interfere with maintaining them as modern welfare societies? At what point does keeping societies open to immigrants interfere with keeping them either culturally homogeneous or manageably pluralistic? What ought Europeans and North Americans to do when any of these crucial points are reached?

These larger, normative issues were directly broached only at the conclusion of the Workshop's two days of deliberation, and then only timidly. Yet, they latently influenced, and lent a certain tension to, much of the evolving discussion at the workshop. This was because the central, though not unanimous, thrust of expert testimony was that immigration into Western societies needs to be much more strictly managed than it has been to date. Much of the analysis concerned forms, ways and means of societal closure. It was acknowledged by most participating analysts that immigration can be more strictly managed. But management invariably implies manners and means of excluding immigrants and the rationales for doing this.

The actual magnitude of immigration into Western societies is not ascertainable with very much precision. One estimate is that in recent years flows into industrialized countries have been in the neighborhood of 2 million people per year, and that over the last decade some 16 million people have legally crossed into Western societies to settle, work or escape. But estimates are very rough for a host of technical reasons such as how immigrants are defined and counted, who does the counting and when, or how many people cross the same borders several times. Estimates of the magnitudes of illegal immigration are even less reliable, but the flows have been sizeable, particularly South-to-North flows. Quantitative assessments of the immigration phenomenon can be improved, and likely will be, but in this instance seeking the trees should not be allowed to obscure the forest: immigration flows into Western societies are very substantial, and because they have been high for several decades they have altered the labor forces, the societies, the politics and the cultures of receiving countries in notable ways.

No firm conclusions were reached at the Workshop concerning the economic consequences of immigration, because economic impacts vary greatly with circumstances. Economic impacts have depended upon the kinds of immigrants entering, where, for example, the costs of accommodating asylum seekers are greater than the costs of integrating guestworkers (as long as they remain employed). Different concentrations of immigrants, as among countries and locations in Europe and states in the US, skew the burdens of providing social services for them. Countries may benefit generally from the efforts of new workers, citizens and taxpayers, but localities where large numbers of immigrants settle may bear the brunt of servicing the new arrivals. Costs to receiving countries also vary depending upon whether immigrants come with or without families (or bring their families later), whether immigrants bring skills in demand in the receiving society or have skills that are redundant, and whether immigrants settle permanently or eventually return to their homelands. For the last several years Germany has borne an inordinate proportion of the cost of both South-to-North and East-to-West immigration into Europe, although the East-to-West flow has not turned out to

<sup>\*</sup>This report was prepared by the Institute of International Studies of the University of South Carolina based upon transcriptions of discussions at the Workshop on Immigration into Western Societies. Though this summary report reliably reflects the course of discussion, its conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views of all workshop participants and should not be attributed to individuals among them.

be the deluge that many expected when Eastern borders were opened in the late 1980s.

Costs also change with economic conditions in receiving countries. Southern Europeans, North Africans and Turks who entered Western Europe as guestworkers in response to labor market demand in the 1960s brought little cost and considerable benefit to the receiving countries. Their labor figured positively into the "economic miracles" that several of the European Common Market countries experienced. However, assumptions that immigrants would return home, or could be sent home, during economic downturns in the receiving countries proved erroneous. Most stayed, and when recessions occurred many became unemployed and sought protection in European welfare-state safety nets. At the moment, improving economic conditions within the European Union will ameliorate some of the abrasiveness in political debates about immigrants. This is undoubtedly true with regard to North America as well. But improved conditions will also attract more immigrants!

The politics generated by the immigration flow into Western societies over the last several decades have been impassioned and volatile, to say nothing of increasingly complex. Over time in both Western Europe and North America the immigrants themselves have become increasingly organized, sophisticated and successful in the democratic arenas of their new countries. Their efforts have been directed by and large to gaining recognition of their presence and affirming and protecting their rights in society and in workplaces. One unfortunate indicator of immigrants' success in furthering themselves, has been the mounting resentment of them displayed by extremists on the political Right in almost all Western countries. There has also been some willingness even on the part of the moderate Right to make issues out of immigrants and immigration for electoral purposes. The success of politicians at scapegoating immigrants has varied from country to country, with time and with other issues that are linked to immigration questions. Some evidence suggests that the current vehemence of anti-immigrant politics in Europe may be dissipating, particularly in Germany and the United Kingdom.

Troublesome too have been extremist political activities targeted at sending countries and perpetrated by immigrant groups operating from receiving countries. Amid the protection and toleration of liberal societies in the West, radicals in immigrant communities have been playing at politics in their homelands, often in opposition to governments in the home countries, and frequently by subversive means. There is something ironic, though historically not uncommon, about exploiting the safeguards of democracy in one country in order to subvert democracy in another.

Immigration is altering the cultures of Western receiving countries. In most dramatic fashion with regard to Europe, the boundaries of cultural communities are becoming incongruent with the boundaries of states, or even with the perimeter of the European Union. There is a Mediterranean cultural community--Muslim, Arabic, Turkic, Persian, Greek, Greek Orthodox--whose social, economic and political networks extend through North Africa, the Eastern Mediterranean, Anatolia, the Balkans and now well up into Italy, France and Germany. An important portion of this Mediterranean cultural community resides nowadays within Europe, but it is not strictly speaking a part of European civilization. Its transactions and communications are "transnational" with respect to established political boundaries throughout Europe and the Mediterranean littoral, though it is more accurate to describe them as oblivious to these boundaries. The significance of Méditerreanée as an emergent second civilization within European geographic space must not be exaggerated, but neither can it be discounted.

With regard to immigrants from non-Western cultures, assimilation into Western receiving societies has been halting, even within second and succeeding generations. The "melting pot" metaphor is therefore not appropriate, but neither is the ghetto image altogether apt. Rather what is happening is cultural pluralism -- i.e., emergent diversity rather than homogeneity, with social order cemented (when it is) by toleration rather than identity. Culturally pluralistic societies are much more difficult to govern than national ones. The Workshop reached no firm conclusions concerning the likely success of adjustments to cultural pluralism in Western societies, though it would appear that "culture wars," that strain civility and challenge democratic institutions are going to affect Western societies for the foreseeable future.

With regard to public policies, workshop participants found it most useful to distinguish between <u>immigration</u> policies having to do with admission into receiving countries, and <u>immigrant</u> policies having to do with the treatment of residing aliens once admitted. Generally speaking, neither kind of policy seems to be particularly well-conceived or administered in most Western countries, and the European Union is still a long way from even having policies regarding immigration matters.

There is little prospect that any Western country separately, or the European Union or some transatlantic cluster of countries collectively, is going to be able to stop immigrants from entering. Emigration flows are the results of countless individual or family decisions made by people in search of enhanced human security. Only by making people more secure--economically, politically, culturally--in their homelands, might they be dissuaded from moving when opportunities to move present themselves. From Western perspectives, and to the extent that constraining immigration is deemed desirable, there is much to be said for policies aimed at ameliorating the "root causes" of emigration. This means directing foreign policies toward changing conditions in sending countries that account for emigration, namely poverty and oppression, or at the very least anticipating that most

Western foreign economic, political and security policies will invariably affect emigration decisions and immigration flows. Planning to deal with these affects should be accordingly engaged. One very specific case in point concerns Algeria, which may be on the threshold of a major political upheaval that will invariably release northward bound immigration flows. Little apparent preparation has been made either for preventing these flows of people or for dealing with them should they occur.

Of course significantly changing adverse conditions in many of the primary sending countries is fanciful, at least in the short run, and even if it were possible to rapidly enhance human security in sending countries, immigration flows into Western societies will not slow appreciably for some time. This is because there are follow-on phenomena associated with immigration, such as bringing wives and families later, that multiply initial inflows. As a result, Western countries all face the problem of establishing policies for admission or rejection, inclusion or exclusion, consonant with clearly defined national interests. As a first step these national interests need to be clearly defined. The European Union faces the rather daunting task of either defining common demoninators among the immigration regimes of member states, or defining an European Union interest, establishing an immigration policy in accord with it, and gaining its adoption by EU member governments.

Among matters that need to be considered in rationalizing immigration policies are first that there is a trade-off between legal exclusion and illegal immigration. To restrict legal entrance is to encourage illegal entrance. As illegal immigration condemns individuals to exploitation and insecurity while it economically and morally corrodes receiving societies, it should be discouraged. Still, unrestricted immigration into Western societies is out of the question. How then is the balance between legal exclusion and illegal immigration to be struck?

There is also a trade-off between pluralism and community. Since cultural assimilation is not accompanying late 20th century immigration any where nearly to the extent that it accompanied immigration earlier in this century, receiving societies are becoming culturally pluralistic. At some degree of diversity societies lose their communal underpinnings and become a congeries of differently identifying groups. Historically, such multicultural societies were common, but they were most successfully ordered by imperial governments. Governing multicultural societies democratically problematic because full representation combined with incompatible values among represented groups could lead to political immobilism. Under such conditions governing majorities seldom emerge. On the other hand if governing majorities are constructed, majority tyranny could stifle multicultural representation, leading to unrest. Worse still, to deny political access to immigrants, and even to their children, as happens in

countries where citizenship is based on the principle of jus sanguinis, is to distort and ultimately jeopardize democracy itself. What then are the limits of multicultural diversity, how can such limits be reasoned in the context of preserving democracy, and how can such limits be incorporated into immigration and immigrant policies?

Migration is a global phenomenon. Extraordinary waves of migration have recurred throughout history, and the world of the late twentieth century appears again to be entering into an The primary demographic era of völkerwanderung. movements today are among non-Western countries, figuratively from South to South, and their greatest impacts will not be registered in Europe or North America. However to the extent that some of the demographic movements today are from South to North, they are trans-cultural, trans-racial, transcivilizational and therefore extraordinarily consequential for receiving societies. The Workshop on Immigration into Western Societies concluded that such movements can be, and undoubtedly will be, disruptive; Western societies will change because the demographic composition of their populations will change. Some of the prototypical nation-states of Western Europe could well become multi-national states. On the other hand, changes invoked by South to North immigration will also be creative as new perspectives and energetic people cross-fertilize the traditional West. For the last five centuries new perspectives and energetic people have been moving from Europe outward, and the world dramatically changed as a result. The late 20th century völkerwanderung may be the beginning of a reverse flow that could equally dramatically change the world.

#### Papers presented at the 1994 ECSA Workshop:

"The Magnitude of Immigration into Western Europe" David Coleman, University of Oxford

"Immigration into North America in a Global Perspective" Bimal Ghosh, International Organization for Migration

"Entering Through the Door of Refugee Resettlement" Rosemarie Rogers, Tufts University

"The Impact of Immigration on Receiving Countries" Philip L. Martin, University of California-Davis

"Shifting Patterns of Immigrant Employment in France and Germany"

James Hollifield, Auburn University

"Immigration and Public Finance: The Case of the Netherlands"

Anton Kuijsten, University of Amsterdam

"Navigating a Multi-Tiered Policy Making System: Immigrant Politics in the European Union"

Patrick Ireland, University of Denver

"Migration in the Demographic Context of European Institutions"

Rey Koslowski, University of Pennsylvania

"The Distance from Brussels to Sarajevo: Immigration Politics in Belgium"

Carl Lankowski, American University

"International Migration and Security: A Trans-Atlantic Convergence?"

Mark Miller, University of Delaware

"Ethnic Business, Ethnic Community and Ethnopolitics Among Turks in Europe"

Nermin Abadan-Unat, Bosphorous University

"Testing Tolerance: The Impact of Non-European Migrants on Western European Cultures"

Beverly Springer, American Graduate School of International Management

"The Cultural Mediators Between France and the Maghreb" Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, CERI-FNSP

"The Political Uses of Xenophobia in England, France and Germany"

Dietrich Thränhardt, University of Münster

"The European Union and Its Quest for a Common Immigration Policy: Problems and Possible Solutions" Chris Bourdevalis, Augusta College

"Comparative Models for Integrative Public Policy" Han Entzinger, University of Utrecht

"Modes of Immigration Politics in the Receiving States" Gary Freeman, University of Texas

"Immigration as a Political Dilemma in Western Europe" Anthony Messina, Tufts University

"World Society and the Future of International Migration" Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny, University of Zurich

"European Immigration Policies in the 21st Century?"

C. Dennis de Jong, European Commission

"Immigration in the 21st Century: Which Framework for Policy Response?"

Reinhard Lohrmann, International Organization for Migration

A volume based upon the papers presented at the 1994 ECSA Workshop is now being planned for publication in 1995.

### ESRC/SEM COST A7 CONFERENCE: THE EVOLUTION OF RULES FOR A SINGLE EUROPEAN MARKET

September 8-11, 1994 London, UK

The objective of this major international conference is to discuss the process of European integration in the 1990s. It is built around eight themes which reflect all facets of that process:

- 1. Setting and influencing the rules
- 2. Implementing the rules
- 3. Competition and conflict among rules
- 4. The impact of the rules
- 5. Rules under different visions of economy and society
- 6. The evolution of rules
- 7. Political legitimacy
- 8. The external impact

The conference will discuss the results of the UK's Economic and Social Research Council programme in the Single European Market as well as a wide variety of contributed papers drawn from many perspectives including economics, political science, sociology, environmental studies, the law and regional science. It is part of the COST A7 Action on "The Evolution of Rules for a Single European Market." COST is the grouping of the main funders of research across the whole of Europe, not just EC and EFTA, but central Europe as well. The conference will be held at St. Luke's College, University of Exeter, Devon, UK. Those interested in attending and/or presenting papers should contact Sarah Leeming, NIESR, by fax at +44 (0) 71 222 1435 or by post at 2 Dean Trench Street, Smith Square, London SW1P, 3HE, United Kingdom.

# FRANCE: FROM THE COLD WAR TO THE NEW WORLD ORDER

September 16-18, 1994 Portsmouth, UK

Proposals for papers are being sought for this conference of the Association for the Study of Modern and Contemporary France. Some of the proposed areas to be covered by the conference are listed below, although the organisers would welcome proposals in any other subject area that is deemed relevant to the overall conference theme:

- 1. Defence
- 2. France and the break-up of the Soviet bloc
- 3. International relations
- 4. The Left and the Cold War
- 5. The Right and the Cold War
- 6. France, the new Europe and immigration
- 7. Cultural aspects
- 8. France and the Third World
- 9. France and international organisations
- 10. French Literature and the Cold War
- 11. Media representations
- 12. End of the Cold War: economic implications for France
- 13. Intelligence services
- 14. Postgraduate session

Proposals for papers should be addressed to: The Conference Organisers, Tony Chafer & Brian Jenkins, School of Languages and Area Studies, University of Portsmouth, Wiltshire Building, Hampshire Terrace, Portsmouth, PO1 2BU, fax (44) 0705.843350.

### THE POLITICS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: THEORY, POLICY, AND PRACTICE WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION

October 21-23, 1994 University of Crete, Greece

Following discussions during Research Sessions held at Trondheim in October 1993, an International Conference is being organized in conjunction with The Erasmus University of Rotterdam, University of Crete and University of Teesside under the auspices of The Green Politics Standing Group of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). For more information, please contact: Dr. Susan Baker, Department of Public Administration, BSK, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, Postbus 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands; phone (+31) 10 408 2096; fax (+31) 10 452 7842.

### GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

### 1995 German Marshall Fund Research Fellowship Program

The German Marshall Fund of the United States offers grants for research that seeks to improve the understanding of significant contemporary economic, political and social developments involving the United States and Europe. Projects may focus on either comparative domestic or international issues. Projects should establish the potential importance economic importance of their findings either by comparative analysis of a specific issue in more than one country, or by an exploration of that issue in a single country in ways that can be expected to have relevance for other countries.

A Fellowship is intended to allow the recipient to work on research full time, without teaching, administrative or other substantial professional responsibilities, during an academic term or up to one year. Projects of three months or less are not eligible for consideration. Within a fixed maximum (\$30,000), the Fellowship will help meet, but cannot exceed, a recipient's current income. Approximately 11 awards will be made in 1995. Completed applications must be postmarked no later than November 15, 1994. Submissions will be reviewed by established scholars from various disciplines. An independent selection committee will make recommendations to the Fund. The Fund will announce awards by letter on March 15, 1995.

For application forms and additional information, please contact: The German Marshall Fund of the United States,

11 Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, DC 20036, phone (202) 745-3950.

The German Marshall Fund of the United States recently announced the twelve scholars awarded these Research Fellowships in 1994. The Fellows and their projects are:

Laird Boswell, Department of History, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Cultural, Political, and National Identity on the Franco-German Border: the Case of Alsace-Lorraine, 1919-1990.

Valerie Bunce, Institute for European Studies, Cornell University

Regional Cooperation in Eastern Europe: The Visegrad Group.

Geoffrey Eley, Department of History, University of Michigan

The Construction of the National Past in British and German Cinema, 1960-1993.

Laura Frader, Department of History, Northeastern University Gender and the Labor Movement in France Between the World Wars.

Maryellen Fullerton, Brooklyn Law School Germany's Constitutional Restriction on Political Asylum: The Impact on Germany and Its Eastern Neighbors. Chris Howell, Department of Politics, Oberlin College The Impact of the British State on Trade Union Structure, Ideology and Strategy.

Michael Moore, Department of Economics, George Washington University

EC Steel Policy in the 1980s: Catalyst or Hindrance to Technological Change?

Lynne Pepall, Department of Economics, Tufts University Multi-Firm Alliances and the Lessons to be Learned from Europe.

Paul Pierson, Center for European Studies, Harvard University

Capital and the Welfare State: Business Preferences and Influence in Britain, Germany and the United States.

Annamarie Seleny, Department of Politics, Princeton University

The Institutions and Culture of Work and Enterprise in Postsocialist Mixed Economies.

Marc Trachtenberg, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania

A Constructed Peace: America, Europe, and the Making of the Cold War Settlement, 1949-1963.

Jonathan Zeitlin, Department of History, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Between Flexibility and Mass Production: Strategic Debate and Industrial Reorganization in British Engineering (Metalworking), 1830-1990.

# Fulbright Research Awards in European Community Affairs\*

Up to four awards are available for research on European Community affairs. Preference will be given to projects focusing on the organization of the EC, particularly on the process of institution building. Other topics related to the EC will also be considered. Interdisciplinary proposals are welcomed. Projects may be based at EC headquarters in Brussels or at an appropriate academic institution within the EC. Project site and travel arrangements are to be determined according to the scholar's individual project. Grantees will have full access to EC resources and individuals in Brussels, as well as to libraries in academic institutions within the EC.

Applicants should submit documentation demonstrating contacts with archives or individuals to be involved with the proposed research. Collaboration with EC institutions is welcomed. Language competency or arrangements for translation may be required depending on individual projects. Grants may range in length from three to ten months during the 1995-96 academic year. Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the time of application and should have the Ph.D. or equivalent

professional qualifications. Successful applicants will receive approximately 64,000 to 80,000 Belgian francs per month (2/94 exchange rate is U.S. \$1=36.14 Belgian francs), depending on the number of accompanying dependents. Applicants may request funding for shorter periods, as long as the minimum stay abroad will be three months. International travel is provided for grantee only. Research travel within Europe will be funded on a case-by-case basis. The application deadline is August 1, 1994.

### Fulbright European Community Scholar-in-Residence Program

Institutions are invited to submit proposals to host a European Community (EC) official or an academic from an EC-member country who specializes in EC affairs as a resident fellow for one or both terms of the 1995-96 academic year. Under an arrangement with the EC, up to 4 grants will be available to bring an EC official or scholar to an American campus for the purpose of strengthening expertise in European Community affairs. The resident fellow will give guest lectures and conduct seminars as appropriate, consult with faculty and students on research, engage in collaborative study, and provide outreach to neighboring institutions and the local community. The resident fellow is not expected to teach regular course offerings.

The awards are made available under the auspices of the Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence Program. All submissions will be reviewed by an academic panel convened by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) and nominations forwarded to the EC, which will select the U.S. host institutions and propose EC officials/scholars for the positions. The application deadline is November 1, 1994.

# 1995-96 Fulbright Scholar Program Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe Regional Research Program

One award is available for an established scholar to conduct research for up to ten months during 1995-96 academic year on a project that relates to the mission and goals of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The research may take place in any of the 51 European participating states. Preference will be given to proposals requiring work in two or more countries, including at least one location in eastern Europe or the state of the former Soviet Union. The grantee will be expected to participate in at least one CSCE-related program at CSCE offices in Warsaw or Vienna. Interdisciplinary proposals are welcomed, and scholars from a variety of different disciplines are encouraged to apply, including those from political science, law, sociology, media studies, economics, European history, art history, environmental sciences, architecture and urban

planning, education, geography and public administration. The application deadline is August 1, 1994.

\*For more information concerning the Fulbright Programs above, please contact Jean McPeek, Council For International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden Street, N.W. Suite 5M, Washington, D.C. 20008-3009, phone (202) 895-5391.

(Editor's Note: Recipients of the 1994-1995 ECSA Graduate Fellowships, Dissertation Fellowships, and Curriculum Development Grants are listed on page 25 in the Association News section.)

## PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS

### **USIS Speakers Program**

The U.S. Information Service (USIS) is sponsoring a Speakers Program involving U.S. Embassies and Consulates throughout Europe. The USIS seeks speakers capable of giving the American perspective on EC Affairs, the U.S.-EC relationship, the transatlantic alliance, and related issues. To qualify for the Speakers Program, individuals must have established travel plans in Europe. The USIS will provide compensation for the costs of travel within Europe, daily maintenance, and a modest honorarium. ECSA members traveling from the United States will find this an excellent opportunity to increase their understanding of European perspectives.

Individuals interested in this Program should fax the following information, well in advance of their travel dates, to the U.S. Mission to the European Communities in Brussels at (32.2) 512.57.20:

- a) planned European arrival and departure points;
- b) dates of availability;
- c) an abbreviated curriculum vitae;
- d) brief descriptions of topics that you find suitable for discussion; and
- e) fax number(s) where you may be contacted.

# Europe and the European Community Council on International Educational Exchange

Europe and the European Community is an overseas study program held at the University of Amsterdam and the Université Libre de Bruxelles. The program, sponsored by Cooperative European Studies Consortium, is designed for a full academic year. However, students may spend the fall semester in Amsterdam and the spring semester in Brussels only.

The fall semester in Amsterdam begins with a ten-day orientation to Amsterdam and the Netherlands which

includes instruction in survival Dutch. Students then select four courses choosing from three special program courses and a wide variety of University of Amsterdam elective courses in the social sciences, international relations, history, and Dutch language. All instruction, with the exception of Dutch language, is in English. The spring semester in Brussels is composed of five special program courses, of which the students choose four and French language offered at the beginning, intermediate and advanced level. While in Brussels students are required to study French, there is no French language prerequisite, and all program course are taught in English. Students with an advanced level of French may supplement their course work with regular university courses.

For more information, please contact Colleen Cuddy of the University Programs Department, Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017; phone (212) 661-1414 ext. 1228; fax (212) 972-3231.

### Diploma in Languages and European Community Studies University of Portsmouth, UK

The School of Languages and Area Studies at the University of Portsmouth has launched a one-year (two semester) Diploma in Languages and European Community Studies. This programme builds on the department's already well established Diploma in English Studies, which takes about 150 students - mostly from other EC countries - a year. The new Diploma, offered at intermediate level (third year of a four-year course) is designed to give students a combination of language study in one or more of the major European languages, together with in-depth study of the origins, development and functioning of the European Community.

For more information and application details, write to: Admissions Tutor (Diploma in European Community Studies), School of Languages and Area Studies, Hampshire Terrace, Portsmouth PO1 2BU, United Kingdom.

### European University Institute, Florence, Italy

The European University Institute (EUI) is a postgraduate teaching and research institute. The mission of the Institute is to contribute to the intellectual life of Europe, through its activities and influence, and to the development of the cultural and academic heritage of Europe in its unity and diversity. In this context, the Institute aims to provide a European academic and cultural training and to carry out research in a European perspective (fundamental, comparative, and Community research) in the area of the social and human sciences.

The four academic departments of the Institute are History and Civilization, Economic, Law and Political and Social Sciences, all of which offer a doctoral degree program. The academic departments are complemented by two interdisciplinary centers. The Robert Schumann Center develops research bearing on important issues confronting contemporary European society. The European Forum brings together experts in a selected topic for one academic year, with emphasis on the international, comparative, and interdisciplinary aspects.

For detailed information on EUI teaching and research activity, request a copy of the Academic Year Prospectus from the Academic Service, European University Institute, Badia Fieslona, via dei Roccettini 5, I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI). Tel 39.55.46851 Fax 39.55.599.887

# Centre for European Economic and Public Affairs (CEEPA), University College Dublin

The CEEPA offers a Master's Degree in Economic and Public Affairs which currently has an enrollment of 29 students. Sixteen of these students are from outside Ireland, with five being from the United States. The programme is actively interested in recruiting students from the United States.

A feature of the Master's programme is the Special Lecture Series, given by a distinguished European figure. Following the appointment of Peter Sutherland to the directorship of GATT, these lectures, formerly given by Mr. Sutherland, are now given by Dr. Garrett FitzGerald, Former Irish Prime Minister and former President of the Council of Ministers of the European Community.

Further information regarding the Master's programme can be obtained from: The Director, Centre for European Economic and Public Affairs, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland.

### Key to Europe

Key to Europe is a non-profit educational organization which organizes training programs, educational seminars and workshops on the European Community, including field trips to Brussels and meetings with European scholars and public officials. For example, "The EC: Policies and Activities for the Disabled," a multinational program designed for staff members of NGO's and other organizations, was organized in the Spring of 1994.

For more information on this and other Key to Europe programs, contact Todd Kingsbury, 6 Irasville Common, Waitsfield, VT 05673. Tel (802) 496-2428 Fax (803) 496-4548

### **European Legal Practice**

The European Legal Practice program at the Tulane Law School is an elective specialization for JD students and an advanced degree for graduate law students. JD students who successfully complete 16 hours of required courses will receive, in addition to the JD degree, a certificate of specialization in European Legal Practice that could prove valuable in enabling them to secure legal postitons in the field. Five students obtained the certificate in May 1992, while over 65 students have indicated they intend to fulfill the requirements for a certificate in the near future. Graduate students receive a Master of Comparative Law (Europe) upon successfully completing 22 hours of credits in the program.

For additional information, contact the Tulane Law School Admissions Office, New Orleans, LA 70118, phone (504) 865-5930, or contact Professor Llyod Bonfield, Director of the European Legal Practice Program, at (504) 865-5850.

### Post Graduate Program in European & International Management Universite de Paris 1 Pantheon Sorbonne

This one year post graduate programme in Europe & International Business is designed for students willing to become managers in a European and international perspective. The weekly schedule is about 20 hours of courses from October to April, followed by a compulsory 3 months of internships or oversees assignment (as of May). Formal teaching is by lecture, tutorial, seminar, or presentation of case studies, in French or in English. All examinations take place shortly after the end of the courses.

For more information, please contact Professor Max Peyrard, the Program Director, at the Research Center in European & International Management, Room 222 B, U.F.R. Gestion-Sorbonne, 17 rue de la Sorbonne, 75231 Paris Cédex 05- Fax:33 (1) 40 46 31 77.

### Baltic Studies Summer Institute University of Washington

The Russian and East European Center at the University of Washington in Seattle has initiated the founding of an inter-

collegiate consortium to sponsor an annual Baltic Studies Summer Institute (BALSSI). In the future, the Institute will offer language instruction in Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian, along with courses on the culture, history, and politics of the Baltic States. The BALSSI program in the pilot year of 1994 (20 June - 19 August) will feature intensive language instruction in First-Year Lithuanian (LITH 150) and a course on Baltic history (HSTEU 454). Other events to be sponsored by the Institute include guest lectures, films, and various cultural activities.

For information about the program, BALSSI, and possible financial aid for Lithuanian language students, contact Professor Thomas DuBois, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature, DL-20, University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195; (206) 543-0645. Internet: tdbois @u.washington.edu.

### Focus on Europe Vesaluis College, Brussels

Vesalius College, the international undergraduate division of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, offers a "Focus on Europe" program for students who want to spend a semester in Brussels. The program concentrates on the European Union and the European integration process, and includes field trips to various European cities. Each field trip is introduced by a seminar dealing with historical, cultural and economic aspects of the city to be visited. On completion of the program, students receive a certificate in addition to the official transcripts of the courses completed. Participants have the option of living with a Belgian host family, or of arranging their own accommodation with the assistance of the College Orientation Office. For details, please contact: Focus on Europe, Vesalius College--VUB, Admissions Office, Dept.

4/E, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels, Belgium.

# World of Women Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice

This July 12-30, 1994 study tour for educators and organizers will visit Warsaw, Cracow, Budapest, Prague, Berlin, and Copenhagen. The tour will include meetings with scholars of Women's Studies and representatives of feminist organizations. For more information, please contact IUC-USA, 307 D Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20003, phone (202) 546-2592, fax (202) 543-8658. In Europe, please contact IUC-Europe, Vilhemskilevej 1, P.O. Box 150, DK-7500 Svendborg, Denmark; phone (+45) 62.21.68.92; fax (+45) 62.20.28.92.

### Master in European Studies and Master in Public Management Université de Genève

These two-years programmes should be especially useful and attractive for graduates who want to build on economic, political and sociological studies with a comprehensive and up-to-date advanced understanding of: (1) the European Union and its impact on public affairs (Master in European Studies); or (2) the management of public administration, and the adoption, implementation and evaluation of public policies, with the opportunity to specialize (during the second year) in public management, environmental policy, social policies, or international policy (Master in Public Management).

For more information, please contact Prof. Paolo Urio, Dean, 102, boulevard Carl-Vogt- CH-1221 Genève 4, Switzerland; Tél. 022/7058001. Téléfax 022/7814100.

### TEACHING NEWS

# Creating a Network for European Studies at the Secondary Level

ECSA members with a particular interest in European studies at the secondary level are encouraged to contact George Wrangham, Head of the History Department, The Shipley School, 814 Yarrow Street, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010; phone (610) 525-4300; fax (610) 525-5082.

The teaching of European studies at the secondary level (grades 9-12) is obviously of great importance to all ECSA members. By identifying members with special interests inthis area, ECSA hopes to create a bridge for communication

between educators at the secondary and university levels and across all disciplines concerned with European studies. They can exchange information on curricula, instructional materials and techniques, and other educational issues.

George Wrangham has designed and is teaching a wholly innovative year-long course on Europe since 1945, including future studies, for advanced students in grades 10, 11, and 12. He has generously offered to serve as the liaison person in this effort. Please contact him at the address above, or Bill Burros at the ECSA Administrative Office for more information.

### **ESSAYS**

### The European Parliament and the National Parliaments

#### Michael Shackleton

The Maastricht Treaty is nowhere more ambiguous than in its vision of parliamentarism at the European level. It reflects three competing, if not necessarily contradictory, visions of the position of parliaments in the European Union: a Union according a preeminent role to the European Parliament (EP), a Union assuring important rights for national parliaments and a Union where the essential decisions remain in the hands of executives and beyond the reach of the EP or national parliaments. There is evidence for all three positions in the text of the Treaty.

First, the Treaty accorded significant new powers to the European Parliament. Since November 1993 and the entry into force of Maastricht, it enjoys the right to co-decision in selected areas of legislation under Article 189b, the right to be consulted on the proposed President of the Commission and to approve the appointment of the Commission as a whole (Article 158), the right to appoint a European Ombudsman (Article 138e) and the right to set up committees of inquiry into alleged cases of maladministration in the implementation of Community law (Article 138c). Together these powers create the potential for a system of power sharing in the Union between the EP and the Council of Ministers.

Second, Maastricht gave formal recognition to the role of national parliaments in two annexed declarations. Declaration 13 seeks to encourage them to have closer ties with the EP on the basis of improved information from their governments:

"The Conference considers it is important to encourage greater involvement of national parliaments in the activities of the European Union.

To this end, the exchange of information between national parliaments and the European Parliament should be stepped up. In this context, the governments of the Member States will ensure, inter alia, that national parliaments receive Commission proposals for legislation in good time for information or possible examination. Similarly, the Conference considers it is important for contacts between the national parliaments and the European Parliament to be stepped up, in particular through

Michael Shackleton is the Principal Administrator, Division for Relations with National Parliaments, European Parliament Secretariat, Brussels, Belgium.

the granting of appropriate reciprocal facilities and regular meetings between members of Parliament interested in the same issues."

In Declaration 14, the Treaty provides for a more formal institutional structure, bringing together members of the EP and national parliaments in a new consultative framework:

"The Conference invites the European Parliament and the national parliaments to meet as necessary as a Conference of the Parliaments (or 'assises').

The Conference of the Parliaments will be consulted on the main features of the European Union, without prejudice to the powers of the European Parliament and the rights of national parliaments. The President of the European Council and the President of the Commission will report to each session of the Conference of the Parliaments on the state of the Union."

These declarations open the way for national parliaments to play a much more significant role in the activities of the Union than they have done up to now, offering a potential challenge to the reinforcement of the powers of the EP.

Third, the Treaty established important new areas of competence for the Union where parliamentary involvement is severely restricted. The Maastricht pillar structure was expressly chosen to ensure that Common Foreign and Security Policy (Pillar Two) and Cooperation in the Fields of Justice and Home Affairs (Pillar Three) should not be subject to the same set of rules as apply under the Community pillar. The Treaty restricts itself to mentioning the EP whose role is strictly limited to that of being consulted. Even in relation to the Community pillar, the Treaty lays down provisions in relation to the move towards Economic and Monetary Union which offer little legislative scope for the EP (there is no codecision, for example), whilst national parliaments are effectively obliged to exercise whatever oversight they can over their own governments. The overall effect suggests an extreme reluctance on the part of governments to allow their control over the most sensitive elements in the Treaty to be put at risk by encouraging excessive intervention by parliamentary bodies.

The fact that the Treaty combined these three perspectives has been particularly important for the relations between the EP and national parliaments. It has brought about a fresh evaluation of the potential for cooperation as well as an awareness of the scope for disagreement as to how to strengthen parliamentary oversight of the activities of the Union. The extent of this change should be seen in historical

perspective. Up until 1979 the members of the EP were all members of national parliaments, thus limiting the scope for the EP to pursue a distinct set of goals. With the holding of the first direct elections the situation changed significantly. The EP started to devote its energies to establishing its own separate identity, notably by strengthening its position in relation to the Council and the Commission. National parliaments, for their part, gave only intermittent attention to EC affairs, generally entrusting the task of parliamentary control to a small specialist committee. Contact between the EP and national parliaments was restricted to biennial meetings of the Presidents or Speakers and occasional joint meetings of committees.

Already in 1989 the pattern of relations was broadened with the establishment of six-monthly meetings of the EC committees of national parliaments along with the EP, known as COSAC or CEAC (Conference of European Affairs Committees). In November 1990 a Conference of Parliaments was held in Rome, bringing together more than 300 members from all 20 chambers of the Parliaments of the Member States and from the European Parliament, with the specific aim of influencing the Intergovernmental Conference which opened the following month and which led to the Maastricht Treaty.

Since 1990 there has been little formal development of the institutional structure. The provision in the Treaty for a Conference of Parliaments has not so far served to bring about such a meeting: some parliaments have favoured the idea (notably Belgium during its Presidency) but up to now it has not proved possible to establish the consensus that the inclusion in Declaration 14 of the words "as necessary" requires. COSAC has continued to meet (the tenth conference took place in Athens in May of this year) but it has remained a place for exchanging information on issues of common concern, with little support for it to assume a broader, decision-making role.

For its part the EP has laid particular stress on the development of informal contacts with national parliaments. It established a small administrative unit in the Secretariat which was given the task of encouraging such contacts at the level of committees and individual members. The result has been a marked growth in such activity. Since 1990 there have been over twenty invitations from EP committees to their counterparts in national parliaments to hold multilateral discussions on topics of common interest and over the same period there have been twice as many bilateral contacts, with an increasing number of MEPs giving evidence at inquiries held in national parliaments.

The EP has consistently maintained that there is a complementarity of interest between itself and national parliaments. Both are faced with executives that are tempted, as the Maastricht Treaty indicates, to keep parliaments at arm's length. To counteract this difficulty the EP has argued for the importance of discussions taking place as early as possible in

the decision-making process, especially before the Council adopts its common position and the institutions start to be subject to strict Treaty-defined time constraints. Such early discussions can benefit from the use of the annual legislative programme, now adopted by EP and Commission in principle in advance of the year in question, and from the provision of information on the progress of legislation through the Community machinery.

The question remains, however, as to whether national parliaments will be satisfied with a diet of exchanges of views and computerized information. In many Parliaments, the Maastricht debates provoked a strong sense of dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements for exercising control over the activities of the Union. In both France and Germany the constitution was revised to permit a stronger parliamentary role and in Britain and the Netherlands the legislation ratifying the treaty contains provisions which reinforce the obligations to which the government is subject, particular in relation to the move towards the third stage of EMU. These changes did not, though, put an end to the argument. There remain very wide differences of view as to how a democratic deficit, measured in parliamentary terms, can be filled.

The critical issue is whether national parliaments will be prepared to accept an increase in the EP's role in the legislative process, notably through a broadening of the provisions on codecision. There has always been a difference of view among national parliaments on this question but it has assumed a much greater salience in the post-Maastricht era, with all very much aware of the high political stakes. Hence one can expect that it will be a central item on the agenda of the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference.

The precise line-up of parliaments on this issue is very hard to determine at the present time. Major electoral upheaval, that has already occurred or is in prospect, makes prediction hazardous. Nevertheless, one issue serves as a critical indicator of opinion, namely whether or not it is appropriate to establish an additional institutional forum to enable national parliaments to be involved in the activities of the Union. The resolution of this issue will show how far national parliaments are prepared to go in subscribing to the EP perspective on the establishment of parliamentary control at the level of the Union.

The EP has consistently opposed the creation of any new institution on the grounds that it would make the decision-making process more complex and would divide and weaken parliamentary control over the executive bodies of the Union. This point of view is hotly contested. Within the French Parliament there has been a broad consensus for some time in favour of such a new institution. Perhaps more significantly, support for such an idea can be seen outside France. In his new book 1, the senior British Commissioner, Sir Leon Brittan, argues that to put Europe's parliaments to better use, it is necessary to establish a Committee of Parliaments made up of

members of national parliaments with substantive powers, not least in relation to the implementation of the principle of subsidiarity.

The strength of this position remains to be tested: Brittan's remarks are one of the first shots in a campaign which is likely to be a long one. However, their significance should not be underestimated. They are a specific response to a situation on which there is a broader consensus, namely that the existing structure is not adequate as a means of ensuring parliamentary control over the increasing range of legislation which is being passed at the level of the Union. On the basis of this shared diagnosis it is now up to the EP and national parliaments to seek to negotiate a resolution to the studied ambiguity of Maastricht over their role in the Union.

### The European Parliament In The New Europe

### **Geoffrey Harris**

The European Parliament (EP), as all the institutions of the European Union (EU), has been running to keep up with the revolutionary events in central and eastern Europe which dominated the international situation in the years between the third European elections in 1989 and the fourth such elections in June 1994.

The Europe which the newly-elected MEPs will have to come to grips with from July 1994 onwards, will be a very different one from the Europe their predecessors faced five years ago. At that time communists were in power from Berlin to Vladivostok. President Gorbachev still dreamed of a Common European Home and Jacques Delors' Commission was concentrating its efforts on revitalizing plans for economic and monetary union. No-one outside Holland or readers of the Three Musketeers had heard of Maastricht and hardly anyone outside the EP was pressing for political union as a matter of priority or urgency.

In these past five years the unification of Germany and the collapse of the USSR have changed the world and have, inevitably, affected the role of the EP in international affairs. When interparliamentary delegations were re-established in July 1989, the first signs of change were present. Separate

Geoffrey Harris is the Head of the Secretariat of the Joint Parliamentary Committees within the Secretariat of the European Parliament. He was formerly the Principal Advisor to the President of the European Parliament. The second edition of his book on the Extreme Right (The Dark Side of Europe, Columbia University Press) has just been published.

delegations were set up for relations with Poland and Hungary respectively. At the time, it felt appropriate to have a single delegation responsible for the relations with the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia: neither of these countries exist any more. Five years ago the rulers of Bulgaria and Romania were, for all intents and purposes, hoping Gorbachev would get pushed out and Albania remained a sad little world of its own. For that reason a single delegation was considered sufficient to oversee relations with these countries. The Baltic States were then, of course, part of the USSR and the idea of an independent Ukraine would have seemed like a bad dream in Moscow and probably in Washington as well.

In 1994 Poland and Hungary, both fresh from their second fully democratic elections, are pressing their case for membership of the European Union by the end of this century. They, as well as Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Romania and Bulgaria, have Association Treaties with the European Union (EU) which recognize their ambition to join the Union. In Copenhagen in June 1993, this ambition was converted by the European Council into a common objective of the EU and the six countries concerned. The massive vote in favor of enlargement for the four candidates, which took place in Strasbourg on 4 May 1994, will be taken as a further encouraging sign that the Union is, for better or worse, at the beginning of a relatively rapid process of enlargement which could lead to a Union of 22 or 24 countries early in the next century.

In spite of the current attempts to fan the flames of Euroscepticism, it is clear that the Union remains a beacon of hope for those working to stabilize free market economies and parliamentary democracy in the newly freed countries of central and eastern Europe. The European idea remains valid and attractive even if a lot of re-thinking will be required if previous plans and theories of integration are to remain relevant in the dramatically changed circumstances of the 1990's.

In this process parliamentarians have an extremely important part to play, and not just in voting on whether or not to admit new Union members. The six Association Treaties, or "Europe Agreements" as Commissioner Andriessen originally baptized them, provide a specific role for members of both the EP and the six national parliaments concerned. In spite of differences in levels of economic development or in terms of urgency of the ambition for EU membership, these treaties have virtually identical institutional structures with an Association Council, a Committee of Officials and an "Association Parliamentary Committee".

In the case of Poland and Hungary, these committees have now begun work following a period of delay of nearly two years between the signing of the treaties and their final entry into force. This extremely unfortunate development was a result of the lack of urgency given to ratification of the Association Treaties by the twelve national parliaments. The

Leon Brittan, Europe: The Europe We Need, (London, Hamish Hamilton, 1994), pp.226-230.

same phenomenon occurred with the treaty ratifying the establishment of the European Economic Area and it suggests that strengthening the role of national parliaments in the EU could lead to a further slowing of the integration process. The EP was helpless to defend the image of a Union which could negotiate treaties in a matter of months but then takes years to ratify them. Indeed, as a sign of impatience, the EP and the Polish Sejm and the Senate decided to go ahead and set up the EU-Poland Joint Parliamentary Committee at the end of November 1993 in Warsaw although the Association Treaty did not finally enter into force until 1 January 1994. In this way, the EP was able to provide an important signal of reassurance and encouragement at a time of frustration with the EU amongst many leaders in central and eastern Europe.

Joint Parliamentary Committees (JPCs) are a unique form of cooperation between the EP and partner parliaments as they transcend the traditionally informal contacts which take place in the framework of traditional interparliamentary visits. In the past, JPCs have paved the way for the accession to the EC of Spain, Greece and Portugal. Indeed, the only JPC which has existed for a long period of time is that with Turkey, whose candidature has been effectively shelved. The principal task of a JPC is to examine how the relevant Association Treaty is working in practice. It is not just a platform for the exchanging of good wishes and well-meaning platitudes.

The Association Treaties with the six central and eastern European countries cover an enormous range of subjects. They replace the previous free trade agreements and provide a flexible, asymmetrical, step-by-step plan within which the EU rapidly lowers its customs and import barriers while Associated countries open their national markets to EU products in a more gradual fashion. JPC meetings with Hungary and Poland have therefore already been looking at the reasons for the current trade surpluses in favour of the EU. The Association Treaty also provides for the gradual establishment of the free movement of persons, capital and services. They also have a section dealing with cultural cooperation and the Union is in the process of extending educational exchange programmes to the countries of central and eastern Europe. The PHARE programme, whereby economic and social modernisation in central and eastern Europe has been receiving direct financial assistance from the EU, exists separately from the Association Treaties themselves but, not surprisingly, parliamentarians from both sides are interested in questioning the EU and national authorities as to how the money is being spent. These are the kinds of practical issues which will provide the substance of the work in the JPCs over the next few years.

Parliamentarians are, however, bound to be equally interested in wider political issues such as the possible expansion of NATO, the catastrophe in the former Yugoslavia and the unfolding developments in Russia and the rest of the ex-USSR. Parliamentarians from the countries pressing for EU

membership over the next few years are also concerned with the internal developments of the EU. Polish parliamentarians emphasize the relevance for central and Eastern Europe of the DELORS' plan for reviving economic growth. Hungarian parliamentarians have been pressing for observer status within the EP and all will be interested to see what kind of EU emerges from the 1996 inter-governmental conference. In particular, it will be necessary for the new EP to carefully examine the possibility of a step-by-step process whereby political integration at the parliamentary level could precede economic integration. This would reverse the agenda of the traditional functionalist approach to European integration and could provide the best way towards ensuring the political stability of a wider Europe which is so necessary for all Europeans.

For the JPCs to work effectively they rely on receiving full information from the Commission, the Council and the government of the relevant Associated country. Under the Association Treaties the JPCs can issue recommendations to these authorities but, as with any new body, each JPC must prove its relevance and make its mark. The EP has, therefore, been engaged in a special programme for the training of staff of the parliaments of the Associated countries, some of whom will be working on the joint committees. The Poland and Hungary JPCs are now fully operational and over the next year similar committees will be established with the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania, whose Association Treaties are now entering the ratification process. possibility of some kind of multilateral cooperation once all these JPCs are in operation, is being considered. This would run in parallel to the regular meetings between the EU Troika and the foreign ministers of the six Associated countries. Whilst the Visegrad process may not have lived up to initial expectations, the EU is still committed to fostering regional cooperation as well as dealing with applications for membership as and when they are presented.

Over the next few years, the new frontiers of European integration will be defined as leaders, institutions, and public opinion comes to terms with the new realities of the post-Cold War era. The European Parliament, which has been in the forefront of efforts for political integration subject to proper democratic control, is bound to be called upon to play a leading role in preparing the next stages of European integration, both in terms of internal institutional development and the building of a new and wider EU.

# The Idea of Europe: A Collaborative Teaching Project Supported by ECSA

#### Joseph Krause

Faculty in various disciplines at Oregon State University (OSU) and the University of Oregon (UO) have been engaged for over three years in a broad interuniversity enterprise to foster collaborative teaching and research specifically within the context of European studies. A European Community Studies Association curriculum development grant, funded by the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington D.C., has served since 1993 to reinforce these linkages between the two universities.

The OSU-UO collaboration was initiated in the fall of 1990 when a multidisciplinary course, centered on the events of 1989, was offered on the OSU campus. The course consisted in great part of round-table discussions on the watershed events of 1989 and involved some two dozen faculty from both institutions along with guest speakers from other universities and from the armed forces (the latter having been invited to discuss European security). Subsequent to this course considerable enthusiasm was voiced at both OSU and UO to extend interuniversity cooperation on Europe by way of an original teaching project that would cross over disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Following open deliberation at UO it was decided that this teaching endeavor would not primarily examine Europe as an institutional construct but, rather, as a polemical and equivocal idea. The centerpiece of this project would be a course that would allow students to critically juxtapose different archetypes for Europe and to challenge their assumptions about Europe as a wellspring for cultural identity.

Inspired by the title and partially by the conceptual framework of Denis de Rougemont's book, two faculty members at UO, Evlyn Gould (Associate Professor of French) and George Sheridan (Associate Professor of History), designed and coordinated this innovative second course. The course is open to both undergraduate and graduate students and entitled "The Idea of Europe." It was first offered during spring term 1993 and involved some twenty specialists (anthropologists, medievalists, economists, political scientists, geographers, among others). Rather than merely offer a sequence of lectures by these faculty specialists the course sought to nurture a Socratic exchange of perspectives on the emergence of Europe: historical inquires were countercontemporary with viewpoints, interpretations of humanities were set against those of social scientists. The purpose of the course was not to "learn" about Europe or the European unity project, but to explore the problematic nature of the European vocation. The multiplicity of viewpoints substantiated the assumption voiced by the French scholar Edgar Morin that Europe, to the extent that it

exists, is the gradual synthesis of discordant ideas (faith versus reason, the particular versus the universal, the individual versus the collective, reaction versus revolution, materialism versus idealism, state sovereignty versus supranationalism, etc.) In weekly discussion groups, students were invited to find areas of intersection or convergence between the different perspectives to achieve a larger integrated understanding of Europe as an unfolding entity. The course proved such a success that it was offered a second time during the 1993-94 year and has hence become the prototype for collaborative teaching in European studies on both campuses.

A curriculum development grant from the European Community Studies Association has assisted OSU in fashioning a course based on the "Idea of Europe" for its own undergraduate students. ECSA funding in part supported the production of a series of videotaped lectures by faculty involved in the original UO course. The grant also subsidized the creation of additional visual materials, including slides of computer generated maps and other classroom graphics. The videotaped production and the other teaching materials will form the centerpiece of an OSU course, "Development and the Idea of Europe," that will serve as the nucleus of a proposed European Studies Certificate program. The course will also be proposed as an offering in OSU's baccalaureate core curriculum.

Fundamental to the "Development and the Idea of Europe" course is the premise that, nearly five years after the 1989 revolutions, Europe remains an ambivalent notion. Europe refers to a search for integration among industrialized societies and to an intellectual legacy fostering development, but it is also an idea that represents a violent suppression of cultures, and an enduring conflict between histories and belief systems.

Consequently, the course's first objective is to address the underlying processes that have given Europe its contradictory nature. Secondly, the course aims to better understand the attitudes and aspirations of Europeans now that the atrophy of the cold war has opened the way to a new continental architecture. Yet Europe is not only an outward voyage toward economic and political integration. It is also an inward search for a larger cultural identity. Does there exist a European consciousness, or is "Europeanness" a notion that has yet to be shaped? Thirdly, the course seeks to interpret in what manner Europe in the 20th century also represents a moral and institutional decline, one that marks the end of the modern age (to echo the position John Luckas presents in his recent book, The End of the Twentieth Century and the End of the Modern Age). What idea of Europe has been formulated after two world wars, after the communist era, after the hyperindustrialization and overarming of the northern hemisphere?

A pilot version of this course was offered at OSU in the fall of 1993 with the expectation that all visual support materials were to have been completed at that time. A number of production delays along with facility problems for the tapings

made it necessary to alter the course structure and contents. However, the grant project will be completed by the end of the 1994 academic year and the integrated version of the OSU course supported by the ECSA grant will be offered for the first time next year.

There is definitely a shared feeling on both OSU and UO campuses that the ECSA curriculum development funds not only strengthened faculty collaboration but, more importantly, provided the course coordinators on both campuses with a technical apprenticeship that will prove valuable in the future as the Oregon State System of Higher Education makes greater use of distance learning, that is, of instruction delivered to several sites via satellite communications.

A course package including syllabi and bibliography for the collaborative OSU-UO teaching project is available upon request. Two slide packages are also being generated as teaching aids through the ECSA grant. The first set of twenty slides "The 1989 Revolutions and the End of the Cold War" is a chronology of the principal events that marked the beginning and the end of the cold war. The second set of twenty-five slides is composed of a series of computer generated maps of Europe from the Roman Empire to the European Union. They will be available for a modest sum after June 15, 1994. For information please contact Professor Joseph Krause, Department of Foreign Languages, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331.

In addition, a video is being produced, "The Making of Modern Europe," that is partially derivative of the OSU course. The video will be available this fall from Educational Video Network, Huntsville, Texas 77340. The video's exact price has not yet been released, but should be approximately \$50.

### **Modeling the European Community**

#### John McCormick

A group of midwestern colleges has just completed its second annual simulation of the European Community (EC), an event that proved once again the enormous educational value of giving students a hands-on opportunity to find out for themselves how the EC really works.

More than 110 students from nine midwestern colleges came to the 2nd Midwest Model EC in Indianapolis this spring. All 12 EC member states were represented along with five non-member states lobbying for EC membership. The simulation won widespread praise from the students and faculty taking part; almost all students agreed that it helped make real to them the politics of reaching decisions in the EC.

As far as I know, the Midwestern is one of only three regular EC simulation being held in the United States. A consortium of New York colleges has been holding model ECs since 1989, and a group of Pennsylvania colleges held their

first simulation last December. At least two colleges also hold in class simulations for students enrolled in courses on the EC.

Unlike the tried and tested simulations of the United Nations that have been held in this country for years, EC simulations are relatively uncharted territory. When we held our first in April 1993, I found myself having to make up the rules of procedure from scratch, without the benefit of a model from which I could work (other than the EC itself, of course). The event was run with the help of a group of student organizers; there were the inevitable teething problems, but everything went remarkably smoothly, and the event attracted about 80 students from seven colleges in Indiana.

Simulations can be based on any or all of the five major EC institutions, but the Midwestern is based around the bi-annual summit of the European Council. Students role-play the 12 heads of government and the 12 foreign ministers, and we follow the actual role for the presidency - so Denmark had the presidency in 1993, and Greece in 1994.

Students are encouraged to research the background of the leaders they role-play and to come to the simulation prepared to represent the actual policy positions of the leaders and their countries. We also try to focus on the actual issues being addressed by the EC at the time, but the students often come up with their own policy ideas as well. To add some tension, we also create a crisis that forces the students to think on their feet; in both 1993 and 1994, the crisis (not surprisingly) grew out of events in the Balkans.

In order to show students how the decision-making structure works, we also simulate the European Commission, and three Councils of Ministers (foreign, economic, and agriculture). The Commission is charged with generating new ideas on law and policy, which then go to the relevant Council of Ministers for discussion. Again, Commissioners and ministers role-play according to the actual positions of their counterparts and the countries they represent. Contact between all the members of each delegation is maintained by students representing the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER).

The result of all this is that participating colleges send delegations of about 6-7 students each. To make room for as many students as possible, we have also included observer delegations from outside the EC, charged with negotiating entry (the 1994 Model EC saw students representing Austria, Norway, Finland, the Czech Republic and the Ukraine). The only institution we have not yet used in our simulation is the European Parliament. We may add it to the list at some time in the future, but wanted to learn to walk before we tried running.

The simulations last 17 hours, spread over a 48-hour period, and we make sure three are plenty of opportunities for students to meet outside formal sessions. This has meant good business for local bars and restaurants, where clusters of students are regularly spotted haggling over policy issues and

trying to reach compromises. COREPER is responsible for drawing up an agenda in advance of the simulation, but students are not held to that agenda.

Three of the colleges taking part in the Midwestern (IUPUI, Indiana University-Bloomington, and Ball State University) have now tied the simulation to classes on the politics of the EC. For IUPUI and Ball State, the simulation has taken the place of term papers, and IU-Bloomington has created a one-hour course specifically to prepare students for the simulation.

During a visit to Europe last summer, I contacted several universities that organized simulations in the hope of sharing experiences and finding out what the Europeans were doing, but found the faculty I spoke to unwilling to share any of their ideas. One faculty member in Britain said she and her team had spent so much time and effort developing their simulation that they were not prepared to let anyone else know what they

had done. I could see her point to some extent, but it would be nice to think that we could compare notes.

Now that there are at least three groups of universities in the United States that are organizing simulations, it might be an opportune time to start networking and sharing experiences. The organizers of the New York state simulation have made available their guidelines, but ECSA may be the logical place to have a clearinghouse that can help other universities begin their own simulations.

The Midwestern will now be held every April in Indianapolis; on the basis of our first two simulations, it is clear that a Model EC is an excellent way of providing a hands-on learning experience for students. For more information, please contact Professor John McCormick, Department of Political Science, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI), 425 University Boulevard, Indianapolis, IN 46202. Tel: (317) 274-4066.

### **BOOK REVIEWS**

Lobbying in the European Community. Edited by Sonia Mazey and Jeremy Richardson, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 263 pages, \$48.00.

This edited volume is useful for understanding the "explosion" of lobbying activity in the European Commentate since the mid-1980's. Mazey and Richardson note that the locus of policy-making power has shifted from the nation-state to the EC in an increasing number of policy areas. As the authors point out, "interests have recognized the reality of a federal Europe" (p.255).

The purpose of the volume is to provide an empirical overview of how the lobbying system is developing and to suggest ways in which scholars can comprehend the policymaking process and policy actors. It is divided into two sections. The first section examines lobbying process from an institutional perspective. The second section provides a number of interesting sectoral case studies, supplemented by three chapters on British/European business organizations and corporate lobbying strategies. The book concludes by suggesting that EC lobbying can best be explained not by a single European "policy-style" but by a variety of styles found in the policy networks that abound in EC policymaking.

Lobbying in the European Community is the third major book on EC lobbying to appear in recent years. National Public and Private EC Lobbying, edited by M.P.C.M. Van Schendelen (Dartmouth Publishing, 1993), examines EC lobbying from a country-by-country perspective. Organized Interests and the European Community, edited by Justin Greenwood et al. (Sage, 1993), identifies the dynamic behind

interest mobilization as well as the impact of organized interests (primarily business and unions) on the "Europeanization" of EC politics. The Mazey and Richardson book differs from the earlier works by bringing a "perspective of practitioners" to the analysis of EC lobbying. Indeed, the chapters written by British civil servants, Commission officials and business federation directors provide the reader with an insider's view of the policymaking process within particular institutions and policy areas.

One of the strengths of Lobbying in the European Community is the focus not only on traditional EC interests such as business federations (competently reviewed by Wyn Grant), but also on national and Community institutions. The chapter by David Spence on the role of the British Civil Service will be helpful to scholars wishing to evaluate the domestic sources of influence and policy coordination in the United Kingdom. (The chapter, however, assumes prior knowledge of Whitehall and British politics.) The Spence piece also suggests how EC policy influences domestic institutional structures and blurs the border between domestic and international politics, even in the area of "high politics." As Spence points out, while "European integration has not totally removed the UK's ability to have an independent foreign policy...many of the tools of policy are now in the competence of the Community" (p.48). The chapter by Martin Donnelly on the structure of the European Commission provides an interesting breakdown of the institution's internal policymaking process from the cabinets to the Commissioners themselves. Both chapters emphasize that national and Community institutions are not only lobbies -- but also become

lobby groups themselves in the EC policymaking process.

Well-researched sectoral case studies comprise another strength of the book. The piece by Andrew McLaughlin and Grant Jordan on Euro-group lobbying and the car industry is noteworthy not only for the empirical evidence but for its theoretical contribution. The authors argue that Mancur Olson's model of collective action cannot be readily applied to the car industry association or other Euro-groups. In today's EC policymaking process, companies realize that they must participate in the organization to ensure that their policy views were represented. Free-riding may not be a viable option. One reason for Euro-group weakness, however, is that firms view these organizations as one option among many in lobbying the EC.

The case study on Scottish regions by Mazey and James Mitchell discusses not only EC regional policy (the 'economic and social cohesion' often discussed by scholars), but also the impact of the Single Market program on local transport, environment, vocational training, and other policies at the regional level. The chapter on voluntary associations by Brian Harvey provides an interesting overview of how the Commission funds networks on poverty, the homeless and one-parent families. The case studies on the federation of stock exchanges, the textile industry, and corporation activities are also recommended.

Despite these strengths, the book suffers from a number of weaknesses. In the first place, while offering rich descriptions, the book does not address the historical context of EC lobbying in a satisfactory manner. While the book examines current EC lobbying patterns, it fails to inform the reader "from what" today's lobbying practices evolved. The activities, composition and access of today's Euro-groups, for example, differ significantly from these organizations first described by neofunctionalist scholars in the 1950s and '60s. Today, many Euro-groups do not merely " aggregate their interests" in response to Commission proposals, but actively seek to shape the drafting of the proposals. Moreover, Eurogroups comprised of individual firms were the rare exception and not the rule in the 1970's. Today, such groups are viewed as a "radical" new way of organizing interests in the Community. While the "perspective of practitioners" found in the book is insightful, several chapters lack analytical rigor in discussing activities and developments in EC lobbying.

A second shortcoming is the overwhelming emphasis on British actors and institutions. Of course, the UK case must be analyzed given the growing role played by British (along with American) firms in EC policymaking, as well as the strong reputation of the British in coordinating and imple enting EC policy. The book overlooks, however, the institutional, structural and historical factors that influence the participation of other governments and national groups in the policymaking process. The prospect of lobbying the EC is particularly troublesome in France, for example, where "le lobbying" still

carries a negative connotation and where interest groups historically were excluded from the early stages of policy formation. On the other hand, the rise of individual firms and groups of firms in the EC policymaking process poses particular challenges to German federations long-accustomed to being the strongest members in traditional Euro-groups. References to other countries or national groups are rarely made in this book. The lack of a comparative framework poses additional problems, for example, when certain policy attributes such as "damage-limitation" are labeled "British" in nature. In fact, these attributes may be shared by other national or supranational policy actors.

A third weakness--though one common to most books on lobbying in European or American politics--is the underdeveloped notion of "influence". To be certain, Mazey and Richardson discuss the shift of power to Brussels, and the impact of voting rules and institutional changes on lobbying activities. Moreover, they are careful not to equate the growth of lobbying organizations with an increases in group influence in EC policymaking. No attempt is made, however, to operationalize "influence" or to identify the conditions under which organized interests shape policy outcomes. While it may not be the intent of the book to demonstrate the actual effect of EC lobbying, some readers may be disappointed with the omission.

Finally, the book could be strengthened by defining such terms as "lobbying," "corporatism," "policy network" and "cooptation." These terms carry different meanings not only for an American, but also for a continental European audience. While most readers would recognize that the term "lobbying" in the EC does not refer to the aggressive confrontation style of interest intermediation found in the United States, they may have more difficulty defining the term in the French, German or Italian context.

Despite the weaknesses, <u>Lobbying in the European Community</u> is well worth reading for its strengths. Readers will find certain chapters very helpful. They will also find the source material invaluable given the impressive scholarship on EC interests by British and other European academics.

Maria Green Cowles, American University

The Road to Europe: History, Institutions and Prospects of European Integration 1945-1993, by David W.P. Lewis (New York: Peter Land Publishing, 1993), xix + 487 pages.

The rapid pace of change produced by the end of the Cold War and the process of European integration have led to both a flurry of scholarly attention in European politics and a renaissance in European studies courses on college and university campuses. Although academic journals provide a forum for the publication of timely research events in Europe,

the availability of text books that contain up-to-the-minute accounts of the current state of European affairs tends to be limited by the sheer speed at which change in Europe occurs. Educators searching for appropriate teaching resources often are forced to rely on books that focus on historical accounts and make little attempt to capture current European events, tedious explanations of the framework of European institutions, or recent accounts of "current events" that are quickly outdated by the vast changes in European affairs.

David Lewis has written a monumental volume that attempts to overcome these pitfalls. The Road to Europe combines a detailed history of postwar European integration with lucid explanations of the institutional framework of the European Union and investigations of topics of current interest. College professors contemplating reading for courses on European politics will want to consider The Road to Europe. However, they will have to think about what aspects of integration they want to emphasize in course readings. If their focus is on the historical progression of European integration, The Road to Europe may be an excellent choice. But if their emphasis is on current issues and debates, they may find that the book comes up short.

The Road to Europe is divided into five main sections. In Part I Lewis introduces the idea of European integration. He lays out the problems Europeans have had in forging peace through the centuries, and the post-World War II solutions proposed by the Europeans Union's founders. Lewis nicely captures the dilemmas of the past and the promise of European unity embodied in the principals that govern the present integration project.

Part II covers in impressive detail the history of European integration from 1945 to the present. Chapters proceed in a chronological manner, which poses certain problems. The linear presentation of events results in larger thematic discussions - for example, on the evolution of the European and Atlantic security organizations - being chopped up and divided throughout the historical narrative. Thus, what Lewis gains from providing continuity in the chronological recording of events he loses in depriving the reader of uninterrupted discussions of the discrete issue areas of European relations as they evolved over time. A better approach would be to cover the major historical trends of European politics, economics, and security in separate thematic chapters.

Furthermore, Lewis slights some important turning points of European integration. The major elements of the Single European Act, for instance, are buried in a lengthy endnote which many undergraduates will overlook, while Greek accession to the EC is treated in a single paragraph. Finally, Lewis devotes space to the history of relatively arcane elements of EC integration such as fisheries policy and the Community's relations with Andorra, while overlooking others that merit greater attention. For example, Lewis writes of Spanish and Portuguese accession to the Community with no

mention whatsoever of the importance of EC membership for consolidating democracy in these two countries.

Part III covers the institutional framework of European politics and integration. Lewis succeeds in avoiding a recitation of the dreadful minutiae of European organizations and their functions. Instead, chapters on the OECD, GATT, Council of Europe, WEU, EFTA, and the institutions of the European Union are presented in a simple and concise manner. Lewis does an especially good job of assessing how each organization discussed fits into the larger framework of European, and global, relations.

The section on European institutions, however, is not without flaws. Chapters on the defunct Soviet-dominated organizations CMEA and COMECON seem totally out of place now that they have ceased to exist. Likewise, a chapter on the Commonwealth of Independent States, while thoroughly informative, also stands out as a needless digression in the otherwise logical explication of the centripetal forces of European integration embodied in the institutions of the EU and other Western agencies. Finally, a chapter on the European Space Agency may delight, but adds little to a serious discussion of those institutions around which lasting European integration is forged.

Four chapters on current issues comprise Part IV of the book. These chapters on agriculture, environmentalism, monetary union (by Tanya M. Atwod), and cultural diversity offer perceptive insights into the present state of European integration. Lewis's examination of the importance of agricultural policy and Atwood's lucid explication of monetary union illustrate why the provision of economic prosperity in Europe must go beyond the technical jargon of Brussels bureaucrats to capture the hearts and minds of the citizens of a unified Europe. The chapters on environmental issues and cultural diversity also highlight Lewis's theme of the need to forge a European (if not global) identity if true unification is ever to be possible.

Lamentably, this excellent section constitutes fewer than seventy pages of the book. One is left wondering why other areas are not covered with the same depth. Immigration policy, mentioned briefly in the chapter on cultural diversity merits a larger discussion of its own. Likewise, the EU's common foreign and security policy (including trade relations with the United States, Japan, and the Third World) deserves more than the scattered discussion it receives in Part II. The expansion of the EU to include Eastern European and EFTA states is treated in different places in Parts II and III, but deserves a larger theoretical discussion in a chapter under this single heading.

In Part V Lewis returns to the idea of European unity. Lewis is at his best capturing the sweep of European integration in its loftiest ideals: "We cannot establish a moral blueprint on economic criteria alone....Our institutional vocabulary may serve as scaffolding to an edifice under

construction but must not impinge on the creativity of the new generation of builders....Europe is more a direction than a goal" (p.386). This is a welcome departure from the usual dreary accounts of European unification offered by more policy-oriented texts.

In addition to these five sections, readers will be delighted to find 15 pages of maps and tables listing the members of important European organizations (although it would have been nice if dates of entry were included), and two invaluable appendices. The first appendix provides a timeline of European milestones from 1914 to the present. This chronology of events, listed in exhaustive detail, will be reason enough for some people to purchase the book. The second appendix provides a thorough glossary of acronyms of European institutions - an invaluable aid in the alphabet soup that is today's Europe.

Lewis's greatest accomplishment is to tie together all elements of the book with the thesis he lays out in the introduction and returns to in the conclusion. Unlike many books that focus on the purely technical features of European integration, The Road to Europe presents integration as the culmination of a centuries-long search for what Gorbachev has called the "common European home". As Lewis argues: "There is clearly a need for greater citizen participation in the European process and firmer reassurance that national and regional identities will be protected before they express themselves in virulent form" (p. 198). By rising above the details of integration nuts and bolts, Lewis elegantly captures the search for the elusive glue of eventual unification: European identity itself.

Yet although Lewis does an excellent job presenting the various sections within this theme of European identity, The Road to Europe provides little in the way of theories of integration. Specifically, the debate between supranationalism and intergovernmentalism is offered scant attention. As this is an introductory text, Lewis might be excused for refraining from obtuse theorizing. On the other hand, professors who want to challenge their students with analytical discussions will have to look elsewhere. Given its historical focus, educators may also find the volume inappropriate for courses that are designed to address the topics of current interest in European relations. In this sense, The Road to Europe may best serve as a background resource than as a primary text. Outside of the classroom, any serious scholar of European integration will find the book an invaluable reference volume.

Michael Marks, University of Wyoming Eisenhower, Kennedy and the United States of Europe, by Pascaline Winand (St. Martin's Press, 1993), 432 pages.

<u>Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity</u>, edited by Douglas Brinkley and Clifford Hackett with an introduction by George W. Ball (St. Martin's Press, 1991), 226 pages.

The past few years have been the best of times and the worst of times for American advocates of European unity and transatlantic cooperation.

First there was the good news. The successful completion of the EC '92 exercise. The negotiation and eventual ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. The abrupt and totally unanticipated reunification of Germany and with it the successful conclusion of the great Manichean struggle that had dominated the second half of the 20th Century.

Then there was the bad news. The savaging of the European exchange rate by a powerful global cabal of currency speculators. The specter of growing unemployment across the length and breadth of continental Europe. The foreboding sense that European industry was simply not going to be able to cut it in the relentlessly competitive global economy of the 21st Century.

Perhaps most disturbing for American Europeanists was the prospect of a yawning gap between U.S. and European policy elites. On the European side we heard Jacques Delors remind America in stentorian terms that Yugoslavia was a "European issue" that should be left to Europeans to resolve. On the U.S. side we witnessed the embarrassing spectacle of Warren Christopher blurting out that U.S. foreign policy had become too "Euro-centric" and now needed to be recalibrated to reflect the growing importance of Pacific Rim economies.

Through it all--the chaotic dénouement of the Cold War, the prickly assertiveness of the European Union, the ominous evidence that the Atlantic Alliance was fraying at the edgesthere was a vague sense that something vital was being overlooked by policymakers on both sides of the Atlantic. Indeed there was--the crucially important lessons of postwar history.

Just in time, two marvelous remedies to collective memory loss on the part of European and American policymakers have arrived--Pascaline Winand's meticulously detailed diplomatic history of U.S.-E.C. relations during the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations and a collection of essays, first-hand accounts and critical commentaries about Jean Monnet assembled by the Jean Monnet Council. Both flesh in the details of a vanished world--those heady years after the catastrophe of World War II when that air was thick with talk of supranationalism and cooperative venture, when Jean Monnet could unapologetically couch his dream of European unity in terms of the establishment of a "sort of second America," when the millenial vision of a genuine world order seemed tantalizingly close to reality.

Winand's book, which benefits from a wealth of primary sources including privileged access to the papers of various participants in the events of the postwar years, is a rigorously thoughtful portrayal of the seedtime of the Atlantic Alliance. What emerges most forcefully from her meticulous research is the sense of shared vision on the part of Monnet and a small cadre of deeply committed American Europeanists. As Winand puts it:

[American] Europeanists were part of a unique network of friends, close acquaintances, and colleagues, in which both Americans and Europeans contributed to a common cause: the advancement of Europeanintegration as an essential element in pursuing the larger goal of an acceptable peace settlement. Americans and Europeans did, of course, pursue separate and distinct interests, but as a key American supporter of European integration has noted, at the time 'they were somehow secondary.'

Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity adds a personal perspective about the key figure in this Euro-American conspiracy to achieve lasting peace in Europe. For aficionados of Monnet's Memoirs this new book is a feast of insights into the work and philosophy of a remarkable genius. The essentials Monnet that emerges from these essays is not a man of letters or even a distinguished statesman but--pardon the oxymoron--a supremely gifted, highly principled lobbyist! Here is Monnet as revealed in Francois Fontaine's essay:

There are plenty of men in every period who like to lobby so as to influence the political scene. Jean Monnet possessed, in addition and exclusively, a high moral vision that is very rarely found among men behind the scenes, who mostly use their abilities to pull down rather than build up, and to divide rather than to unite. It is this combination of distinctive features that constitutes creative genius in a given society and, in certain circumstances, enables that genius to act for the common interest. And it is in this sense that one can speak of the genius of Jean Monnet, who made his mark on the men of his time without wishing or seeming to raise himself above them.

One hopes, perhaps naively that these two vitally important reminders of the lessons of postwar history--these poignant chronicles of a unique era of unabashed transatlantic cooperation, those remarkable testaments to the irresistible power of a shared vision of hop and progress--will somehow make their way to the bedside shelf of that voracious reader who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

James Gardner
Gardner, Cosgrove & Gardner
Portland, OR
International Chairman
Conference of World Regions

Jens Henrik Haahr, Looking to Europe: The EC Policies of the British Labour Party and the Danish Social Democrats, Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1993.

Jens Henrik Haahr's book is an attempt to unscramble the "marble cake" relationship between national level social democratic parties and the European Community. This type of work is both very important and extremely difficult to do well. Clearly, a true understanding of the EC cannot concentrate solely on the internal dynamics of the EC institutions and/or the intergovernmental bargains that drive EC development. A more complete understanding must ask how the EC interacts with national actors and how this interaction alters the national actors and the EC, as well as the dynamics of subsequent interactions. The best known and earliest of these attempts was Ernst Haas' The Uniting of Europe, which analyzed the relationships of various national actors (parties, trade unions, etc.) to the emerging EEC. From this analysis, Haas postulated the theory of neo-functionalism which attempted to explain the interaction and predict its direction.

Haahr clearly sees himself as following in the footsteps of Haas, but in a much more limited fashion. Instead of a study of all parties in every member state (a work which even a modern day Haas would be loath to attempt), he focuses on the relationships of the Social Democratic parties of Britain and Denmark to the EC. Primarily, he wants to examine why both the British and Danish Social Democrats, which had demonstrated strong anti-European sentiments until the mid-1980s, suddenly joined the pro-European camp in the late 1980s. To do this, Haahr provides in-depth studies of the development of British and Danish social democracy, and the relationships of the social democratic movements in both countries to the EC. Both are well done and thorough, based on a combination of primary and secondary sources, and excellent additions to the small but growing literature on socialism and the EC.

Haahr defines three main groups of factors that influence the level of "political attitude integration" of Social Democratic parties: 1) domestic determinants, 2) external determinants, and 3) the internal dynamic of integration. He argues that a varying combination of these factors caused the shift in the British and Danish Social Democratic parties' attitudes to the EC in the mid to late 1980s. Most of the domestic and external determinants analysed are fairly predictable: growth of trade interdependence, growing popularity of the EC, strategic electoral calculations, etc. At varying times and places these factors encouraged the pro- or anti- EC attitudes within the Social Democratic parties, depending on the particular situation of the parties.

Haahr does, however, raise a very interesting point concerning the internal dynamic of integration. He argues that, for British and Danish Social Democrats, the market liberalizing nature of the EC was one of the central objections

to membership in and support for the EC. Hence, to maintain control over the national economy and maintain welfare states, Social Democratic parties resisted both membership in and the strengthening of the EC. Both the British and Danish cases confirm this. However, if despite Social Democratic resistance, their nation does become a firm member and the market liberalizing nature of the EC is not reduced, then Social Democratic parties, using what Haahr defines as a "national-instrumental" logic (the parties are nationally based policy actors which base their actions on instrumental rationality), will try to redirect and strengthen the EC in order to combat its market liberalizing nature and effects.

Once Britain and Denmark became firm members of the EC and the market liberalizing 1992 project began, the British and Danish Social Democratic parties had to respond to these new dynamics. No longer able to leave the EC, they had to turn to its supranational institutions and dynamics for help against its market liberalizing effects. The key to this turn was the EC's social dimension. Now, instead of arguing to leave the EC or keep its institutions as weak and intergovernmentally oriented as possible, British and Danish Social Democrats began arguing that EC institutional powers needed to be deepened and expanded. For example, they argued that the European Parliament (where European Social Democrats have a majority) needed more power. Qualified majority voting in the EC Council should be extended to social issues. EC environmental policies must be developed.

In essence, this idea is a variant of Haas' earlier notion of spillover, which posits that different national actors confronted with common supranational problems will seek supranational solutions. In the case of the British and Danish Social Democrats the option of leaving the EC was lost at virtually the same time as the EC re-dynamized its market liberalizing strategy (the 1992 project). In order to counter this liberalizing strategy, British and Danish Social Democrats had to turn to the EC. And in doing so, they demanded that it expand its area of influence and deepen its powers relative to the powers of individual member-states.

This is a very interesting idea. Unfortunately, Haahr, much like early neo-functionalism, only deals with the period of EC dynamism and success. His analysis ends just before the crash landing of Maastricht and the EMU. How have Social Democratic parties reacted to the recent stagnation of the EC? Will they ignore it and return to a more nationalist orientation? Is there a neo-functionalist "spillback?" Or, will they push even harder for further integration?

Haahr's work only indirectly explores some of the effects of the EC on social democracy. In particular, he raises the interesting point of whether Social Democratic parties have responded to the EC issue with vote-seeking or policy-pursuing strategies. Many other interesting questions remain. Does a greater orientation toward the EC strengthen the hand of party leaders in relation to party activists? Does it strengthen certain party factions over others? Does this orientation alter the relationship between the parties and the unions (as seen in the British case where Neil Kinnock and John Smith linked their growing EC orientation to a distancing from the TUC)?

Overall, this book is a solid academic work that will appeal to two main audiences: those interested in social democracy's relationship to the EC and those interested in neofunctionalism and its application to current EC dynamics. In neither area, however, can the book be considered a preeminent text. In many ways, works that try to duplicate Haas' work must deal with three main problems. First, due to its "marble cake" nature, it is virtually impossible to separate and isolate the various elements of the EC and its relations to its national actors. Second, due to the speed of recent European events, book length works are dated from the moment of publication. Third, the sheer size and influence of the EC makes works such as Haahr's seem very small and inconsequential in relation to Haas' masterwork. Haahr does not solve these three problems, but deals ably with the limitations and difficulties which they impose.

Robert Geyer, University of Wisconsin

### **PUBLICATIONS**

#### RECENT BOOKS

David Arter. The Politics of European Integration in the Twentieth Century. Dartmouth Publishing Co., 1993.

Wolfgang Blaas and John Foster, ed. Mixed Economies in Europe. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

David Buchan. Europe, The Strange Superpower. Dartmouth

Publishing Co., 1993.

Harry Coenen and Peter Leisink, ed. Work and Citizenship in the New Europe. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Andrew Cox and Paul Furlong, ed. The European Union at the Crossroads: The Problems of Implementing the Single Market Project. Earlsgate Press, 1994.

Andrew Cox and GlynWatson. The European Community and the Utilities: An Analysis of the Single Market Reforms in the Energy, Water, Transport and Telecommunications Sectors. Earlsgate Press, 1994.

Andrew Cox and GlynWatson. The Restructuring of European Industry: The Impact of the Single Market Project on Concentration and Merger Activity in the EC. Earlsgate Press, 1994.

Russell J. Dalton, ed. The New Germany Votes: Unification and the Creation of a New German Party System. Berg Publishers.

Desmond Dinan. Even Closer Union? An Introduction to the European Community. Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994.

Francois-Georges Dreyfus, Jaques Morizet and Max Peyrard, ed. France and EC Membership Evaluated. St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Mary Fulbrook, ed. *National Histories and European History*. Westview Press, 1993.

Justin Greenwood, Jurgen R. Grote and Karsten Ronit. Organized Interests and the European Community. Sage, 1992.

Carlos Javier Moreiro Gonzalez, ed. *Banking in Europe After 1992*. Dartmouth Publishing Co., 1993.

Helga Haftendorn and Christian Tuschhoff, ed. America and Europe in an Era of Change. Westview, 1993.

Max Haller and Rudolf Richter, ed. *Toward a European Nation*. M.E.Sharpe, 1994.

Kimberly A. Hamilton. *Internatinal Migration and Europe*. Westview, 1993.

Glennon J. Harrison. Europe and the United States. M.E.Sharpe, 1994.

Jyrki Iivonen, ed. *The Future of the Nation State in Europe*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Alexis Jacquemin and David Wright. The European Challenges Post-1992. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Peter Johnson, ed. *European Industries*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Mary Troy Johnston. The European Council. Westview, 1993.

Michael Keating. *The Politics of Modern Europe*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Heinz D. Kurz, ed. *United Germany and the New Europe*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Pierre-Henri Laurent, ed. *The European Community: To Maastricht and Beyond.* Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, 1994.

Jane Lewis, ed. Women and Social Policies in Europe. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Christopher Lord. British Entry to the European Community Under the Health Government of 1970-4. Dartmouth Publishing Co., 1993.

Sharon Macdonald, ed. *Inside European Identities*. Berg Publishers, 1993.

John Peterson. Europe and America in the 1990s. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

W.R. Smyser. Germany and America. Westview, 1993.

Grahame F. Thompson. *The Economic Emergence of a New Europe?* Edward Elgar Publishing, 1993.

Willie Thompson. *The Long Death of British Labourism*. Westview Press, 1993.

Dirk Verheyen and Christian Soe, ed. *The Germans and Their Neighbors*. Westview Press, 1993

Glyn Watson. The Public Sector in the Member States of the European Community: A Bibliographical Study Guide. Earlsgate Press, 1993.

Thomas M. Wilson and M. Estellie Smith, ed. Cultural Change & the New Europe. Westview Press, 1993.

John Wrench, ed. Racism and Migration in Western Europe. Berg Publishers, 1993.

### ASSOCIATION NEWS

### A Note of Thanks to Peter Doyle

Since 1990, Peter Doyle has served as the Director of Press and Public Affairs of the European Commission Delegation in Washington, DC. In this capacity, he has generously assisted ECSA in the development of many programs and activities. Peter will shortly undertake new responsibilities in Brussels for DGX as Head of Unit, Responsible for the Commission's

Offices in the EU Member States. The members of the Executive Committee wish to express their warm thanks and gratitude to Peter for his longstanding support of ECSA.

### **ECSA Graduate Fellowships Awarded**

With funding from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington D.C., ECSA has awarded two Graduate Fellowships leading to the M.A. degree for the 1994-1995 academic year. The Fellowships began last year with a single position at the University of Limerick, Ireland and have been expanded this year with an additional position at the University of Sussex, England. The 1994-1995 Graduate Fellows are:

Nina Schou, who will attend the M.A. program in Contemporary European Studies at the University of Sussex. Ms. Schou is a History major at Stanford University.

**Heather Popielski,** who will attend the M.A. program in European Integration at the University of Limerick. Ms. Popielski is a International Relations major at American University.

Both fellows will receive approximately \$11,000 toward their tuition, accommodation, and travel expenses. ECSA is grateful to both the University of Limerick and the University of Sussex for making special arrangements which will substantially reduce the tuition fees of the Fellows.

### ECSA Dissertation Fellowships Awarded

With funding from the Ford Foundation, ECSA has awarded three Dissertation Fellowships for the 1994-1995 academic year. Each Fellow receives \$2,500 for dissertation-related expenses. The 1994-1995 Dissertation Fellows and their dissertation topics are:

Lisa J. Conant, Department of Political Science, University of Washington

"The European Court of Justice and Member States of the European Community"

Colin Wayne Leach, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan

"Public Opinion and Immigrant Policy and Politics in the EC: A Comparative Study of Four Member States"

Lee Ann Patterson, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

"Regulatory Competitiveness: A Comparative Study of Biotechnology in the European Union and the United States"

#### **Curriculum Development Grants Awarded**

With funding from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington D.C., ECSA has awarded 8 Curriculum Development Grants for the 1994-1995 or 1995-1996 academic years. The Curriculum

Development Grants are designed for the creation of new courses on the European Union, or for the expansion of existing courses to include material on the European Union. The following individuals and their sponsoring institutions received Curriculum Development Grants of up to \$3,000:

Chris Bourdevalis, Department of Political Science, Augusta College, Augusta, GA

Colette Mazzuccelli, School for Summer and Continuing Education, Georgetown University, Washington, DC

Antonio V. Menéndez, Department of Sociology, Butler University, Indianapolis, IN

James Miller, School of Communications and Cognitive Science, Hampshire College, Amherst, MA

Margarete Myers, Department of History, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, PA

Raffael Scheck, Department of History, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine

Stacia A. Straley, Department of Political Science, Muskingum College, New Concord, OH

**David Wilsford**, School of International Affairs, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA

### **Credit Card Payments Now Accepted**

Payment by credit card will now be accepted for ECSA membership fees. As indicated on the membership application and renewal form at the back of the *Newsletter*, both VISA and Mastercard may be used. Credit card facilities will provide many members with a more convenient form of payment and should be particularly helpful for ECSA members residing outside of the United States.

### Special Subscription Offer from Journal of Common Market Studies

ECSA members may receive a 25% discount on individual yearly subscriptions to the *Journal of Common Market Studies*. This special rate is for \$71, as opposed to the full individual rate of \$94. Interested individuals should contact Blackwell Publishers, 108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK, phone (+44) 0865 791100, fax (+44) 0865 791347, and clearly state that they are members of ECSA-USA.

### Increase in Membership Dues to Begin on January 1, 1995

Effective January 1, 1995, ECSA membership dues will increase to \$15.00 for students, \$30.00 for individuals, and \$75.00 for institutions. The Executive Committee approved this modest increase to defray some of the many costs

associated with ECSA's growing number of activities and noted that membership fees have not increased since ECSA's founding in 1988.

ECSA membership will continue to provide a large number of benefits, including: free and prompt receipt of several ECSA publications, such as the *Newsletter*, the monograph produced by the biennial US-EC Relations Project (written by Catherine M. Kelleher in 1993 and to be authored by Miles Kahler in 1995), the *Membership Directory*, and a volume of abstracts for papers presented at each biennial ECSA Conference; reduced rates for other publications, including the biennial *State of the European Community* volume; reduced journal subscription rates; and reduced registration and lodging fees at the biennial ECSA Conference.

#### **Grants Received**

The Ford Foundation (1994-1995-1996): \$200,000 for programmatic activities and administrative operations.

The European Commission, DGI (1994): 15,000 ECU for support of 1994 ECSA Workshop.

The Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington D.C. (1994): \$63,500 for

programmatic activities and administrative operations.

The United States Mission to the European Communities (1994): \$30,000 for support of 1994 ECSA Workshop.

#### **ECSA NEWSLETTER**

Co-Editors

Christine Ingebritsen

Scandinavian Department, 318 Raitt Hall, DL-20 University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 Tel: (206) 543-0645 Fax: (206) 685-9173 E-Mail: ingie@u.washington.edu

Bill Burros

ECSA Administrative Office, 405 Bellefield Hall University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 Tel: (412) 648-7635 Fax: (412) 648-1168 E-Mail: ECSA@VMS.CIS.PITT.EDU

Depending on the response to this quer	ry, the Executiv	ted members are asked to fill out and return we Committee may proceed with the formatic accouraged to add categories. Thank you for	tion of sections devoted
Please check the areas which are of mo Common Foreign and Security Policy Comparative Economics Comparative Federalism Comparative Integration Comparative Politics Comparative Public Policy Environment Ethics History of the EC/EU Additional areas?:	st interest to yo	Industrial Relations International Business International Organizations International Political Economy Peace Studies Regions Trade Transnational Society	

Please mail to Bill Burros at the ECSA Administrative Office, 405 Bellefield Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA