



# EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION

VOLUME X, NO. 2 SUMMER 1997  
ISSN 1090-5758

# ECSCA REVIEW

## From the Chair

GARY MARKS

### Comparative Politics and International Relations: Suggestions for a Unitary Approach

Studying the European Union asks us to think anew about political science as a discipline and how its subfields fit together. In no other substantive area is the relation between comparative politics and international relations so close and their existence as two independent sub-fields so problematic. Do international relations and comparative politics have distinct conceptual bases or theoretical contributions? My answer to both these questions is no, and I am led to believe that the two subfields have little claim to separate status.

The theoretical distinctiveness of international relations has rested on the following assumptions: the notion that a "state" can be conceived as an autonomous actor, that it pursues its self interest in its relations with other "states," and that relations among such "states" are determined structurally by forces external to their domestic polities. Two generations of IR scholars have questioned these assumptions as they have sought to integrate domestic politics into international relations theories (Keohane and Milner 1996; APSA-CP 1996). They argue persuasively that international processes affect domestic politics and that to explain the policies of states in the international arena, one must pay serious attention to domestic forces.

In a recent article in *International Organization*, Peter Gourevitch summarizes this approach: "To understand Germany's desire to sustain the mark, Britain's refusal to surrender sovereignty of the pound, and the reluctance of other governments to pursue deflationary policies in order to keep their currencies within the snake, it is necessary to examine the politics within each country" (1996: p. 365). These theorists attempt to explain the policies of individual countries by looking inside them and investigating domestic political forces. To figure out what Britain, Germany, or any other country wants, one needs to look inside the black box.

This approach accords with the common practice of treating states, national governments, and countries as if they refer to the same thing, but it is a costly simplification. First, it creates an artificial boundary between what goes on inside a state and what goes on outside a state. Many political actors and organizations operate in the European arena as well as in a variety of domestic arenas. The EU is clearly a multi-level

polity. Surely, we need to develop explanations that work across political arenas rather than say that we need one type of theory to understand what these actors do at the European level and a different theory for what they do in national or subnational arenas. Second, this approach reifies countries. What does Germany desire? Why does Britain want to maintain monetary sovereignty? It is difficult to see how we will make progress in understanding the European Union if our questions rest on such an obtuse rendering of the state.

What would a more refined approach look like? There are a variety of conceptual bases which have the virtue of allowing research on important empirical issues. My own preference is for an actor-centered approach. This begins by conceptualizing political actors, in international relations as well as in domestic politics, as flesh and blood human beings or groups of human beings who associate in organizations of every kind, including political parties, parliaments, civil services, national governments. This allows one to distinguish between the state as a set of rules shaping the allocation and exercise of legitimate authority in a society from political actors who act within—and often try to change—those rules (North 1990; Marks 1996).

This seems to me to be an uncontroversial point of departure, yet it has radical implications for the relationship between comparative politics and international relations. From this standpoint, states do not engage in international relations; national politicians and other actors do. Actors in international relations are in principle no different from actors in domestic politics. Often, indeed, they include the same human beings: national politicians, regional leaders, social movement participants and interest group representatives. Even where national politicians dominate international bargaining, one is reminded that although they may say that they are acting in the national interest, they remain party-political animals who build coalitions and contest elections.

While two-level game and "inside-out" approaches build bridges between domestic politics and international relations, they do not close the divide. Once we abandon the highly reified concepts that underlie realism, it seems possible to develop a sensible approach to politics that is both more concrete and more general than that put forward by writers who otherwise criticize realism.

*(continued on page 2)*

The boundaries among the subfields of political science are not written in stone. European integration, alongside a variety of global economic and social pressures, has blurred the distinction between domestic and international politics. Why do we need one set of concepts or theories to describe politics among states and another to describe politics within states? European integration is chief among those developments that challenge the existence of comparative politics and international relations as distinct subfields of political science.

*To contribute to an on-line discussion of this topic, visit <<http://www.unc.edu/depts/europe>> and click on "CES Publications." Gary Marks is Professor of Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Director of the UNC Center for European Studies.*

### Notes

- APSA-CP (1996) "Is Comparative Politics Obsolete?" Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics.
- Gourevitch, Peter A. (1996) "Squaring the Circle: The Domestic Sources of International Cooperation," *International Organization* 50: 349-73.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Helen V. Milner, eds. (1996) Internationalization and Domestic Politics (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Marks, Gary (1996) "An Actor-Centered Approach to Multilevel Governance," *Regional and Federal Studies* 6: 20-40. Reprinted in Charlie Jeffery, ed., The Regional Dimension of the European Union (London: Frank Cass).
- North, Douglass C. (1990) Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

## ECSA USA Notes

In succeeding Jim Caporaso as Chair of ECSA's governing Executive Committee, I would like to give warm thanks to the outgoing Committee members: Jim Caporaso, Carl Lankowski, Carolyn Rhodes and Alberta Sbragia. Each has done great service to ECSA during their four years on the Committee and beyond, and I will miss their leadership. At the same time I would like to welcome back to their second two-year terms, returning Committee members David Cameron, Leon Hurwitz and Pierre-Henri Laurent. Finally, I am very pleased to welcome to the Executive Committee three new members: Maria Green Cowles, Kathleen McNamara and Vivien Schmidt.

The ECSA Conference in Seattle was a major success. With ninety panels, more than 400 papers and a registered attendance of 460 from throughout the United States, from all fifteen EU member countries and from other countries as well, this was the largest ECSA conference to date. It might have been the largest intellectual gathering ever on the EU. Please

note that ECSA will be issuing a book of abstracts of the papers from the Fifth Biennial Conference later this year, complete with ordering form for those who wish to purchase individual papers from the ECSA office. The Sixth ECSA Biennial International Conference will take place in Pittsburgh in 1999—watch ECSA's Web site for details.

ECSA owes a particularly large thank you to the Delegation of the European Commission in Washington, D.C. for their substantial support of the conference in Seattle. As in previous years, the Delegation brought to the ECSA conference EU Depository Librarians from institutions throughout the USA; sixty-one such librarians attended ECSA panels and shared their expertise with ECSA conference delegates. The librarians' panel, "Europe on the Web: Approaches to Using the WWW in European Union Studies," was among the best attended panels at the conference. ECSA values this collaboration and information sharing with EU information science professionals.

Speaking of collaboration, the ECSA conference marked the culmination of the 1997 US-EU Relations Project, for which David Vogel of the University of California at Berkeley was the scholar. Professor Vogel first delivered his paper on transatlantic trade regulation to scholars and policymakers in Washington, D.C. in January of this year and then again to a group of scholars and policymakers in Brussels in March. He delivered his paper as a plenary address at the ECSA Conference in Seattle in May, and readers will find the introductory section of it in this issue of the *ECSA Review*. The full text will be published as a monograph later this year and sent to all current ECSA members.

ECSA USA members will also be receiving later this year the 1997-98 Membership Directory. Conference attendees received the update form in their conference packets in Seattle; other current ECSA members who wish to be included in the directory will find the update form on page 26 in this issue of the *ECSA Review*. Please return it to the ECSA Administrative Office by fax or regular mail no later than August 31, 1997, for inclusion in this year's Directory. This publication is a benefit of ECSA USA membership and is available at a reasonable fee to other interested persons.

On a final note, congratulations to ECSA's 1997-98 Curriculum Development grant awardees selected for outstanding proposals to upgrade existing courses on the EU or develop new EU courses: Michelle Egan (American University), Peter Loedel (West Chester University), and Sophie Meunier (University of Chicago). These grants are generously funded by the Delegation of the European Commission in Washington, D.C. Please take note of the related new feature in this issue of the *ECSA Review*, a column entitled "Teaching the EU." The inaugural essay for this new feature (see p.9) is Michel Gueldry's, "Bridging the Gap: Integrating EU Studies in a Cross-Disciplinary and Multi-linguistic Curriculum." As the European Union evolves, exciting new courses and pedagogical approaches to teaching about the EU are developing. ECSA USA actively supports these endeavors and we aim as well to inform our interested members about them.—Gary Marks, Chair.

## Essays

*Editor's note: What follows is the introductory section of David Vogel's 1997 US-EU Relations Project paper and address, delivered at ECSA's Fifth Biennial International Conference in Seattle on May 30, 1997. The ECSA-sponsored US-EU Relations Project takes place every two years with a distinguished scholar conducting research on a transatlantic topic and making presentations on both sides of the Atlantic; it culminates in the Conference plenary session address. The entire text is forthcoming in monograph form later this year.*

### **Regulatory Cooperation Between the European Union and the United States: Introduction**

**David Vogel**

Government regulation has come to occupy an increasingly important place on the agenda of international relations. On one hand, the role of environmental and consumer regulations as non-tariff barriers has been the focus of a growing number of trade disputes, negotiation and agreements. On the other hand, international regulatory cooperation and coordination has also enabled nations to improve the effectiveness of their health, safety and environmental regulations and enhanced their ability to address common regulatory problems.

Because of their dominant position in the global economy, whenever the US and the EU agree on regulatory policies and procedures, many other nations are likely to adopt them as well. In effect, they become de facto global standards. Accordingly, a key conclusion of this essay is that the EU and the US need to play a more active role in promoting multi-lateral regulatory cooperation. At the same time, multilateral forums can facilitate the resolution or regulatory related disputes between the US and the EU.

Ironically, it is precisely because the EU and the US have so much in common and are so economically interdependent that their conflicts over each other's regulatory policies have been so contentious. Because both are relatively affluent, open societies whose citizens place a high value on consumer and environmental protection, each is continually enacting new regulations and strengthening existing ones. And because their trade is so extensive to begin with, a significant portion of these regulations affect each other's exports. This accounts for both the number of US-EU regulatory trade conflicts and the importance producers as well as citizens on both sides of the Atlantic have attached to them.

The extent and intensity of competition between European- and American-based firms has not led either political body to lower its regulatory standards in order to gain or maintain a competitive advantage. On the contrary, it is

precisely the steady strengthening of health, safety and environmental regulations on both sides of the Atlantic that has emerged as one of the most important sources of trade conflict between the EU and the US. Likewise, regulatory cooperation between Europe and the United States has resulted in improving both the effectiveness and efficiency of government regulation not only within the Atlantic basin, but globally as well.

The European Union represents the world's most extensive effort to coordinate national regulatory standards. The substantial progress the Europeans have made in creating a single market has significantly affected US-EU trade relations. In some cases, the harmonization of regulatory standards within the EU has exacerbated trade tensions with the United States, while in others it has facilitated international regulatory cooperation. In a number of important respects, the experiences of the EU have provided a model for other international efforts to strengthen regulatory cooperation, most notably those of the GATT/WTO.

This essay explores the relationship between consumer and environmental regulation in EU-US relations. It describes and explains the dynamics of conflict and cooperation between the EU and the US in seven regulatory areas: food safety standards, chemical testing, animal protection, eco-labeling, and ozone depletion. These cases are not only important in their own right but illustrative of the pattern of transatlantic regulatory relations.

Four of the trade disputes described in this essay, namely the ban on growth hormones, meat inspection, the leg-trap ban, and eco-labeling, involve complaints by the US about the discriminatory impact of EU regulations on American exports. Three others—fuel-economy standards, the tuna embargo, and drug inspections—address the EU's complaints about the obstacles to trade posed by American regulatory standards. Two trade disputes, namely the EU's challenge to American fuel economy standards and the American tuna embargo, have come before GATT dispute panels; the US prevailed in the former case while the EU's complaint was upheld in the latter. A third dispute, which stems from an American complaint about the EU's beef hormone ban, is currently being addressed by the World Trade Organization. This essay also examines three important cases of EU-US regulatory cooperation. The US and the EU have worked closely together on developing common testing standards for new chemicals, establishing more uniform standards for drug approval applications and negotiating an international agreement to protect the ozone layer.

The pattern of US-EU regulatory relations has important implications not only for the United States and Western Europe, but the entire global economy. Collectively, they account for more than one-third of world trade and approximately fifty percent of global GDP. Not surprisingly, virtually all of the trade disputes over the (alleged) use of regulations as non-tariff barriers between the US and the EU have affected other countries as well. Consequently, other nations have intervened in a number of EU-US trade disputes, usually supporting the complainant. Sometimes this has

placed them on the side of the US, while on other occasions it involved support for the position of the EU.

The increasing attention given by policymakers to the role of government regulation in the global economy stems from the impact of these regulations on both the international competitiveness of domestic firms and the effectiveness of government controls over business. During the post-war period, the scope of government intervention in the economy expanded considerably. Along with the growth of the welfare state, the twentieth century witnessed a major expansion of government regulation of industry. Governments in advanced industrial societies, as well as in a number of developing ones, enacted numerous rules, standards, and regulations in order to protect public health, maintain and improve environmental quality, as well as to safeguard the integrity of financial markets and institutions.

However, such regulations rarely affect all firms or industries equally, because some producers will usually find it easier or less expensive to comply with than others. Consequently, many regulations influence the competitive position of firms, offering advantages to some and handicapping others. Often these regulations, whether intentionally or inadvertently, favor domestic producers over foreign ones, thus functioning as non-tariff trade barriers. Moreover, even regulations which do not directly impose greater costs on foreign producers may represent obstacles to international commerce by increasing transaction costs. For example, importers may be required to submit their products to clinical tests or safety inspections which duplicate ones with which they have already complied at home. Such regulatory redundancy can significantly increase the costs of engaging in global trade.

When national regulations affect the competitive position, relative costs of market share of foreign producers vis-à-vis domestic ones, they move from being a country's "own business" to the sphere of international relations. The logic of trade liberalization has influenced governments to expand the scope of trade agreements beyond distinct and overtly trade controls such as tariffs and quotas, to encompass a wide variety of regulatory policies, especially as the former have declined and the latter have grown in importance. Accordingly, trade agreements and negotiations are subjecting a growing number of policies toward business that were formally decided exclusively by national or local governments to international scrutiny or coordination. "Starting in the 1980s, the domestic structures of political economy have become major stakes in international trade negotiations."<sup>1</sup> By undermining national regulatory sovereignty, globalization has blurred the distinction between trade policy and health, safety and environmental regulation.

International regulatory coordination cannot only promote trade liberalization; it can also improve the effectiveness of national controls beyond the scope of the nation state, or can be more effectively controlled through international cooperation. Regulatory cooperation is necessary in order to reduce pollution and other environmental damage which either crosses national boundaries or affects the global commons. International coordination may also be needed to enable nations to enact stricter national standards, since otherwise, domestic producers facing more expensive compliance costs than their trading partners would face a competitive disadvantage. Finally, if a nation's testing or inspection requirements are either identical or similar to those of its trading partners, global cooperation may reduce its own administrative burdens.

International agreements to reduce the use of regulations as non-tariff barriers have primarily taken place under the auspices of GATT/WTO. The Uruguay Round agreement strengthened the Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, also known as the Standards Code. This limits the ability of nations to use regulations to protect domestic producers, while also permitting them to maintain or enact regulations which are necessary to fulfill legitimate public policy objectives. The Code introduced the proportionality criterion into international trade law. This requires that national standards or "technical barriers to trade [not] be more trade-restrictive than necessary to fulfill a legitimate objective, taking into account of the risks non-fulfillment would create."<sup>2</sup> At the same time, the Standards Code permits each national signatory to "maintain standards and technical regulations for the protection of human, animal, and plant life and health of the environment."<sup>3</sup>

The GATT/WTO itself has not attempted to establish either common or minimum regulatory standards. Its only authority is negative: it responds to complaints by telling nations if the burdens their regulations impose on international commerce are either disproportionate to the objectives they are seeking to achieve or otherwise violate WTO rules on permissible trade restrictions. However, there is often a fine line between a legitimate health and safety regulation that is more difficult for a foreign producer to meet, and regulation that is really a disguised form of protectionism. As we shall see, a number of judgments of GATT dispute panels, which adjudicate national complaints about the use of regulations as non-tariff barriers, have proven highly controversial. Non-government organizations (NGOs) have often sharply criticized the GATT/WTO for challenging the ability of governments to impose regulatory standards stricter than those of their trading partners.

The WTO has also sought to facilitate trade and minimize trade disputes by encouraging nations to adopt international standards except when they would be "ineffective or inappropriate means for the fulfillment of the legitimate objective pursued."<sup>4</sup> There are a number of private, voluntary, international standards bodies, including the International Organization for Standardization, established in 1947, as well as several more specialized standards bodies, such as the

---

David Vogel is Professor in the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley. His book, Trading Up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy, was published by Harvard University Press.

International Electrotechnical Commission, which deals with electrical and electronic goods and the Codex Alimentarius Commission (the Codex), which were established by two United Nations bodies to formulate international food product and processing standards. In the case of the latter, the WTO agreement requires signatories to scientifically justify standards which differ from those of the Codex if they discriminate against imports. Other international standards have been established under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the International Conference on Harmonization of Technical Requirements for the Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH).

These standard-setting bodies have had the greatest success in establishing international standards that are primarily technical in nature and equally benefit all producers, such as in the cases of chemical and drug testing requirements. They have found it much more difficult to reach agreement on standards which confer significant competitive advantages or disadvantages, such as automotive fuel economy standards, or which raise significant public health and safety concerns, such as growth hormones. Still, uniform regulatory standards are not necessarily appropriate or desirable. There are a wide variety of reasons why nations may adopt distinctive standards, some of which, such as different income levels or distinctive tastes, preferences or priorities, may be legitimate, while others, such as the capture of regulatory authorities by producer interests, are not. Once again, the distinction between the two is not always obvious.

In a further effort to encourage the use of international standards, the Uruguay Round agreement also introduced the concept of mutual recognition into international trade law. Like the doctrine of proportionality, this concept also draws on EU jurisprudence. Mutual recognition became established in EU regulatory law through the decision of the European Court of Justice in *Cassis de Dijon* (1979). This ruling required each Member State to permit the sale of all goods lawfully for sale in any other Member State, unless it could demonstrate that its consumption adversely affected public health or safety. The WTO's Standards Code requires parties to give "positive consideration" to mutual recognition, except when the regulations of the exporting country do not "adequately fulfill the objectives" of the importing country. In the case of food safety and processing standards, parties must be given the opportunity to "objectively demonstrate" the equivalence of their regulations to those of their trading partners.<sup>5</sup>

While the GATT/WTO has played a central role in attempting to reduce the use of regulations as non-tariff trade barriers, the international coordination of regulatory policy to strengthen regulatory effectiveness has taken place through other institutions. The OECD has established a common set of testing methods for chemicals; data generated by the testing of chemicals in a member country in accordance with OECD test guidelines must be accepted by other member countries for the purposes of health, safety and environmental assessment.<sup>6</sup> A recently established, more specialized international organization, the ICH, has made substantial progress toward

developing a common system of registration requirements for ethical drugs for the United States, the European Union and Japan.

Environmental treaties represent another important form of international regulatory cooperation. Agreements such as the Montreal Protocol and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species and of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) have played a critical role in strengthening global environmental protection, in part by preventing less green countries from gaining a competitive advantage at the expense of their "greener" international competitors. These treaties, along with the work of the OECD and the ICH, demonstrate the critical role that international regulatory agreements can play in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of government regulation at the regional and national levels.

In addition to playing a leadership role in these multilateral agreements, the US and the EU have also participated in a number of bilateral efforts to facilitate regulatory cooperation. As each other's largest investment partner and first or second most important trading partner, the EU and the US have, in the words of former EC Commission Christiane Scrivener, "the most important interdependent relationship in the world."<sup>7</sup> In 1993, EU-US trade totaled 170 billion ecus, accounting for seven percent of total world trade. However, "the distinguishing characteristic of the EU and US economic relations is the mutual interlinkage through FDI."<sup>8</sup> Both regions have considerable ownership interests in the other region's market: the EU is the source of more than half of all foreign investment in the United States, while more than 40 percent of US overseas investments are in the EU.<sup>9</sup> The extent of this cross-national investment has affected the nature of EU-US trade flows: approximately 40 percent of transatlantic trade in goods takes place within the same firm. This has given both European and American producers an important stake in maintaining well-functioning transatlantic ties.

The immediate impetus for promoting a transatlantic dialogue on regulatory standards and standard-making was the EC's 1992 internal market program. As the Community began to make progress in establishing EC-wide standards, Americans became concerned that these new regulations would be used to disadvantage American producers and products—in effect creating a "fortress Europe." Fearing the loss of access to a market which accounts for one-fifth of its exports, the US urged the EC to permit American firms to participate in setting EC standards and in certifying compliance with them.

Following negotiations between Secretary of Commerce Mosbacher and EC Commission Vice President Bangemann, in May 1989 the European Commission agreed to establish procedures for the participation of American firms in the EU's standards setting, as well as to negotiate mutual recognition agreements for the inspection of produce safety and quality. The latter would require the US to allow non-US entities, and the EC to allow non-EC entities "to test products for conformity assessment purposes with a view of certifying them as being in compliance with local health, safety, environmental and more purely technical requirements."<sup>10</sup>

Such an agreement on conformity assessment is extremely important since redundant testing and inspection requirements represent an obstacle to US-EU trade as great as actual differences in substantive standards. Under current arrangements, only "notified bodies" located in Europe are empowered to grant final approvals for regulated products, which results in both delays and additional costs for American exporters. This has proven especially burdensome for small and medium enterprises. While no general agreement on mutual recognition has been reached, some progress toward conformity assessment has been made in four or five "priority sectors," including telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, and medical devices.

In 1990, the US and the EU issued a Transatlantic Declaration committing themselves to collaborate in addressing and solving problems of common interest. A number of the subjects included in this document involve regulatory matters, including "technical and non-tariff barriers to industrial and agricultural trade, services ... transportation policy, standards, telecommunications and high technology."<sup>11</sup> One of the consequences of the Declaration has been the issuing of annual reports in which each party sets forth its trade grievances against the other. These reports provide a comprehensive, constantly changing portrait of a critical dimension of EU-US economic relations.<sup>12</sup>

The EC's 1992 report noted that divergent regulations among trading partners, each adopted for valid domestic reasons, result in significant barriers to trade, and it urged that an "in-depth bilateral dialogue of the type envisaged by the Transatlantic Declaration" be held in order to reduce these barriers.<sup>13</sup> Dialogues have been conducted in a number of areas, including pharmaceutical regulation, food safety standards, the regulation of securities markets, air transport and telecommunications. But as we shall see, the results have been mixed. Aside from both substantive policy differences and differences in regulatory styles, there is an important procedural obstacle to agreements between specific American federal regulatory agencies and the various Directorates of the EU. Neither is legally authorized to enter into binding commitments; any proposed regulatory changes must first go through each country's regulatory policy-making procedures. In the case of the EU, this generally involves the approval of a Directive by the Council of Ministers; for the US, regulations must be adopted according to the procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act.

Nevertheless, as the regulatory competence of the EU has expanded, so have both formal and informal discussions between regulatory officials in Washington and their counterparts in Brussels. This is one important way in which the centralization of regulatory policy-making in Europe has contributed to transatlantic regulatory cooperation. Officials on both sides of the Atlantic now regularly monitor each other's proposals and policies, especially those which are likely to affect bilateral trade.

The EU has established a Unit for Regulatory Relations with the US within DG-I, the Directorate-General for External Relations. This unit has, in turn, established an EU-US

Interservice Group, consisting of representatives from most DGs. It is responsible not only for coordinating and overseeing regulatory cooperation with the United States, but also for promoting it. One of its first initiatives was to prepare a sector-by-sector inventory of issues subject to bilateral cooperation, whether current or proposed, in order to help resolve future trade disputes. There have also been a number of ongoing bilateral negotiations between various DGs and their American counterparts to identify areas for additional cooperation with respect to food legislation, veterinary standards, pesticides and biotechnology.

The US and the EU have also established a Sub-Cabinet Group, headed by the Director-General of DG-I and the American Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. In February 1994, the group issued a statement which emphasized the importance of cooperation on regulatory policy-making. The European Commission urged both the US and EU regulatory officials to explore a wide variety of approaches for cooperating with one another, including working together on "technical issues for regulatory projects of joint interest, [making] greater use of each other's technical infrastructures, providing early warning of highly divergent or incompatible regulatory initiatives which may have trade implications, [and developing] mutual recognition schemes for conformity assessment, testing and certification."<sup>14</sup>

The US has been particularly concerned about the trade impact of European standardization. The US Department of Commerce recently estimated that "EU legislation covering regulated products will eventually be applicable to 50 percent of US exports to Europe," noting that this "evolving EU-wide legislative environment [has] caused concern to US exporters."<sup>15</sup> However, one of the difficulties in coordinating EU and American standards is that the former relies much more heavily on international ones, in part because it has employed them to help establish the single market. By contrast, American firms have historically relied less on international standards.

Promoting transatlantic regulatory cooperation has become an important priority of the private sector in both Europe and the United States. In 1995, a conference took place in Seville, Spain under the auspices of the Transatlantic Business Dialogue (TABD), a business-led government and business initiative to lower trade and investment barriers across the Atlantic. Participants agreed to establish a Transatlantic Advisory Committee on Standards, Certification and Regulatory Policy to work jointly towards a new transatlantic regulatory model based on the principle "approved once, and accepted everywhere in the new Transatlantic Marketplace."<sup>16</sup> At a second conference held the following year in Chicago, participants approved a declaration stating that "certain regulatory requirements, in particular duplicative testing and certification procedures and widely divergent technical regulations and standards, were no longer sustainable in terms of resources or results and were not suited to the realities of the global marketplace."<sup>17</sup> They urged officials on both sides of the Atlantic to make progress toward the principle of "one standard, one test, one time." In 1997,

TABD issued a Priorities paper which noted that “several sectors consider completion of a Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) package to be a key demonstration of the effectiveness of the TABD process.”<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, while substantial progress has been made in a number of areas, no agreement has yet been reached on an overall MRA package, due to a lack of trust between regulatory authorities across the Atlantic.

What are the sources of EU-US regulatory conflict? A recent progress report on EC-US Relations published by DG-I observed:

Many problems faced by EC or US exporters/investors on each other’s markets are not the deliberate result of protectionist inspired legislation but rather the unintended outcome of measures adopted for valid domestic reasons or of the differences which exist between the regulatory systems in the EC or the US ...

The report added:

The fact that the EC and the US share a fundamentally similar approach to the question of the market economy and that their citizens and consumers express similar concerns regarding the quality of products and health and environment protection, should, however, make it feasible to encourage convergence in regulations and in the legislation on which they are based.<sup>19</sup>

The case studies of EU-US regulatory relations discussed in this essay confirm the validity of the first part of this statement, but not the second. It is true that regulatory-related trade conflicts across the Atlantic have not been primarily or even significantly caused by the deliberate use of consumer or environmental regulations as trade barriers. Nonetheless, in many cases transatlantic differences in public values and in regulatory objectives and approaches remain large enough so as to make the goal of regulatory “convergence” elusive. Paradoxically, it is precisely because the Member States of the EU and the US are so politically and culturally similar that trade disputes between them are so common and intense: both are democratic, relatively open societies in which public policy is affected by public opinion and in which NGOs enjoy substantial political access and influence. The result is a highly fluid and constantly expanding regulatory agenda which has made the achievement of coordination a moving target. §

## Notes

1. Suzanne Berger, “Introduction,” in National Diversity and Global Capitalism, Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, eds. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996, p.16.
2. Quoted in David Vogel, Trading Up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995, p.136.
3. Ibid.
4. Alan Sykes, Product Standards for Internationally Traded Goods Markets, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995, p.124.
5. Sykes, p.126.
6. Regulatory Cooperation for an Interdependent World, Paris: OECD, 1994, p.142.
7. Quoted in George Bermann, “Regulatory Cooperation Between the European Commission and U.S. Administrative Agencies,” *The Administrative Law Journal*, Vol. 9, 1996, p.935.
8. Horst Siebert, “TAFTA: Fueling Trade Discrimination or Global Liberalization?” American Institute for Contemporary German Studies Seminar Paper, no. 19, March 1996, p.4.
9. Report on United States Barriers to Trade and Investment, Brussels: Services of the European Commission, 1995, pp.2-4.
10. Bermann, p.972.
11. Quoted in Bermann, p.956.
12. For the most recent reports, see Report on United States Barriers to Trade and Investment, Brussels, Services of the European Commission, 1995, and 1992: Implementing the European Community Single Market: Sixth Follow-Up Report, USITC, January 1994.
13. Bermann, pp.957-8.
14. “Transatlantic Regulatory Cooperation,” paper from the European Commission to the EU-US Sub-Cabinet meeting on May 22-23, 1996.
15. 1996 National Trade Estimate, European Union, USTR.
16. TABD Priorities for Mid-Year US-EU Summit, May 13, 1997, p.5.
17. “Chicago Declaration,” Transatlantic Business Dialogue, November 9, 1996, p.2.
18. TABD Priorities, p.3.
19. Quoted in Bermann, p.977.

**The opinions expressed in essays in the *ECSA Review* are solely those of their authors. We welcome submissions of scholarly essays on EU-related issues that foster debate and discussion. Address inquiries to:**

**Valerie Staats, Managing Editor  
ECSA Review/405 Bellefield Hall  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213 USA  
E-mail <ecsa+@pitt.edu>.**

**ECSA USA congratulates the 1997-98  
Curriculum Development Grant recipients:**

**Michelle Egan (American University)  
“Overview of the European Union”**

**Peter Loedel (West Chester University)  
“The European Union Simulation”**

**Sophie Meunier (University of Chicago)  
“The European Union: Business and Politics”**

## The French 1997 Legislative Election and the EU: A Marriage of Models

Crister S. Garrett

Two details from the French 1997 legislative election reveal much about its import for the EU. A clear majority of French are pleased with the results and what appears to be a political roadblock, the third *cohabitation* since 1981. And some two-thirds think Lionel Jospin and company do not know which economic policy they will actually pursue.<sup>1</sup> Do these statistics reveal a France ever-enamored with confrontation and contradiction? Or perhaps a France groping with the understanding that these elements, as in marriage, are to be present as France merges the model of itself of yesteryear with that emerging today, so as to remain vibrant? The answer, of course, is both.

Chirac called the election because of the *euro*, but Jospin beat him at his own game. He did so both in style and in substance. The socialist leader accomplished this by abandoning the all-or-nothing rhetoric on the euro. The euro is not about power or prestige per se; it is about jobs. If too many of the latter are being sacrificed for unseen benefits of the former, then priorities appear confused.<sup>2</sup> The time has come for the hard-sell of the euro in France, and in Germany. Jospin outwitted Chirac in this task by taking the soft-sell approach. Gerhard Schröder, the leading contender for the SPD as chancellor candidate for next year, has been hawking a similar political package in Germany. Some two-thirds of the party's grassroots want him to be their man.<sup>3</sup>

Jospin speaks of a politics of the heart, but plans his politics with the head. He knows traders will pounce on the franc if he tries to reflate the economy à la Mitterand. The patronat have made clear that expecting greater social spending on their part will only mean fewer jobs.<sup>4</sup> And the euro criteria will have to be honored almost completely for the project to be taken seriously internationally.<sup>5</sup> That does not leave much political playing room.

So how to merge political-economic realities with campaign promises like 700,000 new jobs in the short run? By showing the actual limits of the state, and then where it can make a difference (the core state, e.g., provides justice, physical security, modicum of material security, and training). As for the state's ability to create significant amounts of employment—the issue on the EU agenda and that of all member states—Jospin's plea for a massive public works project by the EU, and the German (and other EU members) rejection of it, is instructive.<sup>6</sup> Surely the prime minister knew the idea would be dismissed before he proposed it. Remember how member states wanted budget surpluses back from Brussels (to help meet euro criteria), rather than finance Santer's transportation initiative? Waigel's recent gold debacle underlined the fact that matters have only gotten worse since then.

So this little *mise-en-scène* allowed Jospin to show that even a socialist prime minister cannot outfox the verities of

economic restructuring. Ditto for the symbolic importance of Renault's planned Vilvoorde car factory closing. This decision has unleashed a *cri de guerre* in the Gallic world against Anglo-Saxon liberalism run amok (Renault made the announcement without prior warning.) Jospin said as much during the campaign. Once in power? Alas, the politician with the gentle air (as opposed to Juppe's criticized *énarque* aloofness) conceded, the dossier has moved very far along, but he would see what he could do.

That will be to show the contradictions between the French desire, and the desire in any country, for predictability and stability and the inevitable process of transition, and to reconcile these. This has been going on in France since at least 1981, between the models of a predominantly state-centered and state-managed economy and one increasingly influenced by international and liberalizing forces. Commentators have noted how this has led to a sense of crisis in France. But even the *trente glorieuses* knew Poujade, 1968, and international pressures (currency, energy). France in this century has always had to marry what it thinks it is with what the world is becoming. It has done so with that Gallic flair for crisis, confrontation and reconciliation.

Indeed, any healthy marriage involves give and take. So while the Commission plans for further EU market liberalization, worker councils are being given more rights.<sup>7</sup> And while the current French government has agreed to the text of the Dublin stability pact, it has been seen publicly fighting to add clauses on the importance of creating new jobs. As French firms continue to fire workers, Jospin will hold a national dialogue among unions, workers and employers. As we all know, any domestic or international agenda can only proceed to the extent that it rests upon a solid consensual foundation. The 1997 French legislative election showed that its construction continues in the Hexagon. ☞

### Notes

1. "Emploi et rénovation de la vie politique au coeur des attentes des Français," *Le Monde*, 3 June 1997.
2. Joseph Joffe puts it pithily in "Bonn und Paris würgen am Euro," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 3 June 1997.
3. "Die SPD-Basis will Schröder," *Der Spiegel*, 23/1997.
4. "Le patronat juge que le 'principe de réalité' s'imposera au gouvernement de Lionel Jospin," *Le Monde*, 4 June 1997.
5. "Towards EMU: Kicking and screaming into 1999," *The Economist*, 7 June 1997.
6. "Germany rebuffs French call for big public works project," *New York Times*, 14 June 1997.
7. "Brussels in single market action plan," *Financial Times*, 5 June 1997; "Deal to give full rights to part-time workers," *Financial Times*, 6 June 1997.

---

Crister Garrett teaches comparative European politics at the Monterey Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California. During 1997-98 he will be a Fulbright Fellow at the University of Leipzig, Germany.



# Teaching the EU

*Editor's Note: "Teaching the EU" is a new feature in the ECSA Review, developed due to the high level of interest in EU pedagogy expressed by ECSA USA members. This column will feature essays by ECSA members about their experiences and methods for teaching courses focusing on the European Union at the secondary, post-secondary or graduate level. Reader comments and submissions of material for this column are welcomed; see page 27 for details. The following is the inaugural essay for this column.*

## **Bridging the Gap: Integrating EU Studies in a Cross-Disciplinary and Multilingual Curriculum**

**Michel Gueldry**

Integrating languages with EU studies (and more widely, international policy studies) seems a natural undertaking, given the very nature of the EU polity and the importance of languages within EU institutional workings. In addition, it provides students with a "double education," one that bridges the medium (language) and the content (EU policy and politics)—or rather, integrates them. By integrating a liberal arts component with a social sciences component, this course combines the advantages of both humanistic and professional educations. Based on my experience, in this essay I will describe such a course, specify a general template for planning it, briefly describe an alternative model, list specific World Wide Web resources relevant to the course, and offer a provisional conclusion about it.

### **Description of an Innovative EU Class**

This article stems from an innovative curriculum development project undertaken over a period of two years (spring semesters 1996 and 1997) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS). MIIS is a graduate institution emphasizing the integration of language studies with policy and business studies, in order to offer such multilinguistic courses as "Comparative Environmental Policy," "International Gender Studies," "Doing Business in China," or "European Union Issues." Professors from the Institute's four schools (Language Studies, International Policy Studies, International Management, and Translation and Interpretation) have developed a multidisciplinary course entitled "European Union Issues" (EUI), which focuses on the roles of France, Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom in the European Union.

All four country sections survey the major institutions and policies of the EU. Students with the appropriate second language skills attend separate sections conducted entirely in English, French, German, or Spanish, and then join together every three weeks for plenary sessions lasting one week. There are five plenary sessions. During the plenary session, students in each language section represent the governments of the respective countries (the representatives sitting on the

Council of Ministers), and engage in negotiations on EU issues such as the IGC and enlargement, CAP, EMU, and CFSP. These multilinguistic plenary sessions are interpreted across the four languages by students from the Institute's Translation and Interpretation (TI) school, under the supervision of their professors. This class also integrates the new medium of communication: students are requested to share their findings with their peers through e-mail messages, and to exchange ideas, information, and requests through an electronic bulletin board established specifically for EUI students.

For the duration of the semester, students are requested to write two position papers (*notes diplomatiques*), stating their country's position on the issues discussed during the plenary session, and to present these findings in their target language in front of their peers and professors. During the plenary sessions when they are not presenting, students have to write two reports on another country's position, and address the report to their "government" (i.e., their professor). Each student chooses a particular country—in the case of students from the French delegation, they can choose among Germany, Spain, or the United Kingdom. This is meant to encourage questions and exchanges between presenters and the audience, and to ensure that everyone participates in the plenary sessions, thus avoiding the "passive audience" pitfall. Plenary sessions are equally divided between presentation and information questions on the one hand, and negotiations on the other hand. Finally, a common textbook in English is assigned to all sections. This textbook provides an overview of EU history, institutions, and policy and is meant to provide students with a common background.

### **Analysis of a Template Course**

A notable aspect of this course is that unlike the compartmentalization often found in many universities, the central focus on languages makes it possible to involve faculty from different academic divisions in the development of an integrated curriculum. The six faculty members involved in the project represent six nationalities (Belgian, British, Colombian, French, German, United States), five different languages, and have different fields of specialization in international economics, political science, history, language, translation and interpretation, and educational psychology. In this setting, international policy courses are taught in a variety of languages in order to expose students to a realistic experience. A very practical definition of "content-based instruction" naturally springs forth, since professors do not teach about the language but rather, modern languages (ML) are an integral component of the learning experience. The core component of this experience is role playing, as students have to articulate and defend a national position on a host of issues. This constitutes an appropriate intellectual and professional exercise precisely because students do not always agree with these positions. As such, this kind of role playing is an excellent preparation for careers in public relations, diplomacy and international negotiations. In this context, national preference, or reluctance, for certain policy choices are not seen in isolation but are understood from within. Thus

students experience the inner (linguistic and political) logic of a national perspective. United States students experience the very basic fact that languages, including English, are not value-free. In addition, working through simultaneous or consecutive interpretation and understanding the constraints inherent in the task of interpreting also simulates real-life situations which students are likely to encounter when working internationally in business, government or the non-profit sector.

As much as possible, the emphasis is put on student-centered instruction. In this respect, an important feature of the class is the communicative and collaborative process born of peer interaction and peer teaching. As one example among many, students from the French and German delegations are naturally called to work in close collaboration in order to present to their colleagues common positions, similar to the numerous joint positions by French and German diplomats, such as the Freiburg-im-Brigau joint statement, the agreement known as Dublin I, or the Chirac-Kohl Nuremberg treaty. As yet another example, students from, say, the British delegation must act as a team during plenary sessions, with all British delegates defending their Minister of Agriculture when (s)he is challenged by German delegates during the negotiations relative to the BSE epidemics. A key element of the course is to teach students to teach themselves, and especially how to conduct research. While there is a plethora of books describing the EU in general terms, there are fewer sources stating national perspectives on institutional and policy issues. Hence, the primary responsibility for finding information rests essentially on the students' shoulders, with the instructor acting as a guide to original sources and as a definer of issues, rather than a problem-solver. In this capacity, the instructor is halfway between a coordinator and a mentor.

Most schools do not have a TI program, but this course may serve as a template, with separate sessions conducted in the target languages, and joint sessions in English. What is more, this template may be used for other courses about EU-USA relations, the Pacific Rim, NAFTA, or any transnational policy issue—collective security, trade, environmental issues, and so on.

### **Integrating EU Studies with Language Studies: A Step-by-Step Process**

Such an addition to an international policy studies (IPS) curriculum has to be approached in a thorough and methodical way. The following step-by-step process could be followed with some benefits:

#### **1. Rationale for the Course**

Such a course is especially well suited for IPS departments whose primary mission is teaching, rather than research-oriented departments. It provides a good template for institutions who want to be on the cutting edge of curriculum design and who are interested in cross-divisional collaboration. As such, it is a good model for institutions with fewer faculty members, or less-specialized faculty members, less compartmentalization and an open-minded curriculum and standards committee. Neither a traditional survey class nor a full-fledged seminar, this course could also be used as a pilot.

## **2. Needs Analysis**

**2.1 Student needs:** What is the potential constituency for such a course? What is the profile of the student body, for instance, the language distribution? What is the potential interest for such a course? What are the students' intellectual, academic, and professional goals and needs?

**2.2 Institutional needs at departmental and school level:** What niche can be targeted in the competitive academic environment? What are the curriculum needs of the IPS and ML departments? (Avoidance of curriculum duplication and/or gaps). How does one integrate such courses in the recruiting strategy? How does this curriculum relate to the institution's overall educational philosophy? What is the feedback from graduates and alumni? What is the professional profile of the institution's alumni after five, ten or fifteen years?

**2.3 Job market needs:** What does this curriculum bring to our graduates for prospective job interviews? What are the employers' needs in terms of IPS and ML skills?

## **3. Resources Analysis**

### **3.1. Personnel policy**

**3.1.1. Identification of a multidisciplinary and multilinguistic team of policy, economics, language, and curriculum development specialists and elaboration of rules of inter-school cooperation.**

**3.1.2. Faculty compensation for extra work required in planning and implementing innovative teaching endeavors.**

### **3.2. Pedagogical resources**

**3.2.1. Identification of primary and authentic documents in the target languages. Audiovisual and computer resources analysis. Systematic use of World Wide Web resources and special servers should be considered.**

**3.2.2. Use of native speakers as teaching and/or research assistants. International students (non-native speakers of English) may be requested to take the British section of the course, because English is as much a foreign language for them as Spanish, German or French may be for others.**

**3.2.3. Connection with consulates, embassies, Western Europe research centers and their guest speakers programs.**

## **4. Constraints Assessment**

**4.1. Integration of such a course in the pre-existing traditional EU curriculum (survey classes, introductory courses, seminars); avoid curriculum duplication or gaps. Given the highly specialized nature of such a course, it should be integrated in a coherent EU curriculum. In order to understand and articulate any member state's position on a host of institutional and policy issues, students need to have a good grasp of EU history, institutions and policy. Hence the need for sequential learning. A Fall "European Union Survey" prerequisite for all students who plan to take the advanced, multilinguistic course in the Spring is advisable.**

**4.2. Identification of specific pedagogical methods and issues, such as definition of "advanced" or "upper division language courses," devising a special entrance and/or exit language exam adapted to such a course.**

**4.3. Speaking each other's academic language: IPS specialists should get basically acquainted with standard language terminology and concepts, such as ACTFL proficiency**

guidelines and OPI testing, while language specialists should also “walk an extra mile” to meet their IPS colleagues on their turf. Similarly, business and curriculum development specialists should learn intercultural communication across academic divisions.

#### 4.4. Teaching goals definition

4.4.1 What is the content of “professional education” and its relationship to the liberal arts curriculum?

4.4.2 Necessity to weigh and combine the respective criteria and requirements of language learning and IPS learning.

4.5. Planning phase of the course: Such a course requires much planning, so it may not be practical to offer it in the Fall, because during the summer not all involved faculty members may be on campus and because it takes about one semester to plan this class. In addition, there are potentially more students at the desired (advanced) linguistic level in the Spring than there are in the Fall semester. How does that fit with the students’ requirements, the IPS and the ML core curricula?

4.7 Credit requirement: It is advisable to take into account the extra time involvement that such a course puts on students, and to devise some extra credit arrangements.

4.8 Competition from other colleges: What similar courses may be offered elsewhere?

#### 5. Outcome and performance assessment

5.1 Student assessment: linguistic and content (international policy and language) outcome. An exit exam requirement may be in order to assess the learning process. Student diaries may be an excellent way of eliciting candid reactions to the learning experience. To foster genuineness and openness, these diaries should not be graded, and should be read only by the curriculum development specialist who monitors the course, not by the faculty members directly teaching and grading the students. The instructors need to define and assess such practical skills as public speaking in a foreign language, simulated negotiation, team work, computer literacy (through computer presentations with such software as PowerPoint, Lotus 123, and the use of World Wide Web resources), working with strict deadlines and with different constituencies, translation and interpretation. Some skills are difficult to assess, let alone quantify, such as self-awareness in a public setting, self-confidence in public speaking, intercultural sensitivity, and so on.

5.2. Assessment of instructor’s performance: A mid-course evaluation is desirable, given the original nature of the course and the lack of institutional precedents.

5.3. Assessment of curriculum development effectiveness, for both IPA and ML departments.

5.4. Institutional assessment: Does the course serve the recruiting needs of the college? Can it become a marketing tool for the institution? Explore students’ responsiveness to such an original curriculum. Explore the possibility of external funding from educational foundations and/or the EU.

---

Michel Gueldry is an associate professor of French and European Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies (Monterey, California), where he coordinates the EU curriculum.

5.5. Job market assessments: Get feedback from employers and graduates about the usefulness (or lack thereof) of the skills provide by this kind of education.

#### **An Innovative English-Only EU Course**

Another EU curriculum development possibility would deal with an English-only course. Students may be distributed in nine groups, with each group representing a different step (or aspect) in the EU policy-making process. By way of example, the notorious “mad cow crisis” as a case study of EU policy-making could lead to such a seminar course where the nine student groups would represent:

1. The British government (British representatives from the Council of Ministers and more specifically, Douglas Hogg).
2. The British delegation within COREPER in Brussels.
3. Member(s) of the Brussels Commission. Students could research the Directorate General-VI and play the role of Franz Fischer, the Austrian Commissioner for Agriculture.
4. Judges from the European Court of Justice (or Tribunal of First Instance, depending on the nature of the legal case). Law students may thus be involved in this endeavor.
5. Members of the European Parliament.
6. Members of one or several pressure groups.
7. Members from different political parties from the chosen country (in this case, the UK).
8. Journalists reporting on the situation and its developments. Students from schools of journalism may thus be involved in the course.
9. The US ambassador to the EU in Brussels.

In this English-only model, the course could, like its multilingual counterpart course, engage the students in role playing, research with original documents, writing of position papers, electronic communications, plenary sessions, and so on. It would be advisable to have guest speaker(s) from the EU and/or from the country of the particular case study.

#### **A Brief Guide to Internet Resources**

*Editor’s note: All World Wide Web addresses must be preceded by <http://> which is omitted in the following list for the sake of brevity.*

##### Sites of general interest:

1. Databases for the fifteen EU member states:  
[www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/adj](http://www.ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/adj)
2. [www.europa.eu.int/en/agenda/igc-home/index.html](http://www.europa.eu.int/en/agenda/igc-home/index.html)
3. [www.citizens.eu.int](http://www.citizens.eu.int)
4. [www.columbia.edu/cu/sipa/REGIONAL/WE/iwe.html#IGC](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/sipa/REGIONAL/WE/iwe.html#IGC)
5. [www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI)
6. List of centers for European Studies in the USA and worldwide: [www.eurunion.org/info/resource/eustudy.html](http://www.eurunion.org/info/resource/eustudy.html)

##### British sites:

1. Foreign and Commonwealth Office: [www.fco.gov.uk](http://www.fco.gov.uk)
2. British Parliament: [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk)
3. Representation of the European Commission in the UK:  
[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

##### French sites:

1. Prime Minister’s office: [www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr](http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr)
2. French permanent delegation in Brussels:  
[www.interpac.be/rpfrcell](http://www.interpac.be/rpfrcell)

## Book Reviews

3. Ministry of foreign affairs (Quai d'Orsay):  
www.france.diplomatie.fr
  4. National assembly: www.assemblee-nat.fr/
  5. Senate: www.senat.fr/
  6. European research center at the University of Nancy:  
www.interlex.droit-eco.u-nancy.fr/CEU
  7. French official documents: www.ladocfrancaise.gouv.fr
  8. French embassy in the USA: www.france.diplomatie.fr
- German sites:

1. Federal government homepage: www.bundesregierung.de
2. Federal statistical office: www.statistik-bund.de
3. Federal foreign office:  
www.auswaertiges-amt.government.de/
4. Federal ministry of finances:  
www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/
5. Federal ministry of economy: www.bmw.de
6. German information center: www.germany-info.org

Spanish sites:

1. Center for European Documentation, University of Valencia: www.uv.es/cde
2. Center for European Documentation at Alicante:  
www.ctv.es/cdea
3. Diario Oficial de la Unión Europea:  
www.uv.es/cde/DOCE/
4. Guía de Financiación Europea: www.uv.es/cde/GFC/
5. Bibliografía Unión Europea: www.uv.es/cde/bibliografia
6. Boletín Electrónico Info-Europa:  
www.uv.es/cde/info-europa.html

### A Provisional Conclusion

Curriculum development for such EU courses touches on practical and down-to-earth issues such as cross-listing, credit transfers (between the IPS and the ML departments), and scheduling conflicts; it also touches on more substantive considerations about the definition of a department's educational mission, the relationship among departments, and even the nature of higher education. Experience demonstrates that its success rests on a process of socialization and dialogue across academic borders, among educators from very different backgrounds and heterogeneous academic subcultures.

But such an endeavor, demanding that it may be, yields rich dividends. Imaginative curriculum developments are a means to involving various constituencies within an institution and to foster a dialogue across traditional academic divides. As such, it increases the number of stakeholders in IPS and ML programs. In our age of budget restrictions, such EU courses constitute a powerful argument for administrators who must think in terms of resource allocation among competing departments and programs. Such courses play on the existing strengths of many colleges, and by pooling resources, they can help avoid cuts in IPS and ML programs, while improving the professional reputation and visibility of the entire institution. Both social scientists and language teachers should recognize that exclusion of languages from international studies (and perhaps more widely, social sciences) curricula is counter-productive and self-defeating, and that integration of these disciplines can only help recruit the best and brightest students from the USA and abroad. ☞

**Michael Welsh. Europe United? The European Union and the Retreat from Federalism. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996, 196 pp.**

**David McKay. Rush to Union: Understanding the European Federal Bargain. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 192 pp.**

As their titles suggest, these two books take very different views of recent trends within the EU. They also take very different approaches to their subject. While the book by Welsh is an essentially descriptive account of EU developments and institutions without a theoretical framework or argument, McKay's book is an explicitly theoretical interpretation of the Maastricht EMU decision, although one that in the end is largely unpersuasive.

Europe United? is based upon a series of lectures delivered to university students in 1994, and this is reflected in its organization and content. The book follows the format typical of college texts on the EU, recounting the origins and historical development of the Community, describing the politics of the Maastricht Treaty and the nature of policies and the policy process within the EU's various pillars, and concluding with a description of post-Maastricht developments up through the 1995 enlargement. The book lacks a real conclusion, which reflects its lack of central argument or thesis; instead there are central themes, such as the perpetual conflict between the interests of the Community's supranational institutions and member state interests, and the trend towards intergovernmentalism as represented by the Maastricht Treaty's pillarized structure.

The main value of Europe United? for American readers is the insight it provides on British attitudes towards the EU. Welsh points out, for instance, how the Community's institutions pose real problems for British traditions of government. In particular, the elite-bureaucratic style of the Commission (which reflects French governmental norms) and the European Court of Justice's powers of constitutional review (which challenge the core British ideal of parliamentary sovereignty) are foreign to Britain. That the EU is structured the way it is, however, has much to do with the absence of British influence when the Community was founded in the 1950s. As Welsh makes clear, this tendency of Britain to stand aside from EU affairs, and then be forced to join at a later date institutions that were created without its input, is itself the result of another British trait: the penchant of British political elites to underestimate foreigners. With respect to the EU, the view that "they'll never get their act together" has been a typical one, most recently glimpsed in the debate on EMU.

Welsh's own views on the EU are sympathetic, but critical. He cites approvingly the trend towards intergovernmentalism represented by the Maastricht Treaty and

appears to be anti-federalist, yet at the same time he is critical of Thatcher-style “Euro-bashing” and bemoans the inability of the EU “to provide answers to the problems of a divided continent” (p. 91). He also seems to favor British membership in EMU. In other words, Welsh’s views are typical of the conflicted attitude of many pro-Europeans in Britain.

Overall, *Europe United?* is very well written and readable, although it is plagued by some glaring typographical errors (the Maastricht Treaty came into effect in November 1993, not 1992; in 1989 NATO celebrated its 40th birthday, not 50th; the German Federal Constitutional Court’s decision on the Maastricht Treaty was given in October 1993, not 1992). The book should be most valuable for undergraduate students and general readers without an extensive knowledge of the EU.

McKay’s understanding of the current direction of European integration couldn’t be more different from that of Welsh. In *Rush to Union* McKay argues that the Maastricht Treaty, and in particular the EMU decision, represents a major move towards the creation of a federal state. In fact, he goes so far as to compare the Maastricht conference with the deliberations of the American founding fathers in Philadelphia in 1787. The main purpose of McKay’s book, therefore, is to explain what he terms the “intellectual puzzle” of Maastricht: why sovereign nation-states decided to voluntarily surrender so much power to federal institutions.

McKay finds existing answers to this question inadequate, including those based on neofunctionalist spillover from the SEA and the ideological commitment of EU and national leaders. To solve the Maastricht puzzle, he instead turns to Riker’s theory of federalism, which argues that successful federations emerge in response to either external security threats or opportunities for territorial aggrandizement. Riker’s theory, he argues, is consistent with a realist or rational choice approach, since union can only be explained in terms of the benefits for participating states exceeding costs.

After outlining his theoretical approach, McKay proceeds to an empirical investigation of European integration since the 1940s. Using his Rikerian model, McKay argues that federalism did not emerge in the 1950s in Europe, despite the high level of both external security threat and federalist rhetoric at this time, because the benefits of such a move did not outweigh the costs for European nation-states. At Maastricht, by contrast, a federal leap did occur because the cost-benefit calculus had changed; due to structural changes in the world economy, EU member states could no longer tolerate inflation and monetary instability, and were therefore willing to concede monetary sovereignty in order to secure economic stability through EMU (although for Germany, he concludes, the benefits to be gained from EMU were somewhat different, being mainly diplomatic). McKay thus expands Riker’s model to incorporate internal or domestic security threats stemming from monetary instability. He also claims that the EU is different from past federations, in that it is based not on defense but on macroeconomic policy. Nevertheless, McKay stresses that EMU is essentially a “political” project, as evidenced by national responses to the 1992-93 EMS crisis.

While McKay is correct that EMU is a political project, his attempt to explain the Maastricht Treaty in terms of Riker’s theory of federalism is not convincing. For the purpose of his argument he appears to exaggerate the federalist nature of the Maastricht agreement, just as he downplays the federalist aspects (or potential, at least) of previous integration efforts, especially the ECSC, EEC, and SEA. The author seems to realize this himself, which may account for his effort in chapters six and seven to demonstrate just how EMU will inevitably lead to fiscal and political centralization. In reality, EMU is not the same thing as federalism, and it need not lead inevitably to political union. This is simply making the mistake that many students of European integration have made in the past, of projecting the historical model and path of the nation-state onto the EU.

The Philadelphia analogy is also overdone. While political union was the explicit goal of the American founding fathers, it was not necessarily the immediate or even proximate goal of the national leaders meeting in Maastricht, all rhetoric aside. It is also a stretch to compare the British role at Maastricht to the dissenting position of Rhode Island in the American case (p. 175), a comparison that not everyone in Britain would find flattering.

In the end, McKay’s “rational choice” explanation of European federalism—if we can accept for the moment his use of this term—is somewhat circular: federation only occurs when the benefits from union outweigh the costs; therefore, when federation does not occur (i.e., the 1950s), this is because it was not to the advantage of nation-states; when it does occur (i.e., Maastricht), it must be because the benefits outweigh the costs for the participating states. A more interesting and important set of questions is what exactly are the interests (cost-benefit calculations) of EU member states when it comes to integration and how are these determined. McKay deals with these questions only superficially, neglecting, for instance, the impact of previous integration on perceptions of national interest. The answers to these questions can perhaps best be discovered using the historical-institutionalist approach favored by Pierson and others.

Despite the weakness of its theoretical claims, *Rush to Union* is an interesting and stimulating book which broadens the debate on the EU beyond conventional theories of integration.

**Michael J. Baun**  
Valdosta State University

---

**Maria Dolors García-Ramon and Janice Monk, eds. *The Politics of Work and Daily Life*. New York: Routledge, 1996, 281 pp.**

This collection of case studies by European geographers is a most welcome addition to research on the effects of European policy on women. Its combination of feminist and geographical approaches to contemporary issues in Europe and an emphasis on Southern Europe, make this a particularly

intriguing volume for European integration scholars. The book has a somewhat disjointed feeling due to the many tasks the editors have attempted to tackle, and it does not always fulfill its promise to examine the real implications of union for the diversity of women in the member states. Nonetheless, the eclectic nature of the essays, which examine issues of women and work from interstate, intrastate, regional, and urban levels of analysis, also reminds the reader of the multiple situations and issues which European citizens and policymakers will face in the years to come.

Perhaps the most attractive aspect of this book is its unusually extensive attention to women of Southern Europe. The volume contains five pieces dedicated exclusively to Southern European locales and the women living there, and numerous references are made to Italian, Spanish and Portuguese women's experiences throughout the book. Even those articles dealing exclusively with Northern European states make reference to their southern neighbors and challenge the perceptions of difference between them. For example, Kirsten Simonsen challenges the stereotypical view of Northern Europeans as less family-oriented than their southern counterparts. Her article also demonstrates why women ought not to be perceived as a secondary labor force in Europe—a point scholars of European employment will find noteworthy.

Simonsen's article is representative of the volume as a whole in its relentless challenge to preconceptions about women and work in Europe. Articles of a similar vein include Jürgen Schmude's discussion of German convergence and its effect on women's employment status, Jeanne Fagnani's analysis of French and West German working mothers and family policies, Isabel Margarida André's piece on women in the Portuguese labor market, and the joint piece by editor García-Ramon and Josefina Cruz on regional welfare and female agricultural labor in southern Spain.

The one drawback to these articles is their occasional failure to analyze the effects of EU policy on women. While the book does an excellent job of exploring changes in the work and daily lives of European women of all kinds, it could benefit from regular discussion relating these changes to activity at the supranational level, or indeed even a discussion about when supranational activity is irrelevant to these changes. The volume might acquire a more coherent feel if all the authors had embarked on this type of discussion, for example, in their concluding remarks.

Nonetheless, all of the case studies are first-rate, and the first four (Chapters 2-5) do in fact address directly the impact on women of European Union policy. These articles include Kofman and Sales' piece on welfare regimes under the European Union. The authors conduct a pithy review of contemporary feminist and non-feminist work on welfare regimes. Most intriguing (if rather brief) are their concluding remarks, in which they argue that the pessimistic conclusions suggested by some analyses of EU social policy are not inevitable, and where they express hope that the entry of Scandinavian states will bolster pressures for more active social policy, as the current trend seems to be toward a

European welfare regime based on financial transfers rather than service provision.

Interestingly, this article's vaguely optimistic conclusion about EU policy on women contrasts with the subsequent article by Dina Vaiou. Vaiou views European integration as the reiteration of a homogenizing project, wherein diversity is presented as the major strength of Europe, and where diversity's connection to both profound inequalities and hierarchical differences is ignored. She argues that this dynamic has serious implications for Southern European women. For the majority of these women, European citizenship generalized after Maastricht does not necessarily mean improved conditions of work and life, because EU employment and welfare policies derive from the north rather than the south and from men's rather than women's labor market integration patterns.

The following article by Simon Duncan reveals the problems of examining gender relations at the state, rather than the sub-state level. This article poses an implicit challenge to some of the previous authors' arguments and highlights another important point for scholars interested in the European Union and women. Gill Valentine then investigates how differences in the national legislation of member states with regard to discrimination and the rights of citizens may impinge on the free movement of lesbian workers. She concludes that even as the EU may provide for free movement of workers, differences in national policies regarding lesbian and gay individuals may prevent them from moving freely, and that differences in social and cultural settings may make individuals unwilling to move to other locations simply because they operate under more tolerant policies. This trenchant essay challenges the argument that so-called "social tourism" threatens states with extensive policy regarding discrimination, and provides an exemplary case study for scholars interested in EU employment policy and discrimination generally.

Readers schooled in the theoretical debates about the nature of European integration will note the lack of reference to these theories, but will find it rich in information which addresses their concerns in fascinating new ways. The case studies offer possible examples of how the EU represents a multi-tiered entity, or even (merely) an international organization, particularly because of their attention to the effects of place on policy and on EU citizens. Indeed, this book highlights a need for more attention to geography in EU integration scholarship. Feminist EU scholars will find this volume theoretically informed and insightful about relations among European women and the experiences of marginalized peoples in Europe. And European geographers will appreciate the attention to spatial and temporal issues as well as gender issues. The volume succeeds in demonstrating why it is necessary to consider issues of women and work, marginalization, and work and place in analysis of European integration.

**Kristin Edquist**  
**University of Washington**

**Readers interested in reviewing recent EU-related books for the ECSA Review are encouraged to contact the Book Review Editor:**

**Professor Paulette Kurzer  
Dept. of Political Science, SS 315  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721 USA  
E-mail <kurzer@arizona.edu>  
Fax: 520 621 5051**

**Publishers should send review copies to Professor Kurzer at the address above.**

---

**Dietrich Rometsch and Wolfgang Wessels, eds. The European Union and Member States: Towards Institutional Fusion? Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1996, 382 pp.**

**John Gaffney, ed. Political Parties and the European Union. London: Routledge, 1996, 340 pp.**

In its opening two chapters, Rometsch and Wessels' edited volume promises to offer the reader a careful look at the extent to which European Union member states are progressing in the quest for fuller political integration. This analysis of the degree to which EU member states are influencing each other's political development through the EU apparatus, and in turn, of the extent to which the evolving EU framework itself is shaping political life within member states, comes at an especially timely moment in the EU's history. With the recent entrance of Sweden, Finland and Austria and significant public deliberation and debate in several other European states regarding the potential value to be enjoyed or harm to be incurred through membership in this growing supra-state, a collection of research studies such as this one should be a welcome addition to the EU literature.

Emerging from one of the projects included within the research program begun in 1989 by the German Research Foundation entitled, "Theory of Political Institutions" and coordinated by Gerhard Göhler, the book nonetheless disappoints to an extent, at least at its outset. The volume gets off to something of a rocky start but improves considerably in clarity and depth with the case study chapters detailing the political integration of eleven of the twelve most long-standing EU member states. (Luxembourg is excluded, a national expert not having been found to prepare a study of this small but important European state.) One disadvantage to the acceleration in EU expansion, however, is that the book was already dated at the time of its publication. As the editors note in their preface, the three most recent entrants were not included in the research project and thus no reports are

presented for Sweden, Finland, or Austria; the volume's second edition, according to Rometsch and Wessels, is already anticipated.

On the positive side, once Göhler's rather dense opening theoretical chapter on "Institutions in Political Theory" has been broached and digested (portions of this chapter appearing primarily to have been written for enthusiasts of hermeneutics and semiotics), and following Wessels' chapter, "Institutions of the EU System: Models of Explanation" (which proves almost equally obscure at times due to Wessels' presumption that readers are all highly and equally familiar with the historical evolution, composition and purpose of the EU's principal governing bodies and the EU "pillar" system), the case studies of individual member states prove to be quite informative. As Wessels has explained in the closing section of the second chapter of this volume, the case studies are designed to test three hypotheses regarding Europeanization, fusion, and convergence. In general, the authors of the case study chapters do a nice job of exploring the ways relations among individual member states have been affected by the EU political institutional framework and how domestic political processes and structures likewise have been influenced.

Grouping the case studies into three categories according to type of national governance (centralized, decentralized, and federal), the editors provide their readers with a useful and logical means of sorting out the complex political functioning of the increasingly elaborate EU system. At the same time, the fourteen country experts who have prepared the eleven case study chapters offer significant variety in their styles of exploring the key questions raised by this research project. Some of the more interesting revelations by several of the case study researchers are the mixed reactions of European publics and interest groups to the European political integrative process and in turn, the ways in which public opinion and lobbyists have been shaping the course of EU development.

Once the review of the eleven cases of EU member states featured in this volume has been completed, the editors return to a consideration of their three original hypotheses, deciding in the end that considerable variety exists not only in the ways in which individual member states are governed internally, but also in the effects that these variations in governance are having on European integration itself. As Wessels and Rometsch conclude, "there are differences according to the national institutions and the member states concerning their 'degree of Europeanization' and their 'direction of development'" (p.358). Nonetheless, "an institutional 'de-Europeanization' will not take place," conclude the editors, for "there are no signs of a withdrawal from the system but more of an institutional learning and re-equilibrium" (p.365). Not an altogether surprising conclusion, particularly considering the fact that the volume itself demands further equilibration, now that three additional members have been added to the EU.

Despite its initial shortcomings, Rometsch and Wessels' collection provides a valuable and intriguing set of studies of the symbiosis—and sometimes friction—to be found between

the EU as a whole and its individual members. While its two opening chapters may serve as something of a deterrent to including The European Union and Member States in a college or university course on European politics and European integration, the book's case study chapters in particular provide substantial useful information and thought-provoking analyses for the comparativist interested in supranational political structures and for students of comparative regional politics.

A considerably more approachable book is Gaffney's Political Parties and the European Union, which gathers a delightfully interesting set of studies shedding light not only on larger theoretical questions concerning European integration, but also on specific interest groups and players currently operating in the political sphere of EU member states, both domestically and on a European-wide scale. As Gaffney notes in his preface, he and the twenty other authors of this volume have compiled an essentially tripartite study, examining three types of case studies of political parties in Europe: the first, cases which explore how Europe's most important political parties are responding to the EU as a systemic structure and an evolutionary process; the second, cases which examine in close detail the political parties of a particular country or region, or alternatively, of certain party families; and the third, case studies analyzing how parties organized on a transnational basis within the EU system are operating. An ambitious and fascinating undertaking, this volume could easily be enjoyed by newcomers to studies of the EU or by experts. While Gaffney readily admits in his preface that no one volume could fully do justice to the wide range of topics and questions pertaining to political party life in Europe today, his edited collection offers sufficient breadth and depth on a number of interesting issues as to capture the attention of a diverse array of readers.

**Barbara A. Lakeberg-Dridi**  
American University

---

**Stephen Davies and Bruce Lyons. Industrial Organization in the European Union: Structure, Strategy, and the Competitive Mechanism. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996, 287 pp.**

**Christopher J. S. Gentle. After Liberalisation: A Vision of Europe in the Global Economy of the Twenty-First Century. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996, 139 pp.**

Economic change is rapidly transforming Europe in seismic but more often subtle ways. The books reviewed here describe changes in market structure and corporate strategy in Europe, explore the reasons behind the changes, and address their social and political implications. Although it is unfair to compare the two books—Davies and Lyons address a very specialized academic audience while Gentle does the exact opposite—they share similarities and complement each other fairly well. The results are mixed, but the efforts are important

because Europe is treated as an entity in its own right and not as a group of interdependent countries.

Davies and Lyons take a snapshot of European industry in 1987. As such, Europe refers to the "Europe of 12." Exhaustive in scope, the book is interesting but also inaccessible to the non-expert. This is a pity because the analysis is full of fresh insights.

The authors have three aims which they achieve with relative success. The first is to describe the state of industry in the European Union (technically they are referring to the European Communities). The second is to reconceptualize market structure within the framework of the industrial organization approach. The third aim is to arrive at generalizable conclusions regarding competition in Europe. They succeed but at a cost. The most important contributions of the volume are the reconceptualization of market structure and the rich data bank that accompanies it. The shortcomings are the turgid language and the omissions in their data bank.

Market structure usually refers to degree of concentration in a given market. The authors expand this concept in three more dimensions: international trade, EU versus national concentration, and multinationality. The first dimension explores industrial integration at the EU level by reference to intra-EU trade in several sectors. Their econometric model confirms conventional wisdom, that is, comparative advantage and transport costs, shape production specialization and location. But the model also reveals the importance of technology in the form of R&D expenditures and government intervention in explaining trade flows.

Concentration looks at traditional concentration ratios, but the authors add competitive weapons as well. Concentration ratios are explored largely at the EU level, which the authors categorically assert is different from simply adding up degrees of concentration at member state levels. The important addition to this dimension is the typology based on three competitive weapons: advertising, R&D, and price. They postulate two types of industries. Type 1 industries compete only through price while type 2 compete through advertising, R&D, or both (Types 2A, 2R, and 2AR respectively). Exactly why there aren't four types is not clear. Nevertheless, the effects on structure are profound in that concentration is likely to be greater in high trade, R&D-intensive industries at the EU level but unrelated to trade in advertising-intensive industries at the same level.

Finally, multinationality, that is, the spread of production facilities owned by the same company across countries, affects structure in subtle but important ways. Although their analysis confirms the influence of conventional factors on the degree of multinationalization in Europe—product differentiation, economies of scale, and concentration—there is a difference between advertising-intensive and R&D-intensive industries. In the former, multinationalization occurs at the expense of trade, while in the latter it accompanies high volumes of trade.

What are the implications for competition policy and integration? The most important is that there are no general rules. Each type of industry needs to be examined separately.



Surprisingly, liberalization (or greater competition) might lead to greater concentration under conditions of high production efficiencies due to economies of scale. This is particularly true in advertising-intensive industries and to a lesser extent in R&D-intensive industries. A cursory look at chemical, food or tobacco companies in Europe is revealing. This would have been the fate of telecommunications authorities were it not for political considerations that do not permit complete mergers but rather encourage multinational alliances and partial acquisitions. The notion of integration is also affected in important ways. If integration means a higher ratio of intra-EU trade relative to total EU trade, public procurement industries present an interesting case study. To the extent that procurement rules are eased across Europe, trade is likely to increase and multinationalization will decrease because there is no need to move production to different countries to gain a national identity. At the same time, concentration will rise at the EU level but fall at the national level in low-trade, R&D-intensive industries because low R&D spenders will be driven out of business.

The turgid language and the density of thought make this book very difficult to follow. Imagine reading 27 econometric articles of 10 pages, each, full of statistical analyses, some formal modeling, and lots of comparisons between supranational, national, and firm level relationships. Even if one were to understand each separately, following the flow of thought is very difficult without constant repetition. The authors decided to err on the repetitive side; the book is not repetitive enough to connect all the threads of the argument together. In addition, the authors admit that their interest is in capturing a snapshot of industry at the European level. What their data bank misses is the national picture. It would have been interesting to compare findings between the EU and member-state levels to appreciate the changes taking place, the importance of looking at the big picture, and the potentially misleading conclusions derived from examining exclusively individual states. This is clearly a case where the total is greater than the sum of its parts, but it's nice to gain a glimpse of the parts in order to appreciate the importance of the total.

That's the picture based on 1987 data. What will happen after liberalization? What are the political and social implications? Enter the second book. Gentle's analysis is highly accessible to the non-expert and insightful, but also incomplete and off the mark. The author argues contrary to conventional wisdom that Europe's economic prosperity in the postwar era is tied to countries' abilities to maintain social cohesion and a collectivist consciousness in the face of rapid change. Further liberalization will erode the social fabric that helped promote and redistribute the benefits of prosperity. The implication is that economic liberalization has significant social and political consequences whose effects are not fully understood or appreciated. Such arguments sound provocative, if not true, in light of recent echoes by George Soros and others in Davos, Switzerland. So far, so good.

But while the argument is interesting, the book is off the mark in that it answers a different question than the one posed.

The purpose of the book, the author says, is "to determine how Europe will look after liberalisation" (p.7). Sounds speculative, but there is room for "food for thought." Yet a cursory look at the table of contents reveals a serious imbalance. One chapter is retrospective about liberalization—which is defined broadly to mean the freeing of markets from excessive rules, the transfer of state industries to private investors, and the removal of barriers to trade—and three are mainly descriptive sectoral analyses of changes in financial, computer, and telecommunications services. Only in the final two chapters does the author begin to think seriously about life after liberalization. And even then, only one chapter is grounded in analyzing the effects of present day trends. The other provides a snapshot of Europe in the year 2010! Devoting only 13 of 132 pages of text to answering the research question is "slim trimmings" indeed. With a price of \$69.95, the book is not going to be on many people's summer reading list.

What about that pithy statement that concludes the "vision thing?" Gentle argues that the guiding principle of Europe in the twenty-first century should be "liberalisation where possible, regulation where necessary." Great, but under what conditions is each of these statements true? Are there sectors or situations when liberalization is impossible? Does the author mean appropriate rather than impossible? Who defines what's necessary? What form should regulation take? These are important questions that go unanswered.

Tracking down the changes in European industry and thinking through their implications are worthy pursuits. They are also very difficult issues to explore because of the paucity of data, the frequent subtlety of the changes, or the speculative nature of the enterprise. It's good to see authors addressing these issues not so much for the answers they provide, though both books are insightful, but for sensitizing us to the questions we must ask.

**Nikolaos Zahariadis**  
State University of New York at New Paltz

---

**Taylor, Paul Graham. The European Union in the 1990s. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, 204 pp.**

**Richardson, Jeremy J., ed. European Union: Power and Policy-Making. London and New York: Routledge, 1996, 300 pp.**

These two recent additions to European studies have been written for different purposes and draw their information from different types of analyses. The Taylor book seeks to explain the logic of integration with a view to capturing the Union's special character in the mid-1990s. It is explicitly not intended as a text book (p. 1). Quite differently, the Richardson volume has been compiled with precisely the intention to explain to students of European integration and state politics, the ways in which power is exercised within today's EU (p. ix). Whereas the Taylor book focuses on politics and derives much of its

valuable information from the author's expertise as a long-standing researcher and observer of the politics of integration, the group of researchers gathered in the Richardson volume focuses primarily on analyses of the policy-making process as the "ultimate arena of power in society" (p. ix).

Together both perspectives are important contributions not only to the debate over European integration theories and politics in the run-up to the 1997 intergovernmental conference (IGC) but also to the question of policy-making and politics within a larger framework of the transformation of state politics towards the end of the millennium. Most importantly, a comparison of both books suggests a shift in importance from politics to policy-making as the dynamic process which proves central for newly emergent models of governance. In the following this observation will be sustained by a brief summary of each contribution.

The central argument of the Taylor book suggests a renewed focus on the concept of consociationalism as an alternative to what the author identifies as the "federalism" versus "hard intergovernmentalism" debate (p.180). Instead, it is argued that the state of European integration in the mid-1990s is best defined as "modified intergovernmentalism" in the special form of consociationalism (p.96). As demonstrated by the author, the process of European integration has produced a paradox by strengthening the member states' position on the national level, on the one hand, and contributing to create a strong organisational setting on the European level, on the other. This outcome, it is argued, is best explained by the consociationalist approach which builds on a two-tiered assumption. First, it identifies a "dual structure" entailing horizontal elements such as a collectivity of states held within a consociation and horizontal elements such as the relationship between individual states and that collectivity. Secondly it entails the notion of "symbiosis" as member state governments and Community interests both merge in mutual promotion (pp. 90-91). With this observation at the core, the author takes great pains to show that a federal model of a European central state has ceased as an image for the EU. This conclusion rests on a careful historical account of the politics of European integration, the position of non-members of the EU and the question of national identity and participation in the EU.

The authors in the volume edited by Richardson are less interested in the outcome of European integration than in the process itself. As Smith summarizes, for example, "the EU is not simply an 'actor' or a 'presence' but also a process" (Smith, p. 247). The case studies compiled in this volume build on the observation that in the mid-1990s about sixty percent of what used to be domestic policy-making within national contexts has been transferred to the European level. This leads to the assumption that the EU "has acquired for itself at least the policy-making attributes of a modern state" (Richardson, p. 3). The book does not, however, aim at discussing the EU's degree of statehood. Quite to the contrary, as Majone's contribution stresses, it is helpful to consider the EU as a "regulatory state" for analytical purposes (p. 263).

As Richardson points out, the pooling of policy-making sovereignty has led to a loss of some power of the national governments in particular (p.3). Accordingly, the majority of the contributions seeks to come to terms with this situation on empirical grounds, focusing on the implications of shifts of decision-making power through analyses of the policy process. A shared assumption of the contributors is that the focus on the dynamic policy process not only provides a way of understanding the integration process as a whole (Cram, p.54), but it also enables researchers to understand both substance and direction of the process of integration including the emergence and change of new institutions, constitution making, and the changing political importance of different policy areas. At a time when structures of governance are reconfigured beyond the context of European integration on a wider global scale, such a focus offers invaluable insights for students of comparative politics and public policy in general. His emphasis on the policy process as policy-making and not only agenda-setting is crucial as political power is relocated from traditional modern political institutions to other arenas of society.

Overall, Richardson's collection is an excellent contribution to studies of European integration, offering rich empirical material as well as innovative analytical thought. Apart from covering major areas in studies of European integration such as policy-making (Richardson), the European idea (Mazey), integration theory (Cram), agenda-setting (Peters), the Commission (Christiansen), the Council (Edwards), national co-ordination (Wright), the Court of Justice (Wincott), European elections (Franklin), interest groups (Mazey and Richardson), regional politics (Keating and Hooghe), enlargement (Falkner), "international policy-making" (Smith) and regulatory policy (Majone), the book offers an important contribution to the renewed debate over theories of European integration. It is highly recommended as a most valuable addition to the required reading list for any class on European integration and politics.

**Antje Wiener**  
University of Sussex

## Publications

*The following is an annotated list of EU-related publications or publication notices recently received by ECSA USA.*

### Teaching European Integration in Bulgaria

Published by the Centre for European Studies-Sofia, Bulgarian European Community Studies Association, and the Centre Européen Universitaire de l'Université de Nancy II, France, 1995, 85 pp. TEMPUS-CME-94-F-2003, this trilingual report (Bulgarian, French, English) describes in detail the undergraduate and graduate programs currently available in European Studies at universities in Bulgaria.

## **Philip Morris Institute for Public Policy Research**

Philip Morris Institute has recently released two publications related to the EU, including "How much popular support is there for the EU?" PMI Discussion Paper No. 12 (1997), Emma Bonino et alia, a collection of six essays by both scholars and officials of European governments; and "Europe of the Regions," the proceedings of a conference, including discussions and conclusions, by that name held in Dublin, Ireland in October 1996 (published with the support of the European Commission). Contact PMI at 6, rue des Patriotes, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium; fax 32 2 732 13 07; or by e-mail <100436.1253@compuserve.com>.

## **Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies**

Sussex European Institute (SEI) has issued two new working papers in its above-named series, "Evolution of Governance and the Growth Dynamics of the Korean Semiconductor Industry," S. Ran Kim, SEI Working Paper No.20, and "A Missing Debate? Hungary and the European Union," Tibor Navracsecs, SEI Working Paper No.21. Contact the SEI, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN UK; fax 44 1273 67 85 71; e-mail <sei@sussex.ac.uk>.

## **Journal of Studies in International Education**

The inaugural issue (Vol.1, No.1, Spring 1997) of this new periodical from the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) contains articles of possible interest to European Union scholars, including essays on higher education in Central and Eastern Europe and on international cooperation in support of higher education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Contact CIEE, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017 USA; fax 212 822 2699; e-mail <info@ciee.org>.

## **East-West Dialogue**

The inaugural issue of this new journal is entitled, "The European Union and China: Issues and Perspectives I" (Vol.1, No.1, June 1996), and contains essays by Emile Noël et alia. Volume 2, No.1 (February 1997) is entitled "Philosophy and History I" and includes essays comparing state systems in Europe and China, Sino-German relations, and more. Contact Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), Shaw Campus, No. 34 Renfrew Road, Low Rise Buildings Block 4, 1/F, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, PRC; fax 852 2339 5799; e-mail <lewi@hkbu.edu.hk>.

## **Draft Treaty of Amsterdam**

The European Parliament has notified ECSA USA that the Draft Treaty of Amsterdam is available in all the official languages and can be obtained by sending a request to the European Parliament, Task-Force IGC 1996, Schuman Building, Salle 602, Luxembourg; fax 352 4300 9027; e-mail <mamartinez@europarl.eu.int>.

## **Current Politics and Economics of Europe**

This journal, now in its seventh year, is moving up to fully refereed status, and invites submissions of full-length articles on any contemporary aspect of the political dynamics, economic policies, institutions and the future of Europe, whether EU level or area studies. Submit manuscripts to Current Politics and Economics of Europe, Nova Science Publishers, 6080 Jericho Turnpike, Suite 207, Commack, NY 11725 USA; fax 516 499 3146; by e-mail to <novascience@earthlink.net> or e-mail the editor-in-chief, Justin Greenwood, at <j.greenwood@rgu.ac.uk>.

## **European Law Reports**

This new series to be published six times per year (launched in 1997 by John Wiley & Sons) is subtitled "Cases in the United Kingdom and Ireland" and covers UK and Irish cases on European Community law. Contact John Wiley & Sons, 1 Oldlands Way, Bognor Regis, West Sussex, PO22 9SA Portsmouth, UK; fax 44 1243 84 32 96; or visit their Web site at <http://www.wiley.co.uk>.

## **South European Society and Politics**

This new interdisciplinary journal, established in 1996, covers the spectrum of the social sciences and focuses on Greece, Spain, Portugal and Italy, with an interest in Turkey, Cyprus and Malta. Reviewers are sought for individual book reviews, short review articles covering several books on a similar theme, and review essays examining "the state of the art" in South European studies. Contact the reviews editor, Susannah Verney, 17 Lykavittou, Athens 106 72 Greece; fax 301 363 8323; e-mail <deplan@hol.gr>.

## **Journal of European Public Policy**

This quarterly journal announces that its 1997 rates include a discount for members of national ECSAs. Specify of which ECSA you are a member and contact Routledge Subscriptions, ITPS Ltd., Cheriton House, North Way, Andover, Hants SP10 5BE, UK; fax 44 1264 34 28 07; for a free sample copy, e-mail <info.journals@routledge.com>.

## **Britain and Europe**

This microfiche collection of primary source material on Britain and European integration, published every year since 1973, seeks an academic editor for the collection. It focuses on groups and organizations such as Campaign for a European Political Community, Common Market Campaign, Keep Britain Out Campaign, British Committee for European Security and Cooperation, Young European Federalists, Safeguard Britain Campaign, and more. Contact Susan Dickson, Primary Source Media, P. O. Box 45, Reading RG1 8HE UK; fax 44 118 950 2247; e-mail <susan.dickson@psmedia.co.uk>.

- Michael Artis and Norman Lee (eds.) (1997) The Economics of the European Union. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 384 pp.
- Graham Bishop et alia (eds.) (1996) User Guide to the Euro. London, UK: Federal Trust/Sweet & Maxwell, 208 pp.
- Olivier Blanchard (1997) The Economics of Transition in Eastern Europe. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 192 pp.
- Francoise Blum and Anne Prior-Logue (1997) State Monopolies Under EC Law. Portsmouth, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 300 pp.
- Clive H. Church and Gisela Hendriks (1997) Continuity and Change in Contemporary Europe. Gloucester, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 312 pp.
- Anne Deighton (ed.) (1997) Western European Union 1954-1997: Defence, Security, Integration. Reading, UK: European Interdependence Research Unit, 190 pp.
- Andrew Duff (1997) The Treaty of Amsterdam. London, UK: Federal Trust/Sweet & Maxwell, 176 pp.
- Stephen George (1996) Politics and Policy in the European Union (Third Edition). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 340 pp.
- Robert A. Jones (1996) The Politics and Economics of the European Union: An Introductory Text. Gloucester, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 352 pp.
- Jytte Klausen and Louise A. Tilly (eds.) (1997) European Integration in Social and Historical Perspective: 1850 to the Present. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 288 pp.
- Julian Lonbay and Andrea Biondi (1997) Remedies for Breach of EC Law. Portsmouth, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 300 pp.
- Colette Mazzucelli (1997) France and Germany at Maastricht: Politics and Negotiations to Create the European Union. New York: Garland Publishing, 376 pp.
- David McKay (1996) Rush to Union: Understanding the European Federal Bargain. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 192 pp.
- David Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (eds.) (1997) The Social Movement Society: Comparative Perspectives. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 288 pp.
- Sabrina P. Ramet (1997) Whose Democracy? Nationalism, Religion, and the Doctrine of Collective Rights in Post-1989 Eastern Europe. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 224 pp.
- Elfriede Regelsberger et alia (eds.) (1997) Foreign Policy of the European Union: From EPC to CFSP and Beyond. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 406 pp.
- James Sperling and Emil Kirchner (1997) Recasting the European Order: Security Architectures and Economic Cooperation. Manchester (UK) University Press, 287 pp.
- Stelios Stavridis et alia (eds.) (1997) New Challenges to the European Union: Policies and Policy-Making (The European Political Economy Series). Hampshire, UK: Dartmouth Publishing, 618 pp.
- Loukas Tsoukalis (1997) The New European Economy Revisited. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 300 pp.

As announced in the previous *ECSA Review*, the following is a list of section themes, chapter titles and contributors from ECSA's forthcoming State of the European Union, Volume 4: The Widening and Deepening Exercise, 1995-1996 (Pierre-Henri Laurent and Marc Maresceau, Editors), to be released in 1997 by Lynne Rienner Publishers, the series publisher:

#### *Introduction*

1. Maastricht II: The IGC Monetary, Security and Reform Agenda and The Enlargement Imperative (Pierre-Henri Laurent and Marc Maresceau)

#### *The Backdrop*

2. The IGC and the Renegotiation of the European Order After the Cold War (William Wallace and Anthony Forster)
3. Reflections on the Three IGCs 1985-1996 (Desmond Dinan)

#### *Monetary Union*

4. Enhancing Europe's International Monetary Power (Peter Loedel)
5. Germany and the EMU (Dorethea Heisenberg)
6. EMU and the Implications for non-EMU States (Alison Watson)

#### *Security*

7. The CFSP from Maastricht I to II (Stephanie Anderson)
8. Reforming the CFSP: Collusion and Confusion in EU Institutions (Michael E. Smith)
9. The WEU in the New European Order (Joseph Coffey)
10. France, the CFSP and NATO (Ronald Tiersky)

#### *Enlargement*

11. Enlargement as a Mechanism of Increased Voice (Carlos Closa)
12. The Problem of Capacity and Control in an Enlarged Council (Bart Kerremans)
13. Strategies for the Eastern Enlargement (Peter Balazs)
14. Northern Enlargement and EU Decision-Making (John Peterson and Elizabeth Bomberg)

#### *Special Agendas*

15. Environment Policy: Deepen or Widen? (John McCormick)
16. A European Success Story: The Works Councils Directive (Robert Geyer and Beverly Springer)
17. The EU and Women: The Inequality Conundrum (R. Amy Elman)

#### *The Main Actors*

18. The State of EU/US Relations: Commercial, Political and Security Ties (Roy H. Ginsberg)
19. The EU and Russia in the Post Cold War Era (Vassil Breskovi)
20. The EU and the WTO Global Trading System (Mary Footer)

For ordering information, contact Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1800 30th Street (314), Boulder, CO 80301; fax 303 444 0824; telephone 303 444 6684.

## World Wide Web Sites

*The following annotated list highlights new or newly-discovered World Wide Web sites of interest to EU scholars. NB: All Web site addresses must be preceded by http:// which has been omitted here for the sake of brevity.*

[www.european-voice.com/index](http://www.european-voice.com/index) "European Voice: A Weekly View of the Union" is the Web site of this weekly publication of the Economist Group in Brussels. The site has very current news on EU politics and business, and includes an on-line form for ordering free sample copies

[www.europa.eu.int](http://www.europa.eu.int) "Europa" is the official server and multilingual Web site of the European Union. The Council, the Commission, the Parliament and the Courts post their news here, along with a wealth of EU information from a basic primer to official publications to a chat room on the Amsterdam Treaty. This site is so complete and important for EU scholars that it will be mentioned in every *ECSA Review*.

[arena.nfr.no](http://arena.nfr.no) "ARENA" is the acronym for Advanced Research on the Europeanisation of the Nation-State, a consortium of researchers and research projects based in Oslo, Norway. They investigate the impacts of the evolving European systems of governance on national policies, institutions and collective identities, using a cross-disciplinary approach; the highly informative Web site highlights research in progress, conferences, seminars, publications, links to related Web sites, and more.

[olymp.wu-wien.ac.at/eiop](http://olymp.wu-wien.ac.at/eiop) "European Integration online Papers" is an excellent new Web site produced by the executive committee of the European Community Studies Association of Austria. This bilingual (English and German) site aims to make current research available much more quickly to scholars, and contains papers by EU scholars from both sides of the Atlantic (including ECSA USA members) on the IGC 1996, EU citizenship, governance, and more.

[www.law.harvard.edu/groups/jmpapers](http://www.law.harvard.edu/groups/jmpapers) "Harvard Jean Monnet Chair Working Paper Series" aims to bring to a wider readership papers presented at Harvard Law School under the auspices of the Jean Monnet Chair. Begun in 1995 and currently including 28 papers, the site offers the option of downloading many of the papers in addition to reading them on-line. It is well worth a visit for EU scholars.

[www.ttc.org](http://www.ttc.org) "The Tocqueville Connection: The Insider's Web Source for French News and Analysis" is produced by the U.S. Center for Research and Education on Strategy and Technology, a public policy research institute which aims, among other things, to "foster a broader Franco-American dialogue." The Web site carries the weekly publication of the same name with news on French defense and foreign policy, politics and society, industry and business, finance, and more. The site is worth a visit for EU scholars specializing in France.

## Academic Programs

*The following is a partial list of EU-related academic programs which accept applications from students of various nationalities. Please contact each program directly for updated information on instructional staff, accreditation, courses, policies, and application materials and deadlines.*

M.A. in European Studies, Elliot School of International Affairs, George Washington University. Combines courses on Western and Eastern Europe with more general courses in economics, international business, et alia. The program seeks to prepare students for positions in government, business, the non-profit sector and academia. Contact Prof. Michael J. Sodaro, Director, European Studies Program, c/o IERES, George Washington University, Suite 401, 2013 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20052; tel 202 994 7412; fax 202 994 5436.

EURAS: European Advanced Studies, Danube University of Krems, Austria. Contact Prof. Dr. Manfred Straube, Head of Department, Abteilung für Europäische Integration, Dr. Karl Dorrek-Strasse 30, Donau Universität Krems, A-3500 Krems, Austria; tel 43 2732 74 517 412; fax 43 2732 74 517 414.

M.A. in European Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. Multidisciplinary program in English, combining economics, law, political science, and history, focusing on European integration, the European Union, and its relations with ASEAN countries. Includes four-week trip to Europe. Contact Prof. Apirat Petchsiri, Director, M.A. in European Studies; tel 662 218 3922; fax 662 215 3580; or by e-mail to [cuesp@netserv.chula.ac.th](mailto:cuesp@netserv.chula.ac.th).

M.A. in European Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland. Economic, political and sociological courses in European studies, with special emphasis on European integration. Most suitable for students holding degrees in economics or in the social sciences but open to graduates in other fields. Fair knowledge of French very helpful. Contact Prof. Philip Braillard, Director, Master in European Studies, Faculté des Sciences Économiques et Sociales, 102 Boulevard Carl-Vogt, CH-1211 Genève 4, Switzerland; tel 41 22 705 8003; fax 41 22 705 4100; e-mail [braillard@ibm.unige.ch](mailto:braillard@ibm.unige.ch).

European Diploma in Advanced International Studies, Centre International de Formation Européenne, Nice and Berlin. Post-graduate program taught in French and English, six months in Nice and three months in Berlin. Courses in international relations, democracy and society, European construction, and federalism. Contact Institut Européen des Hautes Études Internationales, 10, avenue des Fleurs, F-06000 Nice, France. Tel 33 04 9337 6924; fax 33 04 9337 7939.

European Summer Course, Europäische Akademie Bevensen, Germany. Three-week program in Bonn, Strasbourg, and

Brussels for young professionals in academia, civil service, business, and the media, as well as post-graduate students from all over Europe. Contact Stefani Weiss, Gustav Stresemann Institut, Langer Grabenweg 68, D-53175 Bonn, Germany; tel 49 228 810 7167; fax 49 228 810 7198.

## Grants and Fellowships

### 1998-99 European Forum Fellowships European University Institute, Italy

The mission of the European Forum is to bring together at the European University Institute for one academic year, acknowledged specialists on a given theme, to conduct research primarily of a comparative, interdisciplinary nature. It furthers the coordination and comparison of research through weekly seminars, organizes roundtables and colloquia, and publishes its work in various forms: working papers, journal articles, and edited volumes or books. While at the European Forum, the Forum Fellows are expected actively to participate in seminars and workshops while pursuing their own research.

The 1998-99 Research Project is "Recasting the European Welfare State: Options, Constraints, Actors." Since the establishment of compulsory social insurance in 1883 Germany, the welfare state has been a fundamental ingredient for the modernization of European society; its programs have greatly contributed to consolidating democratic institutions and to harmonizing economic growth with changing social needs. Yet, despite its success, the welfare state enters its second century of life under conditions of stress and uncertainty. A child of the nation state and industrial society, it stands somewhat disoriented amidst the new socioeconomic and political context. No institution can survive without adapting; thus the welfare state now faces the difficult challenge of modifying its instruments in order to respond to the new context and specific problems. Only through such readaptation can the welfare state relaunch its mission and confirm its centrality to the further progress of European society. Using a broad, long-term, and comparative perspective, the Forum aims to:

- scrutinize the complex social, economic and political challenges to contemporary European welfare states;
- identify the various options for and constraints on institutional reform;
- discuss the role of the various actors in promoting or hindering this reform, at the national, sub-national and supra-national levels;
- more generally, outline the broad trajectories and scenarios of change.

The Forum offers a number of fellowships for the whole academic year (September 1998-June 1999) for senior and junior scholars. Applicants should hold a doctorate by September 1997 and submit a research project which fits into the above-described research program. The Fellowships are full-time in residence in Florence, Italy. Contact The European Forum, European University Institute, Via dei

Rocsettini 9, I-San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy; fax 39 55 468 5775; e-mail <[forinfo@datacomm.iue.it](mailto:forinfo@datacomm.iue.it)>. Application deadline: July 30, 1997 (postmark).

### 1998-1999 Fulbright Scholar and NATO Research Grant Opportunities for US Faculty and Professionals

The following EU-related Fulbright Research Grant opportunities are available for 1998-1999:

1) Fulbright Chair in US-EU Relations, College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium. Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the time of application and have the Ph.D. or equivalent professional qualifications. Applicants should be established professors with a broad background in transatlantic relations, law, economics or political science (interdisciplinary competence desirable). While fluency in French is desirable, it is not a requirement. The chairholder will be expected to give a class or seminar on transatlantic relations, publish the results of seminars or conferences given during the grant period, and advise the faculty of the Collège on possible future directions for this program. Application deadline: August 1, 1997.

2) Fulbright Research Awards in European Union Affairs. Approximately three awards are available for research in one or more EU-member countries. Preference will be given to projects focusing on the organization of the EU, particularly on the process of institution building. Other topics related to the EU will also be considered. Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the time of application and have the Ph.D. or equivalent professional qualifications. Application deadline: August 1, 1997.

3) Fulbright European Union Scholar-in-Residence Program. Institutions are invited to submit proposals to host an EU official or an academic from an EU-member country who specializes in EU affairs as a resident fellow for one or both terms of the 1998-99 academic year. The EU resident fellow will receive salary and other benefits from the EU, while the Fulbright Scholar Program will provide partial maintenance support here and in the U.S., health insurance and international travel expenses. Application deadline: November 1, 1997.

4) Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Regional Research Program. One award is available for an established scholar or a promising younger scholar to conduct research for up to ten months during the 1998-99 academic year on a project that relates to the mission and goals of the OSCE. The research may take place in any of the 15 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 states of the former Soviet Union. Interdisciplinary proposals are welcome. Application deadline: August 1, 1997.

For further information on all of these Fulbright opportunities, contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden Street NW, Suite 5M, Washington, D.C. 20008. Telephone 202 686 6241; fax 202 362 3442; or e-mail to <[we2@ciesnet.cies.org](mailto:we2@ciesnet.cies.org)>.

## Conferences and Workshops

### Enlarging the European Union: The Way Forward

July 1-2, 1997, University of Birmingham, UK: This residential conference will look in depth at the implications of enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean from the perspectives of both the EU itself and the applicant states. Coming just after the Amsterdam Council and before the Commission publishes its opinions on the CEE applications, it is hoped that the discussion will shed light on "the way forward" to meet this historic challenge. Sponsored by UACES (University Association for Contemporary European Studies) and the Graduate School of European Studies and European Studies Research Programmes, University of Birmingham. Contact UACES Secretariat, King's College, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK; fax 44 171 836 2350; e-mail <uaces@compuserve.com>.

### 20th Century Europe: Inclusions/Exclusions

August 27-30, 1997, University of Essex, Colchester, UK: The third European conference of the European Sociological Association, convened by Marco Martiniello (University of Liege), Krystyna Romaniszyn (Jagiellonian University) and Fulvio Attina (University of Catania). The following is a partial list of the themes which will be addressed:

- Globalizations
- European Processes
- Revisiting Classical Theory
- Cultures and Identities
- Inequalities Old and New
- Work, Welfare and Citizenship

For information, contact the ESA Conference Organizer, Department of Sociology, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex CO4 3SQ, UK; fax 44 1206 87 34 10; or e-mail <esa97@essex.ac.uk>.

### UACES Research Conference

September 10-12, 1997, University of Loughborough, UK: The University Association for Contemporary European Studies conference on European integration, broadly defined, with contributions from such areas as social policy and sociology, as well as the more traditional areas of politics, economics, history and law. The Conference Committee Chair is John Redmond, Political Science and International Studies, University of Birmingham. Contact UACES Secretariat, King's College, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK; fax 44 171 836 2350; e-mail <uaces@compuserve.com>.

### The US Governmental System and EU Relations

September 15-19, 1997, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.: Jointly organized by the European Institute of Public

Administration (Maastricht, The Netherlands) and Brookings Institution, this seminar aims to provide participants with a better understanding of the basic institutions of American government at the federal level. Having laid the foundations for an understanding of the American political machinery, the emphasis of the program will shift to an exploration of the major issues of relations between the US and the European Union. NB: This seminar is designed for US federal managers. Contact: The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20036; tel 202 797 6000; fax 202 797 6004; e-mail <brookinfo@brook.edu>.

### Doing Business in Europe: Strategic Issues for the Midwest

September 26, 1997, University of Wisconsin-Madison: Organized by European Studies, the World Affairs and Global Economy Initiative, and the School of Business, this conference is intended to create a dialogue between faculty and business experts in order to examine vital European issues and their implications for transatlantic business relations. Individual sessions will include:

- Business trends and opportunities in Europe
- Economic and Monetary Union
- Single European Market
- Labor issues and deregulation

Company representatives will also have the valuable opportunity for one-to-one consultations with EU Consulate and Trade representatives from a majority of the member states' Chicago offices. Contact Jeffrey Lewis, European Studies Program, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 327 Ingram Hall, 1155 Observatory Drive, Madison, WI 53706; tel. 608 265 6295; fax 608 265 2919; e-mail <jlewis@polisci.wisc.edu>.

### New England Historical Association

October 18, 1997, University of Connecticut, Storrs: The fall meeting concerns United States, European, and Third World historical research by scholars from within or outside the New England region. Contact James P. Hanlan, NEHA Executive Secretary, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 01609; tel 508 831 5438; e-mail <jphanlan@wpi.wpi.edu>.

### The Fuzzy Edges of Community - ECSA Canada

May 29-31, 1998, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: ECSA Canada announces a call for proposals for its third annual meeting to be held as part of the Congress of the Social Sciences and the Humanities. Under the rubric of "The Fuzzy Edges of Community," the conference planners intend to explore the emergence of regional systems in Europe and North and South America; these are either institutionalized or centered on the European Union, NAFTA, or MERCOSUR.

Whether regional systems are intergovernmental or supranational in structure, they have profound consequences

### ECPR Standing Group on European Level Interest Representation

both for the states who belong to them and those which border on or deal with them. Regional systems can affect the focus and intensity of political attachments and in doing so, may be reshaping communities. Regional communities may be emerging and national communities may be weakening, blurring identities and loyalties; thus, political communities may increasingly have "fuzzy edges." Within this conception of the reshaping and "fuzzification" of community, topics for exploration may include but are not limited to:

- Circumstances leading to the emergence of regional systems, including external pressures and inducements (mainly economic); security concerns; the role of political elites in shaping and responding to public opinion.
- Institutional forms, including relationships which emerge not only among member states, but also with neighboring states (those at the fuzzy edge). Comparisons among regional and/or multi-level systems, such as the EU and federal systems, leagues of states, and empires.
- The degree to which regional systems reshape political identities and affect individuals' definition of community; how regional systems affect political loyalties and attachments within participating states / states in the penumbra.
- The extent to which regional systems erode, compromise, or "pool" national sovereignty.
- The degree to which regional systems alter or reshape political processes within participating states (impact on parties, interest organizations, etc.); the extension of parties and interest organizations' activities to the regional or supranational level.
- The effect which regional systems, whether these constitute trading blocs, customs, or economic unions, have on patterns of commerce, including trade, industrial restructuring and labor relations.

Conference organizers especially welcome paper and panel themes which compare the European Union with other systems of governance. ECSA Canada meetings have operated as workshops or small conferences, and organizers hope to maintain this format in 1998 by minimizing time for presentation of papers and maximizing time for discussion. To that end, ECSA Canada would like all the conference papers to be posted on their Web site by April 30, 1998. They would also like to experiment with a modified format in which some papers are presented not by the author, but by the discussant. Formal proposals are due by October 1, 1997; paper proposals should be 100-150 words in length and should indicate the author, title, approach and major themes of the paper.

Send to the conference organizers: Peter Leslie, Dept. of Political Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6, Canada; e-mail <lesliep@qsilver.queensu.ca> or to David Long, School of International Affairs, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6, Canada; e-mail <dlong@ccs.carleton.ca>. ECSA Canada Chair is Steven Wolinetz, Dept. of Political Science, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 3X9, Canada; e-mail <ecsac@morgan.ucs.mun.ca>.

The ECPR Standing Group on European Level Interest Representation passed another landmark this spring by recruiting its 200th member. From a standing start in October 1994, this network has quickly established itself as a "membership must" for anyone working in the EU public policy field. Features of the network include an Internet discussion list, a variety of small workshops, twice-yearly newsletters with news and analysis from Brussels and from its members, and a freely circulated database of members' interests. The group has been particularly successful in recruiting practitioners from Euro groups and from public affairs firms in recent months, who are available as contacts to anyone else in the group. Anyone wishing to join should contact Justin Greenwood (ECSA USA member) by e-mail at <j.greenwood@rgu.ac.uk> or fax 44 1224 262 929.— *Submitted by Justin Greenwood.*

### Hungarian Strategic Task Force for European Integration

The Strategic Task Force (STF) was set up by the Hungarian Prime Minister in February 1996 as part of a new institutional framework designed to promote European integration. Its purpose is to help the government prepare for the tasks it faces as Hungary prepares to negotiate entry into the European Union. It is unique as a structure to Hungary, and has two main functions: 1) Deal with strategic EU-related issues connected with the day-to-day activities of the ministries; and 2) draw up a coherent, national integration strategy. As a non-partisan group, the STF is able to function without being influenced by special interest groups. Although it relies strongly on documents prepared by ministries, its strategic policy papers are designed to contribute new policy considerations, view-points and scenarios.

During 1996 and 1997, the STF experts are examining seven topics. These include a comprehensive evaluation of the present state of Hungary-EU relations and the possible benefits in them; a cost-benefit analysis of the pre-entry period and of full membership; drawing conclusions from the schedules and negotiating strategies of previous applicants for EU membership; examining the preparations by other CEFTA countries; and outlining the incentives and disincentives of Eastern enlargement for existing EU members. The STF is divided into nineteen working groups covering topics such as foreign trade policy, the IGC, agriculture, justice and home affairs, and culture, media, and information systems. Head of the STF is Prof. András Inotai (ECSA USA member). For information contact the Strategic Task Force (Integrációs Stratégiai Munkacsoport), P. O. Box 2, H-1357 Budapest, Hungary; tel 36 1 268 4040; fax 36 1 268 4792; or e-mail <p143@mehp.meh.hu>.— *Submitted by András Inotai.*



## ECSA USA News

At its June 1st meeting in Seattle, Washington, the ECSA USA Executive Committee selected Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as the site of ECSA's 1999 Sixth Biennial International Conference. The Conference will take place from June 2-5, 1999—note that the program will run from Wednesday morning through Saturday afternoon, providing four full days of sessions—at the historic Westin William Penn Hotel, built in 1916 by Pittsburgh industrialist Henry Clay Frick.

The call for paper and panel proposals will go out in mid-1998, and updates about the conference will be posted on ECSA's Web site and in the *ECSA Review* beginning in 1998. Mark your calendars now and plan to attend.

ECSA-USA is cooperating with the Lyman L. Lemnitzer Center for NATO and EU Studies at Kent State University and the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy of Athens in presenting a workshop entitled, "NATO and the European Union: Confronting the Challenges of European Security Cooperation." It will be held at the Anatolia College in Thessaloniki and its associate institution, The American College of Thessaloniki, on October 16-18, 1997. The papers commissioned for discussion will be published in 1998.

ECSA-USA members who will participate include two ECSA Executive Committee representatives, Leon Hurwitz and Pierre-Henri Laurent and in addition to William Wallace of the UK, Josef Janning and Wolfgang Wessels of the Federal Republic of Germany, S. Victor Papacosma of the Lemnitzer Center, and Michael Smith of the University of California at Irvine. Other participants will be Michael Mandelbaum, Stanley Sloan, Giancarlo Chevillard, and Sir John Goulden.

The **ECSA List-Server** was launched in 1996 to be a forum for discussion, debate, and information sharing among ECSA-USA members. Currently 200 Association members in the United States and Europe have subscribed to the list, which is also used as an information dissemination resource by the ECSA Administrative Office. The list is open to current ECSA USA members.

To subscribe, send an e-mail message to ECSA at <ecsa+@pitt.edu> with only this one-line message in the text area: subscribe ecsa@list.pitt.edu. Be sure to send the message to the above e-mail address rather than to the entire list. Include no extra spaces or punctuation and if your e-mail messages regularly carry a signature, you must delete the signature lines. It will take several days to process the request and subscribers will know they are on the list when they have received a welcome message from the University of Pittsburgh's Majordomo.

As of July 1997, ECSA USA has 1200 current members.

c Hinton, ECSA USA master's degree fellowship recipient 1993-94, writes: "Since completing an MA in European Integration at the University of Limerick in Ireland, I have continued my interest in European Union studies. While at Brigham Young University Law School, I have researched and written on a number of EU topics and my most recent publication is a casenote entitled, "The Limits of Affirmative Action in the European Union: Eckhard Kalanke v Freie Hansestadt Bremen," (*Journal of Women & the Law*, May 1997). In the 1997-98 school year, I will be pursuing an LLM (advanced law degree) in EU Law at Leiden University in The Netherlands as a Rotary Scholar."

### Euristote: University Research on European Integration

Of great interest to ECSA-USA members who have been conducting research on European integration, Euristote is the primary extant archive (in electronic database form) of university research on European integration. It currently contains over 22,000 references to university research (such as doctoral theses and post-doctoral research) now being conducted or completed since 1960, in over 350 universities throughout the world. Euristote also contains a list of professors who research European integration (with their affiliations, discipline, specialization, and publications) as well as a list of universities, research centers and institutions (with all contact information) involved in researching European integration. Euristote is produced by the European Commission (DG-X) and the European University Institute.

To keep this resource up to date, the organizers of Euristote seek new entries with the following qualifications:

- university doctoral or post-doctoral level research
- primary research, rather than literature reviews or other secondary-level research
- clearly and specifically relevant to the study of European integration, excluding comparative research and general European studies
- published since 1994 or an ongoing research project

ECSA USA has posted Euristote as a link on its Web site home page, under "What's New," including the full questionnaire. Scholars whose research meets the above criteria are encouraged to complete the form on-line and return it by e-mail via the site. Visit ECSA's Web site at <<http://www.pitt.edu/~ecsa101>>.

The third volume in ECSA's series, State of the European Community, Volume 3: Building a European Polity? is now available at a twenty percent discount price of \$39.95 (shipping included) for ECSA USA members. Order directly from Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1800 30th Street (314), Boulder, CO 80301; fax 303 444 0824; telephone 303 444 6684. (Volume 4 will be released later this year.)

**ECSA -USA 1997-98 Membership Directory  
Biographical Information Form**

*Please type or print in BLOCK LETTERS.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Discipline or Profession \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Home Address/Telephone (Optional) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Degrees \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

EU-Related Fields of Interest (up to 6 - list primary field first)

Current/Future Research Areas (up to 3):

1) \_\_\_\_\_

1) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

6) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Recent Publications (up to 4):

1) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_

EU-related Courses Taught (up to 3):

1) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

This form must be returned by **August 31, 1997** (we cannot accept entries received after that date) to:  
**ECSA-USA, 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA or by fax to 412-648-1168**

## ECSA Review

*ECSA Review* (ISSN 1090-5758) is published three times yearly by the European Community Studies Association, a membership association and non-profit organization devoted to the exchange of information and ideas about the European Union. We welcome scholarly, EU-related manuscripts (please include day-time telephone number and current c.v.):

### Book Review Editor

Professor Paulette Kurzer  
Department of Political Science  
Social Sciences 315  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721  
E-mail <kurzer@arizona.edu>  
Facsimile 520 621 5051

### Managing Editor

Valerie Staats, Administrative Director  
European Community Studies Association  
405 Bellefield Hall  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260  
E-mail <ecsa+@pitt.edu>  
Facsimile 412 648 1168

**Subscription to the *ECSA Review* is a benefit of Association membership (membership form below).**

## ECSA Executive Committee

### 1997-99 Terms of Office

David Cameron (Yale University)  
Maria Green Cowles (University of North Carolina-Charlotte)  
Leon Hurwitz (Cleveland State University), Treasurer  
Pierre-Henri Laurent (Tufts University)  
Gary Marks (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), Chair  
Kathleen McNamara (Princeton University)  
Vivien Schmidt (University of Massachusetts-Boston)



**ECSA-USA thanks the following organizations for financial support of program activities in 1997:**

European Commission DG-I • EU Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, D.C. • The Ford Foundation  
The German Marshall Fund of the U.S. • Siemens Corporation

Contributions from individuals in the USA to support ECSA activities are tax-deductible to the extent allowable by law.

### European Community Studies Association USA Membership Form *(Please type or print)*

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip/Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_ Country \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation \_\_\_\_\_

Membership dues (please check):  Institutional (\$75.00)  Individual (\$30.00)  Student (\$15.00)

Note: US citizens may make a tax-deductible contribution to support the work of ECSA-USA in any amount over the membership dues; you will receive a receipt for tax purposes. Amount of your gift: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Card number \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration \_\_\_\_\_  VISA  MC

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ *(Please do not send cash.)*

If paying by check, please make payable to **ECSA**. Checks must be in US dollars drawn on a USA bank.  
Mail to: ECSA, 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA or fax to 412-648-1168.