

# **European Integration Curricula and 'Europeanisation': Alternative Approaches and Critical Appreciation**

**Heather Field\***

**Paper presented to the ECSA Seventh Biennial International Conference, May 31-  
June 2, 2001, Madison, Wisconsin.**

## **Abstract**

*There has been significant movement in recent years towards formal and de facto identification of principles and content for a common European integration curriculum. This paper considers the relationship between such developments and the process of 'Europeanisation'. It discusses some 'alternative approaches' to the teaching of European integration, and the need to foster critical appreciation. To some extent these issues can be related to Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian approaches as opposed to those more prevalent in the main continental EU member states. Points of difference include the disciplines in which the teaching process is being undertaken, and the adoption or rejection of cultural studies approaches, and research conventions.*

**\*Senior Lecturer in Contemporary European Studies, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, and Fellow of the Contemporary Europe Research Centre, University of Melbourne.**

## **European Integration Curricula and 'Europeanisation': Alternative Approaches and Critical Appreciation**

*Heather Field*

This paper considers some major issues and developments in approaches to European integration curricula and the process of 'Europeanisation'. It looks at actual progress towards more common standards and content, the development of alternative approaches, and the question of fostering a critical appreciation. It is intended to identify and discuss the ramifications of different approaches rather than to serve as a critique or commentary on their merits and demerits. Its main aim is to stimulate debate in an area which deserves a stronger and wider European and international focus than that which it has so far received.

What is argued here is that an appropriate approach to the teaching of European integration is one which covers not only key 'facts' but also different debates and their implications. An approach to the teaching of European integration which aims at standardisation and the removal of 'bumps in the road' would risk losing valuable understandings and stifling the development of new approaches. It would also involve the risk mentioned more generally by Diez (1997, p. 29) of creating 'better' or 'worse' Europeans, on the basis of whether a set orthodoxy is followed.

Where possible, major works are cited rather than journal articles, in an endeavour to avoid too fragmented an approach to the literature and to assist institutional construction of collections of relevant works.

### **Background and context**

The teaching of European integration in Europe is operating within the context of substantial steps towards integration in tertiary education in Europe in general. The greatest progress on this has been made on an intergovernmental basis. The Sorbonne Declaration of 25 May 1998 stressed the key role of universities for the development of a European 'cultural dimension' (Einem 2000, p. 1). Following this, in 1999 the 19 June Bologna Declaration of European education ministers set out the basis of a common tertiary system. This was to consist of a three-year undergraduate and two-year basic postgraduate cycle. It involves the common course credit system based on the present European Credit Transfer Systems (ECTS). The Declaration is intended to lead to a common 'European Tertiary Educational Space' which covers all of Europe and not just the territory of the EU. It is intended to increase the range of study options available to students, and allow for formal recognition for academics and administrators of periods spent in research, teaching or training in other countries.

A specific initiative in European Integration Studies consists of the core curriculum project directed by Wolfgang Wessels, Jean Monnet Chair at the University of Cologne (Wessels, Linsemann and Haegele 2000). This is based on an Anglo-American three-tier model with an undergraduate tier and postgraduate ones of a Master's degree and PhD, the same as the general model specified under the Bologna Declaration.

The Jean Monnet scheme of assistance for course initiatives and professorial chairs in European integration facilitates the standardisation and 'Europeanisation' of European integration courses and curricula through the interaction of appointees. By 2000 the scheme

had resulted in the creation of over 1722 new university courses or projects, including 409 professorial chairs (Shore 2000, p. 28).

A key question with respect to the scheme and to European integration curricula more widely is whether these should be aimed at a 'Europeanisation' or greater commonality of understanding of European integration processes. One of the problems here is the conflict between integration and 'Europeanisation' in themselves, and other more specific objectives of education at the tertiary level.

One aspect of this has been the inherent conflict between the view that a closer management of and involvement in education, including tertiary education, by the European Commission, is what is needed to assist integration in Europe. This view is supported by for example Corbett (1999), who argues that 'It is the commission that has developed the know-how on almost every Bologna issue' and that 'the EU, unlike the intergovernmental organisations, has a good record on policy outcomes'.

It is probably true that harmonisation of tertiary education might be more swiftly and efficiently achieved if it were undertaken by the European Commission than by national authorities and universities acting in concert but retaining their essential independence. However, as well as the possibility of such a move representing a possible threat to academic independence and the freedom universities have at least in some member states to set course content and choose research areas and issues, there is a further potential problem. As the 'guardian' of the EU's treaties with the role of promoter of integration, it might be expected to place a high priority on the role of tertiary education as a means of Europeanising elites. National priorities may reflect instead concerns about for example widening or maintaining access to tertiary education for all social groups, or the adequacy of the numbers training for less lucrative professions such as teaching and nursing, as they do in for example Sweden and the UK (Goddard 2000; De Laine 2000).

The current European Commission headed by Romano Prodi has chosen to integrate its responsibilities with regard to education with those for culture, instead of with employment where they might have been used to play a more instrumental role. This might be said to be linked to the situation that the EC Treaty (Article 149 (4) TEC) forbids attempts by the common political institutions to harmonise national curricula or legal instruments in the field of education, educational policy still being seen as closely linked to national identity (Wessels et al 2000, p. 5).

In spite of major moves such as these, there has been comparatively little published discussion and debate over the teaching of European integration in terms of curricula, sources and approaches. Exceptions to this include a regular but small 'Teaching the EU' feature in the European Community Studies Association (ECSA) *Review*, short articles on events, schemes and issues in the UK-based higher education news journal *The Times Higher*, and collections such as the US one of Bukowski (1997) and the Australian one of Pavkovic and Welch (1999).

### **Divisions and differences**

The major differences found in the teaching of European integration tend to be related to national or regional differences, to differences in the approaches of disciplines, to the different debates and stances which are focused on, as well as to the existence of what might be termed 'alternative approaches'. It should be borne in mind in considering these that just as there are

differing constructs of the EU itself (Diez 1997), there can be no single 'right approach' to the teaching of European integration.

There are differences on a national basis as to the disciplines in which the European integration teaching process is undertaken. This is evidenced by the disciplinary areas under which grants made under the Jean Monnet comes in different European countries. In France 23 of the chairs assisted 1990-95 were in European Law; 16 in each of Spain and the UK, and 12 in Germany. In contrast to this 25 of those assisted in the UK were in Political Science, but only 1 in France, 5 in Germany and 3 in Spain. In terms of courses, 42 were assisted in European Law in France, 32 in Italy and 9 in Germany, but only 10 in the UK and 9 in Germany. Where Political Science was concerned, 15 courses were assisted in the UK and 18 in Germany, but only 7 in France and 3 in Italy (European University News 1996). It may be deduced from this that European integration tends to be taught under the heading 'European Law' in France, but more frequently under that of 'Political Science' in the UK and Germany. Does this make a difference? Possibly, if it is assumed that 'Law' implies a fixed body of knowledge which is relatively immutable, whereas 'Political Science' implies general principles and their application to the analysis of institutions and situations.

There are also differences may also be between the teaching of European integration in the EU and for example in the United States (US). While there does not appear to be a great deal of difference in content, advocacy exercises in which students represent different countries and political institutions of the EU appear to be a more commonly used teaching method or exercise in the United States than in Europe (see for example Field 1997/98; Gueldry 1997). One reason for this is perhaps that education in the US is more geared towards training future lawyers and hence improving advocacy skills of students, another that politics tends to be conflictual between interest groups as opposed to consensual. From a European point of view the impression that such exercises tend to create of EU decision making as a conflictual and zero sum game which necessarily has winners and losers, neglects the non-conflictual nature of a substantial part of decision making. Such exercised could have negative consequences if used to train for example politicians and civil servants in the applicant countries for EU membership, if they create an impression of decision making being necessarily conflictual and in which all parties need to be constant advocates of their self-interest.

A more general difference in teaching methods is related to the extent to which a lecture format is used rather than a more interactive seminar one. For example, after undertaking postgraduate level European Studies in Belgium, Pejovic (1994), compared the system of instruction with the 'Anglo-Saxon' one used in Australia. He found that the Belgian system was less effective in encouraging students to examine material critically and come up with their own argument in assignments and in tutorial discussions. It tended to focus more upon students learning the material provided by the lecturer, with less discussion.

Differing approaches to the teaching of the EU's institutions and decision making reflect differing disciplinary approaches and to some extent the existence of 'alternative' ones. Clearly there is necessarily some standard core content, such as the names of the institutions, their powers, and the basic details of the policies operated. However, accounts of how they operate and interpretations of the meaning of this may differ considerably according to the approach used.

One might distinguish firstly those texts and approaches which endeavour to set out basic facts and details, and which adopt a relatively idealistic or neutral stance. Standard texts and approaches which might be considered to come into this category include popular texts by Desmond Dinan (Dinan 1994), Neil Nugent (Nugent 1991), and that edited by Helen Wallace and William Wallace (Wallace and Wallace 1996). There are also some which focus on specific institutions only, such as for example Michelle Cini's (1996) study of the commission.

The actual operation of the system in practice is illustrated by George Ross' volume on the administration of the commission by its former president, Jacques Delors (Ross 1995). It highlights some of the principles and practice of the Delors era.

The 'interest representation' branch of political science takes the approach Ross used further. It focuses most strongly on how business and other interests can and do achieve representation in the EU system, and the compatibility or otherwise of this with democratic principles and the in-principle or claimed operation of the system. Two of the major works in produced by this branch consist of a study by Justin Greenwood (1997) and a collection edited by Andersen and Eliassen (1996). Gorges (1997) has a rather narrower focus, studying the issue from the point of view of 'Euro-corporatism'.

Where particular policy areas are concerned, the literature available attempts variously to describe and praise or critique the policy. It may also focus instead on interest representation in the sector. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has been a particular focus of attention due to its earlier economic and political importance in the context of European integration. Grant (1997) discusses and appraises the policy as well as some of its political influences. Hendriks (1991) focuses more narrowly on the CAP, Germany and the EC. Much of the earlier CAP literature is now of historical interest only, given changes in the support programmes and the politics lying behind them.

The 'Amsterdam School' has an approach which takes the view of interest representation and common institutions in Europe into more distant theoretical and ideological territory. It is an 'alternative approach' which differs considerably from that of the mainstream literature, and could be said to be Marxian in outlook. It draws attention to the growing consolidation of the business lobby at the supranational level through the activities of the European Roundtable of Industrialists (ERT). They see the ERT as having switched earlier defensive goals of seeking protection to new offensive ones related to meeting the challenges and historical opportunities offered by the eastwards enlargement (Holman and van der Pijl 1996; Holman 1998; Van der Pijl 1998). Their view on this is that the European *bourgeoisie* or capitalist class is seeking to expand its activities through EU enlargement. It is not dissimilar to that described by Moschonas (1996, p. 19) as being held under the 'Marxist theory of integration'. In this view the logic of European integration stems from the internationalisation and expansionary impulses of capital.

While these arguments may be rejected as being narrowly ideological, they nevertheless assist in explaining the strength of support for the EU's eastwards enlargement from the business lobby and member state governments in the face of weak public support. They have some explanatory and predictive powers, conveying an understanding of why suggestions of referenda on enlargement have been opposed, and why enlargement will go ahead regardless of whether public opinion in the EU is opposed to it or otherwise.

The four approaches covered hence reflect different shades of understanding or construction of reality, and it is suggested that exposure to all of them may be desirable in order to encourage a critical approach and deeper understanding of issues. Certainly, simple rote learning of facts and figures about the EU's institutions and decision making system will not do so.

A rather different but related debate is that which has focused on the continued importance of the member states' national governments in decision making relative to that of the EU's common political institutions. Studies focusing on the institutions implicitly accord them considerable importance, though attention has been drawn to the limitations of their powers, for example by Bulmer and Wessels (1987). Andrew Moravcsik's 'liberal intergovernmentalism' (see Moravcsik 1991 and 1993) has stressed the continued importance of the member states' working together to achieve objectives. This is an area of continued recent change of a complex rather than unidirectional nature, given the impact of the Nice Treaty on the one hand and of the establishment of intergovernmental defence arrangements on the other. It is hence one which is well suited for students to research into and by doing this provide themselves with an up-to-date knowledge of the state of play and of the applicability of different theories.

### **Two Major Inter-linked Debates and Approaches**

Two major debates and approaches have come under intense scrutiny in the last three years, and as such merit inclusion in the teaching of European integration and the theories and processes which lie behind this. One of these involves the adoption of a 'rationalist' perspective as opposed to the ideational one. The other, linked to some of the same authors and works involved in the first debate, reflects the extent to which identity is seen as being created on a 'top down' basis as opposed to from the grass roots upwards. To some extent it deals with the acceptance or rejection of a cultural studies approach.

The 'rationalist' perspective puts an emphasis on practical gains or losses such as economic ones. As well as benefits in terms of lower cost goods, higher incomes, and lower unemployment, it acknowledges that there can be an economic value from having to face a lower level of risk and from the 'psychic' value of ideational benefits such as increased national or regional prestige. The major recent work in the area is Andrew Moravcsik's (1998a) *The Choice for Europe*. It puts a case for the importance of economic issues in the development of the EC and EU. A critical review of the work which stresses the 'ideational' aspects of European integration was produced by Thomas Diez (1999a), with this in turn being criticised in Moravcsik (1999b).

A major contribution to the debate which has attempted to put forward an 'ideational' and social constructivist case with respect to explaining European integration has been that of Marcussen, Risse, Engelmann-Martin, Knopf and Roscher (1999). These authors argue that the relative lack of 'Europeanisation' of the UK compared to Germany and to a lesser extent France is due to the failure of political elites to adequately manipulate national identity in favour of this. Their arguments and conclusions, and the theories and assumptions that lie behind them, have been criticised on two major grounds. In considering these it should perhaps be noted that they say (p. 672) that they are trying to work out the way in which interest and identity interact rather than promoting a conflictual account of their impact.

The first set of criticisms relates to the absence of an acknowledgement of any significant importance for economic factors. This flies in the face of the findings of studies such as that of Eichenberg and Dalton (1993) which found a statistically significant relationship between support for integration and the level of unemployment, growth in GDP, and especially, inflation. The relationship was in accordance with *a priori* expectations that lower levels of unemployment and inflation, and higher growth in GDP, increase support for integration. It also flies in the face of the observation that, consistently over the years, economic considerations such as the gains and benefits from CAP decisions have received a good deal of news coverage in the member states, suggesting that they are of interest to the general population.

Moravcsik (1999b, p. 670), in his evaluation of the Marcussen et al (1999) contribution and of others published in the same journal issue, sees them as attempting to rewrite the history of integration on the basis of ideational shifts, as opposed to the series of economic opportunities identified by most other analysts. Acceptance of the perspective of integration as being a series of ideational shifts is that this could lead to a view that where a lack of benefits and a high incidence of costs from integration leads to dissatisfaction within a member state, this is seen only as reflecting only a failure on the part of elites to adequately Europeanise the population. Genuine concerns of the population and/or elites with respect to material impacts might be ignored and remain unaddressed.

A second major debate relates to the use of a 'tops down' view of the construction of identities such as is evidenced in Marcussen et al (1999). The adoption of such a perspective can be seen as relating to the substantial variation in the extent to which cultural studies has been accepted as a discipline and perspective in some member states but not others. Both Marcussen et al (1999) and an earlier contribution by one of these authors, Risse (1998, p. 9), stress the creation of a identity as a tops-down process undertaken by elites. Germany is seen as having Europeanised as a result of the efforts of its elites, and the UK to have resisted Europeanisation because of a failure of its elites and an attachment to a colonial past. A similar theoretical understanding of the creation of identities is evidenced in Jarausch (1998).

British and Finnish explanations of British identity focus more on popular culture and place less emphasis on historical or elite explanations. Arthur Aughey, a senior lecturer at the University of Ulster, states that 'Britishness harks back to an imperial past, which the rest of the UK has forgotten about but is still alive and well in Northern Ireland' (Thomson 1998). David Starkey, history lecturer at LSE, says that Englishness may have been defined once by the empire and the upper classes but both have vanished, taking the English people's sense of identity with them (Thomson). Major influences, particularly on northern regional and proletarian culture, have included 'pop' music. The latter has allowed the inhabitants of depressed low-income high-unemployment northern areas of Britain to feel at the forefront of national and global cultural trends. This has not necessarily been advantageous, in the sense that it may by bolstering their sense of identity reduced the incentive to train or qualify further or to move to less depressed regions. It has not been a temporary phenomenon. Groups such as Manchester's *The Smiths* and *Oasis* continued the tradition begun by *The Beatles*. More than thirty years on George and Ringo now live mainly in the US, John is dead and Paul has become part of the British establishment, but their CD and book recently had an extended stay at global no. 1 in the charts.

Punk was another British cultural trend of proletarian youth which went on to have global implications, if more short-lived ones. The *Sex Pistols* and *Queen* were important elements of the 'counterculture'. *Queen* has a signature rendition of the British national anthem, the *Sex Pistols* a more offensive and less harmonious one. These, the Zanzibar Parsee background of *Queen* lead singer Freddie Mercury aka Farokh Bolsara, and his part-opera rendition of *Barcelona* with Montserrat Caballé were traditional, foreign and high culture elements being transformed and put at the forefront of popular culture. 'Two nations' class divisions were important everywhere, but more so in the north. Along with strong Celtic traditions and Irish influence in cities like Liverpool, Manchester, and Glasgow, they limited the ability of elite culture and any focus on 'empire' to filter downwards achieve a sustained brainwashing of the masses, at least in non-'home counties' regions. Kallioniemi (1998, p. 372) describes how revival of 'Britpop' in the 1990s 'gradually rehabilitated' the notion of Englishness.

The importance of all this is demonstrate the importance of 'grass roots upwards' influences on culture and identity. These have in turn been reflected both in the adoption of cultural studies as a valued academic approach and in a natural suspicion of 'tops down' attempts to create or influence identities. This suspicion is evidenced in Cris Shore's (2000) recent study of the cultural politics of European integration. In it he considers for example whether the European Commission's 'tops downwards' attempt to create popular enthusiasm for the euro using (p. 104) 'mass marketing techniques and advertising professionals' in a campaign characterised by one-sided analysis should be classed as 'information' or 'propaganda'.

Cultural studies' explanations of the success of 'Europeanisation' in Germany differ from those of Marcussen et al (1999). They point to US and other popular cultural influences as having played an important role in opening up Germany identity to change, at least in conjunction with elite 'tops down' actions. Wright (1998: 98) sees the 1960s New Left generation in Germany as having adopted American popular culture as a 'popular political form' which represented a remarkable break with the past. He cites Wim Wenders (Wright, p. 101) as saying that 'the need to forget twenty years created a hole, and people tried to cover this ... by assimilating American culture'.

Cultural studies has been accepted as an academic discipline in the UK and Scandinavia and is used there as a perspective in considering the construction of culture and identity (McNeil 1998; Alasuutari 1999; Gripsrud 1998; Kallioniemi 1998). It has not been so readily accepted as a discipline or perspective in Germany or Austria (Horak 1999). There, it has been accepted mainly in terms of journalistic discourse, as opposed to in an academic or scientific context. Hence in the German-speaking context the debate about the political role of cultural studies and even of culture as such is being held between journalists and radical political activists, but not academics (Marchant 2000).

A major reason behind the failure of cultural studies to be widely adopted in Germany and Austria appears to be the Frankfurt School's critique of popular culture. This saw it as a form of mass deception by the culture industry (Shattuc 1995, p. 86). Horak (1999, p. 112) sees the 'Frankfurt School' as having stymied the reception of cultural studies in Germany by creating the notion of a passive consumer who is helplessly trapped in the entertainment industry's flood of cheap products. However, he notes that critics of the Frankfurt School also have a disdain or fear of popular culture, and that such opposition therefore has to be



understood in the context of particular intellectual traditions which see for example even sociology as *undeutsch* (not in the German tradition) and lacking emotion.

Given the importance of culture and identity for European integration, it is important that a wider perspective is adopted in the teaching of such issues which incorporates both 'tops down' and 'grassroots upwards' approaches, to replace the present sharp division between approaches and the divisive prescriptions and explanations it results in. To some extent the Scandinavian tradition bridges that divide. For example, in *Signs of Nations* Hedetoft (1995) stresses both popular grass-roots sources of culture and the influence of national governments through for example education and the place of music and song within it.

### **The Problematic Nature of Seeking a Common History and Cultural Tradition**

Although a common European history and cultural tradition may be sought in attempts to foster a common identity, there are also very conflictual elements here. An example of this is provided by conflicts which have arisen with respect to the planning of a 'Museum for Europe' to be sponsored or at least approved by the European Commission. The Greek government wanted an emphasis in the museum on the European origin of the 'democratic idea' and by implication ancient Greece. The museum's planners – one guesses that they were perhaps Belgian, French or German – wanted the history emphasised in the museum to commence in the early Middle Ages or Dark Ages with Charlemagne's empire and Latin Christendom (Kaye 2000).

A 'Holy Roman Empire' approach and emphasis on Charlemagne are contrary to the historical instincts of Scandinavians, Greeks and the British. For example, *The Illustrated History of Denmark* (Deleuran 1993) depicts Charlemagne as the man who persecuted the Saxon neighbours and allies of the Danes. Part 5 of the *History* describes how he beheaded 4500 Saxon hostages, and drove out the Saxons from their lands north of the Elbe to replace them with pagan Aboditrians. Part 6 stresses the earlier situation of Denmark as part of the empire of Attila, the ruler of the Huns. Sagas such as that of Sigurd (the German Siegfried) are seen as being set in the context of the empire of the Huns, rather than being 'European' as such.

Pavkovic (2000, pp. 126-127) suggests that the heroes of the battle of Chalons-sur-Marne 'where Europe was saved from Attila's hordes' could be viewed as the 'gloriously fallen' (p. 129) in an attempt to construct a common European myth and identity. However, Deleuran's (1993, Part 5) version of this story shows how the battle, between the forces of the Roman general Aetius and those of Attila cannot be seen as a simple tale of European defence against Asiatic hordes. It was a conflict in which there were West Goths, Alans and Burgundians, among others, on Aetius' side, and East Goths, Heruls, Gepids, Huns and others on that of Attila. Also, Aetius was a personal friend of Attila from his earlier days as a hostage with the Huns, and when the West Goths had the possibility of winning the day by storming Attila's position he ordered them not to. Hence there is no common European myth or history here, just a tale that emphasises diversity, the ridiculousness of war, and how friendship may bridge this even in the most conflictual of circumstances.

Turning to more recent times, there must clearly be a space in the history of the background and formation of the EU for Jean Monnet. He was a 'founding father' of integration in Europe, and one who was motivated not by national political or economic

interests but to do better than his earlier employer, the League of Nations, in preventing a drift to war. Former Commission President Jacques Delors also deserves a place here, regardless of his close links with France and its Socialist party, because of his selfless devotion to integration and the management of the EU.

However, at the same time, the desire to eulogise founding fathers should not blind us to the need to also acknowledge those who did what they felt was the 'right thing' and lost or jeopardised their careers as a result. These include 'whistleblower' Paul Van Buitenen, to whom Cris Shore's book *Building Europe* (Shore 2000) is partly dedicated, and Bernard Connolly who lost his Commission position after publishing the relatively technical economic text *The Rotten Heart of Europe* (Connolly 1995).

### **Research**

There is a major difference between Anglo-Saxon research practice and that of some continental European countries with regard to the admissibility of sources. It is not totally unrelated to the debate over the academic status of cultural studies. In Anglo-Saxon practice, newspapers and indeed any sources are considered appropriate for academic research so long as there is an adequate critical appreciation of the reliability of that source and of any bias in it. Much US research in areas such as international relations is heavily reliant on US and foreign newspapers as a source of data, or web versions of newspapers.

The more continental European tradition appears to be that using such sources means that the research concerned is 'journalism' and not 'academic work'. In this view appropriate sources are government reports and archival material and statistics, and books and journal articles. The danger in such a limited and narrow approach is that research then becomes over-reliant on 'establishment' views such as those of government and other academics.

### **Conclusions**

The main argument here is that education on European integration should seek to provide students with an understanding of different relevant approaches and ideas, and with the critical appreciation skills which allow them to test such theories and approaches against actual evidence.

Some wider acceptance of the academic relevance of cultural studies also appears necessary, though it is admitted that some of the more minor research undertaken in this area maybe of questionable significance.

Given the expansion of tertiary education and academic research, and the need to undertake at least some research directly relevant to the modern world, it seems desirable to abolish the outdated and restrictive convention in parts of continental Europe against the use of newspaper and other 'popular' and unofficial sources.

Some of very best works on European issues and problems of an investigative journalism nature in recent years have been undertaken by Americans. Isabel Fonseca's *Bury Me Standing* on gypsies in post-communist Europe, the chapter in Marc Fisher's (1995) *After the Wall* on the same issue, and Chuck Sudetic' (1998) *Blood and Vengeance* come to mind. Vast numbers of European postgraduate and undergraduate students are nevertheless involved in research projects. This suggests that too much of a distant and 'hands off' approach is being encouraged. This failing lessens the value of what is being done and results in failure to

train the sort of investigative researchers and writers need to shed new light on issues, and to challenge official positions where necessary.

Other 'alternative approaches' in addition to those discussed earlier in the text of the paper include focusing upon gender, upon the situation of the Roma and the rights of minorities, and on the impact of economic and industrial change in the prospective new member states. The focus of research on integration in Europe has tended to be at the 'grand project' and 'high politics' level, and it is suggested that should be more room in the future for an emphasis on 'ordinary people' and how it affects them.

The maintenance of diversity, the fostering of critical appreciation, 'people-focused' research rather than a repetition of the contents of the European Commission's websites, are hence all considered to be desirable goals for teaching and research on European integration in the future. While it is necessary to convey to students some of the minutiae of the powers and functioning of the common institutions, the changes made by the Maastricht Treaty on European Union and so forth, we should never let this obscure the 'big picture' and the need for more research into how it all works and impacts on Europe's 'ordinary people' in practice. This will become a particularly important issue after the EU's prospective eastwards enlargement is achieved.

## References

- Alasuutari, Pertti (1999), 'Cultural Studies as a Construct', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2(1), pp. 91-108.
- Bulmer, Simon, and Wessels, Wolfgang (1987), *The European Council: Decision-Making in European Politics*, Macmillan, London.
- Bukowski, Jeanie (ed) (1997), *Teaching the EU*, Institute of International Studies, Bradley University.
- Cini, Michelle (1996), *The European Commission*, Manchester University Press.
- Connolly, Bernard (1995), *The Rotten Heart of Europe*, Faber and Faber, London.
- Corbett, Anne (1999), (One Step Forward ...), *The Times Higher*, 'Higher Education Trends', 24 September, p. vi.
- De Laine, Michael (2000), 'Sweden Tackles Diversity Problem', *The Times Higher*, 23 June.
- Diez, Thomas (1997), 'Governance – a matter of discourse: discursive nodal points in the British debate over Europe', paper presented to the 1997 biennial ECSA conference, Seattle, 29 May – 1 June.
- Diez, Thomas (1999), 'Riding the AM-track Through Europe: or, the Pitfalls of a Rationalist Journey Through European Integration', *Millenium* 28(2), 1999, review of Andrew Moravcsik's 1998 *The Choice for Europe*, pp. 355-369.
- Eichenberg, R., and Dalton, R. (1993), 'Europeans and the European Community: the dynamics of public support for European integration', *International Organization* 47(4), pp. 507-534.
- Einem, Caspar (2000), *Der Europaeische Hochschulraum: Gemeinsame Erklaerung der Europaeischen Bildungsminister, 19. Juni 1999, Bologna* (The European University Space: Collective Declaration of the European Education Ministers, 19 June 1999, Bologna), <http://www.bmwf.gv.at/service/board/990729a.htm>.

European University News (1996), 'Jean Monnet Project 1995: European Integration in University Studies', *European University News* 189, June, pp. 13-17.

Field, Heather (1999), 'Teaching the EU in Australia: justification, aims and content', in Alexander Pavkovic, Catherine Welch with Carolyn O'Brien (eds), *Teaching European Studies in Australia: Problems and Projects*, Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia, Melbourne, pp. 1-26, ISBN 0-9577656-0-6.\*

\_\_\_\_\_ (2000a), 'On the "Europeanization" and "Internationalization" of Education in Europe: Danish and Other Perspectives', *ECSA Review* 13(1), pp. 10-11.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2000b), 'Integrating Identity, Education and Culture: Questions, Policies and Processes in the European Union', paper presented to the *Nation and Identity* conference held at Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, 12-14 July.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997/98), 'Teaching the European Union: an Australian Experience', *US European Community Studies Association Review* XI(1): 8-9, Winter.

Fisher, Marc (1995), *After the Wall*, Simon and Schuster, NY.

Fonseca, Isabel (1995), *Bury Me Standing*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Goddard, Alison (2000), 'Class-ridden Sector Slated', *The Times Higher*, 7 April, p. 3.

Gorges, Michael (1997), *Euro-corporatism: Interest Representation in the European Community*, University Press of America, Lanham, Maryland.

Grant, Wyn (1995), *The Common Agricultural Policy*, Macmillan, London.

Gripsrud, Jostein (1998), 'Cultural Studies and Intervention in Television Policy', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1(1), pp. 85-95.

Guedry, Michel (1997), 'Bridging the Gap: Integrating EU Studies in a Cross-Disciplinary and Multilingual Curriculum', *ECSA Review* X(2), pp. 9-12.

Hedetoft, Ulf (1995), *Signs of Nations*, Dartmouth, Aldershot.

Hendriks, Gisela (1991), *Germany and European Integration: The Common Agricultural Policy: an Area of Conflict*, Berg, Oxford.

Holman, Otto (1998), 'Comparing Southern and Eastern Europe: the impact of EU-Enlargement on Stability and Security in Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary', paper presented at the Third Pan-European International Relations Conference and Joint Meeting with the International Studies Association, Vienna, Austria, 16-19 September

Holman, Otto, and Kees van der Pijl (1996), 'The Capitalist Class in the European Union', in George A. Kourvetaris and Andreas Moschonas (eds), *The Impact of European Integration*, Praeger, Westport, pp. 55-74.

Horak, Roman (1999) 'Cultural Studies in Germany (and Austria)', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2(1), pp. 109-115.

Jarausch, Konrad (1998), 'A European Cultural Identity. Reality or Hope?', [http://www.unc.edu/depts/eucenter/disc\\_fora98\\_9/jarauschdisc9811.html](http://www.unc.edu/depts/eucenter/disc_fora98_9/jarauschdisc9811.html), 24 November.

Kallioniemi, Kari (1998), *Put the Needle on the Record and Think of England*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Turku, Turku.

Kaye, Harvey (2000), 'Send in the History Platoon', *The Times Higher*, 31 March, p. 11.

Marchant, Oliver (2000), 'Cultural studies as "popularized" science', Abstracts zum Workshop Humanities and Cultural Studies, Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften (IFK), Vienna, 29-30 June.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1991), 'Negotiating the Single European Act: national interests and conventional statecraft in the European Community', *International Organization* 45(1), pp. 19-56.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1993), 'Preferences and power in the European Community: a liberal intergovernmentalist approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31(4), pp. 473-523.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1998) *The Choice for Europe*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999a), 'The Future of European Integration Studies: Social Science or Social Theory', *Millenium* 28(2), pp. 371-391.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999), 'Is Something Rotten in the State of Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4), 69-81.

Pavkovic, Aleksandar, and Catherine Welch (eds) (1999), *Teaching European Studies in Australia*, Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia, Melbourne.

Pavkovic, Aleksandar (2000), 'Constructing a European identity: problems of supranationalism', in Joe Andrew, Malcolm Crook and Michael Waller (eds), *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity*, Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 115-130.

McNeil, Maureen (1998), 'De-centring or Re-focusing Cultural Studies', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1(1), pp. 57-64

Moschonas, Andreas (1996), 'The logic of European integration', in George A. Kourvetaris and Andreas Moschonas (eds), *The Impact of European Integration*, Praeger, Westport, pp. 9-38.

Pejovic, M. (1994), 'M.A. in European Studies in Belgium', *Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia Newsletter*, No. 9, March, pp. 5-8.

Risse, Thomas (1998), *To Euro or Not to Euro? The EMU and Identity Politics in the European Union*, ARENA Working Papers 98/1, University of Oslo, Norway.

Ross, George (1995), *Jacques Delors and European Integration*, Oxford University Press.

Shattuc, Jane (1995), *Television, Tabloids and Tears: Fassbinder and Popular Culture*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Shore, Cris (2000), *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*, Routledge, London.

Sudetic, Chuck (1998), *Blood and Vengeance*, W W Norton & Co, New York.

Van der Pijl, Kees (1998), *Transnational Classes and International Relations*, Routledge, London

Wessels, Wolfgang, Ingo Linsemann and Susanne Haegele (2000), *A Core Curriculum for European Integration Studies: basic assumptions and proposals*, Introductory Paper for Panel 3, Thematic Network in Political Science, Lodz Conference, 18-20 May.

Wright, Les (1998), 'From Outsiders to Insider: Queer Politics in German Film, 1970-94', *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1(1), pp. 97-121.