



Inside the Winter 2009 *EUSA Review*:

EUSA Review Forum: Teaching the EU

Introduction	Craig Parsons	2
A Review of Textbooks on EU Politics	Peter Bursens	2
Web Resources for Teaching the European Union	Iona Annetts	5
Model European Union Simulations: A Brief Primer	Phil Shekleton	7
The Case for Visiting the European Union	Doreen K. Allerkamp	9
Teaching the EU and Europe: Visiting Home with a US Perspective	Hans Peter Schmidt	11

EUSA Latin America Caribbean Interest Section Essay

The European Union and Latin America: Relations and Model	Joaquín Roy	13
---	-------------	----

Book Reviews

Andrew Smith, Book Reviews Editor		17
-----------------------------------	--	----

Join Us!

For the 2009 EUSA Biennial Conference
in Marina Del Rey, California.
April 23-25, 2009

Information, including the preliminary program, is available on our
website-www.eustudies.org.



Teaching the EU

OUR FORUM USUALLY TACKLES substantive issues in the EU or theoretical or methodological issues in EU studies, but this time we offer something more practical. The time had come again for the annual contribution of EUSA's "Teaching the EU" section, which contributes an essay, report, or other document to the Review once a year. (See p. 13 for the contribution of the Latin American and Caribbean section to this issue). In the process of soliciting that contribution, however, it seemed to me that there were many subjects to be covered that might attract wide interest from the Review's readers. With the help of Peter Bursens (University of Antwerp), who co-chairs the interest section, I organized this series of essays.

Bursens offers a review of selected textbooks on EU politics. He makes no claim to evaluate every option in the enormous field of possibilities, but pragmatically presents some critical reflections based on the selections in the programs at Antwerp. Iona Annett (University of Melbourne) then provides a survey of EU-related resources on the Internet. She too cannot claim to cover everything in this rapidly expanding space, but gives us an extremely well-informed set of points of departure into it. Phil Shekleton (longtime Associate Director of the EU Center at the University of Washington) discusses the merits and some nuts and bolts of "Model EU" simulations in the US, drawing especially on UW's experience in the past five years. Participation in such simulations has been rising on both sides of the Atlantic, and I hope this essay will underscore for those who have not yet participated just how valuable simulations can be for students. Lastly, Doreen Allerkamp (University of Mannheim) and Hans Peter Schmitz (Maxwell School of Syracuse University) offer two perspectives on traveling with students for EU studies. Allerkamp discusses the broad benefits of taking students to visit Brussels. Schmidt presents more specific and concrete lessons from his experience in leading a "traveling seminar" of American students in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany. Where resources permit, there is nothing better than to let students see the EU with their own eyes. Having led the same traveling seminar myself when I was Schmidt's colleague at the Maxwell School, I think it suggests a very promising model for universities looking to internationalize their curriculum and extend student experiences beyond the classroom.

Craig Parsons, *EUSA Review* Editor

A Review of Textbooks on EU Politics

Peter Bursens

WRITING A REVIEW of political science textbooks on the EU is a hazardous endeavor. As the EU covers a vast number of policies and institutions, the number of fields that is covered by political science textbooks is equally numerous. All major publishers offer a whole range of textbooks, targeting various levels of students. It is impossible to incorporate these dozens of high-quality textbooks in a single review, let alone to expand to non-English textbooks. I therefore use a pragmatic selection criterion, based on two questions. How does my own department organize its core curriculum on European Integration for political science students? What textbooks do we put on the reading lists of EU courses and why? Departments running programs with similar objectives might be inspired by this selection, and those who have curricula with different aims can choose from numerous other publications. Unlike in a review of research books, I will not go into the research puzzles, theoretical framing, methodology, data-collection and analysis. In stead, I will focus on what a selection of textbooks can offer to satisfy the learning aims of political science programs.

Choosing a textbook for a single course is preceded by a more fundamental choice regarding the contents of the consecutive EU courses in a political science program. The Universiteit Antwerpen department of Political Science organizes a BA in Political Science and, among others, an MA in Comparative and European Politics. The development of a new curriculum with respect to EU studies was based on the idea of James Caporaso's three worlds of regional integration theory (Caporaso 2007). The three worlds refer to three sets of crucial questions that need to be tackled by political science students: (1) Why did member-states create the EU, how did it evolve and why does it have its current form?; (2) How does the EU work and what is the policy output of the EU?; (3) How does the European Union affect in its turn the member-states? In Antwerp we developed three courses to acquaint students with these three sets of issues: the consecutive questions are tackled in "European Integration" at the BA level, and "EU as Political System" and "Europeanization" at the MA level. For each of the courses, the choice of textbooks is overwhelming. In the following sections I review the reading lists we use at the Universiteit Antwerpen, indicating the strengths and weaknesses of some of the textbooks and the reasons why we opted for these reading lists.



European Integration

The selection of a textbook for an introductory BA course on European Integration is perhaps the most difficult one to make. What does a textbook need to offer for an introduction to European integration to third-year political science students who have some background in political science but hardly any knowledge of European integration? In line with the three worlds of regional integration theory, such a textbook needs to contain chapters on integration theories, history of the European integration process and an overview of the current institutional architecture and policies of the EU. In my view, three excellent textbooks serve these purposes for third-year BA students very well. Neil Nugent's *The Government and Politics of the European Union* is very strong on history and institutions. With respect to history, and in addition to the classic integration story, Nugent also offers an overview of the consecutive Treaty changes and a very useful chapter on the role of the Treaties as building blocks of the integration. The chapters on the EU institutions are both informative and strongly analytical. On the more negative side, one could point to the relative neglect of actors such as interest groups and political parties. In addition, for political science students who are confronted with European integration for the first time and who therefore need some theoretical guidance, Nugent's book might best be complemented by another textbook that discusses theories of European integration more extensively, either Ben Rosamond's *Theories of European Integration* (2000) or one of the next two textbooks. Michelle Cini's *European Union Politics* puts a lot of emphasis on theory, institutions and policies and less on history. If EU policy-making is central to the course, Cini might be the most intelligent option. Like Nugent, she also steps beyond a mere description of the formal aspects of the main institutions, and offers clear interpretations of the roles institutions play in real politics. However, the most important asset of Cini's book is the series of more analytical chapters discussing current issues in EU politics (such as democratic legitimacy and public opinion) in an introductory style, preparing students to tackle these questions more in depth in consecutive courses at MA level. Since politics and policy-making are the key subjects at MA level in Antwerp, we opted for Ian Bache and Stephen George's *Politics in the European Union* as the primary textbook at BA level. This book has an ideal mix of theory, history, institutions and policies. It starts with discussing the theoretical perspectives on European integration and governance. It also devotes nearly 150 pages to the narrative of European integration. This is an appropriate choice since a sound historical knowledge of the integration process is in-

dispensable for undergraduate students in political science. Unlike Nugent and Cini, the Bache & George book is far more descriptive in the chapters on institutions and policies. This gives the book an analytical caveat. The flipside of this option is of course that students are introduced thoroughly in the nuts and bolts of the formal institutional architecture and policy-making of the EU. To counterbalance the descriptive character, we add a compulsory reading list of analytical journal articles discussing the functioning of the main institutions and policy domains. One thing that is regrettably missing in both Oxford textbooks, in contrast to Palgrave's Nugent book, is a chapter on the EU budget. However, this gap is amply compensated by the Oxford University Online Resource Depending Centre for both Cini and Bache & George is impressive, containing interactive maps, timelines, questions and answers and even, for lecturers, PowerPoint presentations for each chapter. Also Palgrave hosts a useful but far less exhaustive web page for EU studies.

EU as a Political System

In the MA Comparative and European Politics at the Universiteit Antwerpen, two general EU courses build upon the introductory BA course. First of all a whole course is devoted to the functioning of the European political system. It assumes that the European Union can be defined as a political system and should therefore also be studied with the appropriate tools to study political systems, i.e. the concepts and methods derived from mainstream comparative politics. This course objective clearly goes beyond merely discussing the institutions and policies of the EU, even if the latter is carried out in an analytical way, as for instance Nugent does. Studying the EU as a political system means to unravel the institutional mechanisms, the political behavior and the power balances and to explain the differential outcomes of different policy domains. Since these aims are exactly the same as those of Simon Hix's *The Political System of the European Union*, it should come as no surprise that this textbook is compulsory for many students, among which also the Antwerp MA students. In his book Hix argues correctly that to show students how the EU works, they should learn to look through the lenses of comparative politics. Moreover, Hix takes a consistent rational choice institutionalist perspective to analyze, interpret and explain the functioning of the EU. In the introductory chapter he presents an encompassing drawing of the political system of the EU on which he builds meticulously in the consecutive chapters. This is a great aid for students in order to structure their minds throughout the course. Throughout the book, Hix logically discusses firstly executive (Council–Commission),



legislative (Council–Parliament) and judicial (Court) politics, using—amongst others—concepts such as principal-agent and coalition theory. This approach connects seamlessly with the introductory discussions of Bache & George at the BA level. Next, Hix turns to non-institutional but crucial political actors of any democratic political system such as voters, political parties and interest groups. Finally, Hix's textbook discusses the major policy domains, divided along the lines of regulatory, redistributive, internal security and external policies. What makes this book additionally strong is the continuous referral to the introductory scheme, which is a great tool for students to keep the overall picture in mind. The book also enables discussion of one of the most crucial issues of European integration, i.e. the democratic legitimacy of the European political system as a whole. In combination with well-chosen journal articles that illustrate the conceptual framework, Hix's book offers an excellent choice to acquaint MA students with the ins and outs of the European political system. For courses that focus more on public policy, *The Political System of the European Union* might be nicely complemented by *Policy-Making in the European Union*, edited by Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Mark Pollack. This textbook equally focuses on policy-making in the EU, leaving issues of integration aside. Nicely complementary to Hix is the introductory theoretical chapter by Helen Wallace on the different policy modes of the European Union. Concepts and categories of this chapter can subsequently be illustrated by a selection of the empirical and thoroughly analytical chapters by renowned experts that discuss a wide range of sectors. Since the issues of the Budget, Enlargement and Justice and Home Affairs are often overlooked in many textbooks, these chapters deserve particular recommendation.

Europeanization

The second general course at MA level in Antwerp discusses the downstream stage of European integration. Its aim is to tackle Caporaso's third world of integration theory by focusing on the impact of the European Union on the domestic realm. Two books in particular are on the compulsory reading list. Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink present their edited volume *Europeanization: New Research Agendas* as a handbook, reviewing the state of the art in research into Europeanization, defined by them as "domestic adaptation to European regional integration." The clear and comprehensive structure of the book, however, makes it not only indispensable for academic research but also very interesting for teaching purposes. Especially the introductory chapters on conceptual, theoretical and methodological issues make students fully acquainted with the issue of Europeanization. The core

of the book discusses a wide range of issues that had to adapt to the EU, logically divided in polity (e.g. state structures), politics (e.g. parliaments, executives, political parties, interest groups) and policy domains. All chapters discuss the core questions and the key problems of the research up to 2006 and provide students with an exhaustive bibliography to start working on research papers. A useful complement is provided by the volume *The Member States of the European Union*, edited by Simon Bulmer and Christian Lequesne. Unlike many other textbooks dealing with a selection of EU member-states, Bulmer and Lequesne provide analytical chapters on the upstream (interest representation) and downstream (Europeanization, implementation) relations between the member states and the EU. Above all, they succeeded in bringing together chapters that combine theoretical insights with empirical evidence for each member-state. The analytical focus on the member-states makes it complementary to Graziano and Vink's institutional and sectoral approach.

Bringing the three worlds together

This review has been structured upon the three worlds of European Integration since this was the basis of the BA and MA level courses in European Integration at the Universiteit Antwerpen. One important textbook has not been mentioned yet since it doesn't fit nicely in one of the three worlds. Discussing all three worlds in one volume, however, Roy Ginsberg's *Demystifying the European Union: The Enduring Logic of Regional Integration* needs to be recommended as an excellent overview of the many faces of European integration. Ginsberg begins with a theoretically embedded historical account of European integration. Including an explicit discussion of the legal and economic foundations of the EU, this textbook takes up the necessary challenge to make political science students aware of other disciplines' perspectives on European integration. In the second part, Ginsberg takes a similar approach as Hix, considering the EU as a polity ("a unified construct") and analyzing its institutions, actors and policies. Finally, Ginsberg's textbook also tackles the third world of European integration by discussing the impact of the EU on its member states (and in a final chapter also on the world outside the EU). The comprehensive character of this book makes it a recommendable complement to the previously discussed textbooks. Alternatively it can serve very well MA programs that focus on political science in a more general way, having less space for more than one or two courses on European integration.

Let me finish by stating once more that the selection of textbooks in this short review has been based on the philosophy behind one single curricu-



lum in political science. The reviewed books serve these learning goals in an excellent way. While I can think of many similar MA programs, I can also think of many other MA programs with different—more general or even more focused—objectives. The former might be well-off with this choice as well, while the latter may be inspired by some of the discussed books, but can certainly find their liking in the numerous other reputable textbooks available on the market.

Peter Bursens, Department of Political Science,
Universiteit Antwerpen

References

- Bache, I. and S. George. 2006. *Politics in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2nd ed.).
- Bulmer S. and Ch. Lequesne. 2005. (eds.) *The Member States of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caporaso, J. 2007. "The Three Worlds of Regional Integration Theory," in Graziano, P. and M. Vink. (eds.) *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. London: Palgrave, 23-34.
- Cini. M. 2007. *European Union Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2nd ed.).
- Ginsberg, R. 2007. *Demystifying the European Union: the Enduring Logic of Regional Integration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Graziano, P. and M. Vink. (eds.) 2007. *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. London: Palgrave.
- Hix S. 2005. *The Political System of the European Union*. London: Palgrave(2nd ed.).
- Nugent N. 2006. *The Government and Politics of the European Union*. London: Palgrave (6th ed.).
- Rosamond, B. 2000. *Theories of European Integration*. London: Palgrave.
- Wallace W., Wallace H. and M. Pollack 2005. (eds.) *Policy-making in the European Union*. Oxford, Oxford University Press (5th ed.).

Web Resources for Teaching the European Union

Iona Annett

THERE HAS BEEN a proliferation of EU-related web resources over the past few years, much to the delight of those who teach the European Union outside its boundaries. A great deal of archival material is readily available and the choice of contemporary commentary, news and teaching aids is broad. Bringing our students closer to the experience of the EU in real time is possible with a few judicious clicks. That last point is key—there is so much choice that venturing out to collect resources relevant to our teaching can feel daunting. This review cannot provide an exhaustive and moderated list of resources but it can outline the types of resources available, major collections, and tips for further discovery of web resources. As you peruse the links and resources, begin to consider how you and your students might contribute to the pool. Not only does it increase the quantity available but it may also lead to fruitful discussions on how we teach the EU in non-European contexts. There are some particular considerations when using resources available on the web. The essay will begin with some observations on copyright and open source content with links to further information. The remainder of this essay is separated into sections by resource category. Archival material will be first, followed by open education resources, blogs, and the EU itself. Online resources that require a paid subscription are not covered in this review.

Intellectual Property and the Web

Copyright must be understood and respected and electronic resources can offer a great deal more flexibility in permitted usage than is the case with printed materials. Open source knowledge is a significant part of the web and provides plenty of information and opportunities for contribution by individuals and groups. It is important to check permitted usage of material—placing material on the web does not grant automatic license to redistribute or modify that material. Generally speaking, academic conventions regarding citations are as applicable to web resources as to any other print resource and institutional policy should be adopted in this regard. The malleability of electronic material does mean that care ought to be taken in the distribution, display and presentation of these resources. Online course delivery allows the inclusion of a range of materials for student use that may not have been intended by the author. In most cases, reading copyright notices attached at the original site of the material will clarify permitted use; if this is not the case, an email to the author will quickly clarify the matter.



To cope with the ambiguity of online intellectual property and the intention of many online authors to contribute to a growing and changing body of knowledge and creativity, the creative commons license was established. Full details are available at the Creative Commons website (www.creativecommons.org); it is sufficient to note here that it plays a significant role in signaling to the users of web resources how content may be used and how attribution can be maintained while content is modified, adapted and used in ways not imagined by the author but nonetheless encouraged.

Archives online

European NAVigator <http://www.ena.lu/>

A valuable online archive is the European NAVigator website (ENA), designed and developed by the Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe (Virtual Resource Centre for Knowledge about Europe, CVCE). Based in Luxembourg, it covers the history of European integration from 1945 and includes the Council of Europe and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as well as the EU. It is well organized and its materials may be accessed by era, special subject or through keyword search. The default language of the site is French, with English, Spanish, German and Italian also available and choosing your language will mean that selected documents will appear in that language. Some documents are yet to be translated to English but this is not a serious constraint on the archive's usefulness for English-only speakers. What is most exciting about ENA is the range of material. Official documents from European institutions are available as well as reproductions of private memos (Jean Monnet), photographs, newspaper articles from all of the member states, video and audio recording of press conference (including audio of the Schuman Declaration), excerpts of parliamentary debates, biographical notes, interviews with prominent actors, maps and diagrams. Particularly enjoyable is the large selection of political cartoons. The CVCE permits educational and research use and it is possible to register as a member and make use of its album capacity. What this means is that you are able to select material relevant to your interest and arrange it in an online album for later use and reference. The album can be made visible to the public and this opens up interesting possibilities for student work.

Archive of European Integration <http://aei.pitt.edu/>

Hosted by the University of Pittsburgh, this archive focuses on official EU documents and supplements this with working papers from research institutions and centres from all over the world. It is particularly

useful for the ease of access to official documents.

Europeana – Europe's Digital Library <http://www.europeana.eu/>

At the time of writing, the popularity of this recently launched website had forced its temporary closure due to bandwidth demands. It is scheduled to reopen in early 2009. The development site is available and contains information on the project and a demonstration video (<http://dev.europeana.eu/>). Europeana will be Europe's digital library, museum and archive containing digitised books, films, paintings, newspapers, sounds and archival material. Over 100 hundred institutions are contributing to its development with representation from national libraries, specialist libraries, universities, museums and media organisations.

Open Education Resources

The open education resources (OER) sector has gained momentum in the last two years and the material available increases each month. OER tends to focus on syllabi or modules that may be freely adopted, adapted and disseminated by its users. Providers of OER may be institutions (such as MIT's open courseware or the Open University's open content initiative in the United Kingdom) or knowledgeable individuals contributing to a collection (Rice University's Connexions project). As yet, material on the EU is scarce but the following sites are listed to encourage searching and familiarization with OER. Much of OER is modularized, making it easier for each user to select and adapt material for their particular teaching and learning purposes. When first searching these materials, it is advisable to use broad search terms or to browse by category so that the full range and depth of material can be assessed.

MIT: <http://ocw.mit.edu/OcwWeb/web/home/home/index.htm>

Open University: <http://www.open.ac.uk/openlearn/home.php>

Connexions: <http://cnx.org/>

OER Commons: <http://www.oercommons.org/>

Blogs

The use of blogs as a teaching resource may not be conventional but it does open up the possibility of real time debate and discussion. Blogs as a content type will be familiar to students and, chosen carefully, can be suggested as supplementary reading. It is also possible to tap into the immediacy of blogs and the 'on the ground' perceptions of EU citizens during periods of crisis or major decision-



making. The following list is rudimentary and is offered as a starting point for your own exploration.

<http://blogs.ec.europa.eu/>: links to the blogs of some European Commissioners and Permanent Representatives

<http://eulaw.typepad.com/>: focuses on news and developments in EU law and scholarly articles of particular interest

<http://blogs.ft.com/brusselsblog/>: from Tony Barber, the Financial Times' Brussels bureau chief

<http://blogactiv.eu/blog/category/european-union-member-states/>: multi-author, multi-language blog hub; a subsidiary of EurActiv, an independent, commercial news site (<http://www.euractiv.com>)

European Union

Many readers will be familiar with the EU's portal website, <http://europa.eu/>. Given the depth of material available on this site, listed here are links to sections that may be particularly useful when teaching.

http://europa.eu/youth/index.cfm?l_id=en: Europe for Young People

http://europa.eu/geninfo/info/guide/dbatoz/index_en.htm: index of databases and depositories (institutional documents, agency publications etc)

http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm: Eurobarometer surveys

http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/home/index_en.cfm: the audiovisual service of the European Commission offers internet reception for its EbS news service, as well as broadcasts of sessions of the European Parliament, judgments of the Court of Justice and arrivals and roundtables of Council meetings.

These selections are by no means exhaustive. Your own searching and experimentation will no doubt uncover many more resources. These links are a starting point for finding resources and for thinking about how such an array of information, images and sound can be used in lectures, seminars or tutorials to enrich our students' experience of the EU.

Note

All links were current at the time of writing (December 2008).

Iona Annett is Research Fellow in Higher Education at the University of Melbourne

Model European Union Simulations: A Brief Primer

Phil Shekleton

MODEL EUROPEAN UNION (MEU) simulations have emerged in the last two decades as an effective tool for teaching about European integration, and for attracting more American university students to EU Studies. The hands-on nature of these simulations can help render EU institutions and the complex decision-making process much more tangible and comprehensible to students, complementing and reinforcing their classroom studies of these subjects. While MEUs are not the only form of simulation used to teach European Union topics (there are classroom simulations as well, for example), this essay will focus on the multi-university, multi-day simulations of EU decision-making that today involve hundreds of students at dozens of colleges and universities across the country. It does not seek to provide a comprehensive survey of extant MEU simulations, or furnish a "how-to guide" for running one. Instead, it offers an overview of common elements and challenges of MEUs, as well as some lessons learned and best practices yielded by our Seattle program. The hope is that it will encourage faculty and academic administrators to participate in one of the current MEUs, or to consider organizing a new simulation at their college or university.

While student simulations of international organizations have existed for decades, the Model UN format perhaps being the most famous, simulations of the European Community were first offered in 1988 when SUNY Brockport organized its first Model European Community (SUNYMEC). The event was retitled "EuroSim" in the 1990s, but reincorporated the SUNY name beginning with the 2007 simulation. The SUNYMEU involves a consortium of SUNY campuses, and today alternates its event annually between SUNY New Paltz and a European partner campus. Starting in 1993, the Midwest Model European Union, organized by Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, and the Mid-Atlantic EU Simulation Consortium (MAEUSC) each began offering the EU simulation experience to regional partner colleges and universities. Joining the MAEUSC event in mid-Atlantic region is the Model EU sponsored by the EU Center of Excellence at the University of Pittsburgh. The EUCE at the University of Washington has offered a West Coast Model EU since 2005.

Structuring the Simulation

A common feature of MEUs is that they involve several colleges and universities (typically over a dozen) who



are invited to a host campus for multi-day simulation of EU negotiations. Current MEUs involve several dozen students (Pittsburgh) to over two hundred (MAEUSC) and can last from just over one day (Pittsburgh, UW) to several (SUNYMEU). These events can be expensive and are usually financed by contributions from participating institutions, registration fees, and/or funding from the European Commission. In terms of format, most simulations focus on meetings of the European Council, but often incorporate participation by the European Commission, EU Council, Parliament, and/or other EU and non-EU actors. Though offered in varying formats, MEUs share many common core elements. Prominent among those, as Eleanor Zeff notes, is that they “try to capture the interplay and tension between the intergovernmentalism and supranationalism that is characteristic of much of the European Union’s policymaking” (Zeff, 2003). Additionally, all give students the opportunity to role-play key member-states or EU institutional actors to help them better understand the motivations and role of each in the complex process of EU policymaking, while also allowing them to appreciate the challenges of building the consensus and compromise that characterize EU negotiations.

Whatever the size and scope of their programs, all MEUs face the challenge of selecting a set of issues and structuring a scenario that can be addressed fruitfully in a brief simulation. The topics must of course illuminate important aspects of EU decision-making, but they must also be chosen with an eye towards what students can realistically be expected to negotiate in one or two days. To that end, topics must normally be parsed to focus on the key aspects that lend themselves to discussion and bargaining. For instance, the 2008 Model EU in Seattle included negotiations over EU climate change policy, asking the member-state teams to agree on national carbon caps as well as the industries to be covered by these limits. By avoiding broader debates about climate change along with the more technical aspects of this issue, the simulation scenario enabled students to focus their research and negotiations on those elements most conducive to learning about the EU. Success of the simulation was not gauged by how perfectly it captured the full reality of EU negotiations on this issue, but to the extent that it gave students insight into the nature of intergovernmental decision-making in the European Council.

Preparing Students

A crucial aspect to selecting simulation topics is finding issues that students can research effectively and will be eager to negotiate. Students from our previous MEUs have stated that they prefer to simulate issues from the current EU Presidency as they fear

that simulations of past Presidencies will constrain them—consciously or unconsciously—simply to replicate historical outcomes. Students will also naturally prefer to negotiate the major, headline-grabbing issues in European integration. These often have the added benefit of being more easily researched, as they generate the scholarly and media coverage the students will utilize in their preparations. As the larger member-states tend to produce more press coverage, they are often easier to research than the smaller member-states unless the latter have taken what is deemed a controversial position on a key issue, or if they do a particularly good job of making information on their country’s official policies easily accessible. Students with a familiarity with the language of a member-state will find it easier to research that nation’s positions in the media and through official sources.

Student preparation is critical to a successful simulation, and hence it is vital that the organizers establish some basic expectations and guidelines for team preparations, even if participating universities might interpret and implement them differently. Some teams will come to MEUs without having done enough research to fully or accurately represent their member-state’s positions. Even the best prepared teams can end up being unrealistically intransigent or pliant in negotiations. Many teams can avoid such pitfalls, but their recurrence speaks to the key role faculty advisers must play in ensuring adequate and accurate student preparation. Some faculty find it easiest and most effective to incorporate MEU training into their existing courses. Faculty also learn it becomes easier to prepare students once they have participated as advisers in several iterations of a MEU. Indeed, most faculty involved in our MEU return every year, and in some cases participating universities have developed a specialization representing certain member-states based in part on faculty expertise.

Deriving the Benefits

MEU organizers and participants should not expect that careful simulation design and student preparation will automatically lead their event to duplicate the process and outcomes of real EU negotiations. The degree of abstraction required by these simulations and the variation inherent in any role-playing exercise will often lead to outcomes that diverge to a degree from reality. As Eleanor Zeff (2003) and Bob Switky (2004) note based on their own EU simulation experiences, a debriefing session can provide a useful opportunity to explain to students how their negotiations and the format of the simulation vary from actual EU decision-making processes, and also to reinforce key EU learning outcomes emerging from the exercise. Student feedback on the simula-



tion is likewise crucial to helping event organizers make improvements to future versions of the MEU.

While students and faculty must be realistic about the limitations inherent in MEU simulations, the clear benefits of these exercises outweigh any possible shortcomings. The act of role playing member-state or EU institutional actors in these simulations illuminate aspects of European integration in ways not possible through course readings or lectures alone. The student-centered nature of the simulation provides an opportunity for active engagement with EU themes that can reinforce classroom theoretical lessons and spur students to deepen their study of European integration. A final benefit of hosting a MEU simulation is seeing how much the students appreciate the opportunity to engage with peers from other colleges and universities who share their academic interests. In addition to providing a useful tool for teaching young people about the EU, MEUs are excellent venues for bringing faculty and students together in a broader community of EU scholarship.

Phil Shekleton is Associate Director of the European Union Center of Excellence and Center for West European Studies at the University of Washington

References/Additional Readings:

Galatas, Steven E. 2006 "A simulation of the Council of the European Union: Assessment of the impact on student learning," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, no. 1: 147-151.

Switky, Bob. 2004. "The Importance of Voting in International Organizations: Simulating the Case of the European Union," *International Studies Perspectives* 5, no. 1: 40-49.

Van Dyke, Gretchen J., Edward G. Declair, and Peter H. Loedel. 2000. "Stimulating Simulations: Making the European Union a Classroom Reality," *International Studies Perspectives* 1, no. 2: 145.

Zeff, Eleanor E. 2003. "Negotiating in the European Council: A Model European Union Format for Individual Classes," *International Studies Perspectives* 4, no. 3: 265-274.

The Case for Visiting the European Union

Doreen K. Allerkamp

FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS AND FACULTY engaged in European studies in the United States, traveling to Europe is generally considered a worthwhile endeavor, even though the value added of such trips—especially in times of economic constraints and heightened ecological concerns—may be hard to pinpoint exactly. The key issues are usually experience and exposure, the live encounter of what otherwise is only discussed in the far distant classroom. However, while disciplines beyond the social sciences may easily be able to justify a visit to a particular place, in the context of modern European Union (EU) studies, the breadth, depth and quality of contemporary media coverage and the degree of access available even from a distance may require some elaboration of the pedagogical value of such excursions¹ for the benefit of parents and deans.

This may be even more true for Europe-based programs of EU studies seeking to include a trip to Brussels or Strasbourg in their curriculums. While travel itself might pose less of a challenge (though will usually still incur considerable cost), the case for having to travel for experience and exposure may be harder to make where, one might think, "Europe" is experienced as a matter of everyday life. Furthermore, many European programs, especially those subject to the reforms instigated by the so-called Bologna process, face a challenge to substantially restructure their curricula in the context of tight budgetary and temporal constraints (cf. Goldsmith and Berndtson 2002). In the process, "extras" such as excursions run the risk of being among the first targets for economies—especially if the pedagogical aims of European studies courses may be achieved more cheaply through simulations, for instance, or else more emphasis is placed on longer-term, in-depth experience through internships or other forms of experiential learning.

Indeed, internships and simulations as tools for "teaching the EU" have been the focus of debates in relevant forums and outlets on pedagogy.² The merits of those teaching elements notwithstanding, a case can be made that they are usefully supplemented by short-term excursions to "Europe," and, in the context of teaching the EU, to various EU institutions in particular. Visiting them can concretize experience and exposure to the EU in at least two major ways.

Relevance

In a unique way, visits to the working European institutions can make the connection between the theory and the reality of the EU for students, creating formative



experiences also for those who may not have access to an internship. From the institutions' perspective, direct interaction may reinforce, for European students, a "feeling of belonging" to the EU which cannot be transported in the classroom, as knowledge acquired in class is filled with life and students become conscious of what it may be needed for (cf. Fuchs 2008). Visits can be planned around a particular topic, such as a policy field emphasized by a given class, or targeted at a particular group of EU actors, as in visits to the European Parliament (EP) in Strasbourg or a trip to Brussels with a focus on interacting with lobbyists.

Opportunity

In the interaction with a broad range of actors involved in EU politics, "every conversation is an opportunity for learning" (Bollag 2007) that may provide insider insights and anecdotes not found in books or even simulations (cf. Fuchs 2008). Tying real people and places to abstract institutional concepts and trying out classroom-acquired knowledge in eye-to-eye discussions with practitioners helps students reality-check theory, learn about the practical handling of abstract formal rules, train their soft skills and, potentially, correct subconsciously held expectations (for example about the activities of MEPs), which may lead to revised student perspectives and ambitions. In connection with the possibility of finding inspiration or even role models for students, group visits to European institutions may achieve a certain placement effect, as they provide opportunities for networking and introducing particular academic programs to officials and policy makers.

From the perspective of the EU institutions, too, the rationale for encouraging student visits is strong, and they facilitate visits in at least 23 languages and try to match their program to the visitors' needs. Especially smaller institutions, which do not normally receive much attention and feature prominently in neither the EU's communication strategy³ nor the classroom, are very interested in receiving visiting groups of students in order to communicate their role and relevance. At the Committee of the Regions, for example, the view is that a certain Euro-fatigue cannot be effectively countered through the media, and hence EU achievements that are not newsworthy should be communicated directly. But even to the larger institutions, students are "excellent multipliers" among their peers and families.

At the Council, where 40–50% of visitors are students and the aim is to present its key role in the EU system, a certain correlation has been observed between the country holding the Presidency and visitors' origins and interest. The Commission emphasizes showcasing and explaining its activities, with a focus on key issues in its legislative and work program,

and encouraging participation. The EP, the most accessible of all institutions, also has the most detailed evaluation and feedback system for visits. The European Court of Justice (ECJ), which attracts much more specialized visitors (but also mostly students), focuses on the experience and teaching of its process, the opportunity of attending hearings relevant to the students' interest, and career opportunities. Aiming to demonstrate transparency and foster understanding and acceptance of its role, the ECJ has the closest ties to higher education, achieving something akin to "permanent relations" with some universities. Various ECJ members continue to teach and visits to the Court have become an integral part of many law school programs in surrounding EU member-states and may even be financially supported by it.

In sum, visiting the European Union, especially if supported by a preparatory seminar, allows students to combine theoretical analysis, empirical research and the interaction with practitioners in a unique way—and it poses unique challenges to the teacher. This is vividly illustrated by the "academic travel seminar" introduced by Hans Peter Schmitz below, which underscores the manifold ways in which "field trips" to the EU can be an invaluable teaching tool, complementing various forms of both in-class and experiential learning.

Doreen K. Allerkamp is Assistant Lecturer at the University of Mannheim*

Notes

1 Perhaps unsurprisingly, efforts have been made in the natural sciences to systematically evaluate the relative effectiveness of field trips vis-à-vis other teaching methods in terms of student achievement. An experimental study found that students of ecology taken on field trips outperformed those taught the same material in the classroom due to direct exposure (cf. Hamilton-Ekeke 2007). However, the beneficial effects of experiencing EU politicians and officials in their natural habitats, as it were, might be claimed by adherents of both visits and internships, with merely a difference in focus on breadth and depth, respectively.

2 This is the case for both American sources, such as, for example, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *International Studies Perspectives* or *PS – Political Science and Politics*, and European ones, such as *Higher Education in Europe*, *European Political Science* (eps) or the *Times Higher Education Supplement*. Only a small number of mostly anecdotal contributions focus on excursions unrelated to study abroad or language learning. At the 2006 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, participants did exchange experiences with travel courses in the con-



text of the “Internationalizing the Curriculum” track (cf. Babst et al. 2006); however, normally “Simulations and Role Play” as well as “Civic Engagement” as teaching and learning tools receive more attention.

3 The emphasis there is placed more on the institutions’, notably the Commission’s, visibility in the member states through representations and various outreach initiatives (cf. Wallström 2006); the Council, meanwhile, shares some of the limelight of national governments; and the EP, beyond the attention it generates at least with major decisions, has its election campaigns.

References

Babst, Gordon et al. 2006. “2006 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Track Summaries”, *PS – Political Science & Politics* 39(3), 533 – 544.

Bollag, Burton. 2007. “Hofstra Undergrads Study Europe by Going There”, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 53(48): A.8.

Fuchs, Sebastian Barnet. 2008. “Im Zentrum der Macht” [At the Center of Power], *Die Zeit*, July 15, 2008, <http://www.zeit.de/campus/online/2008/27/bruessel-seminar> [last accessed December 1st, 2008].

Goldsmith, Mike and Erkki Berndtson. 2002. “Teaching Challenges for Political Science in Europe”, *European Political Science* 1(3): http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/publications/eps/onlineissues/summer2002/training_teaching/goldsmith_berndtson.htm [last accessed December 1st, 2008].

Hamilton-Ekeke, Joy-Telu. 2007. “Relative Effectiveness of Expository and Field Trip Methods of Teaching on Students’ Achievement in Ecology”, *International Journal of Science Education* 29(15), 1869 – 1889.

Wallström, Margot. 2006. “Information Note from Vice President Wallström to the Commission: Plan D - Wider and Deeper Debate on Europe”, SEC2006_1553, 24. 11. 2006 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/communicating/policy/index_en.htm#keydocuments [last accessed December 1st, 2008].

* The author would like to thank Jale Tosun at the University of Konstanz as well as the respondents of an informal survey of the Visitors’ Units of EU institutions conducted in November/December 2008 for their input.

Teaching the EU and Europe: visiting home with a US perspective

Hans Peter Schmitz

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES based in the United States maintain a significant physical presence abroad, providing a unique study abroad experience to their undergraduate students. In contrast to their counterparts elsewhere, tuition and alumni support allow US schools to maintain a high level of control of the study abroad experience and design special programs around the interests of their students. Syracuse University (SU) maintains four such centers in Florence, London, Madrid, and Strasbourg which serve both SU and non-SU students. About a decade ago, these centers began to introduce academic “travel seminars” taking place during the two weeks prior to each semester. These seminars are designed to introduce students to topics related to Europe and give them opportunities to meet and interact with their peers before starting their full academic program abroad. Having led such a travel seminar through France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany prior to the spring semester (usually between January 3 and 15) for the past four years,¹ I have learned that teaching the EU and European topics while travelling is a unique way of breaking with (and going beyond) the classroom routine. Here are a few lessons based on the past experiences.

Expectations and organization

Being organized and stating clearly academic and other expectations early on is the most important task to accomplish. This is not unique to a travel seminar, but it matters even more when the likelihood of unanticipated events is high. Planes are late, students and staff get sick, and most students have no or little prior experience traveling abroad or throughout Europe. For that reason, at least some American students also may be operating in “vacation mode,” and may not immediately understand how a non-classroom experience can nonetheless require classroom-style attentiveness. Take time during the first day or an initial dinner to explain the organizational details of the seminar, leaving any substantive discussion of academic issues to the next day. US students will come out of the airport with immediate questions about how to get online or call home from their cell phones. When it comes to ever-changing technological needs, it’s best to enable peer-to-peer learning and connect new arrivals to the previous group of students.

Mix it up

The broad topic of our travel seminar focuses on how Europe is simultaneously integrating on the su-



pranational level and struggling to integrate a diverse group of colonial and labor immigrants as well as refugees within the context of national policies. On average, we organize two events per day where students are expected to take notes and receive information related to the overall topic of the seminar. (Early iterations of the seminar that attempted three events a day quickly ran into limits on student interest and logistical feasibility). One of these events may be a lecture by a researcher working at a local university and the setting will be more formal and similar to the classroom experience at home. Other events will then be held in community centers, a synagogue, a mosque, in the streets, or the Mayor's office. Instead of replicating a classroom experience, it is important for students to be exposed directly to people who in one way or another are directly engaged with the topic of the seminar. These may include local politicians, immigrant representatives, the Imam, or a media representative covering the topic.

Mixing it up also means that one should organize events that challenge the preconceived notions of undergraduates about Europe and requires inviting speakers likely to fundamentally disagree with each other. Immigration and integration issues in Europe are a perfect topic for making things complicated. US students will get easily offended by critical views on immigrants, but they need to understand those perspectives if they want to get a better understanding of the politics of European integration as well as different national policies. It's likely easier to serve them only with the immigrants' or elite perspectives on those topics, but going beyond the classroom often means precisely bringing in some of those politically incorrect voices.

Finally, mixing it up is also important for creating an esprit the corps among the entire group. When students share hotel rooms, we initially assign the rooms randomly and later allow them to choose roommates. This is particularly important when a majority of the group is from one university and the rest join from other schools throughout the US. Another useful tool is organizing two or three group dinners throughout the seminar. Group presentations and other activities during or after dinner are effective ways of learning about each other.

Keep it interesting for everyone

There is no 'perfect' itinerary. From one seminar to the next, we routinely change the program and drop and add events for almost all cities visited. In some cases, this may be the result of a lecture turning out to be a poor fit, but usually such changes have nothing to do with the quality of the past experience. Instead, a main reason to change the mix of lectures and events is to keep the seminar interesting to the repeat teaching staff. In big cities such as Paris, Amsterdam, or Cologne, there

are dozens of opportunities to get at a specific topic and the emphasis can shift from presenting a more official view expressed by a government official to having the group meet with French-Moroccan or German-Turkish residents talking about their daily experiences.

Be social, but keep some distance

Travel seminars are a great opportunity to reach students in ways that are not easily established in the campus routine of classroom teaching and office hours. The students should be encouraged to ask questions about lectures and talk about research ideas while travelling on the bus or walking from one event to another. Being approachable during the day makes students care more about the content of the lectures and other events taking place. Students learn more when they experience positive reinforcement outside of the classroom. There are plenty of opportunities for that during a travel seminar. This does not mean, however, that staff should spend a great deal of social time with students. We maintain our distance by insisting on proper behavior towards the staff and not going out with students after the completion of the daily program. Only for the last evening, we may join students to celebrate the completion of another successful seminar.

Think about rotation and succession

The academic leadership of an excursion or travel seminar should rotate on a regular basis. While it might be too challenging to establish a regular rotation where two or three faculty share teaching such a course, anyone who has taught such a course over many years should consider a succession plan. The first place to look is among the younger faculty in the department or across campus with some background in European studies. While many may have family or other obligations limiting their ability to travel for an extended period, such seminars can only gain from the input by the widest range of interested faculty.

Hans Peter Schmitz is Associate Professor of Political Science at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University

Notes

1 Craig Parsons (now at the University of Oregon) developed the idea for this travel seminar in collaboration with the director of the SU Strasbourg Center, Raymond Bach.



The European Union and Latin America: Relations and Model

Joaquín Roy

BESIDES THE INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP between North America and the European continent, there are no two regions in the world with a deeper mutual affinity than the one existing between Europe and the conglomerate composed by Latin America and the Caribbean. Modern Latin America and the Caribbean trace back much of its roots, history, political culture, languages and predominant religion to the Old Continent. For these reasons, there should not be a more fertile land for the installation of the model of regional integration developed by the European Union during the last half a century.¹ Relations between the two regions should be superior to any other EU's links with the rest of the world. Latin America and the Caribbean would be ideal candidates for receiving the highest attention from Europe and its institutions, resulting in solid integration systems mirroring the EU.² However, the reality is that there is an uneven political marriage. The commercial exchanges are comparatively limited, while regional integration in Latin America and the Caribbean seems to be lagging in commitment and results.³

Nonetheless, the collective profile is impressive. The combined bloc composed of the European member states and the Latin American and Caribbean countries is truly outstanding: it includes 60 sovereign states, with a population of over one billion people, creating over a quarter of the world's GDP. However, for the most part the predominance of the EU bloc is overwhelming, although for positive reasons. Europe is the leading donor in the Latin American region. It has become the first foreign investor and it is the second most important trade partner.⁴ In addition to the subregional programs (as described below), the EU offers a series of horizontal programs: AL-INVEST (to help to small and medium-sized companies), ALFA (for the promotion of co-operation in higher education), URB-AL (links between European and Latin American cities), ALBAN (reinforcement of co-operation in Higher Education), @LIS (information technologies), and EUSOCIAL (social policies, health, education, administration of justice, employment and taxation policies).

From the EU side, this unequal relationship is to be shaped through a plan-concept known as "Strategic Partnership". The EU's aim in its policy towards the region is for strengthening the political dialogue

to better address together new global challenges.⁵ The EU's relations with Latin American countries have developed at the bi-regional level and a number of specialized "dialogues" with specific sub-regions and two individual countries (Mexico and Chile).

This relationship is based on three pillars: economic co-operation, institutionalized political dialogue, and trade relations. The aim of economic and political co-operation of the EU is to support regional integration, to increase the competitiveness of Latin American enterprises in international markets, and to facilitate the transfer of European know-how.

The recognition of Latin America and the Caribbean in the institutional framework of the European Union is a late phenomenon. This peculiarity is in part explained by some complementary dimensions. First, the initial membership and the original aims of the European Communities since the 1950s have to be taken into account. In its early years, the European Community concentrated its efforts in the development of its common commercial policy. The European Political Cooperation (EPC), the predecessor of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was very modest in its reach.

Second, Latin America was not even mentioned in the Schuman Declaration that propelled the formation of the original European Community of Coal and Steel (ECCS). Only Africa was recalled as an additional recipient of the benefits of the aims and purposes of European integration. This apparent discriminatory mention was due to the overwhelming role played by France, the only European Community state power that at the time had former colonies, with the exception of Belgium's colonial control over the Congo. The Caribbean was not seriously considered by the EU until the accession of the UK in the European Community.

Under the inspiration of French and German interests who wished to replicate their peace and reconciliation accomplishments in Central America's violent confrontations, the European institutions began to pay attention to the region. Latin America at last received the favors of Brussels when in 1986 Portugal and, most especially, Spain became members. The rest of the 80s and the decade of the 1990s was the golden era of EU-Latin American/Caribbean relations, in part due to the European interest in contributing to the pacification of conflict zones, such as Central America. The impetus given to the exportation of the European model of integration was the other decisive factor for the involvement in the region.

The structure of EU-Latin American relations is based on periodic summits at the highest level of government in both continents. Every two years, the Heads of State and Government of the European Union, Lat-



in America and the Caribbean have been meeting in a city alternating Europe and Latin America.⁶ The latest event was held in Lima, Peru, in May of 2008.⁷ The preceding gatherings took place in Rio de Janeiro (1999), Madrid (2002),⁸ Guadalajara (2004)⁹ and Vienna (2006).¹⁰ At the same time, this bilateral relationship has been reinforced by using a forum created by Latin America and the Caribbean, designed more for political consultation: the Rio Group.¹¹ At the level of ministers of foreign affairs, the officers of the EU and the Latin American/Caribbean region discuss overall political matters. Biannually, they alternate the site between the two continents. Having met for the last time in 2007 in Santo Domingo, Prague will be the host in 2009.

Respectful of the subdivision of the Latin American/Caribbean subregions, the EU has been organizing its framework of activities with individual trading blocs and subregional integration schemes. In this sense, Brussels deals with the existing schemes: the Andean Community,¹² MERCOSUR,¹³ Central America,¹⁴ and the Caribbean.¹⁵ The fact that two individual countries (Mexico and Chile) do not belong to any of these subregional Latin American schemes has advised the EU to arrange individual agreements. In fact, they are the most advanced in terms of close economic relations. The Dominican Republic and Haiti have been inserted in the Africa, Caribbean, Pacific (ACP) grouping, devised to receive EU's aid. Cuba became a member, pending its application for the signing the Cotonou (successor of the Lomé Convention) Agreement.

Comparative analysis and balance

The EU has experienced great economic difficulties and political defeats in the course of its deepening (constitutional experiments) and its widening (enlargement) processes. European integration still has to face further challenges regarding Turkey, the Balkans, and the eventual expansion towards the borders of Russia. However, the EU still is the most successful and ambitious accomplishment of integration and cooperation (voluntary, not imposed by force) among sovereign states. In addition to its imprint in Latin America, the EU as a point of reference is felt in the Mediterranean, Africa and Asia.¹⁶

One of the reasons for this success is that comparatively Europe enjoys a dense cultural, historical and social cohesion that coexist with the diversity of the profile of its nations. Although this specificity of European identity may be accomplished by a process of elimination of other origins, the fact is that there is something unique that makes citizens feel European. In addition to this essential feature, the progress that led to the formation of the EU has been dominated by a pragmatic political consensus.

The EU leadership detected the benefits of integration early on, especially perceiving the importance of the completion of the stages of deepening that imply the sharing of important sectors of sovereignty.

Chances are that in the long run the current obstacles that affect the EU will somehow be overcome, as has happened in previous chapters of the EU experiment. However, the truth is that the indecision produced by the constitutional derailment has been interpreted as the tip of the iceberg of the imperfections of the system and of its innate peculiarity. This "collateral damage" has already had a negative impact on the integration processes of the rest of the world, most especially in Latin America.

Latin American sectors that are skeptical to the deepening of the schemes of economic cooperation feel strengthened by what they perceive as an ambivalent European example. This stresses the negative approach towards what erroneously is interpreted as "loss of sovereignty" or "cession of national prerogatives." "Pooling" is an alien expression in Latin America. This view claims that the European citizens are uneasy about too much integration beyond economic issues, and that they do not understand the centrality concepts such as supranationality and shared sovereignty. The European model, in essence, fails in its effective projection all over the Americas.

As a consequence, the Western Hemisphere experiments are until now modest, limited at best to free trade. One obstacle is the taboo represented by national sovereignty that does not enjoy the backing of a personalistic political leadership in constant transition in the majority of the countries. The other is the economic and cultural gap of the different sub-regions, most especially in the integration and cooperation schemes where the United States interacts with the rest of the continent.

Nonetheless, on a comparative basis, it would appear that in recent years the process of Latin American integration had been proceeding at a faster speed than the European, stalled after the leap taken by the enlargement and the crashing of the constitutional project. Optimism was the order of the day in MERCOSUR after its own peculiar and shocking enlargement with the membership of Venezuela. A reborn Andean Community was dressed up after the reincorporation of Chile as an associate, to make up for the Venezuelan desertion. Moreover, the plans of both schemes to be conflated in a more ample one, as envisioned by the South American Union, inspired high hopes. For its part, the EU has pressured Central American integration to implement a solid customs framework. This will lead the region to receive the benefits of free trade, coming out of a weak position to take a leadership



role. As a whole, this panorama would indicate that the integration of the Latin American nations had acquired a vertiginous speed. Compared with the apparent inertia of the European process, paradoxically one would bet for an era of Latin American advancement.

Appearances, however, may lead to wrong impressions. The slow process usually taken by the European experience may well surpass in the long run the contradictory and frustrating path taken by Latin America [might you want to qualify this sentence to make clear that the EU process has already gone far, far beyond anything in Latin America?]. In contrast, the Latin American process of integration has been more inclined to make spectacular announcements of foundation of new entities. The latest addition has been the Bolivarian Alternative of the Americas (ALBA) founded by Venezuela to compete with the U.S.-dominated Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). At the same time, there is a formidable resistance to the consolidation of independent institutions. Claiming that these entities, as set in the past, lacking budgets and authority, were the culprits of past failures, the process was left in the hands of a Latin American leadership consumed by a fever for summitry. The result has frequently been a string of media declarations, grabbing headlines, grasping for air to breath, with no time to enjoy between one announcement of a virtual scheme and the next.

The results of recent Western Hemisphere elections left observers with a mixed panorama regarding the prospect of regional integration. The virtual tie resulting in the North American scene only pointed to a moderate strengthening of the basic tenets of NAFTA.¹⁷ In addition, the contradictory declarations of the Democratic U.S. presidential candidates in the primary process of 2008, questioning the validity of NAFTA, left more confusion in the air. The victory of the reformed Sandinista party in Nicaragua added a counterweight to the internal debate between the deepening of the feeble integration scheme and the option presented by the free trade pacts with the United States through CAFTA. It all depends on the political will of the diverse leadership of the Andean countries where the tenuous group will go. Some countries seem to be more inclined to opt for a free trade pact with Washington, questioning the validity of the deepening of indigenous blocs. Threats of Bolivia following the path of Venezuela are alarming. The radicalization and nationalization process exercised by Chávez adds more questions than answers for the reinvigoration of MERCOSUR. Facing the disintegration of the Andean Community and the instability of MERCOSUR, Brussels seems to have exhausted its energies for pushing veritable integration. It is not surprising then that

the EU has crafted a strategic partnership with Brazil, and offered separate deals to Perú and Colombia. Other obstacles make the EU-LA front difficult. On the one hand, the EU resists reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that would open up the market to Latin American products, which are still subject to quotas and quality limitations. Europe has also now attracted the irritation of Latin American governments and societies for restricting immigration. On the other hand, most Latin American countries refuse to liberalize their economies, at the same time that do not meet the request of the EU for the formation of effective customs unions. However, the most daunting obstacle for progress and regional integration is the endemic level of poverty and inequality, the worst in the world. Social exclusion and discrimination fuels the rise of criminality affecting all sectors of the societies, which in turn advocate the establishment of authoritarian regimes. The alternative is then the rise of populist regimes, usually not inclined to market-oriented regional integration experiments. Hence, the appearance of the ALBA.

In sum, the European Union faces its own challenges and it is forced to choose between two basic alternatives. One is the complete abandonment of the ambitious process as envisioned in the constitutional experiments. That will ultimately lead to a freezing of the entity, a glorious incomplete common market, with only half of its members adopting the common currency and no joint foreign policy. This would be in turn a wrong message sent around the world, especially to Latin America. How then could Brussels insist on deepening the different stages of regional integration with a model that apparently has exhausted its capacity and has lost the support of the Europeans? The second alternative is the pursuit of a solution acceptable to the most important leadership of the EU to enable them to sell it to electorates. This will keep sending the message worldwide that the EU does not renounce its principles; it is flexible, it again has learned from mistakes, and finally prevails. However, only time will be able to issue the ultimate verdict.

Joaquín Roy is Jean Monnet Professor of European Integration and Director of the European Union Center of Excellence at the University of Miami

Notes

1 This report relays heavily on two kinds of references. One is the official description and assessment given by the European Commission documents. The second reflects a series of research publications produced by the European Union Center/ Jean Monnet Chair of the University of Miami. For a general treatment of the relations between the European Union and Latin America, see the following volumes: Joaquín Roy, Roberto Domínguez and Rafael Velázquez (eds.), *Retos e interrelaciones*



de la integración regional: *Europa y América*, México: Universidad Nacional de Quintana Roo/Plaza y Valdés, 2003; Joaquín Roy, Alejandro Chanona and Roberto Domínguez (eds.), *La Unión Europea y el TLCAN: integración regional comparada y relaciones mutuas*. (México: UNAM, 2004); Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *The European Union and Regional Integration: a Comparative Perspective and Lessons for the Americas*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2005; Joaquín Roy, Félix Peña y José María Lladós (eds.) *La Unión Europea y la Integración Regional: Perspectivas Comparadas y Lecciones para las Américas*. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero/ Consejo Argentino de Relaciones Internacionales, 2005; Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *After Vienna: Dimensions of the Relationship between the European Union and the Latin American-Caribbean Region*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/ Jean Monnet Chair, 2007.

2 For a general consideration of the prospects and limitations of regional integration: Genna, Gaspare M., "Power Preponderance, Institutional Homogeneity, and the Likelihood of Regional Integration," in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, (eds.) *The European Union, Fifty Years After the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, 19-34; Gómez-Mera, Laura, "Obstacles to Regional Integration in Latin America and the Caribbean", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *The European Union, Fifty Years After the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, 11-132.

3 For selection of recent volumes on the relationship between the European Union and Latin America and a comparative analysis of the corresponding regional integration networks, see: Angel Casas (ed.) *Integración en Europa y América México*: Instituto Tecnológico de Monterrey, 2007; Tremolada Alvarez, Eric (ed.) *Crisis y perspectiva comparada de los procesos de integración*. Bogotá: Universidad del Externado de Colombia, 2008; Adiwasito, Erneko; Philippe de Lombaerde; Ramón Torrent (eds.) *The Future of Andean Integration and the Relations with the EU*. Brussels: Studia Diplomatica, 2006; Beneyto, José María; Patricia Argerey (eds.) *Europa y América Latina: el otro Diálogo Transatlántico*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva/ Instituto Universitario de Estudios Europeos, Universidad CEI, 2008.

4 For a general description and figures, see data provided by the European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/trade/issues/bilateral/regions/lac/index_en.htm

5 European Commission. Regional Strategy Paper. http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/la/rsp/07_13_en.pdf; European Commission. Latin America http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/la/index_en.htm

6 For analytical essays on the summits: Chanona, Alejandro, "An Assessment of the Summits," in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *After Vienna: the EU-Latin America-Caribbean Relationship*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/ Jean Monnet Chair, 2007, 35-49; Cieslik, Thomas, "The Future of the Strategic Association," in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *After Vienna: the EU-Latin America-Caribbean Relationship*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/ Jean Monnet Chair, 2007, 51-62.

7 European Commission. EU-LAC Summit. Lima 2008 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/lac/index_en.htm

8 European Commission. EU-LAC Summit. Madrid 2002 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/lac/madrid/dec_02_en.pdf

9 European Commission. EU-LAC Summit. Guadalajara 2004 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/lac/guadalajara/decl_polit_final_en.pdf

10 European Commission. EU-LAC Summit. Vienna, 2006 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/lac/vienna/index_en.htm; For an evaluation: Domínguez, Roberto, "Between Vienna and Lima," in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *After Vienna: the EU-Latin America-Caribbean Relationship*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/ Jean Monnet Chair, 2007, 23-32.

11 European Commission. The EU and the Rio Group http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/la/riogroup_en.htm
12 European Commission. Relations with the Andean Community http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/andean/index_en.htm; For an evaluation of the EU-Andean relationship: Casas-Gragea, Angel, "Lessons from the Andean Community," in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez (eds.) *After Vienna: the EU-Latin America-Caribbean Relationship*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/ Jean Monnet Chair, 2007, 131-145.

13 European Commission. Relations with Mercosur http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/mercosur/index_en.htm; Kanner, Aimee, "Prospects for New Governance in South America: Insights from Europe", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 165-176.

14 European Commission. Relations with Central America http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/ca/index_en.htm; Rueda-Junquera, Fernando. "Perspectives of Central American Integration". In Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, editors, *After Vienna: the EU-Latin America-Caribbean Relationship*. Miami: European Union Center of Excellence/Jean Monnet Chair, 2007, pp. 95-116.

15 European Commission. Relations with the Caribbean. http://ec.europa.eu/development/geographical/regionscountries/eucaribbean_en.cfm?CFID=1306536&CFTOKEN=53102587&jsessionid=2430648ae4ad105f444d; Grenade, Wendy, "CARICOM: coming of age?", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 145-164.

16 Babarinde, Olufemi, "The African Union: finally in the path of the EU?", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 53-72; Weber, Katja, "European security integration: lessons for East Asia?", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 73-100. Boening, Astrid, "The Euro-Med partnership and regional integration", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 101-109.

17 Domínguez, Roberto, "NAFTA: will it ever have an EU pro profile?", in Joaquín Roy and Roberto Domínguez, *The European Union, fifty years after the Treaty of Rome (March 25, 1957): The EU model in the Americas, Asia and Africa*. Miami: European Union Center/Jean Monnet Chair, 2008, pp. 133-144.



Studying the Political Economy of EMU

Tal Sadeh. *Sustaining European Monetary Union: Confronting the Cost of Diversity.* Boulder / London: Lynne Rienner, 2006.

Karl Kaltenthaler. *Policymaking in the European Central Bank: The Masters of Europe's Money.* Lanham/Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.

Daniela Schwarzer. *Fiscal Policy Coordination in the European Monetary Union: A Preference –Based Explanation of Institutional Change.* Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2007.

MOST RESEARCHERS WORKING on European integration will be familiar with at least some of the specialist academic work on the history of European monetary integration, notably on the negotiations leading up to the historical agreement on Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) at Maastricht in December 1991. During the decade since the launch of the single currency, the actual operation of EMU has attracted far less attention from the political science community and sustained analysis is limited. While there are a small but growing number of journal articles, special editions and edited volumes dedicated to the operation of EMU or specific aspects of it, there are fewer than a dozen monographs by non-economists on the subject. Recent works by three political scientists, Sadeh, Kaltenthaler and Schwarzer, make an important contribution to this sub-field. These scholars provide theoretically and empirically rich analyses of three central EMU topics: the economic and social cost of EMU; European Central Bank (ECB) policy making; and the operation of fiscal policy co-ordination in EMU. All three studies have a strong interdisciplinary element, incorporating the insights and – especially in the case of Sadeh – the methods of economic analysis. Yet all three produce work that should be accessible to most specialists of the EU, including those with only a rudimentary background in economics.

Sadeh explores the ability of present and potential Euro Area member states to adjust to EMU and in doing so argues that 'EMU is disproportionately socially expensive for many of the present and potential member states' (201). Sadeh tests no less than seven hypotheses drawn from the existing literature, notably optimum currency area theory and comparative politics (impact of partisanship, cabinet duration and

the political business cycle), and in doing so analyses the merit of a series of variables (market-driven, non-market economic and political) to explain the ability of national economies to adjust to EMU. The range of his findings is impressive. The adjustments in the 1990s are shown to depend upon bilateral variations in the exchange rate, fiscal and monetary policies, while prices and labour costs and labour and capital flows are shown to be of little explanatory use. While cabinet duration is shown to be of some importance to adjustment in the 1990s, the effect of political business cycle correlation on adjustment is statistically weak (although the author shows that this correlation is still relevant). The book's main claim is supported by the evidence: with Germany as the anchor country, over half of the sample of countries considered are under pressure to adjust real exchange rates beyond the level previously allowed under the ERM. Without the move to the single currency, all but two of the present Euro Area member states would have been forced to realign. Not surprisingly, the UK is the potential anchor country for the Euro Area incurring the least adjustment costs for present and potential members. Furthermore, the author shows that for European and Mediterranean countries that are not presently in the Euro Area, the euro imposes higher adjustment costs than the dollar as a potential anchor currency.

Kaltenthaler's study provides the first systematic exploration of all the potential sources of ECB policy making. His central argument, rooted in public choice theory, provides real added value over the studies produced by (principally) economists on independent central banking. Kaltenthaler demonstrates that ECB Governing Council members are not driven just by their hawkish pursuit of the official low inflation goal

EUSA members interested in reviewing recent EU-related books, please contact the reviews editor:

Dr. Andrew Smith
CERVL
Sciences po Bordeaux
Domaine Universitaire
11 Allée Ausone,
Pessac 33607, France
E-mail a.smith@sciencespobordeaux.fr
Fax 56 84 43 29

Publishers should send two review copies of books directly to Dr. Smith.



established in the Treaty on European Union or by their determination to establish the credibility of their policy for financial market operators. Rather, these independent central bankers have two principal goals: 'to appear competent to as large a section of society as possible and to maintain policy making independence. Central bankers try to achieve these goals by keeping the macroeconomy healthy' (pp.7-8). Kaltenthaler supports these claims with a detailed analysis of over half a decade of ECB policy making.

EU fiscal policy coordination merits much greater attention by the European Studies community. This coordination has imposed a constraint upon the policies of Euro Area member states that is unprecedented in world history and Member states have bound themselves to follow procedures and rules that the regional governments of all national federal systems have avoided. The constraint has been real even though several member states have failed to follow the rules which were then relaxed. Why and how this happened and why and how fiscal policy coordination has developed is the subject of Schwarzer's excellent study. The author explores the on-going development of the institutional base of fiscal policy coordination in EMU through a model of intended or unintended institutional change which considers actors (the member states and the European Commission), the sources of change (their preferences) and the process of change (the intermediation of preferences in the EU system). Schwarzer's analysis incorporates the insights of European integration theory, analytical frameworks from the study of public policy and multi-level governance theory. The author applies her model to explain the reinterpretation of Stability Pact rules and, eventually, its formal revision agreed in March 2005. While the author herself describes the model as 'simple' (177), it is one of least parsimonious analytical frameworks I have come across in some time. Yet, as with Sadeh, the parsimony lost allows for a comprehensive and highly informative study. Schwarzer explores the relationships among an impressive range of independent variables: she is interested in preferences but, accepting the limits of exploring preferences to explain outcomes, also emphasises the importance of the bargaining system.

These three studies can be compared through their treatment of the interplay of economics and politics. For Sadeh, national politics and economic policy shape the ability to adjust to EMU more than market-driven factors. Through his argument that independent central bankers are principally concerned about their reputation as competent stewards of macroeconomy, Kaltenthaler addresses some of the concerns of those observers who see a detached and

inflation-obsessed supranational bank as a significant element of EMU's democratic deficit. The interplay of politics and economics is also central to Schwarzer's study, which helps us to appreciate the complexities of the ongoing clash of democratically legitimated national interests with EU rules designed to guarantee common goods. Given the reluctance to create automatic stabilisers which function across borders, the political management of this clash is central to the long term survival of EMU.

David Howarth

University of Edinburgh

Helen Wallace and Daniel Naurin (eds.). *Unveiling the Council of the European Union. Games Governments Play in Brussels*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2008.

THIS BOOK BRINGS TOGETHER contributions from eighteen leading participants in 'a golden age for research on the Council' (xi). Indeed, fuelled by changes in 'the transparency' of the latter that have made public its minutes and voting records, these scholars have developed increasingly sophisticated data sets and research designs. Nevertheless, as the book testifies, at least three debates which currently divide this area of study also suggest that not all the gold that has been mined is currently helping enrich understandings of the EU as a whole.

The first of these debates concerns the impact of Eastern enlargement upon behaviour in the Council. Contributors to this book are unanimous in affirming that expansion of the EU has not led to Council gridlock. However, divisions emerge over what other changes have ensued. Mattila concludes that North-South cleavages continue to dominate Council negotiations, whereas Hagemann, Naurin and Lindahl consider instead that there has been a shift towards more East-West cleavages within which Germany has become the sole pivotal player.

A second debate concerns leadership in and of the Council. According to Tallberg, governments which hold the Council Presidency consistently orientate EU decision-making by using their formal presidential powers. Warntjen, however, nuances this conclusion by finding instead that Council presidencies can only steer, not lead. Meanwhile Beach goes a stage further than both by playing down the power of the Presidency and revealing instead the resources of today's Council Secretariat which, he claims, are often considerable.

At its most explicit in the deliberately juxtaposed chapters by Heisenberg and Schneider, the third and final debate that traverses this book is one of epistemology and ontology. In one corner of this 'ring', the



book's institutionalists and/or constructivists (Heisenberg, Lewis, Aus, Beach) tend strongly to use qualitative research methods in order to uncover what has taken place within different sectoral formations of the Council. From this they then propose general conclusions and hypotheses about what determines actor behaviour in the Council. In the opposing corner, the book's partisans of rational choice theory, formalized models and quantitative analysis (Schneider, König, Thomson, Mattila) see the Council as ideal terrain for developing large data sets, aggregated findings and the testing of assumptions about what causes actor behaviour. The book thus provides fundamentalists on both sides the opportunity to air their views, thereby allowing the reader to make up their own mind about which angle of analysis to follow. The clarity of the positions expressed on both sides is to be welcomed. As part of a cleavage that extends throughout the social sciences, it is indeed difficult, I would say impossible, to imagine even partial epistemological agreement between members of both camps. Nevertheless, one still regrets that no chapter in the book even attempts to find some terrain d'entente around the development of research strategies that would combine both quantitative and qualitative data-producing techniques.

More generally, the book's exclusive focus on meetings within the Council itself also tends strongly to turn its authors away from developing knowledge and in-depth interpretation of how this body fits within the EU in its entirety. Can one really study 'the games governments play in Brussels' without fully integrating into research design the constant interactions that go on beyond representatives of Member States, the Commission, the European Parliament and interest groups? Only the chapter by Pollack and Shaffer consistently does so, and this by carefully retracing how issues are 'politicized' in spaces and arenas which extend significantly beyond the Council itself.

If one builds upon such approaches, hopefully this excellent book will serve not only as a means of closing an innovatory but ultimately limiting period of research on the Council. Instead, it also contains many reasons for opening a new period within which data about the Council is produced in order to systematically inform our knowledge about how the EU itself is governed.

Andy Smith
SPIRIT-Sciences Po Bordeaux



EUSA Review

The EUSA Review (ISSN 1535-7031) [formerly the ECSA Review] is published four times yearly by the European Union Studies Association, a membership association and non-profit organization (founded in 1988 as the European Community Studies Association) devoted to the exchange of information and ideas on the European Union. We welcome the submission of scholarly manuscripts. Subscription to the EUSA Review is a benefit of Association membership.

Editor:	Craig Parsons
Book Reviews Editor:	Andrew Smith
Managing Editor:	Joseph Figliuolo

2007-2009 EUSA Executive Committee

Liesbet Hooghe, Chair
(UNC Chapel Hill; Free University Amsterdam)

Neil Fligstein, Vice-Chair
(University of California, Berkeley)

Amy Verdun, Secretary
(University of Victoria)

Frank Schimmelfennig, Treasurer
(ETH-Zurich)

Erik Jones
(Johns Hopkins University)

R. Daniel Kelemen
(Rutgers University)

Craig Parsons
(University of Oregon)

Alberta Sbragia, ex officio member
(University of Pittsburgh)

Immediate Past Chair (2005-2007)

John T.S. Keeler
(University of Pittsburgh)

European Union Studies Association ©
415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA
Web www.eustudies.org ©
E-mail eusa@pitt.edu
Telephone 412.648.7635



Join Us for Teaching Workshops at the 2009 EUSA Conference in Marina Del Rey!

For the first time the Conference will feature workshops devoted specifically to teaching the EU!

Session 2K Thursday, April 23, 10:30 a.m.

Teaching EU Studies in EU Languages: Tricks, Tips and Traps

Chair and Discussant: **Michel Guedry** (Monterey Institute of International Studies)

Session 11K Saturday, April 25, 2:00 p.m.

Teaching the European Union: Goals and Strategies

Gretchen Van Dyke (The University of Scranton)

Peter Loedel (West Chester University)

Colette Mazzurcelli (Molloy College)

Andreas Sobisch (John Carroll University)

Jeanie Bukowski (Bradley University)

John McCormick (Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis)

John Occhipinti (Canisius College)

Peter Bursens (University of Antwerp)

How to Support the European Union Studies Association!

Library Membership

- * To build the EU-related library collection. \$150 / year

Sustaining Membership

- * Free conference access for up to 4 graduate students.
- * One free 1-page advertisement/announcement in the Review per year. \$1,000 / year

Contributing Membership

- * 25% conference fee reduction for up to 4 graduate students.
- * 50% reduction on one 1/2-page advertisement in the Review per year. \$500 ? year

Your gifts are tax-deductible to the extent allowable by U.S. tax law. Include a contribution with your membership renewal, or contact the EUSA Office to make a contribution. Call 412.648.7635 or email EUSA.



EUSA Lifetime Membership

What is it?

Simply put, it is a one-time dues payment to EUSA of US\$ 1500.

What does it include?

The Lifetime Membership includes all regular membership benefits for life. Among those benefits currently are subscription to the quarterly EUSA Review, receipt of occasional EUSA monographs, discounted registration rates at the EUSA International Conference, subscription to our e-mail List Serve, and the opportunity to join EUSA interest sections.

Are there any other benefits?

By making a one-time membership payment, you not only avoid the task of renewing each year, but gain the twin advantages of securing lifetime membership at today's dollar values and avoiding future dues increases.

Who should do this?

Any person wishing to support the endeavors of the European Union Studies Association—the fostering of scholarship and inquiry on the European integration project. For U.S. taxpayers, an additional benefit is a receipt for a one-time \$500 charitable contribution to EUSA, tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law (reducing your tax liability for the year in which you become a Lifetime Member).

How do I become a Lifetime Member?

Simply mail your check, in US\$ and made payable to "EUSA," to the European Union Studies Association, address given at right. (We can not accept lifetime membership payments by credit card.) We will send you a receipt and letter of acknowledgment.

EUROPEAN UNION STUDIES ASSOCIATION New Individual Membership Form Only (Please type or print)

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State/Province _____ Postal Code _____

Country _____

Work Telephone _____

Work Facsimile _____

E-mail _____

Your Professional Affiliation _____

Do you wish to be subscribed to

EUSA's e-mail List Serve? _____ yes _____ no

Two-year Membership dues (please check as appropriate):

Individual _____ \$150 (income \$70,000, and above)

_____ \$105 (income under \$70,000)

Student* _____ \$65 two-year membership

Lifetime Membership _____ \$1500 (+ credit for \$500 tax deduction)

* also community college and high school teachers

EU Law Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Political Economy Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

Teaching the EU Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Latin America Caribbean Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Economics Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Public Opinion and Participation Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU as Global Actor Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EUSA Public Policy Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EUSA members may wish to make a contribution to support the work of EUSA in any amount over membership dues:

EUSA Grants and Scholarships Fund \$ _____

Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies \$ _____

Total amount of dues and gifts enclosed \$ _____

We prefer payment by check (payable to "EUSA") when possible. Checks must be in US\$ and drawn on a USA bank. We also accept international money orders and MasterCard or Visa credit cards. Your cancelled check or credit card statement will be your receipt.

MasterCard # _____ / _____ / _____ / _____

Visa # _____ / _____ / _____ / _____

Expiry ____ / ____ Last 3 digits from back side of card ____ / ____ / ____

Signature _____



(please do not mail *and* fax this form) to:

European Union Studies Association

415 Bellefield Hall

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

Facsimile 412.648.1168

