



EDITORIAL

JAMES A. CAPORASO
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Starting with this issue, we change the name of our publication to ECSA Review. This change recognizes that we provide more than news of events and conferences relating to the European Union. Indeed, substantive articles and detailed reviews have long been part of the "Newsletter". The old designation was a bit of a misnomer. We trust the new name will more accurately convey the contents of our publication.

Let me say thank you for a job well done to our departing book review editor, Christine Ingebritsen, my colleague at the University of Washington. The book review section of the Newsletter prospered under her stewardship. We trust that these lively and informative essays will continue under Paulette Kurzer's direction. Kurzer is associate professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Arizona (Tucson). She is a frequent contributor to comparative politics journals and has written an important book: Business and Banking: Political Change and Economic Integration in Western Europe (Cornell University Press, 1993). Welcome aboard Paulette Kurzer.

I would like to take this opportunity to report briefly on the exciting 1996 ECSA Workshop organized by Carolyn Rhodes of Utah State University on the theme "The European Union in the World Community." The workshop, held in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, was funded by the Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, D.C. and Utah State University. Academics, practitioners, and students from Utah State University met for three days in Jackson Hole and discussed papers ranging from common foreign and security policy to trade negotiations during the Uruguay Round and the role of the EU in global environmental politics. Four days of nearly incessant rain did not prevent a successful workshop -- indeed, it probably contributed to it. Rhodes will report on the workshop in more detail in the fall issue of the Review.

Planning for the biennial ECSA conference, to be held in Seattle, Washington, May 29 to June 1, 1997, is moving along smoothly. While colleagues have pointed out that I have a standpoint on this issue, Seattle provides a hospitable venue for our meeting. The Madison-Stouffer Renaissance Hotel will provide excellent accommodations and the city itself offers opportunities for sightseeing, dining, and retail therapy. As in Charleston last year, arrangements have been made for a limited amount of inexpensive dormitory housing to facilitate the par-

ticipation of graduate students.

The Chair of the Program Committee is Gary Marks of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. A call for papers was sent out with the last ECSA Newsletter and also appears on page 2 of this issue. The Executive Committee of ECSA would like to encourage proposals from a broad range of topics relating to the EU, including numerous "Pillar 3" issues: minorities, citizenship, human rights, immigration, crime and police cooperation. In part, this programmatic emphasis is animated by James S. Jackson's report on the status of minority scholar participation in European Studies. A condensed version of the report is included in this issue.

Finally, I would like to thank our funding agencies for supporting our programmatic activities, especially the ECSA dissertation grants (the Ford Foundation), graduate fellowships and curriculum development grants (the Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, D.C.). The relevant ECSA committees have deliberated and selected their awardees. We congratulate the recipients and at the same time express our gratitude to the Ford Foundation and the Delegation of the European Commission for making these activities possible. We are also hopeful that the Jacques Delors Fellowship at the European University Institute (EUI), Florence will continue for the 1996-1997 academic year. The EUI has graciously agreed to provide the Delors Fellow with a tuition waiver, while funding of living and travel expenses is contingent upon final approval by the European Commission.

Inside...

Conferences and Workshops	2
Grants and Fellowships	4
Research News	7
Program Announcements	7
Teaching News	8
Essays	9
Book Reviews	26
Publications	33
Association News	35

CALL FOR PANELS AND PAPERS



EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION FIFTH BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

MAY 29 - JUNE 1, 1997 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

The European Community Studies Association (ECSA) invites scholars and practitioners engaged in the study of the European Union to submit panel and paper proposals for the 1997 ECSA International Conference. The Program Committee hopes to promote the broadest possible exchange of disciplinary perspectives and research agendas. The Committee actively encourages proposals from a broad range of topics relating to the European Union, including numerous "Pillar 3" issues: minorities, citizenship, human rights, immigration, crime and police cooperation. Participation by graduate students is welcomed, and a limited amount of funding for participant travel may be available.

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

Proposals must be received by November 10, 1996. Please send proposals and inquiries to:

Bill Burros, Administrative Director
European Community Studies Association
405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA
Phone (412) 648-7635
Fax (412) 648-1168
E-mail: ecsa+@pitt.edu

The Members of the 1997 ECSA Conference Program Committee are:

David Cameron, Department of Political Science, Yale University
Neil Fligstein, Department of Sociology, University of California-Berkeley
Ellen Frost, Institute for International Economics
Alan Henrikson, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Carl Lankowski, American Institute for Contemporary German Studies
Gary Marks, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chair)

Additional information on the Conference, including details on registration, accommodations, and travel arrangements will be given in the Fall 1996 [ECSA Review](#).

UACES Conferences 1996

The University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES) of the UK sponsors a number of conferences throughout the year. Forthcoming projects include:

The New Commission - Regional Trade Blocks, London, Autumn

Research Students Conference, London, Autumn

Mediterranean Presidencies (Spain-Italy), Bristol, Autumn (to be confirmed)

National Perspectives: Domestic Consequences of the EMU, London, October 26

European Information Sources and the Academic Sector, venue to be determined, November

Openness and Transparency - Meaningful or Meaningless, Manchester, November 26 or 28

For further information, contact Susan Jones, UACES Secretariat, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK; Tel/Fax (+44) 171 240 0206; email: <100633.1514@compuserve.com>.

The Changing Roles of Parliamentary Committees

June 20-22, 1996 Budapest

Further details for this Conference are available from Attila Agh, Dept. of Political Science, Budapest University of Economic Sciences, Fovám ter 8, 1093 Budapest; Tel/Fax (+36) 1 218 8049 or from Lawrence Longley, Dept. of Government, Lawrence University, Appleton, WI 54912; Tel (414) 832-6673; Fax (414) 832-6944. Lawrence Longley may also be contacted for information on a coordinated, but separately organized second international conference on "The New Democratic Parliaments: the First Years," in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Information on this second conference may also be obtained from Drago Zajc, Dept. of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, P.O. Box 47, 61109 Ljubljana, Slovenia; Tel 386 61 168 1461; FAX 386 61 168 3421; email <DRAGO.ZAJC@UNI-LJ.SI>.

1996 Conferences of the Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration (AEI)

The Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration (AEI) of Germany is sponsoring the following conferences in 1996:

The EU social policy since Maastricht under examination.

Perspectives for the IGC, Tutzing, July 4-6

Germany in Europe, Bonn, November 14-16

Constitutional Law in the EU, Heidelberg, November 28-30

For more information on these conferences, contact the AEI, c/o Frau Meike Leube, Bachstrasse 32, D-53115 Bonn, Germany; Tel +49 228 729.00.20; Fax +49 228 69.84.37.

Memory and History: European Identity at the Millennium

August 19-24, 1996 Utrecht, The Netherlands

This conference is organized by the international society for the study of European ideas. The essential debate is "how can a new Europe be built on a dialogue between culturally different entities?" For more information, contact Dr. Heinz-Uwe Haus, Workshop Chair, Pasteurstraße 28, D-1047 Berlin; tel/fax +49 30 429.95.01.

Economic Integration in Transition

August 21-24, 1996 Athens, Greece

This conference is organized by the Athens University of Economics and Business and the Department of Economics of York University (Toronto). It will evaluate the deepening and widening of the integration process both within the major trade blocs (such as NAFTA and the EU) and elsewhere. Final papers must be submitted by the end of June, 1996. For information, contact Prof. Theodore Georgakopoulos, Dept. of International and European Economic Studies, Athens University of Business and Economics, 76 Patisson Street, G-10434 Athens; tel 301/82.14.021 or 122; fax 301/82.26.204.

German Historical Institute Upcoming Conferences and Workshops

The German Historical Institute is sponsoring the following conferences and workshops:

"Imagination, Ritual, Memory, Historiography: Conceptions of the Past in the Middle Ages." Heidelberg, September 5-8;

"Republicanism and Liberalism in the USA and Germany from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Nineteenth Centuries." University of Wisconsin, Madison, October 3-5;

"How Total was the Great War? Germany, France, Great Britain, and the USA, 1914-1918" Muncherwieler/Berne, October 9-12; and

"The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Politics, and Society until World War I" GHI London, December 12-15.

For further information contact the German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009; Tel. (202) 387 3355; Fax (202) 483 3430.

Regional Development in Agencies in Europe

August 29-September 1, 1996 Aalborg, Denmark

Promotion of economic growth by means of specialized regional institutions has become important in European regional policy. The seminar will provide an opportunity to review the record of institutions in West and East Europe. Contributions in the form of case studies and comparative surveys are welcomed. For further information please contact Henrik Halkier, European Research Unit, University of Aalborg, Fibigerstaede 2, DK 9220, Aalborg, Denmark; Tel. 45 98 15 85 22; Fax 45 98 15 11 26.

**Third ECSA-World Conference:
The European Union in a Changing World**

September 19-20, 1996 Brussels

This Conference, organized with the support of the European Commission by the federative body of all the European Community Studies Associations, including ECSA-USA, will consist of several plenary sessions and the following Working and Regional Groups.

WORKING GROUPS

1. Europe and the World Economy: Competitiveness, Competition; Investment
2. Trade Relations
3. Monetary Policy and Capital Markets.
4. Challenge and Instruments of Foreign and Security Policy
5. Europe and the International Migrations

REGIONAL GROUPS

1. The EU and Central and Eastern Europe (including the NIS)
2. The EU and the Mediterranean Countries
3. The EU and North America
4. The EU and Asia
5. The EU and Latin America
6. The EU and Africa

For more information, contact the ECSA-World Secretariat, 67 rue de Trèves, B-1040 Brussels, Belgium; Tel +32 2 230.54.72; Fax +32 2 230 56 08.

**Fifty Years after Nuremberg:
Human Rights and the Rule of Law**

October 1996 Storrs, Connecticut

For more information on this Conference, contact Henry Krisch, Dept. of Political Science U-24, University of Connecticut, 341 Mansfield Rd., Storrs, CT 06269-1024; Fax: (203) 486-3347; E-mail: "henryk@uconnvm.uconn.edu".

Europe and the Mediterranean

October 1996 Alicante, Spain

This international conference is organized by AUDESCO (ECSA-Spain). For more information, contact AUDESCO, c/o CE-Oficina en España, Paseo de la Castellana 46, E-28046 Madrid, Spain; Tel +34 1.431.57.11; Fax +34 1.576.03.87.

**New Developments in
European Equal Opportunities Policies**

October 4, 1996 London

This seminar will explore the most recent developments in EU policies in respect of men and women, race and disability, and will consider the implications of the new Community initiatives. For more information contact the School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, Rodney Lodge, Grange Road, Bristol BS8 4EA, UK; Tel +44 117 974.11.17; Fax +44 117 973.73.08.

German Studies Association

October 10-13, 1996 Seattle, Washington

The twentieth annual conference of the German Studies Association invites proposals on any aspect of German Studies, including history, *Germanistik*, political science, sociology, philosophy, pedagogy, and the arts. For more information, contact Glenn R. Cuomo, Division of Humanities, New College of USF, 5700 N. Tamiami Trail, Sarasota, FL 34243-2197; Tel (941) 359-4262; Fax (941) 359-4298; Email: <cuomo@virtu.sar.usf.edu>.

49th International Conference on Education Exchange

November 10-12, 1996 Monterrey, California

This conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) has the theme "Implementing a New Agenda for International Educational Exchange: The Roles of Learning, Technology, and Language." For more information, contact Andrew Young at phone (212) 661-1414 ext. 1114; Fax (212) 983-7081; or e-mail <Conference3@ciee.org>.

Grants and Fellowships

ECSA Graduate Fellowships in European Integration

With funding from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, D.C., ECSA has awarded two M.A.-level Graduate Fellowships for the 1996-97 academic year. These Fellowships provide support toward tuition, living, and travel expenses. The Selection Committee for the Graduate Fellowships was composed of Alan Cafruny, Hamilton College (Chair); Reba Carruth, George Washington University; and Maria Green Cowles, University of North Carolina-Charlotte. The Graduate Fellows are:

Elizabeth Hughes, who will attend the M.A. program in European Studies at the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium. Hughes has earned a B.A. (French and Comparative Literature) from the University of Iowa and a M.A. (International Transactions) from George Mason University.

J. Todd Thorpe, who will attend the Institut d'etudes européennes, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium. Thorpe will graduate in June of 1996 with a B.A. (Political Science major with French minor) from Utah State University.

The award of a third ECSA Graduate Fellowship in European Integration was pending as this issue of the ECSA Review went to press.

ECSA Dissertation Fellowships

With funding from the Ford Foundation, ECSA has awarded four Dissertation Fellowships for the 1996-97 academic year. These Fellowships provide \$2,500 for dissertation related expenses. The Selection Committee for the Dissertation Fellowships program was composed of Lily Gardner Feldman, Georgetown University; Roy Ginsberg, Skidmore College;

Carolyn Rhodes, Utah State University (Chair); and M. Estelle Smith, State University of New York-Oswego. The 1996-97 Dissertation Fellows and their dissertation topics are:

Carolyn Marie Dudek, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh, "Does Brussels Matter? EU Monies and Their Affect on Spanish Regional Politics";

Jeffrey M. Lewis, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, "European Union Membership and the Constitutive Processes of National Interest Formation: The Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER) in the EU Interaction Context";

Daniel Powers, Department of History and Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University, "The Role of Christian Democratic Parties in the Process of European Integration"; and

Alasdair Robert Young, Contemporary European Studies, Sussex European Institute, University of Sussex, "The EC's Common External Economic Relations in the New International Arena: Multi-Level Governance and the Dynamics of Integration."

ECSA Curriculum Development Grants

With funding from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, DC, five Curriculum Development Grants were awarded for the 1996-97 or 1997-98 academic years. These grants are designed for the creation of new courses on the European Union, or for the expansion of existing courses to include new material on the European Union. The Selection Committee for the Curriculum Development program was composed of Joseph Krause, Oregon State University; Kathleen R. McNamara, Princeton University; and Glenda Rosenthal (Chair), Columbia University. The following individuals and their sponsoring institutions received awards:

James Angresano, Department of Economics and **Steven Spencer Maughan**, Department of History, Albertson College of Idaho for a course on "The European Union: Past, Present, and Future";

W. Robert Brazelton, Department of Economics, University of Missouri-Kansas City for a course on "Europe and the Economic Community: Background, Potentials, Opportunities";

Eve Darian-Smith, Department of Anthropology, University of California-Santa Barbara for a course on "Contemporary Issues in the New Europe";

Pawel Kepinski, Political Science Department, Oregon State University for a course on "European Union Politics"; and

Paulette Kurzer, Political Science Department, University of Arizona for a course on "Institutions and Politics of the European Union."

ECSA Graduate Fellowship (1997-1998) at the College of Europe

Contingent upon funding from the European Commission Delegation in Washington, DC, ECSA hopes to continue a Graduate Fellowship at the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium for the 1997-1998 academic year. If approved, the Fellowship will provide approximately \$14,500 toward tuition and living expenses. Students must possess a high level of proficiency in the French language, have completed a university degree (B.A. or B.S) by August of 1997, and be U.S. citizens to apply for this Fellowship.

The College of Europe is the oldest European institution exclusively devoted to postgraduate teaching, focusing on issues of European integration. The Academic Program of the College of Europe is divided into four departments: European Political and Administrative Studies, European Economic Studies, European Legal Studies and Studies in Human Resources Development.

Applications for the ECSA Graduate Fellowship at the College of Europe must include all of the following:

1. Letter of application from the student, addressed to the Graduate Fellowship Selection Committee, which discusses:
 - a) the student's preparation and qualifications for the Fellowship;
 - b) how the Fellowship will enhance the student's educational and professional goals; and
 - c) the student's proposed area of specialization at the College of Europe.
2. Three letters of recommendation which comment directly on the applicant's qualifications for the Fellowship.
3. Academic transcript(s).
4. Certification of proficiency in French from an officially recognized Language School or Institute (e.g. Alliance française, British Council, TOEFL).
5. Resume or curriculum vitae.

The application deadline is April 1, 1997. Please send all application materials and direct all inquiries concerning this program to:

Bill Burros, Administrative Director
ECSA Administrative Office
405 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Phone (412) 648-7635
E-mail: ecsas+pitt.edu

The Robert Bosch Foundation Scholars Program in Comparative Public Policy and Comparative Institutions

With a grant from the Robert Bosch Foundation, the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies (AICGS)/Johns Hopkins University offers two resident research fellowships for six months starting January 1, 1997 to one American and one German post-doctoral scholar. The program

seeks candidates in political science, economics, sociology, business and interdisciplinary studies whose work deals with "Employment Training and Workforce Studies." Successful applicants are expected to organize a workshop that explores relevant themes of their work and publish their papers in the AICGS series, Policy Papers. Residency will be from January 1 - June 30, 1997. Application deadline is August 1, 1996. For application information contact AICGS at: Suite 420 1400 16th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-2217 Tel.:(202) 332 9312.

Robert Bosch Foundation Fellowship Program

The Robert Bosch Foundation is currently accepting applications for its 1997-1998 Fellowship Program. This nine-month work and study program will begin in September 1997 with an introductory seminar in Bonn, Germany, and Fellows will then work as interns in the public and private sectors. Applicants should possess a graduate or professional degree and some relevant work experience in one of the following fields: Business Administration, Economics, Journalism, Law, Mass Communication, Political Science, or Public Affairs. The application deadline is October 15, 1996. For more information and application materials contact Elisabeth Helmke, CDS International, Inc., 330 Seventh Avenue, 19th Floor, New York, NY 10001; (tel) 212-760-1400; (fax) 212-268-1288

The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation Opportunities for International Research Collaboration

The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation of Bonn, Germany, provides highly qualified individuals of all nationalities the opportunity to conduct research in Germany. The Foundation's North American Office in Washington, D.C., distributes information on collaborative research support programs to North American scholars. Since 1953 the Foundation has enabled more than 3500 scholars from the United States and Canada to participate in such programs.

The Research Fellowship Program provides support to non-German scholars who have earned a doctorate and are under 40 years of age for the conduct of research in Germany in all fields of scholarship for periods of 6 to 12 months. For the past several years, approximately 70 American scholars have been selected annually in worldwide competition. The Humboldt Research Award provides internationally recognized scholars with the opportunity to spend between 4 and 12 months conducting research at German institutions; candidates for awards may be nominated by eminent German scholars and previous awardees. The Feodor Lynen Fellowship Program enables German scholars under 38 years of age who have a doctoral degree to spend as many as three years at the home institutions of former Humboldt fellows and awardees. The Max-Planck Award permits internationally recognized German and non-German scholars to conduct long-term, project-oriented cooperative research; only senior officials of German research institutions may nominate candidates. The Bundeskanzler Scholarship Program provides the opportunity each year for as many as 10 promising young Americans who demonstrate the potential of playing a pivotal role in the future relationship between Germany and the United States to spend a year in Germany on research projects of their own design.

Qualified individuals are encouraged to apply for these programs. For more information about the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and its programs, please contact Dr. Bernard Stein, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Suite

903, 1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036; (202) 296-2990; fax:(202) 833-8514.

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD)

DAAD is a private, publicly funded, self-governing organization of institutions of higher learning in Germany. All DAAD grants are available to faculty and students in Canada and the United States. Unless otherwise stated, participants must hold Canadian or U.S. citizenship and must be full-time members of Canadian or U.S. colleges or universities at the time of application. Permanent residents should inquire about eligibility. DAAD offers funding for the following:

- Grants for German Studies Program
- Grants for Study, Research and Information Visits to Germany
- Grants for courses in German Studies and Language in Germany
- Annual Grants
- Other programs

There are grants for team teaching, guest lectureship, summer language courses, research grants for both graduate students and faculty, full-year grants, among many others. Each program has different deadlines and eligibility requirements. Those interested should contact the DAAD directly for information at: DAAD--New York Office, 950 Third Ave., 19th Floor, New York, NY 10022; Phone (212) 758-3223; Fax (212) 755-5780.

1997-1998 Fulbright Scholar and NATO Research Grant Opportunities for US Faculty and Professionals

The following Fulbright and NATO Research Grant Opportunities are available for 1997-1998:

Fulbright Research Awards in European Union Affairs
Approximately two awards are available. Preference will be given to projects focusing on the organization of the EU, particularly on the process of institution building. Other topics related to the EU will also be considered. Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the time of application and have the Ph.D. or equivalent professional qualifications. Application deadline: August 1, 1996.

Fulbright Chair in U.S. - E.U. Relations, College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium. Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the time of application and have the Ph.D. or equivalent professional qualifications. Applicants should be established professors with interdisciplinary competence and a broad background in transatlantic relations. Scholars with expertise in economic and monetary cooperation and/or security studies are especially welcome to apply. While fluency in French is desirable, it is not an absolute requirement. The chairholder will be expected to give a class or seminar related to or on transatlantic relations, publish the results of seminars or conferences given during the grant period, and advise the faculty of the College on possible future directions for this program. Application deadline: August 1, 1996.

Fulbright European Union Scholar-in-Residence Program
Institutions are invited to submit proposals to host a EU official or an academic from an EU-member country who specializes in EU affairs as a resident fellow for one or both terms of the 1997-1998 academic year. The EU resident fellow will receive salary and other benefits from the EU, while the Fulbright Scholar Program will provide partial maintenance support here in the US, health insurance, and international travel expenses. Application deadline: November 1, 1996.

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Regional Research Program. One award is available for an established scholar or a promising younger scholar to conduct research for up to ten months during the 1997-1998 academic year on a project that relates to the mission and goals of the OSCE. The research may take place in any of the 51 European participating states. Preference will be given to proposals requiring work in two or more countries, including at least one location in eastern Europe or the states of the former Soviet Union. Interdisciplinary proposals are welcomed. Application deadline: August 1, 1996.

1997 Fulbright German Studies Seminar. Three-week interdisciplinary seminar on German society today in Bonn, Leipzig, Munich and Berlin during June and July 1997. Designed to expose American academics to a broad spectrum of current German culture and society. Participants will meet leading experts in German print and broadcast media. Unlike past years, the 1997 seminar will be offered in English. The seminar is open to faculty in German Studies, communications, history, sociology, and political science. U.S. citizenship and Ph.D., Ph.D. candidacy, or equivalent experience is required. Community college faculty are encouraged to apply. Application deadline: November 1, 1996.

U.S.-Germany International Education Administrators Programs. Three-week seminar in Germany during April/May 1997 on current issues in Germany higher education and international education exchange. Applications are invited from full-time administrators in a number of educational settings. Community college administrators are encouraged to participate. Application deadline: November 1, 1996.

NATO Advanced Research Fellowships and Institutional Grants. Awards are to promote research leading to publication on political, security, and economic issues directly affecting the health of the NATO alliance. Research in one or more of the European member countries, with time spent at NATO headquarters, is strongly encouraged. For individuals, Ph.D. or equivalent professional status and U.S. citizenship required. Fellowships are intended for scholars of established reputation. Institutional grants are offered to departments of political science, international affairs, institutes, centers for security studies, and research teams. Application deadline: January 1, 1996.

For further information, contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden Street, NW., Suite 5M, Box GNEWS, Washington, D.C. 20008-3009; Tel 202/686-4000; Fax 202/362-3442; Internet: info@ciesnet.cies.org.

Program Announcements

Internship Opportunities at the European Commission Delegation

The Delegation of the European Commission offers internship positions at its office in Washington, DC. Internships are intended to provide students and recent graduates with the opportunity to acquire considerable knowledge of the European Union, its institutions, activities, laws, statistics and EU-US issues. Internships are offered three times a year in keeping with the "semester calendar" from: the beginning of September

through the third week in December; early January through May; and late May through August. In addition, interns are accepted periodically for the January inter-term period. Preference is given to candidates available on a full-time basis, i.e., 35-40 hours per week, although part-time interns are accepted and encouraged to apply.

Applications should contain a curriculum vitae, a copy of a recent transcript and a cover letter indicating the reasons for pursuing an internship with the European Union. A daytime phone number should be included. While there are no formal deadlines, it is advisable to submit applications at least three months prior to the beginning of the internship.

Several sections of the Delegation accept interns, including Public Inquiries, Academic Affairs, Agricultural Section, Economic Financial Section, and Environment/Energy. Internship applications for these services should be addressed to the "Internship Coordinator." Europe Magazine, Audiovisual Section, and the Speaker's Bureau also accept interns. Applications for these areas should be addressed to the specific department. The general address for applications and further inquiries is Delegation of the European Commission, 2300 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037; phone (202) 862-9500; fax (202) 429-1766.

USIS Speakers Program

The U.S. Information Service (USIS) has a regional office, the Regional Resources Unit based at the American Embassy in London. The Regional Resources Unit seeks speakers capable of giving the American perspective on EU Affairs, the U.S.-EU relationship, the transatlantic alliance, and related issues, to participate in Speakers Programs involving the U.S. Embassies and Consulates throughout Europe.

To qualify for the Speakers Program, individuals must have established travel plans in Europe. The Regional Resources Unit will provide compensation for the costs of travel within Europe, daily maintenance, and a modest honorarium. ECSA members traveling from the United States will find this an excellent opportunity to increase their understanding of European perspectives.

Individuals interested in this Program should fax the following information, **well in advance of their travel dates**, to the Regional Resources Unit, American Embassy London, at +44 171 499.8218:

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

King's College School of Law Center of European Law Summer Course in European Community Law

This July 1-12, 1996 Summer course has been designed to provide a series of lectures by expert speakers on the main areas of Community Law. Topics of the Summer course include Principles of EC Law, EC Company Law, Free Movement of Goods, Free Movement of People, Environmental Law, Consumer Law, Intellectual Property, and Consumer Law.

The fees are 800 pounds sterling for tuition and accommodation in a hall of residence, and 600 for tuition only.

For further information contact Eva Evans MBE, Centre of European Law, School of Law, King's College London, Strand, London, WC2R 2LS, Tel 0171-873 2377 or 0171-8732387, Fax 0171-873 2387.

University of Limerick, Ireland MA Program in European Integration

This course, currently in its eighth year of operation, is multi-disciplinary in character with students taught by a team of academics drawn from history, law, politics and economics. In addition, a number of outside speakers from the academic world and public life contribute lectures and seminars during the academic year. The program is full-time, and weekly seminars are scheduled over the course of two semesters. During the second semester students spend a residential week at the Irish Institute for European Affairs in Leuven, Belgium.

The course attracts a wide variety of students from the European Union, Central and Eastern Europe and North America. Students in the program may have the opportunity to assist with the teaching of undergraduate courses in the European Studies program, which provides additional education experience and is also a source of funding

For more information, contact Dr. Nicholas Rees, Jean Monnet Professor of European Institutions and International Relations, Course Director for the M.A. in European Integration, University of Limerick, Ireland; Tel +353 61 202445; Fax +353 61 202569.

- *IGC general information and thematic fact-sheets
- *New documents (complete text of most recent documents)
- *Other key documents
- *Speeches of EU representatives
- *Speeches of Member State representatives
- *EU Institutions' documents
- *Member States' documents
- *Other institutions' activities and documents
- *Seminars, conferences, and other events related to the IGC

Seminar and Archive on the IGC

The Forschungsinstitut für Politische Wissenschaft und Europäische Fragen, Universität zu Köln, Germany has organized a seminar to explore various issues related to the IGC '96, including theories on integration, the history of the "European Constitution", the Maastricht Treaty, proposals for reforms of the structures, and positions of the different Member States.

A special archive on the IGC has also been established, containing proposals from all main political and social actors on the European level as well as in the national contexts. Exchange is envisaged with other institutions via E-mail and internet in order to establish some kind of "1996 network".

For more information, contact Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels, Jean Monnet Chair in EC Law, Forschungsinstitut für Politische Wissenschaft und Europäische Fragen, Universität zu Köln, Gottfried-Keltr Str. 6, D-50931 Köln, Germany; Tel +49 221-470 4131; Fax +49 221-470 5017; E-mail: <ahw03@rrz.uni-koeln.de>.

ECPR Standing Group on the European Union

This is a newly established Group which aims to support the development of the field by serving as a structure of information, promotion and coordination of research efforts. It will monitor the state of investigation on EU politics and signal neglected aspects. A wide range of topics are of interest to the Standing Group, for example: institutions and decision-making systems, political forces and processes, policies, common foreign and security policy, Union-state relations, integration theory and Union development.

The immediate aims of the group are: to publish a directory of specialists; to establish an informal newsletter which can diffuse information on research (in progress and accomplished), books and reviews, scientific meetings and conferences, schools and courses, data banks and archives, available research funds, etc.. The Standing Group will also collaborate on the organization of workshop proposals on EU politics.

For more information, contact: Professor Fulvio Attina, Dipartimento di Studi Politici, Università di Catania, via Vittorio Emanuele 49, I-95131 CATANIA, Italy. Tel: (+39) 95 532 866/645; Fax: 95 533 128.

Research News

New Transatlantic Action Program Online

The new Transatlantic Agenda and Action Program unveiled at the December 3, 1995 EU-US presidential summit in Madrid is available to online users on both sides of the Atlantic. The Action Program's launch in cyberspace fulfills one of the goals of the wide-ranging transatlantic initiative, which includes specific commitment to promote the public's use of resources like the internet to help people in the EU and the US learn more from and about each other. Building Bridges across the Atlantic - one of the Action Program's four priority areas - pledges to "use our sites on the Internet to provide quick and easy access to the New Transatlantic Agenda, the Joint EU-US Action Plan, information on the EU and US studies, descriptions of pertinent library holdings, as well as other material relevant to the EU-US relationship."

The US and EU internet sites are accessible on the World Wide Web (WWW) using either of the following universal resource locators (URLs):

Europa server: <http://www.cec.lu/en/agenda/tr01.html>
USIA: <http://www.usia.gov/usis.html>

1996 Intergovernmental Conference Online

The European Commission has set up a database for the IGC on the Internet. It is located on the EC Web-server, EUROPA. The URL for EUROPA is <<http://www.cec.lu>>. To access the IGC database, select the window "On the Political Agenda: next steps to integration" and then go to the heading "EU's future shape - The 1996 Intergovernmental Conference". The database includes the following items:

Teaching News

Free Educational Videos on the EU

The following videos from the European Union are available free of charge for instructional purposes:

1. **Implementing Common Policies** (running time 47 minutes); Contains "The Union and its Regions", "The White Paper: Europe Toward the 21st Century", "The Treaty on the

European Union”, and “1992 and Beyond”.

2. **International Cooperation** (running time 59 minutes); Contains “Extraordinary Partners: the European Union and the United States”, “PHARE, the EU Aid Program for Eastern Europe”, Lome Mark Four: Stability in a Changing World”.
3. **Business/Economics** (running time 53 minutes); Contains “Europe World Partner”, “The ECU for Europe”, “Eastern and Central European Countries and the EU”, “1992 and Beyond”, “The White Paper: Europe Towards the 21st Century”.
4. **Environment** (running time 50 minutes); Contains “The EU and the Environmental Control of Chemicals”, “The Environment”, “The Environment at the Center of EU Policy”.
5. **European Union Historical Overview** (running time 56 minutes); Contains “Jean Monnet: Founder of Europe”, “Who Runs the Union?”, “Towards a European Union”, “A Growing Europe.”

Requests should indicate video subjects in order of preference (first choice, second choice, etc.) as supplies are limited. To order these videos, please contact:

The European Union
c/o Video Placement Worldwide
P.O Box 58142
St. Petersburg, FL 33715-9976
Fax: 1-800-358-5218

Essays

The Costs of Convergence: The Case of France

Alan J. Dillingham
Political Science Department
Villanova University

On October 26, 1995, French president Jacques Chirac announced on French television that, despite high levels of unemployment, his countrymen could expect two years of budgetary austerity to meet the Maastricht treaty's convergence criteria for membership in economic and monetary union (EMU) by the treaty's 1999 deadline. After a cabinet reshuffle in the beginning of November, his prime minister, Alain Juppé, announced a new budget plan that called for the reduction of France's social security deficit from FFr60 billion in 1995 to zero by 1997 and the elimination of the entire FFr250 billion debt of the social security system over 13 years. In addition, the welfare system would be brought under parliamentary control, ending the unions' role as co-managers of the system along with employers.¹

The response was the greatest domestic unrest seen in France since May 1968. Twenty-four days of strikes, aimed explicitly at forcing the withdrawal of the Juppé plan, paralyzed public transportation and, at their height, brought an estimated one million people out into the streets of Paris.

Paradoxically, the French government's efforts to meet the convergence criteria may actually undermine its ability to fulfill them. Increased taxes and reduced government spending may have the effect of depressing French economic growth and raising unemployment, thus reducing tax receipts and actually *increasing* French budget deficits. This is apart from the effects of the strikes of November-December 1995, which will probably have similar consequences. Why then does France seem determined to wreck its domestic economy and provoke a major social and political crisis for the sake of the convergence criteria?

The French Stake in EMU

Should France abandon its efforts to meet the Maastricht convergence criteria, it would probably spell the end of the EMU project altogether. To understand the French stake in EMU, it is necessary to start with the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system in the early 1970s.

From 1945 until the early 1980s, French leaders had been committed to a policy of high economic growth based on a highly inflationary strategy of state-guaranteed finance, explicitly designed to advance French power internationally and bolster political stability at home.² The Bretton Woods system made this strategy viable by first insulating the franc's exchange rate from speculative pressures for long periods of time, and then allowing France periodic devaluations to adjust its economy. After 1973, when all exchange rates were allowed to float, this external prop was knocked out from under the franc.³

Since the end of the Bretton Woods system, France has lost control over its macro-economic policy to international financial markets. These markets have expanded geometrically, fueled by the uncertainty inherent in a floating exchange rate system and facilitated by advances in information and telecommunications

technology. According to the latest estimates, global turnover on foreign exchange markets is currently over \$1.2 trillion a day and the market for foreign exchange is now 130 times its size in 1973.⁴ Central bank reserves have declined dramatically as a percentage of the global daily turnover on foreign exchange markets, reducing the ability of states to stabilize exchange rates through market intervention. France, like other states, has found itself in an increasingly tough global competition for capital that has reduced its ability to set macro-economic policy according to domestic policy goals.⁵

Further compounding France's difficulties has been the fact that the post-Bretton Woods international financial system rotates around a dollar/deutschemark/yen axis. During periods of dollar weakness, international investors tend to prefer the deutschemark as a dollar substitute over other European currencies, largely because of Germany's perceived political stability, its liberal policy on foreign investment, the liquidity of markets for the Deutschemark and the Bundesbank's commitment to maintaining its value. Since the dollar has continued to dominate international finance even after the collapse of Bretton Woods, dollar instability tends to weaken the franc against the mark regardless of the state of France's domestic economy.⁶

In the decade following the collapse of Bretton Woods, France sought to shield its currency from the adverse effects of floating exchange rates through European monetary arrangements like the Snake and the European Monetary System. However, these arrangements ended up being inadequate compromises and were not strong enough to protect the franc from external turmoil. As a result, floating exchange rates confronted France with a vicious cycle of currency depreciation, price inflation, and increased indebtedness that progressively retarded its ability to pursue its strategy of economic growth.⁷ The failed attempt by the French Socialists to reflate the French economy unilaterally during the early 1980s, revealed and exacerbated the extent of France's vulnerability to the international financial system. In response, France was forced to embark on an austerity policy in March 1983 to protect the value of the franc -- the origin of the current *franc fort* policy.

Despite the radical departure the *franc fort* policy represented, economic growth remained the most important objective of French policy. However, it was recognized that high levels of international capital mobility coupled with floating exchange rates meant this goal could not be achieved with a weak currency. Low inflation was desirable not for its own sake but only as a necessary prerequisite for economic growth.⁸ Therefore, European monetary integration remained desirable as a way of bolstering the franc against the harsh effects of the international financial environment.

In addition to initiating the *franc fort* policy, the French Socialists also undertook a complete overhaul of the French financial system, followed by a diplomatic initiative that would eventually culminate in the Single European Act. French ambitions to build a single European market in the area of finance were both a reaction to international constraints and a way to force progress towards European monetary integration. The creation of a single European market in finance would spur economic growth by simultaneously increasing the amount and decreasing the cost of capital within the EC. However, the abolition of exchange controls this required would increase the potential volatility of intra-EC capital flows and further expose EC currencies to the pressures of the international financial system. Failure to reform European monetary arrangements to meet these dangers could force a reversal of financial integration

via the reimposition of exchange controls--a re-fragmenting of Europe's financial markets that would effectively destroy the EC's 1992 single market project.⁹ As François Mitterrand declared after the EC Hannover summit in June 1988: "It is not possible to envisage the liberation of capital movements without reinforcement of the European Monetary System. These things are linked together. The facts will speak for themselves."¹⁰

Recognizing this relationship, French finance minister Edouard Balladur proposed the creation of a European central bank in January 1988. Balladur's proposal would later culminate in the Delors report of April 1989, which delineated a three stage process for creating a European central bank and a single European currency.

German unification raised the stakes and accelerated the process of European monetary integration. The Cold War division of Germany and the subordination of its western half within NATO had previously provided France the opportunity to pursue an independent foreign policy. The end of this division threatened to loosen a unified Germany from its Cold War moorings. In this new environment, France's leaders feared that its own independence could only encourage German independence, which in turn would inevitably mean French marginalization. Under these circumstances, French leaders decided that the process of European integration, and in particular the process of monetary integration, needed to be strengthened and accelerated to preserve France's influence before its position eroded any further.¹¹ It was in this context that France negotiated and signed the Maastricht Treaty.

Much is at stake for France with respect to EMU. Specifically, French leaders believe EMU will:

- 1) improve French growth prospects over the long term, by eliminating the exchange rate premium attached to the franc, allowing for permanently lower interest rates;
- 2) regain some measure of control over interest rates within France by transferring monetary policy from the Bundesbank to the European Central Bank, where France will have a voice;
- 3) increase France's ability to affect international monetary conditions generally by establishing a European counterweight to the dollar;
- 4) protect the development of the European single market, particularly in the area of finance, which would enhance French growth prospects by providing a greater supply of credit available to French economic actors at lower interest rates; and
- 5) prevent French marginalization in Europe and the world by eliminating the Bundesbank's domination over European monetary affairs and firmly subordinating German power and freedom of maneuver to European institutions.¹²

Significance of the Convergence Criteria

The Maastricht treaty reflected a grand compromise between French and German positions on European monetary integration that have their roots in the Werner Group discussions of 1970. The French, or "monetarist" approach has traditionally stressed the *external* dimensions of European monetary stability, i.e. exchange rate stability. This approach de-emphasizes formal coordination of domestic economic policies, arguing instead that

the commitment to maintain fixed exchange rates in Europe would bring domestic policies into convergence. On the other hand, the German, or "economist" approach focuses on the *internal* dimensions of European monetary stability, i.e. domestic price stability. In contrast to the French position, this approach argues that exchange rate stability can only come about as the result of convergent domestic economic policies.

In the treaty itself, France won a commitment to establish an economic and monetary union (EMU) by a firm deadline -- January 1, 1999. Starting on that date, those states participating in EMU would pool their foreign exchange reserves in a European central bank (ECB) and irrevocably fix their exchange rates against a single European currency, which would replace national currencies at a later date. To obtain this objective, France agreed to a number of German pre-conditions. The new European Central Bank would be independent of political control and committed to the principle of price stability. All national central banks would be made politically independent as well. France also accepted strict convergence criteria for economic policy as prerequisites for admission into the final stage of EMU. These included national budget deficits below 3% of GDP and a public debt ratio no greater than 60% of GDP.¹³

The convergence criteria were more important for political rather than economic purposes. They incorporated into the Treaty the German Bundesbank's view that monetary union should be built on fiscally sound domestic policies. Although never enthusiastic about the convergence criteria, France was willing to accept them in order to placate these concerns. In any case, at the time the convergence criteria seemed to represent little more than an extension of the *franc fort* policy, forced on France by the international financial system. The blow was also softened by the fact that the Maastricht treaty did not make the convergence criteria mandatory. The ultimate decision about who would enter EMU rested squarely with the leaders of the member states.¹⁴

However, the convergence criteria assumed greater importance after the signing of the Maastricht treaty than the French had anticipated. In the immediate aftermath of the signing of the treaty, financial markets had assumed that the political commitment to EMU and fixed exchange rates would force economic convergence to occur. After all, the EMS had already been successful in bringing about a closer convergence of inflation rates within the EC. However, after Danish voters rejected Maastricht in a binding referendum in June 1992, markets began to lose confidence in the political will of EC member states to bring EMU about. Their anxiety increased over fears that French voters might also reject the treaty in a referendum Mitterrand had scheduled for September 1992 to show his country's support for the treaty. The Bundesbank's decision in July 1992 to raise German interest rates to their highest level in over 60 years highlighted the strains that financing German unification was putting on the rest of Europe. The result was a major crisis in September 1992, in which Great Britain and Italy left the exchange rate mechanism of the European Monetary System.¹⁵ The French managed to maintain the franc's value, but only by increasing their own interest rates and by engaging in massive intervention on foreign exchange markets in conjunction with Germany. A second crisis in August 1993 nearly destroyed the EMS completely. The new right-wing government that came to power in France in March 1993 engaged in an aggressive policy of lowering French interest rates to stimulate growth. Based on the fact that the French economy had been outperforming Germany on inflation since July 1991, the new government probably believed that there was room to make significant interest

rate reductions without threatening the value of the franc.¹⁶ However, international markets interpreted these moves as a signal that with unemployment above 12% and a presidential election less than two years away, France was ready to make a dash for growth and willing to abandon its *franc fort* policy to achieve it if necessary. Concerted French-German exchange rate intervention could not dampen the rush from the franc. Under severe speculative pressures, the EC countries agreed on August 2, 1993 to widen the margins of fluctuation between their currencies from $\pm 2.25\%$ to $\pm 15\%$.¹⁷

The August 1993 EMS crisis taught the French a bitter lesson. Even a domestic policy which had produced a better inflation performance than Germany's was not enough to isolate the franc from the perverse effects of the international financial system. Frustration at France's unwilling prostration yet again to the power of international financial markets translated into a renewed determination to pursue EMU as a countermeasure.¹⁸ More significantly, with the old exchange rate mechanism severely cracked the convergence criteria assumed even greater significance. French leaders were forced to declare their complete support for the criteria, fearing that to do otherwise would provoke another franc crisis. At the same time, the German government, faced with the difficult prospect of selling EMU to a skeptical public, insisted that the criteria would have to be strictly applied.

In the changed circumstances after August 1993, the new emphasis on the convergence criteria actually provided the franc some relief by taking financial markets' attention away from making one-way bets against specific exchange rates and towards economic fundamentals--something which should work more in the franc's favor. Nevertheless, acceptance of the "economist" position focused the debate over implementing EMU to an area the French had wished to minimize.

Chirac's Road to Damascus

With the election of Jacques Chirac as France's new president in May 1995, concern grew that France might be ready to abandon EMU altogether. After all, Chirac was notorious for his "Cochin appeal" in 1978, when he vehemently denounced France's impending entry into the European Monetary System from his hospital bed. In 1992, Chirac hesitated for over a month before finally supporting French ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. As late as November 1994, he had proposed holding a national referendum before France adopted the single European currency.

However, a new EMS crisis in March 1995 left Chirac vulnerable to the charge that his comments were undermining the franc.¹⁹ He affirmed his support for EMU during the presidential election campaign by repudiating both the 1978 Cochin appeal and his call for a new referendum on the single European currency. In his desperate bid to finish ahead of Edouard Balladur in the first round of the presidential election, Chirac ran on the proposition that fighting unemployment, increasing wages, reducing the budget deficit and qualifying for EMU were all complementary rather than conflicting goals. However, his insistence that tackling unemployment, which stood at twelve percent, would be his "priority of priorities", suggested to many that if push came to shove he would choose the fight against unemployment over deficit reduction and the EMU.

These concerns intensified in August 1995 with the resignation of Alain Madelin, the French finance minister. Madelin had publicly called for a decrease in the number of public sector employees and a reduction in their special privileges and

welfare benefits in order to make more room for tax and budget cuts. Not surprisingly, these comments infuriated French public sector unions. Chirac's prime minister, Alain Juppé, favored a strategy of reform through negotiation and dialogue with the unions rather than confrontation and forced Madelin's resignation. In doing so, Juppé appeared to favor the unions over socio-economic reforms, thus undercutting the credibility of the government's economic policies.

By the fall of 1995, Chirac was forced to make the choice he had been trying to avoid. A franc crisis in the beginning of October indicated that the honeymoon period between the Juppé government and international financial markets was over. On October 25th, Chirac and German chancellor Helmut Kohl reaffirmed their countries' commitment to strict application of the Maastricht convergence criteria. The next evening Chirac appeared on French television to promise France's unconditional support for EMU.

To meet the Maastricht convergence criteria, a reshuffled Juppé government submitted a new budget plan in November that proposed a complete overhaul of the French social security system. Despite divisions within the French labor movement, two unions, the *Confédération Générale du Travail* (CGT) and *Force Ouvrière* (FO), spearheaded twenty-four days of strikes aimed explicitly at forcing the withdrawal of the Juppé plan. Marc Blondel, leader of FO, complained bitterly: "French society is being placed under the control of the financial markets."²⁰ In the face of mass protest, the Juppé government stood firm, supported by President Chirac. "The hour of true reform has struck for France," Juppé declared. "Putting them off, as we have for 15 years, would mean accepting a [national] decline."²¹ The strikes petered out in the middle of December, after the government agreed to make some minor concessions on the issue of public sector pensions. However, the Juppé plan to balance social security spending was not withdrawn. French efforts to fulfill the Maastricht convergence criteria remained on track.

Conclusion

Despite the problems associated with meeting the Maastricht convergence criteria, French policy-makers see the alternatives as much worse. Abandoning the convergence criteria at this juncture would not only damage progress towards EMU, but would also destroy the franc's credibility as well. The *franc fort* policy has been a proven success, providing lower inflation, improved public finances, increased competitiveness and an economic growth rate comparable to Germany's. On the other hand, experiments with devaluation since 1973 have been disastrous, resulting in vicious cycles of higher inflation, higher interest rates and greater indebtedness with no appreciable change in unemployment or growth.

The argument that looser fiscal and monetary policies might lead to a dramatic decrease in unemployment, as they did in Britain after it withdrew from the EMS in 1992, is treated skeptically by most policy-makers. Apart from periodic franc crises, French interest rates have been at their lowest levels in over twenty-five years. Indeed, yields on French government bonds recently dipped *below* those in Germany. With payroll taxes adding forty percent to French labor costs, unemployment is seen as a structural problem. Since the ratio of gross public debt to GDP rose from 31 percent to 57 percent in France between 1980 and 1994, failure to counter the growth in deficit spending can only act as a drag on French growth in the future.²²

Despite the increased prominence of the convergence criteria

after the signing of the Maastricht treaty, it would be a mistake to over-estimate their true importance. If such criteria did not exist, France would still face a hostile international financial climate. French leaders still see Maastricht as the solution rather than the problem.

Notes

1. The French social security system includes healthcare, pensions and family allowances. The social security debt would be paid for with a 0.5% tax on incomes for all but the poorest citizens. To close the social security deficit, the Juppé plan proposed higher health insurance charges for retirees and the well off unemployed, a freeze on family allowances in 1996, taxing family allowances starting in 1997, spending controls on doctors, hospitals and drug companies and increased pension contributions by public sector employees. See *Financial Times*, November 16, 1995, p. 2. This was on top of the Juppé government's announcing a freeze on public sector wages, which account for 40% of the French budget, in September.

2. This strategy was a direct response to the political, economic and social stagnation under the Third Republic which was seen as responsible for the defeat and humiliation of France in 1940. See Richard F. Kuisel, *Capitalism and the state in modern France* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 157, 171, 203, 215, 249. Also see Jean-Pierre Rioux, *The Fourth Republic, 1944-1958*, trans. by Godfrey Rogers (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 173-174; Charles de Gaulle, *The War Memoirs: Salvation, 1944-1946* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), pp. 111-112, 131-136; and Michel Debré and Pierre Mendès-France, *Le Grand Débat* (Paris: Goutier, 1966), pp. 15-16.

3. The relationship is explained in great detail in Michael Loriaux, *France after Hegemony*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991). See especially pp. 30-33.

4. These figures are taken from *The Economist*, March 30, 1996, p. 69.

5. On this point, see Philip G. Cerny, *The Changing Architecture of Politics: Structure, Agency and the Future of the State*, (London: Sage, 1990), pp. 212-222; and John B. Goodman, *Monetary Sovereignty*, (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), p. 183.

6. A good explanation of this phenomenon can be found in Elke Thiel, "Deutschmark Between the Dollar and the EMS," *Aussenpolitik*, English edition, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1982. Also see Jacques van Ypersele, *The European Monetary System: Origins, operation and outlook* (Chicago: St. James Press, 1985), p. 99.

7. See Loriaux, pp. 55-75.

8. See French Treasury Director Jean-Claude Trichet's discussion of "competitive disinflation" in "Dix ans de désinflation compétitive en France," *Les Notes bleus de Bercy*, 16 October 1992.

9. See Christian Goux, "La Libération des Mouvements de Capitaux en Europe et la Question d'une monnaie européenne," *Après-demain*, February 1988, p. 25.

10. Mitterrand's remarks quoted in *Le Monde*, June 30, 1988, p. 3.

11. See Stephen Philip Kramer, "The French Question," *The Washington Quarterly*, Autumn 1991, especially pp. 83 and 86; and Stanley Hoffmann, "French Dilemmas and Strategies in the New Europe," in *After the Cold War*, ed. by Robert O. Keohane, Joseph S. Nye and Stanley Hoffmann, pp. 128-132.

12. Many of these points were made by Alain Lamassoure, then French minister for European Affairs, appearing before the French Senate on November 25, 1993. The text of his comments can be found in *La Politique Etrangère de la France* (Paris: Documentation Française), November 1993, pp. 114-117.

13. Other items of the convergence criteria included: an inflation rate not more than 1.5% above the average of the three member states with the lowest rates; long-term interest rates within 2% of the average of the three member states with the lowest rates; and a record of currency stability, defined as a period of two years within the narrow band of the EMS and without any devaluations. See "Protocol on the convergence criteria referred to in Article 109j of the Treaty establishing the European Community," in the English edition of the (Maastricht) Treaty on European Union (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1992), pp. 185-186.

14. Art. 109j(3) and 109j(4) of the (Maastricht) Treaty on European Union.

15. Spain also devalued the peseta by 5%. Spain devalued by another 6% in November along with Portugal. Portugal, Spain, and Ireland all temporarily reimposed exchange controls to protect their currencies. These three countries and Denmark also raised short-term interest rates intermittently during November to ward off speculators. Finland, Sweden and Norway who had tied their currencies to the ECU to bolster their applications for membership in the EC were forced to float in September, November and December respectively.

16. Indeed, at the end of June, a senior Bank of France official suggested that France could even share the anchor role within the European Monetary System with Germany. At about the same time, France's new finance minister, Edmond Alphandéry, suggested that based on the soundness of its economy France was ready to take the lead in setting European interest rates and began pressing Germany to cooperate in "concerted" interest rate reductions.

17. The Deutschmark and Dutch guilder remained within their $\pm 2.25\%$ bands.

18. As François Mitterrand put it in an interview with a regional French newspaper: "I find it senseless and immoral that speculation, proceeding at blows of billions of dollars, could prevail (*obtenir raison*) against states which themselves represent the interests of their people, that is tens of millions of people whose daily life has been overturned and who can do nothing about it. It is a challenge to democracy. . . . More Europe, a single currency and the political will it presupposes, and we will come to master the conspiracies of money." *La Politique Étrangère de la France*, August 1993, p. 108.

19. Spill-over effects from the Mexican peso crisis had led to this crisis. A global flight to quality sent funds flooding into the deutschmark, pushing up its value against the franc and other EMS currencies. As a result, the franc hit an all-time low against the mark during the March crisis and the Bank of France lifted its 3 month money market rate from 5.4% to 8.3% during the first week of March to protect the franc's value.

20. Quoted from the *Financial Times*, October 28, 1995, p. 2.

21. Quoted in *Financial Times*, November 30, 1995, p. 1.

22. See *Financial Times*, December 1, 1995, p. 17.

European Community Law from a U.S. Perspective*

George A. Bermann

Charles Keller Beekman Professor of Law
Columbia University School of Law

Introduction

Although less than forty years have passed since the founding of the European Economic Community (now the European Community),¹ the lifetime of the Community is well marked temporally. The term of each Commission² furnishes a convenient time-line for measuring the Community's progress in legal integration. Since the 1970s, each year has been punctuated by two or more "summit" meetings of heads of state or government.³ These summits not only are key markings in their own right, but also furnish an occasion for additional monitoring of the Community's state of health. Throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, the Community submitted to periodic "self-examinations" through specially commissioned studies and reports on the Community's well-being.⁴ In more recent years, intergovernmental conferences (IGCs), convened for the express

*This Article originally appeared in *The Tulane Journal of International and Comparative Law*, Winter 1995, Volume 4:1. The Article is adapted from a lecture presented at the Eason-Weinmann Colloquium on International and Comparative Law at Tulane Law School in November 1994.

purpose of negotiating amendments to the constitutive treaties, have provided additional fora for deliberately and comprehensively assessing the state of the Community and its direction.⁵ While the Community continues to fulfill its geographical "manifest destiny" through successive enlargements within the European continent, it provokes a considerable amount of interest in the effect that each particular "widening" has on the Community's overall "deepening."⁶

The Community has thus acquired a strong habit of taking its own measurements, and even its own temperature. Of course, the Community is a good candidate for such treatment since it is, after all, an enterprise and, like most enterprises, has its more or less well-defined criteria of success and failure. Unlike other polities, it seems never to have had the luxury of just surviving—that is to say, of merely meeting its population's basic needs and avoiding internal and external threats to security. It has always had, and continues to have, a positive program to accomplish. Moreover, the Community has continually had to justify itself nearly every step along the way, since its very mission implies a challenge to the political and legal autonomy of some nations with a well-developed sense of sovereignty. Finally, the Community has been subject from the start to intense scrutiny by the well-established academic communities—legal, economic, and political—within each of the Member States.

My aim is neither to recount the results of the European Community's self-examinations over the last forty years, nor make a parallel inquiry into the United States. These forty years have brought changes not only in the Community and the United States, viewed separately, but also in the common understanding of the Community within the United States, and vice versa. This Article addresses the question of changing U.S. perspectives on EC law, with particular focus given to nontransactional developments. It is curious (though, for the reasons I suggested above, perhaps not surprising) that we know a great deal about the European Community's changing legal and political self assessments over time, but rather little about how the U.S. legal conception of the Community has itself changed during that period. In other words, we probably understand the reception of European law in the European legal community better than we understand its reception in our own.

The altered reception of EC law in the United States is actually a question to which I have recently paid considerable attention. It is not, of course, very surprising that one who is devoted to understanding American conceptions of EC law would find the changing American perspective on EC law to be of interest. However, during my recent stay at the Legal Service of the European Commission, I found myself continually testing the prevailing U.S. conceptions of EC law. Whichever meeting I attended or whatever conversation I had, the dominant U.S. perspectives on EC law were always poignant.

In these remarks, I envisage the notion of the American reception of European Community law in the most common "telecommunications" sense of the term. I seek to discuss not so much the "picture" or "image" of EC law received in the United States as the "wavelengths" on which that picture or image is received. I simply ask whether the *nature* of the interest in the European Community within the American legal community has changed significantly over the last forty years and, if so, how and why?

The aspect of EC law that seemed to hold the greatest interest for Americans throughout the 1960s, 1970s, and into the 1980s, was very largely a transactional one.⁷ By the European Community's transactional aspect, I mean the impact of EC law on the shape and conduct of discrete legal transactions. Those transactions include, first and foremost, the private business

dealings of U.S. enterprises with European enterprises or otherwise those affecting the European market. Transactions also include the processes by which private law claims arising out of such business dealings are resolved legally. Even the handling of state-to-state international trade disputes relative to those dealings may be considered a transactional event. It is no exaggeration to suggest that American scholars of EC law were highly absorbed in the early years in the transactional impact of that law in all these senses. Their attention was drawn, significantly enough, to the competition law of the Common Market,⁸ to the Brussels Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Foreign Judgments,⁹ and to direct bilateral trade relations between the United States and the European Community,¹⁰ to name only a few of the more salient subjects of interest.

Of course, matters were never quite that simple. Competition law, transnational litigation, and international trade were at no time the only EC law areas of interest to the U.S. academic community. Eric Stein, the most eminent U.S. scholar of EC law in those years, consistently displayed a broader appreciation of Community law than the listing of those fields would suggest.¹¹ The transactional perspective on EC law has not been left behind since. United States and world economists alike would be rightly dismayed at any suggestion that the 1990s represent a post-transactional world. However, if the needs for counseling in international transactions may have defined the interest of American jurists in EC law, it would be difficult to maintain that view today.

What features are now competing with European Community law's transactional aspects for the attention of the American audience? In other words, in what respects has EC law come to assume a nontransactional significance for us? I suggest that recently Community law has: (1) fostered a remarkable renewal of interest in the problems of American federalism, (2) provided an unparalleled frame of reference for evaluating U.S. law reform proposals more generally, and (3) introduced unprecedented opportunities for U.S. public authorities to engage in bilateral regulatory cooperation with overseas counterparts. My purpose in this Article is to trace briefly each of these nontransactional developments in the U.S.-EC legal relationship.

Federalism: European and American

Questions of federalism, though never absent from the American constitutional scene, have enjoyed a special prominence in the United States in very recent times, and seem unlikely to lose that prominence in the near future. Even before the rise of the so-called "new Republican majority" in Congress,¹² the U.S. Supreme Court had evidenced its intention to take federalism more seriously than it had become accustomed to taking it in recent decades. No decision better exemplifies the Court's current concern with federalism than its ruling in the case of *New York v. United States*.¹³ In that case, the Court suggested that principles of federalism captured in the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and even more basic notions of representative democracy, prohibit Congress from enacting legislation that compels the states to enact legislation over their objection, or from otherwise "commandeering" state resources.¹⁴ The Court's ruling followed, and partly relied upon, a body of academic writing and public advocacy in favor of curbing Congress' and the federal agencies' right to dictate state and local government policy.¹⁵ The Court's more recent ruling in the constitutional challenge to the Federal Gun-Free School Zone Act as in excess of the limits of federal prescriptive jurisdiction under the Interstate Commerce Clause¹⁶ further limits Congress' power to legislate in areas or in ways traditionally reserved to the

states.¹⁷

Various legislative and constitutional initiatives in the current U.S. Congress show that Congress is not waiting for the courts to tell it how far it may go in shaping the agendas of state and local governments. Whether it is the constitutional requirement of a balanced federal budget, or legislative limits on the issuance to the States of unfunded federal mandates, or a more general requirement of strict cost-benefit analyses in support of federal regulations, each of these initiatives aims at lowering the federal government's involvement in the shaping of public policy with a commensurate empowering of the states and their localities.¹⁸

I am not suggesting, of course, that the revival of U.S. judicial or political interest in federalism issues is in any substantial sense traceable to EC influence. Still, the European Community presents the U.S. judiciary and U.S. political institutions with their first real opportunity to examine the operations of federalism in an overseas setting that is both of comparable scale and complexity to the United States and shares with it the same basic political, economic, and cultural values. We know that at least some of our Supreme Court Justices are aware of, and quite interested in, the contemporary European federal experience.¹⁹ However imperfect the U.S.-EC comparison, it is significant for those now thinking seriously about federalism in the United States that the European Community has been facing these problems very directly and deliberately for well over a decade. With the 1996 IGC now underway,²⁰ and with several more of these conferences scheduled, the Europeans are unlikely to lose their focus on federalism anytime soon.

The European Community as a Legal Frame of Reference

The emergence of an EC frame of reference is scarcely limited to federalism issues; it extends to other institutional issues and fully to noninstitutional issues as well. U.S. policymakers have traditionally gone about their business with a marked indifference to the policies of other legal systems concerning the same or similar problems. They still exhibit such indifference more than they should. But the same broad comparability that makes the European Community instructive to us on federalism issues may also make it instructive on virtually any other aspect of governance, including the law. I suspect that the European Community may be in the process of becoming a generalized frame of reference for U.S. policymakers (though by no means the only one), just as the United States has been for so long the measure (or, at least, a measure) for other countries. If this is the case, it would represent a significant change in U.S. legislative and regulatory attitude, and in my judgment a healthy one. Whatever one's opinion of this development, it could not realistically have occurred until the European Community had acquired its present profile as a large and complex regulatory environment having political, economic, and cultural characteristics clearly recognizable to us in the United States.

Although the emergence of a EC frame of reference may be new and important, it need not exclude the development of other more or less bilateral—or even multilateral—frames of reference. Moreover, within the U.S.-EC frame of reference, references properly run in two directions. I shall once more take federalism as my initial example, but the point is a decidedly more general one. Those who have been following European Court of Justice (ECJ) case law on Article 30, concerning the elimination of nontariff barriers to the free movement of goods,²¹ know that that ECJ has been in search of a new framework for dealing with these issues. More particularly, it has been in search of a principled basis on which to restrict an expansive and rather dogmatic jurisprudence on the subject. However, the ECJ's most notable

recent effort in that direction, the judgment in the case of *Keck and Mithouard*,²² has itself been subject to severe criticism as illogical and even simplistic.²³ I have found that at least some EC officials, in Brussels and Luxembourg alike, believe that U.S. Supreme Court decisions may be instructive in this regard. Though far from unproblematic, the prevailing Supreme Court case law on the "dormant" interstate commerce clause has taken the ECJ down quite different, and in some ways more promising, avenues of analysis. There appears to be at least some European interest in the idea, originating in the Supreme Court's "dormant" commerce clause case law, that the clause has no application at all in the absence of an actual and demonstrable burden on interstate commerce.²⁴

The EC frame of reference applies to institutional issues extending well beyond federalism as such. The 1996 IGC is dealing with the whole next generation of treaty amendments required for the European Community's continued functioning into the next century and, as noted,²⁵ this is unlikely to be the last such conference. The Commission determined, in preparation for the heavy institutional agenda facing the IGC, to assemble a committee of foreign experts to advise it on those issues and Americans are likely to be among them. The Commission's position seems to be that the experts' experiences in foreign countries may be useful to it. One example of such an issue is the establishment within the European Community of independent agencies that would function with greater or lesser independence from the Commission and be able to capture the benefits of greater expertise and efficiency.²⁶ There is good reason to suppose that the IGC will benefit from the American experience with independent regulatory agencies, and with the various instruments that the Executive Branch has devised over time to solve the problems of coherence and coordination that such fragmentation of power almost invariably raises.

Institutional questions, however, do not even begin to exhaust the field over which the United States and the European Community have become mutual frames of legal and policy reference. It was virtually inconceivable that the European Community would develop and adopt a directive on insider trading²⁷ without taking a long and careful look at U.S. law and practice in that sphere. Conversely, the recently revived initiative to enact uniform products liability legislation in the United States is unlikely to proceed in ignorance of the 1985 EC directive harmonizing the Member States' legislation on products liability.²⁸ Countless other examples exist. They all suggest that the United States and the European Community are actually in a position to carry out the largest and most ambitious exercise in law reform by the comparative method that the world has ever seen, if they choose to do so.

International Regulatory Cooperation

From this conclusion, it is a relatively small step to envisage a veritable program of international regulatory cooperation between the United States and the European Community. By "international regulatory cooperation," I mean the process by which U.S. federal agencies and the European Commission directorates-general conduct their respective regulatory activities through various forms of collaboration with the other.²⁹ In a growing number of fields—aviation, food and drug, and telecommunications, for example—departments or agencies of the U.S. government are in fact engaging in collaborative regulatory activities with their EC counterparts.³⁰ Such initiatives may be prompted by a variety of considerations. Regulators observe that they face similar problems and stand to benefit from sharing information, research and experience in addressing them.

Moreover, by making their regulatory standards fairly common, national officials place themselves in a position to take mutual advantage of each other's enforcement activities and resources.³¹ Finally, private industry ordinarily prefers to operate in a reasonably uniform regulatory environment of the sort that international regulatory cooperation may be capable of producing; it may find as a result that the overall cost of conducting multinational business is lowered.

On the other hand, intensive regulatory collaboration raises difficult political, legal, and administrative problems. Assuming that it goes beyond the mere exchange of views or of documentary material, collaboration can considerably complicate the usual regulatory process. It may introduce criteria that are foreign to the usual domestic administration. Collaboration may also complicate regulation procedurally, for example, by reducing the degree of transparency or the forms of public participation that are possible. When two or more nations collaborate in regulation, they may in any event find themselves operating more in the mode of negotiation than lawmaking. The more substantive question also arises of whether the participating nations should seek an accommodation between their standards, settle for something more in the nature of a lowest common denominator, or possibly pursue the highest possible standard of protection. Harmonization inevitably raises the issues of whether uniformity or merely convergence is required, and the extent to which local differences and local preferences can justifiably be suppressed in the interest of having common standards and procedures.³²

In sum, international regulatory cooperation, though highly promising, is problematic in that it risks distorting both prevailing policies and procedures. To that extent, it necessarily raises questions of democratic legitimacy and democratic accountability. My aim here is not to explore either the promises or the pitfalls of international regulatory cooperation,³³ but rather to underscore that the reciprocal involvement of the United States and the European Community in each other's regulatory processes has lent their legal relationship still another new and important nontransactional dimension. This evaluation is perfectly captured by the December 1995 "Transatlantic Agenda" for cooperation between the U.S. and EU.

Conclusion

My remarks thus far are meant to convey my enthusiasm over the unveiling of new horizons for the U.S.-EC legal relationship. That relationship seems poised to transcend the boundaries of transactional law, such as competition, trade and transnational litigation law, which have very largely defined U.S. interest in EC law and legal developments. But even if I have correctly identified and characterized the elements of change, I may be mistaken in applauding them. Let me raise, in a final series of remarks, what seem to me to be the most salient objections to my characterization and evaluation of the trends.

First, the very distinction between the transactional and the nontransactional may be called into question. At the very least, this distinction calls to mind a more conventional, and often discredited, distinction between private and public law.³⁴ Arguably, what I have shown is merely that the public law side of the U.S.-EC legal relationship has grown in importance along with the public side of the law generally, to the relative detriment of traditional private law. In each of the scenarios that I described above, government regulators essentially occupy center stage, whether borrowing from the other side in the reshaping of their law or engaging in direct regulatory coordination in pursuit of a more common regulatory environment. Some might criticize my apparent preoccupation with these aspects of the modern

regulatory state and my apparent neglect of the EC law subjects that bear most directly on private commercial behavior: corporate, tax, and contract law, as well as more specialized business law topics. This objection, however, suffers from the same flaw that has come to discredit the sharp distinction between public and private law. Even those legal regimes that we most closely associate with private economic activity, such as corporate, tax, and contract law, form part of the overall regulatory environment. Conversely, business is governed as fully by enactments of the regulatory state as by traditional private law sources.

Second, the comparative and collaborative activities that I have identified proceed on the premise that the United States and European Community are not profoundly different as legal environments. But in fact they do represent important differences. For example, the United States is a two-centuries old federation whose constituent units had relatively little experience in self-government prior to forming a union. It is characterized by an exceedingly high level of mobility. It occupies a culturally and linguistically unified landscape. By contrast, the European Community has had to contend with Member States that have had long and successful experiences with political independence, that retain strong cultural and linguistic particularities, and whose populations are correspondingly less mobile. As the European Community expands eastward, its relative heterogeneity in these and other respects may only become more pronounced.

Perhaps because of its well-defined territorial distinctions, the EC has thus far behaved in accordance with the view that geographical criteria count heaviest in determining the structure and organization of political power. Overall political trends in the United States, well illustrated in the outcome of the fall 1994 congressional elections, suggest that the salient political lines in the United States are not geographic but rather socio-economic ones. In the very long term, the European Community will probably develop political lines that are as fully socio-economic as they are territorial. Yet, until it does, policy comparisons with the United States will be dangerous.

Finally, even if the European Community provides an apt frame of reference for U.S. law, as well as a suitable partner in regulatory cooperation, the further question remains whether it is in itself a sufficient one. The twenty-first century will be one in which other regional groupings present themselves for consideration more forcefully than ever in these transactional respects. Those groupings will do so differently, depending on the issues at hand and the changes taking place within the groupings themselves. The United States is, at the same time, situating itself within an altered North American regional environment. This fact cannot help but affect the continued suitability of a EC legal frame of reference for the United States and challenge the European Community's privileged position in U.S. regulatory cooperation.

Because the European Community's preeminence in these respects will be subject to competition and other stresses in the period ahead is not, however, a reason to minimize the changes in the U.S. conception of EC law that I have described. It has been one thing to consult European law (or indeed any foreign law) for purposes of designing, executing, and "mopping up" after international transactions. It is quite another thing to enlist that law in the analytical and critical challenges facing the U.S. legal system more generally. The current U.S. perspective on EC law has already made that transition.

1 Article G(1) of the TREATY ON EUROPEAN UNION, Feb. 7, 1992 [hereinafter MAASTRICHT TREATY] replaces the term "European Economic Community" with the term "European Community" throughout the TREATY ESTABLISHING THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY Mar. 25, 1957 [hereinafter EC TREATY]. The European Community now represents one of the pillars of the European Union; the latter is described in Article A of the MAASTRICHT TREATY as "founded on the European Communities, supplemented by the policies and forms of cooperation established by this Treaty." *Id.* art. A.

2. Art. 158 of the EC Treaty, *supra* note 1, as amended by the MAASTRICHT TREATY *supra* note 1, art. 11, provides that the Commission shall have a five-year term. The term of the present Commission began in January 1995.

3 Art. 2 of the SINGLE EUROPEAN ACT, effective July 1, 1987, provides that the European Council "shall bring together the heads of State or of Government of the Member States and the President of the Commission of the European Communities," and "shall meet at least twice a year."

4. For a brief discussion, see GEORGE A. BERMAN, ET AL., CASES AND MATERIALS ON EUROPEAN COMMUNITY LAW 13-14 (1992).

5. The two most recent rounds of amendments to the EC TREATY, *supra* note 2, embodied in the SINGLE EUROPEAN ACT, *supra* note 3, and the MAASTRICHT TREATY, *supra* note 1, were negotiated at intergovernmental conferences [hereinafter IGCs, convened in 1985 and 1990, respectively. IGCs for these purposes were originally provided for by the EC TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. 236, and are now provided for by the MAASTRICHT TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. N. The MAASTRICHT TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. N, also specifically provides for the convening of an IGC during 1996 for purposes of further amendments to the constitutive treaties.

6. See generally John Redmond, *The Future Enlargement of the European Community*, 9 ST. LOUIS U. PUB. L. REV. 149 (1990).

7. See Roger Goebel, *US Law Contributions to European Union Studies*, ECSA NEWSLETTER, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (1995) for a useful bibliographic overview of recent U.S. legal scholarship on the European Union.

8. The principles of competition law of the European Community are set out in the EC TREATY, *supra* note 1, arts. 85 and 86, and in secondary legislation. See generally David J. Gerber *The Transformation of European Community Competition Law*, 35 HARV. INT'L L.J. 97 (1994); John Temple Lang *European Community Competition Law and Member State Action*, 10 N.W. J. INT'L L. & BUS. 114 (1989); Pierre Pescatore, *Public and Private Aspects of European Community Competition Law*, 10 FORDHAM INT'L L.J. 373 (1987); Peter D. Sutherland, *The Competition Policy of the European Community*, 30 ST. LOUIS U. L.J. 149 (1985).

9. Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Sept. 27, 1968, as amended), 1978 O.J. (L 304) 77, as contemplated by the EC TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. 220. See generally Richard G. Fentiman, *Jurisdiction, Discretion and the Brussels Convention*, 26 CORNELL INT'L L.J. 59 (1993); Christian Kohler, *Practical Experience of the Brussels Jurisdiction and Judgments Convention in the Six Original Contracting States*, 34 INT'L & COMP. L.Q. 563 (1985); Robert Rowland, *The Recognition of Judgments in the European Community*, 14 MICH. J. INT'L L. 559 (1993).

10. For a brief discussion, see BERMAN, *supra* note 4, at 952-61. See also Mark L. Jones *The GATT-MTN System and the European Community as International Frameworks for the Regulation of Economic Activity*, 8 MD. J. INT'L L. & TRADE 53 (1984); Randy E. Miller & Jessica A. Wasserman, *Trade Relations between the European Community and the United States: An Overview of Current Issues and Trade Policy Institutions*, 15 B.C. INT'L & COMP. L. REV. 393 (1992).

11. See, e.g., COURTS AND FREE MARKETS: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE (Terence Sandalow & Eric Stein, eds. 1982); Eric Stein, *Lawyers, Judges and the Making of a Transnational Constitution*, 75 AM. J. INT'L L. 1 (1981); Eric Stein, *Uniformity and Diversity in a Divided-Power System: The United States' Experience*, 61 WASH. L. REV. 1081 (1986).

12. See Helen Dewar & Kenneth J. Cooper, *COP Senators Want to Cut 100 Programs*, WASH. POST, Jan. 4, 1995, at A1; David E. Rosenbaum, *G.O.P. Facing Some Obstacles After Fast Start*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 13, 1995, at A1.

13. 505 U.S. 144 (1992).

14. *Id.* at 176.

15. For academic writings, see, e.g., Akhil Reed Amar, *Some New World Lessons for the Old World*, 58 U. CHI. L. REV. 483 (1991); Michael W. McConnell, *Federalism: Evaluating the Founders Design* 54 U. CHI. L. REV. 1484 (1987); Deborah Jones Merritt, *The Guaranty Clause and State Autonomy: Federalism for a Third Century* 88 COLUM. L. REV. 1 (1988). As to public advocacy, see, e.g., U.S. ADVISORY COMM'N ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, FEDERAL REGULATION OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: THE MIXED RECORD OF THE 1980'S (1993) (MIXED RECORD); U.S. ADVISORY COMM'N ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, REGULATORY FEDERALISM: POLICY, PROCESS, IMPACT AND REFORM (1984) (REGULATORY FEDERALISM).

16. *United States v. Lopez*, 115 S. Ct. 1624 (1995).

17. See generally MIXED RECORD, *supra* note 14; REGULATORY FEDERALISM, *supra* note 14.

18. See Kenneth J. Cooper & Helen Dewar, *We're Halfway Done; Tougher Tests for House Republican "Contract" Lie Ahead*, WASH. POST, Feb. 20, 1995, at A1; Michael K. Frisby, *Americans Polled on GOP and Contract Like Big Picture but Have Trouble with Small Print*, WALL STREET J., Mar. 9, 1995, at A20.

19. STEPHEN BREYER, BREAKING THE VICIOUS CIRCLE 70-80 (1993); STEPHEN BREYER, REGULATION AND ITS REFORM 278-79, 345, 362 (1982); Antonin Scalia, *Subsidiarity a l' Americaine: C'est a Dire Preemption*, in MAASTRICHT, SUBSIDIARITY AND ITALIAN-EC RELATIONS 4 (The Mentor Group, The Forum for U.S.-EC Legal-Economic Affairs, Venice, 1992).

20. See MAASTRICHT TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. N.

21. The EC TREATY, *supra* note 1, art. 30, forbids "[q]uantitative restrictions on imports and all measures having equivalent effect." See generally Manfred A. Daus, *The System of the Free Movement of Goods in the European Community*, 33 AM. J. COMP. L. 209 (1985); David T. Keeling, *The Free Movement of Goods in EEC Law: Basic Principles and Recent Developments in the Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities* 26 INT'L LAW. 467 (1992).

22. Judgment of November 24, 1993 in Joined Cases C-267/91 and C-268/91 (not yet officially published).

23. See A. Mattera, *De l'arret "Dassonville" à l'arret "Keck": L'obscur Clarté d'une Jurisprudence Riche en Principes Novateurs et en Contradictions* 1 REVUE DU MARCHÉ UNIQUE EUROPÉEN 117 (1994); see also Note, 1 COLUM. J. EUR. L. 120, 128 (1994-95).

24. See *Barclays Bank PLC v. Franchise Tax Bd.*, 114 S. Ct. 2268 (1994); *West Lynn Creamery, Inc. v. Healy*, 114 S. Ct. 2205 (1994); *C & A Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown*, 114 S. Ct. 1677 (1994); *Oregon Waste Systems, Inc. v. Department of Env. Quality*, 114 S. Ct. 1345 (1994); *Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. County of Kent*, 114 S. Ct. 855 (1994).

25. See MAASTRICHT TREATY *supra* note 1, art. N and accompanying text.

26. See Claus-Dieter Ehlermann, *Case for a Cartel Body: Europa*, FIN. TIMES, Mar. 7, 1995, at 14; Simon Kuper, *Drug Agency Will Draw Companies*, FIN. TIMES Jan. 25, 1995, at 8; Caroline Monnot, *Les Enjeux du Téléphone du Futur: Une Autorité Européenne?*, LE MONDE, July 14, 1994, at 16; Craig R. Whitney, *With European Union's Arrival, Fears on Economy Cast a Shadow*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 30, 1993, at 1, col. 1.

27. Council Directive 89/592/EEC of Nov. 13, 1989, coordinating regulations on insider trading, 1989 O.J. (L 334) 30. See generally Barbara Crutchfield George, Matia Kathleen Boss & Marty Haraldson, *The European Community Directive Regulating Insider Trading: Harmonizing Difficulties for the United States*, 22 ANGLO AM. L. REV. 257 (1993); Thomas Lee Hazen, *Defining Illegal Insider Trading: Lessons from the European Community Directive on Insider Trading*, 55 LAW & CONTEMP. PROBS. 231 (1992).

28. Council Directive 85/374/EEC of July 25, 1985, on the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning liability for defective products, 1985 O.J. (L 210) 29. On current U.S. products liability initiatives at the federal level, see Stephen Labaton, *G.O.P. Preparing Bill to Overhaul Negligence Law*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 19, 1995, at 1.

29. See George A. Bermann, *Regulatory Cooperation with Counterpart Agencies Abroad: The FAA Aircraft Certification Experience*, 24 LAW & POL'Y INT'L BUS. 669 (1993); ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES 1991 ANN. REP. 63 et seq.

30. *Id.* See also George A. Bermann, *Regulatory Cooperation Between the Commission and U.S. Administrative Agencies*, 9 ADM. L. J. OF AMER. UNIV. 933 (1996). On international regulatory cooperation generally, see ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD (1994).

31. George A. Bermann, *Managing Regulatory Rapprochement: Institutional and Procedural Approaches*, in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29, at 73.

32. See John Braithwaite, *Prospects for Win-Win International Rapprochement of Regulation*, in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29, at 201; Scott H. Jacobs, *Regulatory Co-operation for an Interdependent World: Issues for Government*, in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29, at 15; Giandomenico Majone, *Comparing Strategies of Regulatory Rapprochement*, in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29, at 155; James K. Martin & Alan Painter, *Seeking Mutual Gain: Strategies for Expanding Regulatory Co-operation*, in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29, at 93; Jacques Pelkmans & Jeanne-Mey Sun, *Towards a European Community Regulatory Strategy: Lessons from Learning-by-Doing* in REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD *supra* note 29, at 179.

33. See REGULATORY CO-OPERATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, *supra* note 29.

34. On this distinction, see Randy E. Barnett, *Foreward: Four Senses of the Public Law—Private Law Distinction*, 9 HARV. I.L. & PUB. POL'Y 267 (1986); Alan David Freeman & Elizabeth Mensch, *The Public-Private Distinction in American Law and Life*, 36 BUFF. L. REV. 237 (1987); Jonathan Hill, *Public Law and Private Law: More (French) Food for Thought*, 1985 PUB. L. 14 (1985); L. Harold Levinson, *The Public Law/Private Law Distinction in the Courts*, 57 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 1579 (1989); Alfred P. Rubin, *Private and Public History: Private and Public Law*, 82 ASIL PROCEEDINGS 30 (1990); Charles Sampford, *Law, Institutions and the Public/Private Divide*, 20 FED. L. REV. 185 (1992); Harry Woolf, *Public Law—Private Law: Why the Divide? A Personal View*, 1986 PUB. L. 220.

The New Transatlantic Agenda: Third Generation of U.S.-EU Political Relations

Roy H. Ginsberg

Assoc. Professor of Government and Director,
International Affairs Program, Skidmore College
Visiting Fellow in European Studies,
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Introduction

At the U.S.-EU biannual summit in Madrid on December 3, 1995, Presidents Clinton, Gonzalez (European Council President), and Santer (European Commission President) signed "The New Transatlantic Agenda" (NTA) and a "Joint Action Plan."¹

The NTA reaffirms the transatlantic security, political, and economic partnership as a "powerful force for good in the world" and outlines the broad areas of policy coordination and/or joint action to which the U.S. and EU commit themselves: promoting peace, stability, democracy, and development worldwide; responding to global challenges; expanding transatlantic and world trade and investment; and building a popular level of support for transatlantic relations.

The NTA is an attempt by U.S. and EU leaders, diplomats, and civil servants to reanchor the U.S.-European relationship and advance the practice of policy consultations under the terms of the 1990 Transatlantic Declaration (TAD) to that of policy coordination and joint action. This is done at a time when

--the EU is facing a period of uncertainty in advance of the next round of treaty revisions and eastern enlargement;

- the United States is faced with a presidential election year and a foreign policy in flux;
- the Atlantic Alliance itself is in flux following the end of the Cold War; and
- business leaders on both sides of the Atlantic are pressing for the removal of obstacles to the bilateral flow of goods, services, and capital in the post-GATT era.

Although the NTA and the TAD have failed to gain the press coverage they deserve, they represent milestones in the evolution of U.S.-EU relations. They are particularly important when compared to the paucity of the political dialogue during the Cold War.

The Generations of the U.S.-EU Political Relationship

There have been three generations in the incremental development of U.S.-EU political relations.² The current generation (NTA) picks up where the second generation (TAD), lasting from 1990 to 1995, left off. The TAD in turn followed the first generation of consultative links (1974-90), which had developed after the failed Grand Design (1962) and Year of Europe (1973) initiatives.

Through the early 1970s, U.S.-EC relations were defined in largely commercial terms. Kennedy's Grand Design challenged the EC to a political partnership before the EC was either ready or willing. Kissinger's Year of Europe, which aimed at placing the development of EPC in an Atlantic framework, was rejected for its attempted hegemony. Instead, transatlantic political cooperation evolved piecemeal in response to external stimuli.

The U.S. and EC commenced biannual high-level consultative meetings between members of the U.S. Cabinet and the Commission in 1974 (replaced in 1991 by the Presidential Summits identified below). In 1984, the two sides began biannual consultations between the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs and the EPC troika Political Directors, and in 1987 they began annual consultations between the EC Foreign Ministers (with the Commission Director-General for External relations) and the U.S. Secretary of State. Ad hoc consultations began in the 1980s at the subcabinet and working group levels. Finally, in early 1990 the two sides agreed to twice-yearly summits between the EC Council and EC Commission Presidents on the one hand, and the U.S. President on the other.

The premium during the second generation was on consultation and not coordination. The U.S. and EC sought to share information and avoid working at cross ends at the least, and to paralleling policies at the most. Joint action was not the expressed objectives of the TAD. However, as time passed, principals from both sides were pressed to show the results of their consultations and a number of coordinated and complementary foreign policy declarations and actions tied to the TAD consultative process emerged.³ The TAD did not identify two other fora for consultations that have since grown in importance: biannual meetings of working group experts in geographical and functional areas and regular links between U.S. and EU troika Ambassadors in selected third country capitals.

The NTA confirms the evolution of the TAD from a consultative framework to an emerging action-oriented one. The passage of the TAD to the NTA, and thus of the second to third generations of U.S.-EU political cooperation, no doubt reflects

the mammoth demands on both the EU and the United States to help solve global problems too big for any one actor to do alone. This transition is also prompted by the enactment of the Treaty on European Union, with its provisions for an EU Common Foreign and Security Policy and the expectations such provisions unleash, and the growth of the EU as a major actor in European and international relations.

Main Provisions of the New Transatlantic Agenda

In the NTA, the U.S. and EC agreed to cooperate, coordinate, or act jointly to promote democracy and market reforms throughout Europe and the world; support the peace plan for ex-Yugoslavia and the peace process in the Middle East; use preventive diplomacy to attack the root causes of conflict; increase bilateral and multilateral trade and investment; promote economic development, humanitarian assistance, population stabilization, and nuclear safety throughout the world; support nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction; fight international crime, terrorism, drug trafficking, illegal migration, environmental degradation, and communicable diseases; and foster deeper and broader commercial, social, cultural, scientific, and educational ties across the Atlantic.

To operationalize the NTA, the Action Plan commits the two sides to go beyond the practice of cooperation to that of coordination and joint action and to establish new consultative mechanisms to achieve this where necessary. The two sides have agreed, among other initiatives, to:

- commence annual high-level consultations to reinforce cooperation on consolidating market economy and democratic transitions in Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, Ukraine, and the newly independent countries;

- create a high-level consultative group to coordinate and act jointly in development and humanitarian assistance activities around the world; cooperate in improving the effectiveness of international humanitarian relief agencies; improve U.S.-EC operational information-sharing on humanitarian assistance; pursue assistance cooperation in beneficiary countries through intensified contacts between U.S. missions and Commission delegations; and improve coordination on food assistance;

- jointly assess, identify, and plan for support of African-led regional initiatives to deal with the regional dimensions of the conflicts in Rwanda and Burundi;

- reinforce joint efforts to further democratic reforms and human rights in Burma and Cambodia;

- support the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization as a means to express resolve to prevent nuclear proliferation;

- jointly support and contribute to ongoing training programs and institutions for crime-fighting officials in Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, Ukraine, and other states;

- coordinate negotiating positions on major global environmental issues and undertake coordinated initiatives to disseminate environmental technologies and to reduce the public health risks hard hazardous materials;

- coordinate the program of action of the International Conference on Population and Development;

- coordinate positions in the negotiations in the International Convention on Radioactive Residues;

--establish a U.S.-EU task force to develop and implement an effective global early warning system and response network for communicable diseases;

--establish an information exchange mechanism to facilitate U.S.-EU cooperation in law enforcement and criminal justice; provide technical assistance to other nations; foster exchange of law enforcement and criminal justice expertise; jointly prepare studies and analyses of emerging trends in international criminal activity; jointly prepare reports to include recommended courses of action; and coordinate alternative development programs to counter drug production; and

--create a "New Transatlantic Marketplace" by progressively reducing or eliminating barriers that hinder the flow of goods, services, and capital; undertake studies on ways to reduce or eliminate tariff barriers and non-tariff barriers that arise from divergent regulatory processes and non-tariff barriers; conclude accords on mutual recognition of certification and testing procedures for certain sectors and on customs cooperation and mutual assistance; cooperate to develop and implement regulations on vehicle safety requirements and on measures to reduce air and noise emissions; encourage collaboration in testing and certification procedures by promoting greater compatibility of standards and health- and safety-related measures through joint projects; conclude an accord to establish a framework for determining equivalence of veterinary standards for live animals and animal products; seek to conclude by the end of 1996 a customs cooperation and mutual assistance accord; and negotiate a new, comprehensive science and technology cooperation accord by 1997.

The scope of the Joint Action Plan is impressive. It identifies over a hundred functional areas of U.S.-EU coordination and joint action. Despite the scope of the Joint Action Plan, the significance of the NTA is uncertain. Analysts of the NTA are of two minds: those who are sanguine suggest that the accord represents an important step forward, while those less sanguine suggest there is little new here and the most difficult issues in bilateral relations are not addressed.

Alternative Views of the New Transatlantic Agenda

It is clearly too early to assess the impact of the NTA on bilateral relations.⁴ The proof of the NTA will be how far the two sides go in accomplishing the tasks they have set out for themselves. Readers will want to measure the early functioning of the NTA by what, if any, coordinated or joint actions are reached in time for announcement at the U.S.-EU Summit this summer. Indeed, one of the goals of the NTA is to better prepare for and achieve more tangible outcomes from the twice-yearly U.S.-EU Presidential Summits.

A sanguine perspective suggests that the NTA signifies a pragmatic recognition by both sides that they can do more together than apart in solving global problems and that they are already translating the process of consultations into acts of cooperation. The Action Plan identifies areas of coordination and joint action where the EU already has competence and expertise (e.g., humanitarian aid), and where it has potential competence (police cooperation) and thus avoids raising expectations. The concept of a Transatlantic Marketplace is preferable to a Free Trade Area which would have been too ambitious and politically costly to member governments in certain sensitive sectors.

The NTA is thus another step in the evolution of bilateral

relations. The two sides were not ready for a bilateral treaty but were prepared to witness the graduation of their consultative relationship to a more action-oriented one. Whether or not this third generation of the bilateral relationship produces a fourth one, which some suggest would be a bilateral treaty, remains to be seen, but the growth of political cooperation over the past decade has occurred--conventional wisdom to the contrary.

U.S. principals in the State Department, National Security Council, and elsewhere in the Federal Government working on the implementation of the NTA in the run up to the next U.S.-EU summit have never been more energized to put flesh on the promises to coordinate policy. The pressure to produce tangible results of bilateral consultations is coming from the highest levels of the Clinton Administration.

A pessimistic view suggests that the NTA and Action Plan are the work of bureaucrats and diplomats seeking to extend their influence when the real problems in transatlantic relations are dealt with either minimally or not at all. For instance, provisions in the Action Plan to raise the level of popular support for transatlantic initiatives are not convincing; there are no concrete provisions for cooperation in monetary affairs, which is a very large and important facet of bilateral trade and investment relations; and there are no concrete provisions for cooperation in security affairs on which the future of the Atlantic Alliance may depend. Although monetary and security issues have traditionally fallen outside the competence of U.S.-EU relations, they are central to the next generation of those relations.

The largest threat to the future of U.S.-European relations is the weakening of NATO. The future of the U.S. commitment to NATO surely depends on the strengthening of the European pillar of NATO through the Western European Union (WEU). WEU's ability to act as the defense arm of the EU, as indicated in the Treaty on European Union, depends on the implementation of the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTFs) by which the WEU could use NATO assets without U.S. personnel to pursue certain security operations in Europe. Despite the myriad of reasons behind the very slow progress in developing the NATO-WEU modalities for CJTFs, the NTA's overall impact is diminished for not having included some acknowledgment of support for the strengthening of the European pillar of NATO, and thus of the EU's defense identity and CFSP.

The pessimists might argue that the NTA merely reflects what is already happening and thus has only a symbolic impact. The document is minimalist; it reflects the least common denominator. The accord is designed more to reassure the EU of U.S. support rather than to capture any new major change or improvement in the transatlantic relationship. Functional cooperation, however important, will not recapture the imagination of publics on either side of the Atlantic and thus will not raise the popular level of support needed to breathe new life into the Atlantic Alliance. Lastly, the pessimists argue that the Transatlantic Marketplace concept, while preferable to a free trade area, will nonetheless have adverse effects on certain sectors and locales on both sides of the Atlantic, creating new political problems that could sour bilateral ties.

In sum, an approach to the NTA that shies away from optimistic and pessimistic scenarios is in order. A middle ground approach suggests that despite what the NTA does not address, it does raise expectations on both sides of the Atlantic that their consultative relationship has to bear fruit for the three presidents at the U.S.-EU summits to display to their publics every six months. The future of U.S.-EU political relations and thus of the NTA hinges to some large degree on how the EU itself evolves

after the Turin Intergovernmental Conference and enlargement. The purpose of the NTA is to reanchor the transatlantic relationship as the EU copes with the uncertainties of the future. It was never designed to take the form of a bilateral treaty that would address all facets of relations. If a fourth generation of U.S.-EU political relations, which could take the form of a bilateral treaty, is to evolve in the future, the two sides will have to complete the tasks they have set out for themselves at Madrid last December.

Notes

1. United States Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, The New Transatlantic Agenda: Joint U.S.-European Union Action Plan (Washington: United States Department of State, 1995)

2. The evolution of the U.S.-EU relationship is analyzed in Kevin Featherstone and Roy H. Ginsberg, The United States and the European Union in the 1990s: Partners in Transition (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996)

3. Thirty-one examples of coordinated or complementary U.S.-EC/EU foreign policy actions or declarations between 1990-1993 were linked to the TAD consultative process by Frellesen and Ginsberg in Thomas Frellesen and Roy H. Ginsberg, EU-U.S. Foreign Policy Cooperation in the 1990s: Elements of Partnership (Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 1994).

4. Analysis of the NTA to date tends to focus on the Transatlantic Marketplace concept. See Wolfgang H. Reinicke, Deepening the Atlantic: Toward a New Transatlantic Marketplace? (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1996) and Bruce Stokes, ed., Open for Business: Creating a Transatlantic Marketplace (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1996).

Minority Scholars in European Studies

James S. Jackson
Daniel Katz Distinguished
University Professor of Psychology
University of Michigan

Kelly C. Conlan
Columbia University

Introduction*

Since 1989 the field of European Studies has greatly expanded its horizons. The opening of Eastern Europe since the collapse of communist governments has resulted in greater cooperation between East and West. Migration, immigration, inter-ethnic conflict, economic and political instability, as well as discussions of possible broad economic and political integration, have given scholars of European Studies a wide variety of re-emergent, transformed, and new areas to investigate.

In a report released by the Social Science Research Council in 1994¹, Sydney Tarrow indicated that the number of American students pursuing higher education in European Studies has greatly increased since 1989 and continues to grow. More American universities are opening centers dedicated to the study

of Eastern and Western Europe. The SSRC European Studies Report begins by explaining that European Studies has changed radically since 1989. The relationship between Eastern and Western Europe has become much more important and developments in one region are now more important and connected to developments in the other.

The number of European Studies majors and minors in both M.A. and Ph.D. programs has increased since 1989. The SSRC report, however, lists several weaknesses with the educational system of European Studies: 1) Americans know less about Europe than Europeans know about America; 2) European Studies started with scholars who received their training abroad--this is no longer the case; 3) American schools are giving much less attention to Europe in terms of geography, history, and languages; 4) the growing emphasis on theory and methods has sometimes been at the expense of substantive knowledge and conversely; 5) few area studies programs mesh effectively with comparative or international studies resulting in programs that sacrifice theory and methods. A constant general problem has been a lack of adequate funding. While the interest in Europe (especially Eastern Europe) has increased, real funding has declined. This is the result of shrinking government and private funds, coupled with a growth in the number of scholars in the area. Thus, there is increased competition for fewer dollars.

Given these concerns, and with all of these changes taking place in the field, one issue remains constant: participation by scholars of color is very rare and does not seem to be improving. The Program for Research on Black Americans at the University of Michigan, under the auspices of the European Community Studies Association, with funding by the Ford Foundation, recently completed a study on minority participation in European Studies. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the numbers and distribution of ethnic minority scholars of color working in the area of European Studies. We also investigated what is presently being done to encourage minority participation.

The study has two main conclusions. First, there are woefully few scholars of color working in European Studies. Second, we found little organized efforts to actively encourage scholars or graduate students of color to enter the European Studies area.

Study Methodology and Approach

We begin with a brief summary of our methodology and results. The first step of the project was to define the terms "minority scholar" and "European Studies". The former was defined using Federal Census Bureau and Office of Management and Budget guidelines--African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanic Americans were all included. European Studies was defined as the scholarly or empirical study of historical and contemporary events and processes in Eastern or Western Europe. This broad definition resulted from the increasing amount of work being done that compares East and West and the growing inter-relationship between the two regions. The wide breadth of disciplines encompassed in the field made it necessary to examine a variety of specialties. As a result, we cast a wide net for minority scholars specializing in Psychology, Sociology, History, Political Science, Literature, Anthropology, Public Policy, and, in some cases, the physical sciences, with a focus on Europe.

Obtaining information about these scholars proved to be quite challenging. We attempted to gain statistical data about minority scholars in the field, but with the same result in every case: no

*This article is a condensed version of a larger Report which contains additional information on the findings and methodology of the authors. Those interested in receiving the full Report should contact the ECSA Administrative Office.

agency, public or private, has compiled the data. Government institutions contacted included the Department of Education, Department of State, and various educational institutions. Several professional organizations, such as the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Association, the American Historical Association, and the National Congress of Black Faculty, were also contacted without great success.

The majority of institutions could provide little data other than the number of minority members in the organization. Some could not even provide that. The Department of Education and the National Research Council (NRC) (both use the same NRC data) seem to have the most comprehensive data.² By surveying scholars completing doctoral training the NRC provides information about the number of scholars in European Studies. Detailed information about the interests of minority scholars who recently received doctoral degrees is also provided. However, no intersection is made between the two sets of data. More clearly there is no racial and ethnic background information about the scholars listed as European Studies specialists. Conversely, the data on minority scholars lists European Studies as part of a comprehensive area studies field which also includes Asian, African, Latin American, Caribbean, and Russian studies.

In sum, we contacted a long list of local, grant-giving organizations, government agencies, universities, professional organizations, and research centers and obtained the same dismal results from each source. We were able to obtain statistics about minority participation in area studies, but the category includes African, Asian, and Latin American studies as well as European Studies. All the information available about the levels of participation in European Studies activities did not contain the relevant information about racial or ethnic background. Finding both racial background and participation in European Studies proved to be extremely difficult. Through the assistance of David Featherman, who was then at the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), we obtained about seven additional names for the list of scholars.

To overcome these disappointing results at the organizational and institutional level, a "snowball" technique was employed to better understand the role currently being played by scholars of color in European Studies. Basically, anyone who was believed to know a minority scholar in European Studies was contacted by mail and phone. Research scientists, academicians, directors of grant institutions, and members of professional organizations were all contacted. A partial listing of the organizations and individuals contacted is available in the complete text of this study. Although the technique cannot produce total accuracy, we did meet with limited success. Twenty scholars of various ethnic backgrounds meeting our criteria, with varying interests in European Studies, were identified. This admittedly small number actually exceeded our original estimate of 10-15 scholars. Once identified, each scholar was sent a brief questionnaire designed to elicit information about his or her interests in European Studies and professional background.

Examples of European Work by Ethnic Minority Scholars

A sampling of some of the work of minority scholars reveals a broad array of topics and interest areas. For example, Janet Hart, a member of the Anthropology Department at Michigan, recently completed work on a book that examines the role of narrative in the Greek Resistance. The main idea is that the occupation of 1941-1944 allowed the Greeks an opportunity to reshape their societal narratives, particularly the role of women. The work also

provides an interesting history of the Balkans.

Kathie Stromile Golden, a political scientist, examines changes in media coverage in various East European states. She is generally interested in cross-national perceptions of inter-ethnic group conflict in former Yugoslavia, Russia and Hungary. Orlando Patterson, a sociologist, has for many years examined theoretical approaches to ethnicity -- what it is, what defines, shapes, and effects ethnicity, and how ethnicity affects the development of nation states and the intellectual roots of Western ethnicity. Similarly, Winston James works on the nature of ethnic identity of Caribbean peoples in Britain, as well as the similarities and differences of their descendants. He investigates the colonization of the Caribbean (causes and consequences) and the relationship between migration and racism and the formation of ethnic identity.

In a related vein, Lenneal Henderson, a political scientist, studies racial minorities in European cities and the dynamics of incorporating former Warsaw Pact countries in the European Union. Daria Kirby, an organizational psychologist, works on the perceptions and experiences of racial discrimination among Caribbean individuals in Britain. Elaine Jones, a developmental psychologist, is investigating moral and liking judgements among black and white children in the United States and England. Finally, F. M. Baker, a psychiatrist, is working on the nature and distribution of depressive symptoms in the United States and the Netherlands.

Questionnaire Findings

We do not believe that our list of twenty scholars is exhaustive though it was developed through a wide array of organizations and personal contacts. At each stage of identifying individuals, we asked for additional names of scholars of whom they may be aware. Thus, the list represents both those identified by organizational memberships as well as individuals reported by other scholars of color located during the process. While the list is assuredly not complete, we do feel that we have captured a broad spectrum of relevant individuals.³

Each of the individuals was sent a questionnaire requesting information about their education and training, institutional background, interest in European Studies and personal characteristics. Sixty percent of the questionnaires were returned and were fairly representative of the twenty individuals. Approximately 84% were African American, the remainder being Hispanic. Approximately 60% were females and the median age was late forties to early fifties. The majority were in the empirical social sciences of Political Science, Sociology and Psychology, with a sprinkling in Psychiatry and Policy Analysis. All felt that they had had in graduate school and continue to have adequate mentoring. The vast majority (60%) indicated having been involved in European Studies for more than 10 years. Similarly, a large number (75%) reported studying Western Europe, 17% Eastern Europe, and the remainder indicated studying both Western and Eastern Europe.

About two-thirds of the scholars returning questionnaires indicated that their interests had shifted during their careers. About half indicated being actively involved in an ongoing project. Half of the respondents also indicated attempts to obtain funding for their projects, and half of those indicated encountering difficulties. Females tended to be younger than males; this perhaps accounts for why 70% of females were actively involved in seeking funding while only 20% of males reported active involvement. On the other hand, 42% of females reported no

European relevant professional organization memberships, while all of the men reported such involvements.

Overall, two-thirds of the respondents indicated belonging to relevant professional organizations and nearly 100% gave permission to have their names and addresses released to professional organizations. It is somewhat disturbing to note that only about 40% indicated having knowledge of graduate students of color who are pursuing European Studies.

Organized Efforts to Assist Scholars of Color

Another key element of the project was to explore current methods of encouraging scholars of color to participate in European Studies. Several organizations who primarily support projects focused on Europe were questioned about funding specifically made available for minority applicants. In almost every instance, no specific funds were reserved specifically for minority scholars. Similarly, the organizations that target grant funds for racial and ethnic minorities do not provide funds specifically for European Studies.

We did find general fellowships in political science, economics, and other disciplines that can be used to study Europe, but nothing specifically for that purpose. We investigated programs and organizations that might be likely to assist scholars of color. In terms of scholarships, fellowships, and other funds intended for minority scholars, we found almost none. IREX, Carnegie, and a few other places do not give any special consideration to minorities who apply, but there are some foundations that "encourage the applications of minority and female scholars". We spoke with several grant-giving agencies (Ford Foundation, IREX, United States Institute of Peace, the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, etc.) and none offer funding specifically for scholars of color. Some like the Berlin Program encourage minorities and women to apply. There are several scholarships and fellowships specifically for minority students and scholars to study in such disciplines as political science, psychology, and sociology, but none specifically for European Studies. By contrast, there are funds allocated for students of color wanting to study, for example, Latin American, Caribbean, and African politics.

Some hope in this area is given by the recent training programs developed by the Fogarty Institute of the National Institutes of Health.⁴ This four year old program is geared specifically for under-represented minorities in biomedical and behavioral research and provides support for undergraduate and graduate students and faculty participation.

Summary and Conclusions

During 1995-96 we spent considerable time and effort attempting to gain information on the numbers and distribution of scholars of color working in European Studies. A wide variety of professional government, university and private organizations were contacted in an effort to learn of previously compiled lists or knowledge of individuals within these organizations. Supporting the impressions of the ECSA Executive Committee, we found very few individuals who met our definition.

Overall, this project has revealed a startling lack of information about the minority status of scholars working in Europe Studies. Extensive investigations of a wide variety of government, private and university organizations revealed few such scholars. Notably, when questioned themselves and combined with our organization contacts, only 20 scholars could

be clearly identified.

We began this project out of two broad concerns. The first related to issues of social justice and ascertaining whether we could have confidence that minority scholars are having equal access to European Studies programs and resources needed to work there. The second grew out of a set of scientific and intellectual concerns with guaranteeing a broad diversity of orientations and interest in European Studies that, we believe, are furthered by including scholars of color in the pool of researchers and investigators who work on this part of the world.

Unfortunately, whether one emphasizes the first or second perspective, the numbers of scholars working in Europe is woefully small. We did not ascertain from our questionnaire responses that these scholars of color viewed discrimination or unequal opportunities as problems in their own careers. Although a few indicated having some difficulties in securing support, we are not sure that the small proportions would not be equally present among non-minority scholars.

Somewhat more worrisome is a recent study by Margaret Simms and Winston J. Allen that investigated the participation of minorities in international affairs for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.⁵ Their study included 49 faculty and staff at 14 universities and colleges and personnel officers at 10 international affairs organizations and agencies. They did find that interest in international affairs is increasing among minority institutions and minority students. The historical nature of this involvement and the recent increased interest among faculty and students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities were also documented in a 1995 report by Joan Morgan.⁶

However, Simms and Allen also find several potential barriers to minority participation in international affairs. These barriers include: 1) financial constraints and inadequate financial support; 2) lack of opportunities for pre-college overseas travel; 3) negative expectations of minority families that often view international affairs careers as "non-traditional" when compared with careers in medicine, law, engineering or teaching; 4) a lack of role models and potential mentors in international affairs; 5) lack of relevant work experience and prior language training; 6) lack of access to networks that facilitate opportunities and jobs and the pigeon-holing of minorities into specific geographical regions or cultural settings dependent upon their ethnic origins. This latter potential barrier is particularly worrisome, since it implies that students and scholars of color may be actively discouraged from studying Europe and instead channeled (both intellectually and materially) to focus on Africa, the Caribbean, South America and Asia.

The growth in Europe of a set of important issues related to immigration and movements toward the development of an African-European identity suggest growing fertile ground for research and scholarship by scientists and academicians of color. We suspect that the numbers of European scholars of color are also very small. Our research suggests that the first step may well need to be a concerted effort on the part of private organizations, public government and universities to address the small numbers of ethnic minority scholars studying to work in Europe. Increased fellowship funds directed toward areas that may have appeal for ethnic minority graduate students and scholars, better data collection efforts on the status and circumstances of ethnic minority scholars, encouragement from private funding agencies, like the Mellon, Ford, and Macarthur Foundations, and the Carnegie Corporation, may go a long way in redressing this possible barrier.

It is clear from the list we generated that there are a small

number of well known and accomplished scholars of color working on European issues. Some indications portend that a slightly greater pool than what exists now may be present in the future. The previously described series of reports by Margaret Simms and her colleagues at the Joint Center for Political Studies indicate increasing numbers of undergraduate and graduate students entering training in international affairs. Interventions instituted now may make changes that will permit a more hopeful and encouraging report to be written ten years in the future. It is our opinion that concerted effort needs to be taken by the ECSA and relevant funding agencies to develop effective interdisciplinary scholarly and research training programs focused on European Studies. While the growth in applied international affairs programs are encouraging, there is a need to develop greater capacity among individuals of color to conceive of, plan and conduct systematic historical and contemporary empirical studies of Europe and its peoples.

Greater outreach efforts to the scholars identified and their graduate students for membership and participation in ECSA and other European Studies organizations would be a good first step. The development of intellectual and material inducements in the form of competitive grants for travel and research, would be another. Finally, we believe that there needs to be greater emphasis placed upon the creation of university based training programs that have as their explicit purpose the expansion of the inclusion of students and scholars of color, such as the the Fogarty International Institute program for minority scholars.

These proposed steps will not be without costs. We believe that for both intellectual and social justice reasons the effort should be made. The ECSA could play a critical role as both a voice for these efforts as well as a broker of the programs that could be developed. In partnership with universities and institutions that have the existing infrastructure and interest it is possible that effective programs could be developed and targeted to organizations that have the greatest chances of success. Whatever the proposed solutions, our study suggests without focused and concerted efforts of institutions, and relevant European Studies scholars and administrators, that greater inclusion of scholars of color will not occur.

The internationalization of the social sciences as described in the 1994 SSRC report⁷, summarized earlier, certainly suggests that greater attention to international comparative work and area studies is needed as we expand our scientific and humanistic understanding of the new Europe. Attention to the potential barriers for full participation of scholars representing all backgrounds could help contribute to this burgeoning and important area of research.

Notes

1. Tarrow, S. (1994). Rebirth or stagnation: European studies after 1989. New York: Social Science Research Council.

2. National Research Council (1995). Summary Report 1993: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

3. We believe that this summary of the study can also serve as an additional source of names. We would appreciate hearing from individuals or organizations that may have names of scholars of color working in European Studies.

4 "Minority International Research Training Grants." NIH Guide, Volume 25, Number 7, March 8, 1996.

5 Simms, M.C. & Allen, W.J. (1995). "Participation of minorities in international affairs: Career interests, barriers to entry, and professional experiences." Washington, D.C.: Center for Political and Economic Studies.

6 Morgan, J. (1995). "World view: HBCUs have a little-known

history of involvement in international affairs." Black Issues in Higher Education, March 9, 24-27.

7 Tarrow, S. (1994). Rebirth or stagnation: European studies after 1989. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Information Sources on the European Union

Phil Wilkin

Bibliographer for West European Studies
University of Pittsburgh

Introduction

This article describes some of the major Internet and paper sources relevant to the study of the European Union (EU). It is written primarily for faculty, students and librarians at colleges and universities which do not have major academic programs focusing on the EU or which are not EU depository libraries (and hence may not have large EU collections), and for the relatively inexperienced World Wide Web (WWW) user. It is hoped, however, that even those with access to depository libraries and knowledge of the WWW may find useful information below.

Internet resources

One of the most significant developments in the field of EU documentation and resources in the last few years has been the rapid proliferation of information available on the WWW. Parties at several institutions have compiled WWW sites containing a wide variety of information on the EU. This includes EU publications, both full text (White Papers, Green Papers, Treaties, etc.) and bibliographic, as well as descriptive information on EU institutions, policies, etc. Some of the more important WWW sites are:

Those sites maintained by the European Union, which include the Europa server, run by the European Commission (<http://www.cec.lu/>), the I*M Europe site, run by DG XIII (<http://www.echo.lu/>), and the European Union site, compiled by the Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, DC (<http://www.eurunion.org/>);

The European Union Internet Resources site, UC Berkeley Library Web (<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI/eu.html>);

The European Union & Internet site, compiled at the University of Helsinki, Finland (<http://www.helsinki.fi/~aunesluo/eueng.html>);

The George Mason University's International Institute Home Page houses a link to the Center for European Integration Studies Home Page (<http://www.gmu.edu/departments/ii/>);

The Centre for European Union Studies site, compiled at the University of Hull, UK (http://www.hull.ac.uk/Hull/CSS_Web/eu.html);

The European Documentation Centre (EDC) Home Page, at the University of Mannheim (<http://www.uni-mannheim.de/users/ddz/edz/eedz.html>);

The European Union/European Community site at Duke University (<http://www.lib.duke.edu/pdmt/eu.html>); and

The European Studies Home Page, University of Exeter (<http://www.ex.ac.uk/~pcovery/lib/eurostudies.html#top>).

Many of these sites contain much of the same information. All can be accessed directly, and many include links to some of the others. They can also be accessed through the European Union section of this author's West European Studies Research Resources WWW site (<http://www.pitt.edu/~wwwes>), compiled at the University of Pittsburgh and co-sponsored by the Center for West European Studies there.

By June 15, 1996, a new section which includes guides to a number of EU research resources will be added to this site. Though they are designed as beginning research guides for undergraduates at an institution which has an EU depository library, they should also be useful to others. The new section will contain a few general reference guides, listing works containing information on such topics as EU institutions, officials, terminology, and current awareness, as well as subject guides for issues including enlargement, the environment, and more. The guides will consist primarily of annotated bibliographies, with some description. The primary types of publications included will be policy documents of the European Union, such as White or Green Papers and COM docs, major reference works, selected textbooks and other secondary materials. The guides will also contain links to relevant WWW sites. Because the guides are intended for use by University of Pittsburgh patrons, readers should be aware that they will include only items located in the University of Pittsburgh library system.

Paper Resources

The following is an annotated list of some of the more important items available in paper form for the study of the EU. Though the list is concise and therefore selective and incomplete, it does include many helpful materials.

Journals, newspapers:

European Access. Pub. by Chadwyck-Healey. \$150 annual. Bimonthly, this is the single most useful journal for current awareness on EU. Contains short articles on current topics, as well as thorough bibliography, arranged by subject.

European Voice: A weekly view of the Union for the Union. 32 pp. \$123 annual. Published by Economist Group. Excellent current awareness newspaper on activities in EU.

Financial Times. \$450 annual. The most important English-language newspaper for coverage of EU financial affairs.

Newsletters:

EUROPE. Daily Bulletin. Pub. by Agence Europe, five times a week. \$870 annual. An "insider's" newsletter containing current information on wide range of EU topics. Other publications in the Agence Europe series include Documents - reprints of important documents either by or on the EU. See authors of guide for list of all titles since 1985.

European Report. Twice a week. \$1270 annual. Similar to EUROPE. Daily Bulletin, with slightly different coverage and little less comprehensive.

Major reference works, handbooks, etc:

European Union: Interinstitutional Directory. EUR-OP, 1995. Serial, latest September, 1995. EUR-OP. \$25 paper. Extensive listing of important bodies, representatives, and staff of the

European Union. Replaces other guides to individual institutions published by EUR-OP.

Directory of EU Information Sources, 1995-6 7th ed. Euroconfidential. 950 pp. \$295. Major source, includes thorough source and contact information for officials and groups in all EU institutions. Includes similar information for foreign representations in Brussels, press agencies, journalists, consultants and lawyers specializing in EU news and information, trade and professional organizations, graduate educational institutions, EU grants and loans, EU consultants, etc.

European Union Encyclopedia and Directory. 2nd ed. Europa Publications, 1996. 500 pp. \$385. Includes: 112 pp. glossary; short essays providing information on political, economic, legal framework of EU; essays on policies and activities of EU; description of EU institutions; 100 pp. statistical section; directory of contact information on EU officials. The best single item for general reference.

European Union Handbook. Ed. by P. Barbour. Fitzroy Dearborn, 1996. 349 pp. \$55. Introduction to EU, concentrating how EU has evolved out of European Communities, with special emphasis on post-Maastricht period. Includes twenty-two chapters, with bibliographies, within sub-headings of History and Context, Politics, Economics, Law and Society, Future. Includes Chronology and 19 pp. Glossary.

European Union 199--: Annual Review of Activities Oxford: Blackwell. \$30. Published annually by the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES), who also publish the Journal of Common Market Studies. Provides surveys of major policy or subject areas.

Handbook of European Union. 2nd revised edition. By Nicholas Moussis. Rixensart: Edit-ur, 1995. 354 pp. \$42 paper. Bills itself as practical manual for European integration. Focuses on organization of EU and objectives, means, problems and attainment of each policy area, with chapters on major policy areas. Based largely on, and liberally quotes, EU publications. Includes bibliography for each chapter.

Monographs:

Enlarged European Union. By Ian and Pamela Barnes. Longman, 1995. 419 pp. \$23 paper. General text-like introduction to the EU.

The EU: Understanding the Brussels Process By Christopher Bright. Wiley, 1995. 238 pp. \$25 paper. Excellent introduction to how the European Union and its institutions function. Describes EC legislative process in depth, including "co-decision" procedure introduced by Maastricht Treaty, as well as process for adopting a directive. A separate section reprints the Treaty of Rome and subsequent amendments contained in both the Single European Act and Maastricht Treat.

European Union: Structure & Process. 2nd ed. By Clive Archer and Fiona Butler. St. Martin's, 1996. 232 pp. \$20 cloth, also available in paper. Excellent introduction to nature and functions of EU. Includes description of EU legislative processes, with details of cooperation and co-decision procedures. Also covers major subject areas.

Government and Politics of the European Union. 3rd, 1994. By Neill Nugent. Duke Univ. Press. 473 pp. \$53 cloth, \$22 paper. General introduction to EU institutions, policies, etc.

Council of the European Union. By Martin Westlake. Stockton, 1995. 415 pp. \$75. Thorough description of the origins, structure, organization, functions, Rules of Procedure, etc. of the Council.

European Courts. By Neville Hunnings. Cartermill, 1996. 328 pp. \$60. Describes Europe-wide courts, their inter-relationships, powers, and how they constitute the beginnings of a court structure for Europe. European Court of Justice and Court of First Instance are featured.

European Commission. Ed. by G. Edwards and D. Spence. Longman, 1994. 311 pp. \$55. Thorough examination of what Commission is, how it functions, and its relationship with other EU institutions.

European Parliament. 3rd ed. By F. Jacobs, R. Corbett, M. Shackleton. Cartermill, 1995. 357 pp. \$60. Comprehensive survey of structure, organization, and powers of the EP.

Modern Guide to the European Parliament. By Martin Westlake. Pinter, 1994. 302 pp. \$59; \$22 paper. Good introduction to EP in EU, politics of EP, EP powers, electoral links in Member States. Includes "Glossary of Parliamentary Terms and Jargon."

Guide to the European Parliament, 1994-1999. Brussels: EU Committee of the American Chamber of Commerce, 1996. \$66.

European Council: Gatekeeper of the European Community. By Mary T. Johnston. Westview, 1994. 174 p. \$42.50 paper

Europe's Money. A Guide to the European Union Budget 1995. 2nd, Cartermill, 1995. 140 pp. \$68 paper.

Finances of Europe. 7th ed. (3rd English ed.). By D. Strasser. EUR-OP, 1991. 493 pp. \$30 paper. Author was Director and Director-General for Budgets in Commission for 15 years, now member of Court of Auditors. This is thorough description of budget process, describes rules and regulations governing budget, also agencies involved in preparing budget and how it is implemented.

State of the European Union, Vol. 3: Building a European Polity? Carolyn Rhodes and Sonia Mazey, eds. Lynne Rienner, Inc. 520 pp. \$49.95; \$39.95 to ECSA members.

Glossaries, Dictionaries, etc.

EC/EU Fact Book: A Complete question and answer guide. 4th ed. By A. Roney. London Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 1995. 332 pp. \$28 paper. Compiled primarily for businessmen, but contains a wealth of information on EU institutions and how work, also EU policies, services and funds available, etc. In Q&A form, but chapter titles and index make information easily accessible.

Eurojargon: A Dictionary of European Union Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Sobriquets 4th edition. Compiled by Anne Ramsay. Capital Planning Information Ltd., 1994. 154 pp. \$50.

Glossary of EC Terms and Acronyms. By Christian de Fouloy. Butterworths, 1992. \$95. Multi-lingual; English, French, German, Italian, Spanish.

Historical Dictionary of European Organizations By Derek Urwin. Scarecrow Press, 1994. 389 pp. \$50 cloth.

Historical Dictionary of the European Community. By Desmond Dinan. Scarecrow Press, 1993. 291 pp. \$38 cloth.

The New Europe: An A to Z Compendium on the European Community. By Jerry M. Rosenberg. Bureau of National Affairs, 1991. 206 pp.

Penguin Companion to European Union. By T. Bainbridge and A. Teasdale. Penguin, 1995. 502 pp. \$18 paper. Excellent introduction to history, institutions, individuals, politics, etc. of EU from beginning, worthwhile even for knowledgeable readers. Author calls it a "Companion rather than a dictionary in that it

aims to present not only facts, but also arguments."

Political Leaders of Contemporary Western Europe: A Biographical Dictionary. Ed. by David Wilsford. Greenwood Press, 1995. 514 pp. \$115.

What's What and Who's Who in Europe. By Harry Drost. 1995. 646 pp. \$75; \$25 paper. Dictionary of terms covering wide range of topics.

Other titles of potential interest I have not seen:

European Union Almanac: Handbook on the world's Single Largest Marketplace. Americas Group. \$25 paper.

European Union Handbook and Business Titles Americas Group. \$18 paper.

European Union publications:

Many of the best reference and informational sources on the EU are published by the EU official publications office, EUR-OP. Some are available only to depository libraries, but many are available to anyone. UNIPUB is the sole domestic distributor, but some items may be purchased directly from EUR-OP. UNIPUB may be contacted at 4611-f Assembly Drive, Lanham, MD 20706-4391; tel (800) 274-4888; fax (301) 459-0056. The best current awareness source for EUR-OP publications is EUR-OP NEWS, a quarterly available in paper or online at <<http://www.cec.lu/en/comm/opoce/wel.html>>. To subscribe to the paper version, contact William Bray, EUR-OP News, EUR-OP, Office 172, rue Mercier, L-2985 Luxembourg; fax (352) 29 29-427 63; e-mail EUROPNEWS@OPOCE.CEC.BE.

In addition to the publications above, many informative pamphlets and other published materials are available without charge (though some mailing costs may apply) from the Office of Public Inquiries, Delegation of the European Commission, 2300 M Street NW, Washington DC 20037; tel (202) 862-9500; fax (202) 429-1766; World Wide Web site URL <<http://www.bso.com/eu/>>. These free materials include overviews of particular policy sectors and institutions. Academic institutions may also wish to subscribe to the frequently distributed European Union News, EuroMemo, and Eurocom flyers/newsletters offered by the Washington and New York offices of the Delegation. EuroMemo in particular contains valuable references to recently published Commission reports and white papers, and often enables readers to obtain these publications directly from the Delegation.

The following are some important EUR-OP publications, available at UNIPUB (address above):

Community Budget: The Facts in Figures. Annual. Commission. 110 pp. \$14. Includes descriptions of basic principles and concepts of budgetary procedure, how process has worked from 1950s, current year's budget, and preview of upcoming year's budget. Details the structure of revenue by member states and expenditures by major categories.

Europe in Figures. Eurostat. \$12 paper. Presents statistics, maps and text on most important aspects of EU, i.e., integration, current state of EU.

European Union: Interinstitutional Directory. EUR-OP, 1995. Serial, latest September, 1995. EUR-OP. \$25 paper. Extensive listing of important bodies, representatives, and staff of the European Union. Replaces other guides to individual institutions published by EUR-OP.

General Report on the Activities of the European Union

(formerly *General...Communities*). EUR-OP. \$35. The Commission's annual report to the European Parliament, published in February, focuses on development of integration. Outlines the previous year's activities in all policy areas. With citations in footnotes, is excellent source for tracking legislation to its policy beginnings. It is accompanied by a work program for the next year and a policy speech by the Commission President. The two latter items are published as a Supplement to the Bulletin of the European Communities, usually issue No. 1 of each year.

Panorama of EU Industry. UNIPUB. \$175 cloth. Excellent survey, with statistics, of all sectors of EU industry.

Portrait of the regions. 1993. Eurostat. 2 vols. \$420. Includes maps and harmonized statistical tables, commentaries, and analysis on territory, environment, infrastructures, population, employment, structure of economies, etc. for ca. 200 regions of EU.

Book Reviews

M.J. Artis and N. Lee, eds., The Economics of the European Union: Policy and Analysis. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Frédérique Sachwald, ed., European Integration and Competitiveness: Acquisitions and Alliances in Industry. (Aldershot, England: Edward Elgar, 1994).

Although these two edited volumes both concern themselves with economic analyses of European integration, they speak to very different audiences, and achieve somewhat different levels of success in communicating their insights. The Artis and Lee volume is an extremely useful textbook for a graduate or upper-level undergraduate class on the political economy of the European Union. Its fifteen chapters cover all the main areas of policymaking in the EU; for the most part, the authors use straightforward economic theory, a minimum of statistical work, and national and EU historical studies to make sense of the policy dynamics at work. The clarity of the writing, balanced analysis, and comprehensive nature of the book will make it appropriate for a broad readership, although one or two of its more technical chapters may discourage readers not trained in basic economics. In contrast, the Sachwald volume is a more narrowly focused assessment of the role of 'external growth operations,' such as corporate mergers and acquisitions, in determining firm

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

Professor Paulette Kurzer
Department of Political Science
Social Science 315
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
E-mail: KURZER@Arizona.edu
FAX: (520) 621-5051
TEL: (520) 621-7600

Publishers should send review copies to Professor Kurzer at this address.

competitiveness in an increasingly integrated EU. The book is most notable for its series of sectoral case studies of European firm strategies in the 1980s. It will be of interest to scholars working on similar subjects for it provides a wealth of valuable information on firm strategies, but it is unlikely to appeal to the general reader. Its sectoral studies may be suitable for courses in political economy, but its lack of clear analytic framework and often awkward prose make its more theoretical chapters unsuited for classroom use.

Mike Artis and Norman Lee have provided a very welcome addition to textbooks on the EU with The Economics of the European Union: Policy and Analysis. Artis and Lee, who teach at the University of Manchester, as do almost all the book's authors, have put together a complete guide to European integration from the standpoint of basic economic analysis and policy evaluation. Laudably, the authors note that they will be publishing a revised edition of the volume every two years to ensure that the chapters stay up to date, which is crucial in a book of this type.

Every contribution to the volume, save perhaps one, is valuable. The book begins with three overview chapters. First, a succinct political history of European integration is provided by Simon Bulmer. Bulmer rightly argues that economic integration cannot be understood without attention to the broader political context, and offers a balanced account of the development of the European Union and its institutions. A companion chapter, a statistical survey of the contemporary European economic situation, by Artis and Nick Weaver, is the volume's only disappointing contribution. The idea, to provide a basic statistical context (population, GDP, income inequality, labor market characteristics, trade and so on), is excellent, but the majority of statistics are based on 1991 data and thus out of date even by the book's initial publication in 1994. In future editions, the authors might consider the use of time series data to outline basic trends, instead of providing a snapshot of EU economic conditions which students and teachers could better get from the latest issue of EU publications like European Economy.

A third overview chapter evaluates the European Union in terms of the economic effects of preferential trading areas. Lynden Moore does a nice job of reviewing the standard analyses of tariffs, customs unions, and economies of scale, although the substance of the chapter may be too technical for students not trained in intermediate level economics. This is the only chapter where such familiarity with economic analysis is a necessity.

The balance of the book then takes up a series of policy areas. Agriculture, competition policy, science and technology, regional policy, transport, environmental, social, foreign aid, and trade policy are each treated in respective chapters. Exchange rate cooperation in the European Monetary System, and European Monetary Union both have their own chapters, as does a discussion of the EU's budget. Each chapter covers the basic economic logic behind the policy program, outlines the program's development and institutions, with attention to national variations in policy tradition or experience, and offers an evaluation of the program's effects.

As the political foundations for EU policies are not investigated, but mentioned only briefly as part of the historical backdrop, this text would have to be supplemented by readings on the role of international and domestic politics in producing the policy outcomes so well described by the authors. But almost all of the chapters in the Artis and Lee volume are uniformly accessible and informative, and will provide an excellent economic perspective to courses on the EU.

The audience for European Integration and Competitiveness: Acquisitions and Alliances in Industry will be much smaller than that of the previous collection. Frédérique Sachwald has set out to investigate a fascinating and understudied area--European firm strategies in response to increased integration within the Single European Market, as well as increased internationalization more generally. Contributors focus on the use of mergers, acquisitions and alliances by European firms, strategies Sachwald sees as having implications both for the competitiveness of firms and for the national economies of Europe. Unfortunately, the theoretical link between the firm and national competitiveness is not made clear, and will certainly be unpersuasive to those critics who see linking the two as a fallacious exercise. For those more sympathetic to this view, however, Sachwald's discussions in Chapter 1 and 2, drawing on Michael Porter, of the need for a 'comprehensive' assessment of national and firm competitiveness may be of interest. But readers may well be put off by the unwieldy prose which mars the volume (save for the case study contributions of Hobday, Bloom and de Wolf). As the book originally appeared in French, the culprit may be a poor translation.

Most useful are the five empirical chapters which analyze EU firms' responses to the twin pressures of European integration and increasing international globalization of markets. The authors examine the automobile and autoparts industries, semiconductors, consumer electronics, chemicals, and the pharmaceutical sector, detailing the strategies firms have pursued in the 1980s to increase their competitiveness through external growth operations.

For example, in a chapter on the auto industry, Sachwald finds that cooperative agreements and acquisitions have been used as a way for European firms to penetrate new markets, increase efficiency of production, enlarge the scope of production with niche vehicles, and to innovate. However, she concludes that the process of competitive restructuring has not been fully carried out, and there has been a overconcentration on European markets by EU firms. The following chapter, on the autocomponent industry by Etienne de Banville and Jean-Jacques Chanaron, probes into its oligopolistic industrial structure, linking these firms' competitive strategies firmly to those of the car makers.

Mike Hobday's chapter on the semiconductor industry provides a useful in-depth empirical assessment of the build-up of competencies by European owned chip producers during the 1980s, as well as evaluating the impact of the EU's research and development policies on this industry. He argues that external operations, such as technical joint ventures, mergers, acquisitions and other equity operations, have been critical to the development of these competencies, and that EU policies have tended to reinforce and support this process rather than determining it. Rationalization and consolidation in the electronics industry, particularly the video sector, is the subject of a strong chapter by Martin D.H. Bloom. Bloom compares the strategies of Philips, Thomas and Nokia, the main actors in this sector, differentiating the types of external strategies pursued in various product markets. Similar chapters by Sachwald on the chemical industry, and by Peter de Wolf on the pharmaceutical industry, round out the case studies. For students of firm level responses to increasing European market integration, these case studies will be useful in tracing the extent to which European companies have risen to the challenge of increased competition.

In sum, these two books offer readers distinctly different types of benefits; their appropriate audiences would do well to investigate them.

Carolyn Rhodes and Sonia Mazey, eds., The State of the European Union, Volume 3: Building a European Polity? (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1995). 520 pp.

This third volume in a series of biennial "yearbooks" on European integration sponsored by ECSA is well worth the money for anyone who wants to catch up on state-of-the-art scholarship in the field. The editors have done a splendid job of integrating theoretical perspectives with an eclectic collection of papers on specific aspects of EU development. Although the purpose of the volume is also to review events during 1993-94, the book is most useful as a guide to ongoing theoretical debates.

Part of this emphasis may be due to timing. The project was caught between the "big bangs" of Europe 92 and the Maastricht Treaty on the one hand, and the pending mega-issues on the horizon beginning with the IGC review of 1996-97, preparations for monetary convergence in 1998-99, and the great enlargement projected for the following years. This volume suffers from inadequate time to evaluate the impact of Maastricht and prematurity for assessing the return of Europessimism over how these future issues can be resolved.

The book does provide a most useful summary of theory-building to date. The editors have written an excellent introductory chapter which summarizes the ongoing battle between the neorealist "intergovernmentalist" perspective that still dominates international relations scholarship and the resurgent "neofunctionalist" paradigm which reflects the growing interest of comparative politics and public policy scholars in the field. They point out that the intergovernmentalist framework seems to be of greatest utility for explaining the "high politics" of the Union involving major bargains among states, whereas neofunctionalism often seems more useful to those who wish to study the "normal" functioning of EU institutions as an existing policymaking machine.

The editors divide the book into three sections that capture much of the current research on the EU. Part 1, entitled "Reflections on Integration Theory", begins with another strong theoretical chapter by James Caporaso and John Keeler which traces the ups and downs of functionalism-neofunctionalism since the 1950s and focuses on the resurgence of "grand theory" since 1987 (by such scholars as Sandholtz and Zysman, Moravcsik, Marks, Cameron, and Sbragia, to name only a few). The other six chapters in this section look at specific topics that cast more or less light on problems of integration--e.g., Patricia Chilton's probing discussion of conceptual and organizational difficulties in developing integrated defense policies; Christopher Anderson's careful analysis of data on public support for the EU as a function of time and economic conditions; and Miles, Redmond and Schwok's study of why the most recent "Nordic" enlargement of the EU is best explained in terms of intergovernmentalism rather than neofunctionalism.

Part 2 focuses on perhaps the newest area of EU scholarship, the reverse side of integration called "the Europeanization of national politics." The six chapters in this section illuminate influences in both directions--how national and subnational institutions and groups are shifting focus and building capacity to influence policymaking at the EU level, and how EU decisions and requirements are increasingly influencing politics within and between individual member states. An example of the former is the growing involvement of the German Laender in EU policymaking as a result of bargains they were able to strike as a condition for accepting Maastricht, analyzed in an enlightening chapter by Richard Deeg. Other chapters focus on the evolving Franco-German relationship, the role of Germany in the 1992-93 ERM crisis, and the debate over central bank independence as a

Kathleen R. McNamara
Princeton University

condition for monetary union.

Part 3 of the book--and to my mind the best--contains seven case studies of EU policymaking, covering both internal and external policies (the latter negotiation of the Uruguay round and the history of the Lomé conventions). The section begins with a new elaboration of Sonia Mazey and Jeremy Richardson's theory of an emerging EU "policy style"; i.e., a set of characteristics that helps to explain how the uncertain and ever-changing policy environment of Brussels favors certain kinds of political entrepreneurship and bureaucratic expertise. Many of their insights are borne out in the subsequent chapters, though each reaches somewhat different conclusions about the shape of the policy elephant. While John Peterson and Gerhard Fuchs find evidence for neofunctionalist claims that experts associated with the Commission shape most of the details of scientific research and telecommunications policies, respectively, Mark Pollack makes a strong case that EC structural policymaking is dominated by intergovernmental bargaining.

The relative calm and confidence reflected in most of the chapters of this book may be temporary. Volume 4 is likely to confront a deeper set of critical problems that may test not only the relevance of traditional theories but the stability and success of the EU itself.

Norman J. Vig
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

Desmond Dinan, Ever Closer Union? An Introduction to the European Community. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994).

"Comprehensive" is by no means the only adjective with which to complement Desmond Dinan's Ever Closer Union?, but it is certainly among the first to come to mind. This introduction to the European Community (as it is aptly subtitled) offers a rich history, navigable institutional blueprints, and a frank discussion of the past, present, and future activities of the European integration project.

Like many such surveys, Dinan's endeavor attempts to introduce the entirety of his subject matter through a textbook-style construction that allows the reader to explore different aspects of European Union (EU), one step at a time. Unlike most textbooks however, Dinan's focus on the story of Europe and its various political characters offers many a pleasurable yarn to accompany his effective introduction to the historical, institutional, and political realities of the EU.

The book is composed of seventeen chapters which are grouped into three coherent Parts: History (I), Institutions (II), and Policies and Processes (III). In Part I, Dinan begins his history of European integration in the immediate post-war era, rushing a bit through the Community's founding moments of the Schuman Plan, the Messina Conference, and the Defense Community debacle, to spend considerably more time on its adolescent turmoil (the 1960's and 70's) and its impressive coming of age in the Delors era. Lamentably, Dinan passes over much of integration's pre-history and political and philosophical roots, although some reference to a longer Euro-tradition is made.

The book's story is wisely structured around the landmark events in Community history (the Empty Chair Crisis, the three enlargements, significant institutional changes, and inter-governmental conferences) but always with an emphasis on the players, political struggles, and personalities from which they

were born. The blow by blow of negotiating positions and barb trading ("Thatcher seemed to think the EC was a branch of NATO!") is frequently amusing. More importantly, Dinan roots the survey in a historical environment that was as plainly political as it was intensely personal. As with any focused history, the attention of Ever Closer Union is firmly fixed on its subject. However, this history is of a political process, and while the comprehensiveness of its internal focus is all but beyond reproach, some additional consideration of external global events may have been warranted. Concluded before 1994, Part I leaves readers with allusions to the probable success of the Maastricht ratification process, and points to an uncertain future in Community affairs.

Part II divides its attention evenly between the four major institutions of the EU: the European Commission, the Council of Ministers (joined with discussion of the Council of Europe), the Parliament, and finally the Court of Justice (with treatment of secondary institutions and committees). Dinan's straightforward explanations of the formal functions, rules, and organizations of the EU's major institutions offers welcome relief to those seeking a working introductory knowledge. Further, the treatment of the political aspects of these institutions (their rivalries, collaborations, compromises, and aspirations) is executed with the same diligent attention to personal and historical idiosyncrasy as is seen in Part I.

The book's institutional review aims for balance; indeed, the chapters on each institution are of roughly the same length. However, whereas the Commission and the Parliament are dealt with exclusively in their respective sections, discussion of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) shares its allotted space with introductions to such secondary bodies as the Court of Auditors, the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions, and the European Investment Bank. While it can hardly be said that the ECJ was slighted here, it does seem curious that Dinan gives less attentions to an institution widely agreed to have had a most profound and independent effect on integration (the ECJ) than he affords to one that is generally recognized as being the least significant in terms of political power (the Parliament).

Notwithstanding such quibbles, what is perhaps most noteworthy is Dinan's ability to present an integrated discussion of these distinct and often competing bodies. While each is presented in a separate chapter, every effort is made to discuss its political significance and constitutive reality in the context of the other three. The reader gets a real sense of the complexity of relationships here, and is offered a sympathetic explanation for much of the public impatience with EU institutions; an impatience resulting from the organizational complexity and delicate political balances Dinan skillfully chronicles.

Part III presents the book's most challenging task. Dinan seeks to explain what the EU actually does in the course of managing the affairs of the Community. In a series of seven chapters, Dinan systematically discusses each policy area in which the EU is active. Beginning with the Common Agricultural Policy, through the Single Market, social policy, monetary union, and international affairs (among others), the reader is cogently guided through the otherwise complex programs and activities of the Union. The discussion is evenhanded, crediting the EU with its successes and clearly signaling its failures, and provides concrete policy information without bogging the reader with overly-technical Euro-jargon.

Part III nicely packages the policy domains in a manner accessible even at the introductory level. Yet, it may go too far in its separation of policy by issue area by failing to clearly

demonstrate the extent to which issue-linkage and policy crossover have expanded Community competencies over time.

Ever Closer Union? is an enjoyable book, a valuable reference tool, and unquestionably up to the task of introducing its readers to the European Community. As a teaching resource, its comprehensive coverage, attention to detail, and amusing anecdotal style make it an ideal text for undergraduate and graduate courses alike. It is superior to a purely historical text in its treatment of institutions and policy activities, and more appealing than some of the dryer volumes dealing only with institutional design for its detailed historical perspective. Combined with a healthy index, chapter end notes, and extensive bibliography (rich in primary European sources) the volume's logical organization and historical perspective will make it attractive to researchers as well, although much of what is here is available in greater depth from more specialized sources.

Dennis R. Palmieri
University of Washington

Donald Barry, ed., Toward a North American Community: Canada, the United States, and Mexico. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995).

Thomas C. Fischer, The Europeanization of America: What Every American Should Know about the European Union. (Durham NC: Carolina Academic Press, 1996).

T. David Mason and Abdul M. Turay, eds., Japan, NAFTA, and Europe: Trilateral Cooperation or Confrontation? (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994).

The Rise of Regionalism and the End of the Nation-State?

One major theme unites these three distinctive books: the virtually inexorable rise of economic regionalism/globalism. From Europe, to North America, to Asia, the economic rationality and power of regionalization and globalization has become virtually unstoppable. Each of these volumes accepts this basic argument and attempts to explore the development of a particular region and its relations to other main regions. Economic regionalism/globalism may or may not exist in reality, but in these volumes it is without a doubt a new hegemonic concept.

The Barry volume brings together a number of prominent Canadian academics who discuss the rise of NAFTA and its implications for its member-states, Latin America, and the European Union. It is a solid work on the development of NAFTA and could easily be used in advanced undergraduate and graduate courses on international political economy or North American Studies. The introductory chapters provide a good historical overview of the development of the NAFTA agreement. In Part Two, the historical contexts of the Canadian-US, US-Mexico, and Canada-Mexico relationships are examined. The three chapters in this part, by Denis Stairs, Stephen Randall, and Gustavo del Castillo, are all well-written and nicely compliment each other. Part Three examines the current aspects of the NAFTA relationship in more detail. Of particular note is Neil Nevitte's chapter using Karl Deutsch's integration theory and the Canadian, American, and Mexican segments of the World Values Survey to analyze value change in the NAFTA countries, and argue that a convergence of values within the three states paved the way for the NAFTA deal. The book also contains a short

section on the lessons and impact of the EU for North American integration. The most interesting element here is Evan Potter's review of Canadian responses to European integration in the WWII period.

Overall, the volume is a positive contribution to the field and a useful addition to the literature on NAFTA and regional integration. However, it only briefly explores the possible linkages to European integration. Furthermore, it suffers from the obvious problem of timeliness. Regional integration developments move so quickly that most works seem dated almost from the moment they are published. This is not intended as a complaint about the volume under review, but as an observation on the difficulties of writing in this field.

T. David Mason and Abdul M. Turay's volume is a more uneven work that attempts to cover a much broader field of regional integration and international relations research. The volume brings together a combination of academics and policy experts who attempt to look at relations between Japan, North America, and Europe. Chapters by Kenneth Holland and William Dymond provide reliable reviews of the development of NAFTA and the EU and some implications of their success for Japanese trade policy. The rest of the work concentrates on Japan's relationship to Western and Eastern Europe, Russia, and selected Asian countries. Of these chapters, John McIntyre on "Europe 1992 and Japan's Relations with Western Europe" and Gordon Smith on "Trade Blocs and the Prospects for Japan's Relations with Russia" were the most interesting from a Europeanist perspective. Again, the problem of timeliness was clear. The volume developed out of a conference that was held in 1989 and many of the contributions reflect the thinking of that period. Overall, the work could be useful in courses on international political economy and the Japanese perception of the EU.

Unlike the two edited volumes, Fischer focuses on the EU. The Europeanization of America is a manual for encouraging US businesses, politicians, and policy makers to pay more attention to the EU. The first half of the book is an introduction to the institutional structure of the EU, its basic legal arrangements, and the recent history of its development (from the Single European Act to Maastricht). The second half is comprised mostly of various issues that are currently confronting the EU: subsidiarity, the democratic deficit, widening vs. deepening, etc. Fischer is a Professor of Law at the New England School of Law, and his expertise in the area of EU law is clearly demonstrated throughout the book. Chapter 12, "Competing Competition Laws and Policy," provides a particularly interesting comparison of the legal structure of EU and US competition policy.

Unfortunately, Fischer does not position the work within the larger theoretical debates surrounding the European project. Questions from a realist or intergovernmentalist perspective are ignored as he argues that the EU is automatically federalizing due to the inevitable "economic Darwinism" of the current stage of globalizing capitalism. One reads repeatedly of how a federal Europe is inescapable. The model of Europe is the USA: "In the end, I think increased federalism in the Community is simply inevitable, as it proved to be in the United States" (pg. 43). Therefore, how does he explain the EU's past and present difficulties? Fischer largely deals with the problems of the past by ignoring them. He only briefly mentions the deeper historical roots of the EU and its uneven development from the 1950s to the mid-1980s. This lack of attention is clearly rooted in his economic argument. There is no need to pay attention to the past, since global economic Darwinism (regionalization/globalization) had not developed yet. For the present, he argues that the main

impediment to integration is competition and conflict between national and EU elites. The problem with this position is that elites, whether national or European, tend to be much more pro-integration than the European masses.

In general, Fischer's book is a work of brilliant flashes. His arguments about the legal development and character of the EU are excellent. However, the lack of theoretical comparisons and shallowness of EU history make it difficult to see where the work might fit in the classroom; these two elements are essential in introductory texts for undergraduate courses. For graduate courses, its legal expertise may be of greater interest, while its introductory section may be repetitive. As to his stated aim of influencing US business and policy makers, it is difficult to envision the book's impact.

In their different ways, all three of these works represent contributions to their respective fields. Furthermore, they demonstrate that economic regionalization/globalization has become the new catch-all phrase for developments in the 1990s. I do not doubt that it exists and has an impact. However, regionalizers/globalizers often miss the fascinating political stories that lie beneath these trends. The two edited volumes do include chapters (particularly in the Barry volume) in which regionalization/globalization was interwoven with an examination of the development of strategies and ideologies of particular social and political actors. Unfortunately, these moments of light, exposing the intricate balance between national and international dynamics, were often buried under a layer of "inevitable" regional and global forces.

Robert Geyer
University of Liverpool

René Maurice, ed., Administration "La vie quotidienne des Français dans l'Europe de 1993". Paris: Association Préfectorale, January-March 1993.

Jean-Baptiste de Foucauld, ed., La France et l'Europe d'ici 2010. Facteurs et Acteurs décisifs. Paris: La Documentation française, 1993.

Yves Lacoste, ed., L'Europe, la France et la Méditerranée: vers de nouveaux Partenariats. Paris: La Documentation française, 1993.

Pierre Le Roy, Les Agricultures françaises face aux Marchés mondiaux. Paris: Armand Colin, 1993.

Bernard Dézert, La France face à l'Ouverture européenne. Thèmes transfrontaliers. Paris: Masson, 1993.

There exists today no single comprehensive and timely analysis of France and European unification. In the English literature, both Steven Kramer's Does France still Count? and Ronald Tiersky's France in the New Europe,¹ while valuable in their own right, seem incomplete. Tiersky provides a well-balanced description of the French polity, but chooses to address the European dimension as only one parameter among others. Kramer's book is more of an essay that sympathetically addresses the subject of France's position in the "new world order," but lacks a systematic assessment of the impact of the integration process on France. Gregory Flynn's Remaking the Hexagon comes closer to achieving this goal, as does F.G. Dreyfus' France

and EC Membership Evaluated.² Moreover, this gap is not filled in the French-language literature. French scholarship is replete with accounts of traditional, and relatively dated, subjects such as De Gaulle et l'Europe, or books with a single technical focus, such as La France et l'UEM.³ Three functionally specific books do stand out: Christian Lequesne's examination of the institutional mechanisms of France's European policy, Paris-Bruxelles, Jacques Lesourne's Où va l'Etat?, a most interesting study of the "Europeanization" of the French State, and Claude Goyard's La Constitution et l'Europe.⁴ However, no French books meet the two essential criteria: comprehensiveness of perspective and timeliness. Pinto Lyra's is too narrowly focused, Léonard's is incomplete, and Rideau's volume, although quintessential in its own time, is already twenty years old.⁵ Given these constraints, this reviewer has tried to assemble as large and varied a sample of books as possible, both in terms of theme and authorship. Whereas Maurice, Foucauld, and Lacoste edit semi-official volumes blending articles by specialized technocrates and contributions from scholars, Dézert and Le Roy have more strictly embraced an academic approach to the subject. It is worth noting that two of the edited books in this selection are published by La Documentation Française, the Prime Minister's official publisher, which offers a vast collection of official and semi-official reports, parliamentary studies, legal and technical textbooks, and international treaties. As such, it is an unrivaled source of primary materials for all scholars interested in the French polity.

The first of the works under review here, Administration is the quarterly journal of the corps préfectoral; this special issue consists of twenty chapters concerning the impact of European unification on various aspects of French daily life. Its main emphasis is on the economy, but social matters come a close second; due attention is also paid to the audiovisual industry, education and the environment.

The range of themes addressed here is wide indeed. For instance, "la sécurité routière," long the exclusive domain of national legislation, has increasingly been subjected to Community scrutiny and harmonizing legislation (pp. 42-45). As yet another example, Paul Braendli, chairman of the Munich-based European Office of Copyright Protection, describes his organization and addresses the issue of intellectual property rights in a world increasingly marked by the democratization of knowledge and its acceleration dissemination (pp. 24-27). What is especially relevant for French industries in this case is the existence of a centralized procedure for patent protection. Even if many French scientists and industrialists still request patent protection at the national level, increasing numbers turn to the EOCP to secure a better European guarantee for their inventions. French research centers find themselves increasingly part of a European network of similar institutions, and the very dynamic created by the EOCP forces them to work within a continental context.

Especially noteworthy are the articles about the audiovisual industry. Jacques Rigaud, an executive from Radio-Télé-Luxembourg, details the technical, political and sociological pitfalls of a possible pan-European networking system. He sharply criticizes France's "cadre juridique contraignant" (p. 73) which stems from her deeply held belief in the superiority of managed markets to protect her television and cinematographic industry (not to mention her language). Christian Phéline, head of the Prime Minister legal service, articulates the French official position on this sensitive topic (pp. 74-79). He stresses the trade imbalance between the USA and Western Europe: "... le taux de couverture des importations par les exportations est d'environ

25% pour l'Europe et de 570% pour l'Amérique du Nord." (p. 74) He then describes various initiatives to foster European cooperation, many of which have been spearheaded by the French government. Four French-sponsored initiatives are noteworthy: the creation of a European news channel, Lyons-based Euronews, designed to counter CNN's de facto monopoly of instantaneous news dissemination, the creation of a Franco-German cultural channel, Arte, in operation since May 1992, the definition of new technical standards for television (HDTV), and the multiplication of joint productions with trans-national financing mechanisms. This article testifies to a French activism that should not be underestimated by any scholar interested in this field. This book recommends itself for the brevity and clarity of its functional studies. Nevertheless, articles written by préfets very much espouse a Jacobin viewpoint: they always put the central State apparatus at the core of their analyses. This consistently reaffirmed bureaucratic ideology, sometimes served by a self-aggrandising rhetoric, certainly indicates the limits of the French-model of European unification.

Foucauld's La France et l'Europe is part of a European survey initiated by the Brussels Commission in 1991, consisting of twelve reports on the future of European integration, one for each country. In Paris, the very official Commissariat Général au Plan created the French report. Its preface disclaims any pretense of being an official document; although not endorsed by the French government, it does shed considerable light on French fears and expectations. In fact, this kind of exercise -- predicting tomorrow's France in tomorrow's Europe -- resembles an assignment in the ENA curriculum for hauts fonctionnaires.

As well as describing in broad terms the evolution of the world economy since the 1960s and the "new world order," the first three chapters present some limited projections. They mostly serve as a long introduction to the real prospective chapters. In a very synthetic section (pp. 115-25), two demographers underline some inescapable facts regarding France and the EU: the transformation of the family structure, the demographic imbalance between the two sides of the Mediterranean, and the impact of uncontrolled immigration on Western societies. Other long-term considerations are the shrinking manpower base and the transformation of "la carte ethnique" of the continent (p. 115). These demographers quite sensibly put forth two policy recommendations: a reorientation of welfare policies to favor population growth, and the integration of legal immigrants together with a reinforcement of aid policies for countries south of the Mediterranean. The electoral success of the Far-Right in France proves the very pressing nature of these questions of immigration and national identity.

Four chapters address technical and economic developments. The first one, by Jean-Eric Aubert, a member of the OECD Science and Technology Office, concerns the long-term evolution of technological competition and industrial nations' research policies (pp. 155-70). It evaluates in a sober and realistic manner Europe's and France's chances in an increasingly competitive environment. The next two describe the future of biotechnology and the audiovisual industry, twenty years after Maastricht, and underline that only through integration into a European system will French companies acquire the critical mass necessary to survive in the world market. Finally, Elie Cohen delivers a thought-provoking consideration of the connection between economic globalisation and sovereignty. He coins a new word, glocalisation (p. 203), an extension of his classic Colbertisme High Tech, which is an indispensable reference for scholars interested in French political economy.⁶ In contrast to the préfets,

who tend to exhibit self-satisfaction, these four balanced appraisals probe deeply into France's weaknesses, such as her mixed international image (p. 216), her institutional rigidities (notably an ever-present State bureaucracy that stifles individual initiative), and her periodic crises as "son mode de régulation central." (p. 222).

This book suffers from two drawbacks. Chapters 5 and 13 mistake prediction for wishful thinking. Instead of describing what may reasonably be expected given the current situation, they establish lists of desirable goals, with little, if any, consideration of means and feasibility. Chapter 7 describes things as they are, not as they are likely to be. However, in terms of intellectual content, the five chapters previously described plus one by Yves Mény about the compatibility of Fifth Republic institutions and practices with Europe (pp. 251-65), will best inform more demanding readers.

Lacoste's Méditerranée stems from a deep French concern: that of a crisis between the affluent, relatively underpopulated North and the developing, demographically dynamic South, a scenario which the Fundamentalist violence in Algeria only exacerbates. Over the last few years, relations with Mediterranean countries have been at the core of French diplomacy. Paris is now pushing a pro-Mediterranean agenda in Brussels, oftentimes opposing Germany, which is more bent on helping her own Eastern neighbors.

In spite of its title, this book does not focus on France's particular role in this region; rather, it considers the role of Europe as a whole. For instance it shows that today's Fundamentalism should be viewed as the latest development in the long-term evolution of the Muslim world, characterized by successive political "cycles" (the Liberal beginnings of the 1920s-30s, the Nationalist phase of the 1950s-60s, the Nasserian phase of the 1960s-70s), but leaves unclear the French stakes in the current Algerian crisis. When considering the economy, this book contrasts, within this extensive geographical area, four sub-regions: pre-capitalist, still largely agricultural economies (Sudan, Yemen, Mauritania), oil-dependent economies with a small industrial base (Saudi Arabia, UAE, Libya), oil-producing countries with a broader industrial base and a large population (Iraq, Iran, Algeria), and "les économies manufacturières" (p. 26) (Turkey, Morocco, Tunisia, Syria, Jordan and Israel). Priorities for all are identical (full employment, economic development, management of natural resources) but prospects differ and with them, Europe's and France's possibility of action vis-à-vis these regions. Indeed, France was instrumental in helping Algeria renegotiate its international debt with the IMF, but there is only passing reference to this crucial fact. By the same token, the considerable French economic involvement with Iraq before the Gulf War, and Paris' attempts within the UN Security Council to have the economic embargo lifted, are not even mentioned.

France has historically privileged her African ties more than any other European nation, but is now timidly reappraising her thirty-year old policy. In that respect, the main contribution of this book is to show (although quite indirectly) that Paris would like to see her "special relationship" with North Africa included in, not replaced by, regional agreements involving the EU as an entity (pp. 97-99). The section comparing EU attitudes to the East and to the South may serve as a conclusion: financially, the EU has helped the East more than the South, and intra-European trade has grown at a 130% rate since 1989, as opposed to 40% with the Mediterranean (p. 51). However, when comparing EU attitudes toward specific countries, another picture emerges: both Hungary and Turkey enjoy direct access to international financial markets,

and both Poland and Egypt were granted comparable liberal conditions for financing their public debt. The fact remains that, institutionally speaking, the Visegrad Four are much closer to entering the EU than, say, Turkey. This book is most useful for its consideration of regional relations; it strikes a fair balance between a descriptive approach and an analysis of the issues. If one is willing to ignore its countless typographical errors, it will be judged an interesting, if secondary, addition to any course on Europe and the Muslim world.

The exclusion of agriculture under French pressure from the 1993 GATT agreement proves that it is no small matter to French officials. In fact, agriculture still retains in urbanized France a strong emotional appeal, and the farming lobby enjoys political clout little justified by its actual number. So it is with great interest that one sees Armand Colin, a respected academic publisher, release *Agricultures françaises*. The outline is sound, the content informative while sometimes repetitive, with a subjective slant that at times strays into anecdotal musings (p. 107). For instance, in trying to substantiate why he distinguishes “une dizaine de catégories d’agriculture” in France, all Le Roy can present is “aucune (source), sauf mes propres investigations très empiriques” (p. 108). Elsewhere, he oddly refers to the “langue anglo-saxonne” (p. 187)! Bearing this in mind, readers will still find plenty to profit from in this book. Le Roy sums up the economic evolution of French agriculture since 1945, from the productivist euphoria of the 1950s-60s to the shock of the early 1970s, to the protracted adaptation of the late 1970s-early 1980s and, since the Fontainebleau summit of 1984, the chronic difficulties brought on by the quota system and by the crisis of CAP financing. This overview is complemented by a description of the various types of farms in France, which allows Le Roy to underline regional and sectoral differences that weigh heavily on the policy-making process. He then becomes more analytical when drawing useful distinctions between, on the one hand, agricultural policy, and on the other hand, social policy (using agriculture to fight unemployment), rural policy (using it to remedy imbalances in population distribution and promote ecotourism) and “politique alimentaire” (quantitative output or value-added production).

Dealing next with the future, he succinctly describes the CAP and the GATT (pp. 180-92), readily criticizing the latter. He also finds fault with the USA, summarily described as “hyperprotectionnistes” (p. 193). But his suggestions to help solve the Franco-American quarrel, presented in barely one page, are anything but convincing (p. 200). Given the stakes involved, this section on the CAP and the GATT should have been his strongest; unfortunately, it is probably the weakest. The author openly shares the French resentment vis-à-vis the USA as the dominant economic power, and advocates a vigorous effort on the part of all concerned in France. Although deeply sympathetic to the plight of impoverished farmers, his approach is refreshingly realistic: he favors modernization, stressing that “cette logique économique doit être équilibrée ... par la fiscalité et par des mesures sociales.” (p. 186). Indeed, he is at his most lucid and articulate when advocating the need to respect market imperatives, “tout le reste ne venant que de surcroît” (p. 205). Significantly, he devotes better pages to the improvement of France’s agricultural policy at home (pp. 205-39) than to her agricultural policy abroad. He rightly supports more efficient vocational training, simplified financing mechanisms and tax procedures, enlargement of the average farm size, stricter accounting practices, improved public relations efforts, and a different role for the State.

After reading this book, one is left with mixed feelings. It is clearly at its best in the descriptive sections and when it addresses “la politique agricole”. But it lacks depth when trying to integrate monetary disturbances with agricultural trade (p. 202), and leaves unclear the role of agricultural industries. It also claims to prove some points, but in fact only asserts them (p. 238). Given the academic visibility of this publisher in France, one would expect an authoritative book on this crucial subject. This promise is not kept here.

From Professor Bernard Dézert, of *La Sorbonne*, comes a well-structured book of *géographie économique* dealing with the territorial impact of European integration. No other Western European nation is as dominated, eclipsed even, by its capital as France is by Paris, which comprises no less than 20% of the entire French population. Such notions as *Jacobinisme* or *le désert français* are commonplace in comparative political studies of France. It should come as no surprise to find this imbalanced territorial structure, along with so many characteristics of contemporary France, affected by the Single Market and by EU legislation. A model of clarity and concision, this book has two main parts: one describing French demographics, the tourism industry, territorial organization, transportation and telecommunication networks, and economic localization in relation to the European context, and another presenting six regional case studies of the impact of the EU.

Dézert discerns three trends for French regions concerning their relationship with Europe. The first is the emergence of regional economic entities that ignore national boundaries more and more. For example, the *Nord-Pas-de-Calais* has long created trade links with Belgium and the Netherlands that allow this region to escape Paris’s “smothering” embrace; similarly, Alsace and Lorraine find themselves in the economic orbit of the Rhineland. This trend is not without problems: for instance, in the North, French unions and retail businesses are vehemently opposed to the Sunday opening of department stores, a common practice in nearby Belgium ... which French customers do choose to patronize on weekends! This flight of capital across the border creates a unique set of problems for French businesses and labor organizations, one which so far they have failed to resolve satisfactorily. The second scenario is that of the trans-national influence of a metropolis located in the hinterland: such is the case with Lyons, turned toward Geneva and Italy, and to a lesser extent with Toulouse and Montpellier, both striving to emulate the example of Barcelona, a true economic powerhouse. Finally, such regions as the West and deep South-West of France, finding themselves far from any profitable trans-border associations, suffer from their peripheral position. As always, owing to its international status, Paris is a special case that receives due attention (pp. 153-62).

Dézert’s fundamental argument is that new regional power structures are fast emerging due to their integration in European trade, what he calls “une nouvelle typologie régionale en fonction du degré d’ouverture sur l’Europe” (p. 163). Indeed, European free trade has had the strongest impact on the regional structure of France and the distribution of power between Paris and *la province* -- an impact that can be compared in magnitude only to the 700-year long efforts by the Monarchy and the five Republics to “parisianize” France. This he amply supports: his prudent generalizations are substantiated by many academic and case examples, and rely on a variety of statistics, maps, and pertinent international comparisons (i.e., German *Länder* and Italian *reggios*). Thus, *Thèmes transfrontaliers* is a compact, well-organized and very up-to-date book, with few neologisms. It is

regrettable, though, that the author omits Defferre's 1982 decentralizing laws that did so much to reinforce the régions. All observers of contemporary France should take them into account, as they deliberately broke with decades of centralisme. They dramatically shifted power away from the core to the periphery, and the substantial increase of local taxes experienced since the 1980s is a direct by-product of this reform.

The transformation of France under the influence of European unification is the common theme in all of these studies. In the absence of a comprehensive French work on this subject, one has to turn to such sources. Taken together, they do offer a detailed and timely, if incomplete, picture of the new France. They show that the Gaullist politico-economic synthesis which had defined France since the 1960s is giving way to a new paradigm. This emerging framework is based on a powerful, if sometimes ambivalent, European commitment. This begets a more competitive economy, what Foucauld calls "une chance exigeante" (p. 9), a redefinition of the role of the State, a néo-colbertisme, and, finally, the choice, between liberalism and federalism, of what Michel Albert labelled le capitalisme rhénan.⁷

Notes

1. Steven Kramer, Does France still Count? The French Role in the New Europe (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994), Ronald Tiersky, France in the New Europe. Changing Yet Steadfast (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1995).

2. Gregory Flynn ed., Remaking the Hexagon. The New France in the new Europe (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995), François-Georges Dreyfus and Jacques Morizet eds., France and EC Membership Evaluated (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993). See also Sydney Nettleton Fisher, France and the European Community (Ohio State University Press, 1964) for an historical perspective.

3. Pierre Maillard, De Gaulle et l'Europe. Entre la Nation et Maastricht (Paris: Tallandier, 1995), Rudiger Dornbusch and Pierre Jacquet, La France et l'Union économique et monétaire européenne (Paris: IFRI, 1991). See also Jean-Pierre Fitoussi, Le Débat interdit. Monnaie, Europe, Pauvreté (Paris: Arléa, 1995).

4. Christian Lequesne, Paris-Bruxelles. Comment se fait la politique européenne de la France (Paris: FNSP, 1993), René Lenoir and Jacques Lesourne eds., Où va l'Etat? La souveraineté économique et politique en question (Paris: Le Monde, 1992), Claude Goyard ed., La Constitution et l'Europe (Paris: Montchrestien, 1992).

5. Rubens Pinto Lyra, La Gauche en France et la construction européenne (Paris: LGDJ, 1978), Yves Léonard ed., La France et l'Europe (Paris: La Documentation Française, 1991), Joël Rideau and Pierre Gerbet eds., La France et les communautés européennes (Paris: LGDJ, 1975).

6. Elie Cohen, Le Colbertisme High Tech. Economie des Télécom et du Grand Projet (Paris: Hachette, 1992).

7. Michel Albert, Capitalisme contre capitalisme (Paris: Le Seuil, 1991)

Many thanks to Heidi Bjorge who most patiently edited this essay. All remaining mistakes are mine.

Michel Gueldry
Monterey Institute of International Studies

Publications

State of the European Union, Volume 3: Building a European Polity?

The most recent volume in ECSA's State of the EU/EC series is available from Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. Edited by Carolyn Rhodes and Sonia Mazey, the volume considers the implications of the Treaty of European Union, in the context of integration analysis for both the member states and the EU itself. In addition to an introductory essay by the Editors, twenty chapters are included in sections devoted to "Reflections on European Integration," "Europeanization of National Politics," and "European Public Policy Making: Internal and External Dimensions."

The regular purchase price for this volume is \$49.95, plus shipping. ECSA members receive a discount rate of \$39.95 which includes shipping. Orders should be sent to Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1800 30th Street, Suite 314, Boulder, CO 80301; Fax (303) 444-0824; Tel (303) 444-6684.

1995 ECSA Conference Papers on CD-ROM

ELLIS Publications of Maastricht is offering a CD-ROM title of papers presented at the 1995 ECSA Conference. Over 130 papers from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and on a broad range of EU-related topics are included. Papers may be displayed on screen, printed out, saved partially, or saved as a complete document.

The standard price is US \$175.00 plus US \$25.00 for postage and handling. ECSA-USA members (individuals, students, and institutions) receive a special discount rate of US \$99.00 plus US \$25.00 postage and handling. Authors contributing to the ECSA Conference CD-ROM Collection receive previously agreed discounts. Orders may be made by credit card (VISA, MasterCard and American Express); otherwise pre-payment is required. Credit card orders must include the card number and expiration date. All orders must include a full postal address, telephone, fax number and e-mail address. Orders may be faxed directly to:

EPMS bv - ELLIS Publications
P.O. Box 1059
6201 BB MAASTRICHT
THE NETHERLANDS
Fax: +31-43-457-2148

Orders by electronic mail may be sent to Mr. Richard Hainebach at <100644.3600@compuserve.com>.

South European Society & Politics

The aim of the journal is to provide a forum for comparative interdisciplinary studies of southern Europe, along with innovative country and subnational studies, and to encourage work on the region and its social, economic, cultural and political dimensions. In particular the editors wish to encourage quantitative work and more extensive study of policy-making. The first issue will be available in June of 1996, with three issues produced each year in Spring, Summer, and Autumn.

The contents of the first issue include the following articles: "Social Assistance in Southern Europe," by Ian Gough; "Less Successful Strategies: Japanese Manufacturing in Southern Europe," by James Darby; "Developing Environmental Policies in Southern Europe: The Enactment and Enforcement of

European Legislation," by Geoffrey Pridham; "Mafia: The Sicilian Cosa Nostra," by Pino Arlacchi; and "The Rejection of Authoritarian Policy Legacies: Family Policy in Spain (1975-1995)," by Celia Valente. Review articles and essays, book reviews, a research forum, and a "South European DataWatch" will also be regular features.

The normal subscription rates are individuals £35.00/\$45.00 and for institutions £90.00/\$135.00. However, an introductory discount of 20% is available to members of ECSA-USA. For more information about the journal or to order a copy, visit the Frank Cass Publishers WWW site at <http://www.frankcass.com/jnls>, or contact them at 900 Eastern Avenue, Newbury Park, Ilford, Essex, IG2 7HH, UK (Tel: +44 181 599 8866; Fax +44 181 599 0984; or E-mail info@frankcass.com). Enquiries regarding submissions should be directed to the editors: Martin Baldwin-Edwards or Martin Rhodes, c/o Frank Cass Publishers at the above address, or E-mail the editors at sesp@qub.ac.uk or Rhodes@datacomm.iue.it.

Harvard Jean Monnet Working Paper Series

This series edited by Prof. Joseph H.H. Weiler includes the following papers produced in 1995:

- No. 1. "European Democracy and its Critique - Five Uneasy Pieces," by Joseph H.H. Weiler with Ulrich Haltern and Franz Mayer.
- No. 2. "Sovereignty or Management? The Dual Character of the EC's Supranationalism - Revisited," by José de Areilza.
- No. 3. "Evolution and Effort: The Development of a Strategy of Docket Control for the European Court of Justice and the Question of Preliminary References," by Sarah E. Strassner.
- No. 4. "The European Court of Justice and the Protection of Fundamental Rights in the European Community: New Developments in Expanding Fundamental Right-Review to Member State Action," by Darcy S. Binder.
- No. 5. "The European Union after the Maastricht Decision. Is Germany the 'Virginia of Europe'?" by Steve J. Bloom.
- No. 6. "The State 'über alles': Demos, Telos and the German Maastricht Decision," by Joseph H.H. Weiler.
- No. 11. "Race Discrimination in the European Union: Potential Sources of Protection for Racial Minorities," by Jeremy Richmond.
- No. 12. "Europe after Maastricht - Do the New Clothes have an Emperor?" by Joseph H.H. Weiler.
- No. 13. "Political Review of the European Court of Justice and its Jurisprudence," by J.W.R. Reed.

Papers can be ordered for \$7.00 each within the U.S., \$10.00 overseas air mail, and \$7.50 overseas surface mail. For more information, contact Joseph H.H. Weiler, Jean Monnet Chair, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Conference Proceedings for "The Integration of Central and Western Europe: Legal, Economic, and Security Dimensions"

The proceedings for this June 15-18 1995 Conference have been published by the Forum on Central and Eastern Europe in conjunction with the Centre for European Studies of the University of Essex. The cost is 14 pounds sterling, including postage; payment must be sent with each order to the Centre for European Studies, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK.

Launching of Newsletter for the *Forum Européen de Prévention Active des Conflits*

The *Forum Européen de Prévention Active des Conflits* (FEPAC) will shortly distribute a newsletter in partnership with the Phillip Morris Institute for Public Policy Research (PMI). FEPAC is comprised of 120 MEPs of all EU nationalities and from all political tendencies. Their aim is to raise awareness among citizens and their representatives of the need to prevent the occurrence or reoccurrence of armed conflicts, to contain violence and to facilitate the settlement of deadly confrontations. The new FEPAC/PMI newsletter is intended to disseminate to a wider public the parliamentary intergroup's debates on the crucial questions of foreign policy and conflict prevention currently facing Europe. The newsletter will be published in English, French, and German. For more information, contact the PMI at 6, rue des Patriotes, 1000 Brussels, Belgium, or the FEPAC at the Parlement Européen, 97-113 rue Belliard, 1047 Brussels, Belgium.

Journal of Political and Military Sociology Special issue on the European Union

Scholars are invited to submit article manuscripts for a planned special issue of The Journal of Political and Military Sociology (JPMS) on political and civil-military aspects of the European Union. Interested scholars should send four copies of articles for submission to the Editor of the JPMS, Prof. George A. Kourvetaris, c/o JPMS, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois 60115. Prof. Kourvetaris also invites queries from scholars interested in serving as guest editors for this special issue.

Recent Publications on the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference:

1996 intergovernmental conference (IGC '96): reflection group report and other references for documentary purposes By General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1996.

Intergovernmental conference 1996: Commission report for the Reflection Group. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1995.

A Transatlantic Blueprint: The U. S. and the EU 1996 Intergovernmental Conference: Final Report of the European Institute Transatlantic Joint Action Initiative (TJAI). By Rashish, Peter S., et al. Washington; European Institute, Oct. 1995.

Making Europe Work: Intergovernmental Conference 1996. By Richard E. Baldwin. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1995.

The Federal Trust Paper Series on the IGC:
State of the Union. No. 1. 1995.

Towards the Single Currency. No. 2. 1995.

Building the Union. No. 3. 1995.

Security of the Union. No. 4. 1995.

Enlarging the Union: the intergovernmental conference of the European Union, 1996. No. 5. 1996.

Justice and Fair Play. No. 6. 1996.

Competition and Employment. No. 7. 1996.

In addition, the Secretariat Working Party of the European

Parliament has established a Task Force for the 1996 Inter-governmental Conference. The Task Force has produced a White Paper on the 1996 IGC, and a series of briefing papers on various issues related to the IGC. The Director of the Task Force is J. Javier Fernandez Fernandez. For more information contact the Secretariat Working Party of the European Parliament at L-2929 Luxembourg; Fax +352 43 40 72; or at 97-113 rue Belliard, B-1047 Bruxelles, Belgium; Fax +32 2 231 1232.

**Special Offer to ECSA-USA Members for
*Journal of Common Market Studies***

Blackwell Publishers are offering a special reduced subscription price for The Journal of Common Market Studies to members of ECSA-USA. A recently distributed mailing offers an individual rate of £53.25 in Europe, US \$102.00 in North America, and £64.50 in other areas of the world. The regular rates are £71.00, US \$136.00, and £86.00, respectively. Subscription includes The European Union: The Annual Review of Activities. Members who have not received this mailing should contact either K. Azzopardi, Blackwell Publishers, 108 Cowhey Road, Oxford OX4 1JF UK, Tel +44 1865 791100, Fax +44 1865 791347; or Journals Marketing (JCMS), Blackwell Publishers, 238 Main Street, Cambridge, MA 02142 USA, Tel 617 547 7110; Fax 617 547 0789.

Association News

**ECSA-NET Project Continues:
ECSA-USA Membership Directory to be Placed On-line**

Through the efforts of the University Information Unit, DGX of the European Commission, ECSA-USA and the thirty other national ECSAs hope to place valuable EU studies information on-line. This project, known as the "ECSA-NET", is ultimately intended to include material on current EU-related research projects, recent publications, conferences, teaching

programs, and the membership rosters of all the ECSAs. It will be an important forum - an interactive communications network linking scholars of the EU around the globe.

Though the ECSA-NET in limited form is already available via the Commission's EUROPA server at <<http://www.ccc.lu/ecsa/homepage.html>>, progress is ongoing as a number of technical difficulties are being worked out. The ECSA World Secretariat hopes to give a demonstration of the ECSA-NET at the September 19-20, 1996 conference in Brussels. Updates on the ECSA-NET will be included in the ECSA Review.

One issue is of immediate concern to members of ECSA-USA: the ECSA-NET will eventually include the membership directories of each national ECSA. Members of ECSA-USA who do not wish to have their entries listed on-line should contact Bill Burros at the ECSA-USA Administrative Office.

ECSA REVIEW

Co-Editors

Professor Paulette Kurzer
Book Review Editor
Department of Political Science
Social Science 315
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
E-mail: KURZER@Arizona.edu
FAX: (520) 621-5051
TEL: (520) 621-7600

Bill Burros
Managing Editor
ECSA Administrative Director
ECSA Administrative Office
405 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
E-mail: ecsa+@pitt.edu
FAX: (412) 648-1168
TEL: (412) 648-7635

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION
1996 Membership Application and Renewal Form**

Name: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____
City State Zip

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

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

Card number: _____ Expiration: _____ VISA MC

Signature _____

If paying by check, please make payable to ECSA.

Mail to: ECSA, 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA; FAX (412) 648-1168