EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION
VOLUME X, NO. 1 – WINTER 1997
ISSN 1090-5758

ECSA REVIEW

Editorial

JAMES CAPORASO
University of Washington

In a January seminar co-sponsored by ECSA-USA and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies in Washington, D.C., Professor David Vogel of the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, delivered his paper, "Regulatory Competition Between the European Union and the United States." Vogel's paper is the third in an ongoing project between ECSA-USA and the European Union known as the US-EU Relations Project, following Professor Catherine Kelleher's paper in 1993 and Professor Miles Kahler's in 1995. (Kelleher's topic was security relations while Kahler wrote about 'behind-the-border' obstacles to trade and investment.)

Vogel's paper goes a step beyond the 'behind-the-border' approach to examine the sources of and obstacles to regulatory cooperation between the European Union and the United States. He discusses what drives the increasingly strict regulations and the impact of these regulations on trade negotiations. The paper analyzes the dynamics of conflict and cooperation with respect to regulations in food safety, ethics and pharmaceuticals, fuel economy standards, animal protection, environmental labeling of products, and ozone depletion; Vogel uses cases such as the leg trap ban, tuna embargo, beef with hormones ban, and others to support his arguments. He argues that whatever regulations are adopted by the U.S.and the European Union, they have enormous global influence and effectively set world standards; because of this, trade regulation negotiations between the U.S. and the European Union are *de facto* multilateral rather than bilateral.

Professor Vogel was joined in Washington by an impressive array of roundtable discussants from the U.S. government, the private sector, NGOs and research institutions. He will present the paper to a largely European audience in Brussels on March 10, 1997, and again as a plenary presentation at our own ECSA Fifth Biennial International Conference in Seattle in May.

That is but one reason among many that ECSA members and others interested in the European Union will want to attend our upcoming Conference. A Provisional Conference Program has been included with this issue of the Review; please browse through it and see for yourself the truly exciting range of scholarship and inquiry about the European Union which will be offered. As mentioned in the last Review, we are also quite fortunate to have Ambassador Hugo Paeman of the European Commission Delegation, Washington, D.C. as our Keynote Luncheon Speaker on Friday, May 30th. This will be our largest conference to date and we believe it has become the preeminent gathering of EU scholars in this hemisphere.

One important item of ECSA business which requires members' immediate attention is the election of the 1997-99 Executive Committee. Ballots and nominee biographies were recently mailed to ECSA members. Members must select seven committee members to fill two-year terms as ECSA's decision-making body. Eleven accomplished persons are this year's nominees, and ECSA members are kindly requested to read the biographies which accompanied the ballot, mark seven choices, and mail us the ballot to be received no later than March 31, 1997. The new Executive Committee will be announced in the Spring/Summer *ECSA Review* and will be inaugurated at our May Conference in Seattle.

This winter sees a time of transition for ECSA-USA; our administrative director *non-pareil*, Bill Burros, has taken a position as information specialist with the Delegation of the European Commission in Washington, D.C. Bill will be working in the Office of Academic Affairs on projects such as assisting in the development and coordination of information services, particularly with reference to the Internet. Bill had held the ECSA administrative position since April, 1993, and did a superlative job in both administering and developing projects for the Association. Happily, he is not lost to us; Bill will continue to work on projects that will be of interest to ECSA members, and he may even surface at the ECSA Conference in Seattle.

We welcome to ECSA a new administrative director, Valerie Staats, to whom Bill passed the administrator's baton in January. Valerie holds a Ph.D. in public and international affairs from the University of Pittsburgh; her dissertation study of an immigrant community in Chicago investigated policy implications for NGOs with clients who are undocumented migrants outside the reach of formal institutions. She has developed and taught undergraduate courses on both U.S. and comparative immigration policy. Valerie has edited two journals and founded two non-profit organizations, and has worked extensively in fundraising and development. She has studied in Dijon, France and Salamanca, Spain and was a Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco. We are pleased to have been able to appoint her.

Please enjoy this issue of the *ECSA Review*; we have included a variety of articles, book reviews and announcements all concerning European Union scholarship. Note particularly the announcements for ECSA-sponsored master's and doctoral-level fellowships; applications deadlines are in April. We encourage you to bring this information to the attention of students and faculty at your institutions.

This publication was made possible in part by a generous grant from the Delegation of the European Commission, Office of Press and Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.

REGISTRATION INFORMATION

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION

FIFTH BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

MAY 29 - JUNE 1, 1997 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
SESSIONS BEGIN AT 8:30 A.M. ON MAY 29 AND END AT 4:00 P.M. ON JUNE 1

The European Community Studies Association (ECSA) is proud to host its Fifth Biennial International Conference in Seattle, Washington this year. More than three hundred scholars specializing in the European Union will gather to participate in over 75 panels and roundtable discussions during a four-day period. This promises to be our most exciting and fruitful engagement of scholarly inquiry into the European Union to date. A provisional program has been included with this issue of the ECSA Review. We greatly look forward to seeing you in Seattle.

Please note that all paper givers, panel chairs and discussants must formally register to attend the Conference.
The next two pages include the conference registration form and details about housing and travel arrangements.
Registration must be received by May 1, 1997. Please send registration forms by regular mail or fax to:

European Community Studies Association
405 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

Fax (412) 648-1168

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)

The conference registration form, information on accommodations, conference travel agent, and links for information about the Seattle area are also available on the ECSA World Wide Web site at the top of the home page under "What's New" at **<http://www.pitt.edu/~ecsa101>**.

1997 ECSA 5th Biennial Conference Registration Form

Please complete the following form and return by regular mail or fax at (412) 648-1168 to the ECSA Administrative Office, 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA.

Please type or print legibly.

Name _____

Institutional Affiliation _____

_____

Mailing Address _____

_____

_____

E-mail _____

Telephone _____ Facsimile _____

Please Check the Appropriate Fees (Registration and payment must be received by May 1, 1997):

___ ECSA Individual Member ($70.00)
___ ECSA Student Member ($20.00)
___ Individual Nonmember ($100.00)*
___ Student Nonmember ($35.00)*

Friday, May 30th Keynote Address Luncheon Fees (seating is limited to first 300 subscribed)

___ Conference participant ($15.00)
___ Conference participant and Guest - one guest limit ($30.00)

Total Fees Enclosed By Check or Charge Card: $_____

Payment: If paying by check, please make payable to ECSA. Checks must be in US dollars, drawn on a bank with representation in the USA. Payment by Credit Card (Visa or MasterCard only—please indicate which) must include:

Card Number _____
Expiration Date _____
Cardholder Signature _____

**Registration fees of non-members include a one-year ECSA-USA membership.*

Conference Hotel

The 1997 ECSA Fifth Biennial International Conference will be held at:

The Madison-Renaissance Hotel
515 Madison Street
Seattle, Washington 98104 USA

Tel. (206) 583-0300
Fax (206) 624-8125

Conference attendees must make their own hotel or housing arrangements. The following daily guest room rates are available for those attending the Conference:

Single/Double Occupancy $129 US
Corner King Suite $149 US

These rates do not include state and local taxes. The cut-off date for reservations is April 30, 1997. Reservation requests received after the cut-off date will be accepted on a space available basis at the prevailing rate. All reservations must be accompanied by a major credit card or a check payable for first night room and tax as an advance deposit.

Conference Travel Agent

The designated travel agent for the 1997 ECSA Conference is Mutual Travel of Seattle. Michael Blakley, reservations manager, is handling the ECSA account—ask for him when you contact them. For domestic air tickets purchased through Mutual Travel, United Airlines is offering Conference participants a discount of 5% off the lowest available published airfare. Mutual Travel can also handle car rentals if conference-goers so desire. Please note that hotel reservations must be made directly with the hotel.

While we have a group services arrangement with Mutual Travel, they are not set up to handle conference attendees' personal travel arrangements beyond travel to and from Seattle for the Conference.

To contact Mutual Travel, call U.S.A./Canada toll-free 1-800-426-8284. Conference-goers may also order airline tickets through Mutual Travel by using fax (206) 205-4711. Callers from outside the United States and Canada may telephone (206) 205-4800.

Campus Housing for Graduate Students

Sixty rooms for graduate students only will be available in residence halls on the University of Washington campus, a 15-minute local bus ride from a stop right in front of the dormitories. These rooms are available on a first-come, first-served basis and come as a three-night package from May 29th through June 1st (a.m. departure). Room rates are reasonable at approximately $92 US per person for *three nights and three breakfasts* with double occupancy or approximately $125 US for single occupancy. A fourth night, for those who arrive on Wednesday, May 28th, is available at the extra rate of $21 per person for a double room or $32 for a single (no meals included).

Interested students may send an e-mail request to <ecsa+@pitt.edu> including a fax number, and we will fax to you the registration form; interested students may also make rooming arrangements directly with the University of Washington Housing Service by contacting:

Ms. Noel Bruzzichesi
Tel. (206) 543-9384
Fax (206) 543-4094

Travelers from Europe

Please note the following tips to minimize the costs of your air travel to the United States:

- A stay in the U.S. of 7 days or longer will get the cheapest air fare rates.
- Purchasing a non-refundable ticket will also reduce the air fare.
- Inquire about excursion fares directly to Seattle or to San Francisco, the nearest large city, from which Seattle is a short, inexpensive air trip.

ECSA 5th Biennial International Conference
Provisional List of Panels and Roundtables

The following is a provisional list of panel and roundtable titles for ECSA's 5th Biennial International Conference to be held in Seattle from May 29-June 1, 1997. Please note that this list does not include individual paper titles, and is subject to change.

- Break Out, Break Down, or Break In: Germany and the EU on the Eve of Maastricht II
- Breaking the Bonds of Servitude: The Political Autonomy of EU Institutions
- CFSP and IGC: A Multinational Perspective
- Challenging the Common Agricultural Policy: Reform and Enlargement
- Citizenship and Democracy
- Citizens, the Court, and EU Law
- Common Agricultural Policy
- Developing a Credible Common Foreign and Security Policy: Practical and Theoretical Perspectives
- Domestic Politics and EU Policymaking
- Dynamics of Decision- Making in the EU
- EC's Law Community: Subsidiarity, Citizenship, and Legitimacy in the EU
- Economic Implications of Enlargement, I and II
- EMU and Eastern Enlargement
- EMU Sources and Origins
- EMU: Moving to the Third Stage
- EMU: The Politics of Ideas
- Enlargement of the EU: Political, Economic, and Security Issues
- EU Democracy in Global Perspective
- EU Development Policies in the 1990s
- EU Social Policy
- Europe and the Significant Others
- Europe on the Web: Approaches to Using the WWW in European Union Studies
- Europe's Regions in a New System of Governance
- European Business: Deregulation and Competitiveness
- European Defence: the Role of the WEU and NATO
- European Institutions and the Third Pillar
- European Monetary Integration: The Institutional Dimension
- European Union Citizenship: New Polity, Old Polity, or Beyond the Polity
- Explaining European Governance: Pitfalls and Opportunities
- Framing European and Atlantic Cooperation: Historical Structures and Doctrines
- France and European Integration 1947-1997: Half Century Historical Perspectives
- General Political Science Theory and European Integration
- Germany and the EU: Building Europe or Pursuing National Self-Interest
- Governance and Policy Making in the European Union: Alternative Perspectives
- How to Give the EU a Soul? Promoting Identity and Citizenship
- Implementation in the European Union
- Institutional Change in the European Parliament
- Institutional Innovations in EU Regulation: Conflict and Coordination in Horizontal and Vertical Policy Areas
- Institutional Processes in the EU
- Integration and Internationalism in European Competition Policy
- Interest Groups and the European Community
- Issue Linkage in the European Union
- Legal and Political Perspectives on the Governance of the Social Dimension
- Levels of Governance
- Multilevel Governance in the European Union
- Multilevel Politics in a Global Economy: Bridging Comparative Analysis and Integration Theory
- National Governments and Civil Aeronautics: The Theory and Practice of International Rivalry Between the US and EU Countries
- National Identity, Citizenship, and European Identity
- National Interest and Monetary Integration
- Organised Interests and European Integration Theory
- Orientations Toward Immigrants, I and II
- Parties and Elections in the EU
- Peace, Neutrality, and Security
- Policy Diffusion in the EU
- Policy Networks and the Europeanisation of Domestic Policy
- Political and Institutional Aspects of Enlargement
- Political Parties, Political Elites, and European Integration
- Public Opinion, Citizenship, and the EU
- Public Support for European Integration
- Regional Responses to European Integration
- Roads of Change: New Institutional Accounts of EU Common Transport Policy
- Security and Defence Implications for the European Union of Further Enlargements
- Security, Scandinavia, and the European Union
- Teaching the EU: Exchanging Ideas on Techniques and Methods
- Technology and European Union Information: New Approaches and Official Development
- Telecommunications Reform in the EU
- Territorial Politics in the European Union
- The Commission and Legislation
- The Domestic Consequences of EU Policy
- The Double Expansions of Europe: The EU and NATO
- The Environment and European Integration
- The EU *is* Domestic Politics
- The EU and the Mediterranean
- The EU's New Asia Strategy
- The EU's State Aid Regime: Multidisciplinary Perspectives
- The European Commission: A Purposive and Influential EU Actor
- The European Commission: Approaches to Unpacking the Monolith
- The European Parliament Within a Changing Institutional System
- The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI)
- The European Union and the United States Toward 2000: Patterns and Processes
- The IGC: New Avenues to Governance?
- The International Capability and Influence of the European Union
- The Large Firm in the European Public Policy Process
- The Politics of Institution Building in the European Union
- The Theoretical Challenge of EU Governance
- The Way Forward for the European Regulatory System
- Theorising Change in the European Community/Union
- Toward a European Civil Society: Protest and the Emergence of a Unified Europe

Conferences and Workshops

The EU's Economic and Monetary Union: Toward the Millennium

March 13, 1997, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK: A one-day conference organized by the Centre for European Studies at the University of Leeds. Topics and speakers include:

- "Britain and EMU: Policies, Strategies and the Domestic Management of an Explosive Agenda," Kevin Featherstone (University of Bradford, UK)
- "The IGC, the Euro and the Future," Geoffrey Martin (Head of the European Commission)
- "Winners or Losers? Structural Funds in the Context of EMU and Further European Integration," Harvey Armstrong (University of Sheffield, UK)
- "Who rules whom? EMU and the Political Future of the EU," Christopher Lord (University of Leeds)

For further details, contact the Centre for European Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK or fax to 44 113 233 6784, or e-mail to <n.j.hey@leeds.ac.uk>.

1997 European Year Against Racism International Conference on Cultural Diversity

March 13-14, 1997, Goldsmiths College University, London, UK: Prometheus-Europe and Goldsmiths College University are co-hosting a variety of workshops and seminars to consider how models of cultural diversity are evolving in both Europe and North America. Broad workshop themes are "Trends in North America," "Trends in Europe" and "Common Themes and Divergences," and questions for consideration include:

- Cultural Diversity and Social Integration in 2020 in North America?
- Long-Term Interactions of the ALENA Process and Cultural Diversity Issues in North America?
- Cultural Identities and the Rights of Minorities: Central Issue for Democracy in North America in the Next Century?
- The European Integration Process' Impact on Cultural Diversity in Europe?
- Cultural Diversity and Political Cohesion in Europe in 2020?
- The Return of Non-Management of Cultural Diversity in Europe: Toward the 'Tribal" Model Once Again?

Speakers will include Jacques Chagnon, MP of Montreal, Canada; Padraig Flynn, Social Affairs Commissioner, European Commission; Eric Hayes, Council of the European Commission (DG-I, External Relations-USA); Iyiola Solanke, London School of Economics, and many others. For information, contact Mary Claire Halvorson, Club Prometheus London, Director of Professional Training, Goldsmiths University of London, 14 St. Donatt's Road, London SE14 6NR, UK, or fax to 44 171 919 7213 or e-mail to <m.c.halvorson@gold.ac.uk>.

Prometheus-Europe is a European Community integration movement seeking coherent solutions to the current and future problems posed by the building of the European Community and its relations with the rest of the world. P-E is a non-profit organization composed of volunteers from five continents, an outgrowth of a student movement started in Europe in 1985.

Dis/ease in Europe

April 11-12, 1997, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI: The Center for West European Studies at Kalamazoo College will sponsor this conference with the following focus:

"The seductions of scientific discourse form an enduring, painful and often captivating theme within the historical, artistic and political societies in Europe during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This conference examines the special fascination dis/ease holds for various disciplines and political movements. Topics to be addressed include the consumptive heroine in opera, immigrants and xenophobia, the treatment of the disabled in Nazi Germany and the political climate in Europe today toward combating AIDS."

For information, contact Professor R. Amy Elman, Center for West European Studies, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI 49006, USA, or by fax to 616 337 7251, or e-mail to <elman@kzoo.edu> or Janet Riley at e-mail <cfwes@kzoo.edu>.

Economic System of European Union and Adjustment of the Republic of Croatia

April 24-25, 1997, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia: For information, contact Prof. Maja Vehovec, Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Vukovarska 58/IV, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia, or by telephone to 385 51 33 27 77, or fax to 385 51 51 21 78, or e-mail to <skalamer@ oliver.efri.hr>.

Ungovernable Margins: Governance and Integration on the Edges of Europe

April 25, 1997, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK: Following a successful 1996 workshop on "Borders in Contemporary European Politics and Culture" this workshop takes a comparative perspective on governance issues in a number of regions:

"Each such area can usefully be thought of as geographically and politically on the margin of EU-led integration ... Discussions are being invited which cover areas such as the Mediterranean, the Baltic, Great Britain and the Visegrad countries. Alternatively, contributions may address different levels of integration such as the relationship between market integration and alignment of political cultures."

A limited fund for contributor's travel expenses is available. For information contact Noel Parker, Lecturer in European Politics, Linguistics and International Studies, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 5XH, UK, or fax to 44 1483 30 26 05, or e-mail to <n.parker@surrey.ac.uk>.

The Politics of Health: New Agenda and Political Forces in Europe

May 2-3, 1997, London School of Economics, London, UK: This conference will concentrate on two themes:

- New patterns of interaction between policy makers and political actors at the national and European levels.
- The impact of these relationships upon health-related issues such as national health systems, priority setting in health policy, the pharmaceutical and bio-technology industry, insurance policy, free movement of goods and persons, health needs of migrants and health and safety policies.

For information, contact Elias Mossialos, Director, LSE Health, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK, or e-mail to <y.shechter@lse.ac.uk>.

Jean Monnet, Europe and Paths of Peace

May 29-31, 1997, Institut Pierre Renouvin, University of Paris I: Co-sponsored by the Institut Pierre Renouvin (Department of History), the German Historical Institute of Paris, and the Jean Monnet Association. For information, contact Gerard Boussat, Institut Pierre Renouvin, Universite of Paris I, 1, rue Victor Cousin, F-752131 Paris, France, or fax to 33 1 40 51 79 34.

Religion: The City and Beyond

July 7-11, 1997, University of Toulouse, Toulouse, France: Organized by the Department of Sociology at the University of Exeter, this conference will include a plenary session on religion in France followed by sessions on religion in urban public space; social problems and policy; the religious response; time-space disjunction; reactions to globalizing trends; elective identities in mass societies; and old religions in new communities. For information, contact Grace Davie, Secretary General, Department of Sociology, University of Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK, or fax to 44 1392 26 32 85, or e-mail to <g.r.c.davie@exeter.ac.uk>.

20th Century Europe: Inclusions/Exclusions

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

Globalizations:
- Institutionalization of Migration
- Migration and the Global Division of Labour
- Europeanization of Immigration Policy
- 'Fortress Europe:' Myth or Reality?

European Processes:
- Costs and Benefits of the European Economic Process
- Democracy in Europe: Institutions and Citizenship
- Europe on the Edge: Nationalism and the Far Right
- Europe as a Social Universe

Revisiting Classical Theory
- Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft 100 Years On
- Modernity and Postmodernism
- Feminist Theory Meets the Classics
- Sunset of Socialism?

Cultures and Identities
- Language, Territory and the Construction of Identity
- Cultural Traditions and/or Homogenization?
- Formative Agents of Cultures and Identities

Inequalities Old and New
- New Forms of Patriarchy
- South/North - East/West: Constructions of Inequalities and Regions
- An End to Class Society?

Work, Welfare and Citizenship
- Restructuring the Labor Market
- Welfare States, Welfare Societies
- Economic Powers and Social Rights
- Gender and Citizenship

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

Second UACES Research Conference

September 10-12, 1997, University of Loughborough, Loughborough, UK: The University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES), King's College London, has issued a call for panels and papers for its second research conference:

UACES invites academics and others interested in the process of European integration to submit proposals for panels and papers; proposals from or including post-graduate research students are welcomed. Panels should consist of a chair (who may or may not give a paper) and 3 papers, and may be on any aspect of European integration, broadly defined. UACES encourages contributions from such areas as social policy and sociology, as well as the more traditional areas of politics, economics, history and law.

Paper proposals are also invited; in order to facilitate grouping of papers into panels, they should be within one of these broad fields:

- Theory of European Integration
- Institutions and the Policy Making Process of the EU
- Economic and Monetary Union
- Justice and Home Affairs
- Structural Funds/EU Regional Policy
- Social Policy of the EU
- EU Environmental Policy
- Security and Defence of the EU
- Enlargement of the EU
- External Relations of the EU

Please specify the field(s) your paper falls into; where more than one, please indicate this and rank order the fields in the order you consider appropriate. Deadline for proposals is February 14, 1997. Notifications of acceptance will be sent in April 1997.

Proposals should be sent to Susan Jones, UACES Secretariat, King's College, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK, or fax to 44 171 836 23 50, or e-mail to <100633.1514@compuserve.com>.

The Conference Committee Chair is John Redmond, Political Science and International Studies, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham BI5 2TT, UK, or fax to 44 121 414 3496, or e-mail to <redmondj@css.bham.ac.uk>.

The European Community of Charbon and Acier (CECA)

October, 1997, University of Provence, Aix-en-Provence, France: This colloquium will analyze CECA with a scientific, interdisciplinary approach which includes the historical point of view of the business sector. The program will examine CECA's influence on organizations and businesses and CECA from its 1967 inception up until today. For information, contact Philippe Mioche, Jean Monnet Chair in History, University of Provence, Hotel Boyer de Fonscolombe, 21, rue Gaston de Saporta, F-13100 Aix-en-Provence, France, or fax to 33 42 96 50 91.

Emile Noel, the Institutional Player

November 17-18, 1997, Brussels, Belgium: This colloquium is being organized by the Jean Monnet Project - Universities and the European Community Studies Associations to honor the late Emile Noel, European Union scholar and diplomat of extraordinary stature. For information, contact CUE AJM, 67, rue de Treves, Brussels B-1040, Belgium, or fax to 32 2 230 56 08, or e-mail to <ecsa@pophost.eunet.be>.

Essays

Ireland's Presidency and the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference[1]

Nicholas Rees
University of Limerick, Ireland

The Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) was convened in response to the provision in the Maastricht Treaty that a review of the Treaty be undertaken in 1996.[2] The covening of the IGC so soon after the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty was seen by elites in the national and political circles as something of a mixed blessing. There was little enthusiasm for the conference and even a fear that many of the issues on which agreement had not been reached in the past would lead to further conflict among the member states. The timing was not particularly good and the circumstances in which the IGC opened, during a domestic crisis in Italian politics and the looming BSE scare in the UK, meant that it was overshadowed by other events.[3]

If internal circumstances in the member states were far from portentous, then external events and pressures provided little solace. The impending US election, continuing political uncertainty and instability in Russia, as well as growing disenchantment with the EU in Central and Eastern Europe, placed the EU under considerable pressure to provide stronger and better leadership in Europe, something that it has seemed incapable of doing. Within the Union, there was also a growing dissatisfaction among some of the member states with the nature of the EU and its policies. Traditionally Britain and Denmark had been opposed to deeper integration, but there was also growing dissatisfaction in Germany and Portugal, states which have usually been pro-integration. In addition, the spectre of the debacle of the Maastricht referendum campaign haunted officials in Brussels and the national capitals. Indeed, the attempt to promote greater public awareness of the IGC and issues associated with it, as well as the emphasis on citizenship and justice and home affairs (e.g., drugs and internal security), were met with a deafening silence by the citizens. For example, a poll conducted by MRBI in December 1996 and reported in the *Irish Times*, noted that 69 percent of the people questioned did not know that the IGC was a meeting to discuss the reform of the EU and its institutions.[4]

The Preparatory Work - Defining the Issues

The preparations for the IGC began in June, 1995 when a Reflection Group was established with the task of preparing for the revision of the Treaty in 1996.[5] The Reflection Group, chaired by Carlos Westendorp, the then Spanish Minister for European Affairs,[6] was required to define the issues to be discussed in the IGC. In its deliberations the group had available to it the various reports drawn up by the EU institutions on the functioning of the Maastricht Treaty[7] and the member states' position papers. The final report of the group, which was presented to the Madrid European Council in December 1995, proposed three broad areas for discussion in the IGC:

- measures to bring the EU closer to the citizens
- reforms to make the EU a more democratic and efficient Union
- strengthening the capacity of the EU to act in external affairs

In addition to these issues and in the context of bringing the EU closer to its citizens, the need to combat unemployment was stressed at the Madrid European Council as a further area for consideration. There was also great awareness that a number of issues that were not on the agenda would implicitly affect the discussions. In particular, four issues underlie the wider European agenda for integration: a) Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), b) enlargement, c) the budget, and d) the West European Union.

The most immediate issue and most contentious one is EMU, on which there is a division among the member states. Some member states, such as Britain, are simply opposed to EMU and see it as a further threat to their already diminishing economic sovereignty. Governments in some of the other member states such as France, while not opposed to EMU, are concerned about whether or not they will be able to meet the Maastricht criteria, and also whether they will be able to convince the public that this is a good thing. Much will depend on the political will of the member states' governments to move forward on EMU and their ability to sell the EMU project to a sceptical public. In practice, meeting the Maastricht criteria may be less important than a political commitment to being a part of an economic and monetary union.

The enlargement of the Union is a further issue of concern and one that is clearly linked to the reform of the EU's institutions and policy making. Enlargement of the Union by possibly six states, and in the longer term twelve, sometime in the early part of the next century, raises fundamental questions about the way in which the Union functions and the very nature of the Union. While enlargement may be an opportunity, it is also a threat to the existing EU system, which is far from being fully efficient or democratic, and might not be able to cope with an influx of new member states.

The issue of the budget, while less immediate than the previous two issues, will be of concern in 1999 when the Delors II package expires and a Santer I financial arrangement will need to be agreed. Whether such an agreement will be forthcoming will depend on agreement among the member states, and given past difficulties in reaching such agreements, much preparatory work will need to be done. The budget issue is also linked to the issue of enlargement as the question of who will pay for further enlargement will also arise. The issue is of concern to both the richer and poorer states. The richer states (Germany, the Netherlands, France and Britain) have been net contributors to the EU budget for many years, and their willingness to pay for enlargement of the Union may depend on their own national economic situations and domestic public opinion. In contrast, the poorer member states (Portugal, Greece, Ireland and Spain) are likely to be concerned that side payments made to them through the structural funds and CAP will be threatened by new, and in some cases, less developed member states.

The final issue concerns the relationship of the EU to the West European Union (WEU). In 1998 the Brussels Treaty that

Nicholas Rees is Jean Monnet Professor and Director of the Centre for European Studies, University of Limerick, Ireland.

created the WEU will expire and the existing members of the WEU will have to review the options open to them. The significance of this is that the members of the WEU are all EU members and some would like to see the WEU and its functions incorporated into the EU. In effect this would mean the EU's role in defence and security matters might be expanded, an issue that clearly raises concern among some member states, such as Ireland. Hence the relationship of the EU to the WEU and the role of the EU in defence and security matters is a further contentious issue in the IGC discussions and one that will need to be considered in advance of 1998.

The IGC and the Italian and Irish Presidencies

The IGC was formally convened on March 29, 1996 in Turin under the auspices of the Italian presidency. The opening of the IGC was overshadowed by the BSE crisis in Britain and the threat that the British government would adopt an obstructionist policy in the EU if its trade in beef was subjected to export restrictions. The atmosphere, however, was reported by those involved as being more positive than might have been expected, given the ongoing crisis and the earlier antipathy of many of the actors to the convening of an IGC.

The pace at which the negotiations proceeded was determined at the outset by an agreed-upon process by which the issues defined in the Reflection Group's report and at the Madrid European Council in December 1995 were each in turn considered by the conference. The negotiations were conducted at two levels: first, in the monthly meetings of the Foreign Minister in the General Affairs Council and second, at weekly meetings of the personal representatives of the foreign ministers.[8] In effect, much of the day to day work was undertaken by the personal representatives, who discussed the various chapters of the Reflection Group report. The working group then consulted the ministers at their monthly meeting on issues on which political direction was required and on which there was no agreement at the working group level.

Under the Italian presidency each of the three chapters went through two readings, and an interim report was prepared for the European Council at its June meeting in Florence. By the end of the Italian Presidency most of the major issues had been raised and the member states' positions were reasonably well known. Thus, at the June European Council the heads of state and government charged the incoming Irish Presidency with preparing the provisions for a draft treaty in time for the Dublin European Council in December 1996. It was also agreed that a further special meeting of the European Council should take place on October 5, 1996 in Dublin.

Within this framework the Irish Presidency's role was to carry out the detailed negotiations. Much faith was placed in the Irish Tanaiste and Foreign Minister, Dick Spring, and Noel Dorr, the Irish chairman of the working group of personal representatives. The objective of the Irish Presidency was to ensure that any further revision of the treaty should make the Union more relevant to the everyday concerns and needs of European citizens. This corresponded to the Irish Presidency's priorities on employment and measures to combat crime and drug trafficking.[9] Other priorities included maintaining the momentum on EMU and the issue of enlargement. The Irish Presidency's approach to the IGC was to move forward by means of a deliberate and methodical discussion of the issues identified during the Italian Presidency. The Presidency undertook to do this at an early stage by distributing "Presidency Notes"—prepared by the Council Secretariat—on the major issues.[10]

The Irish Presidency's task was a difficult one and required considerable diplomatic skill to ensure the talks did not become deadlocked. In particular, Britain's ongoing beef crisis, Mr. Major's slim majority in the House of Commons, and the looming British elections, meant that considerable diplomacy and skill were needed to keep the British involved in the process and to avoid a confrontation between Britain and the other fourteen member states. Thus, the Irish Presidency adopted an incremental approach to the negotiations, ensuring that differences of opinion on key issues were acknowledged, but that no attempt would be made to resolve them and thereby risk a deadlock in the talks. The strategy was effective in that it avoided major confrontations and ensured that the British were kept on board. It would, however, be unfair to suggest that Britain was isolated on all of the main issues, as Britain was seldom in a minority of one.

At an early stage of the Presidency, Ireland was criticised by some of the member states for failing to make sufficient progress on the issues under discussion in the IGC. This prompted the calling of a special European Council in early October in order to facilitate progress and understanding in the IGC negotiations.[11] At the meeting the heads of state and government reconfirmed their commitment to the IGC agenda and reiterated their wish to see a framework outlining draft provisions and possible options at the December European Council. While the meeting may not have been necessary, it did provide an opportunity to review progress and to dispel doubts about what was being achieved.[12] At a very minimum, it ensured that the French President's desire to accelerate the process and Chancellor Kohl's fears that a Maastricht III would be necessary were kept in check in an attempt to maintain cohesion among the member states.

The Conclusion of the Irish Presidency: Dublin II and Beyond

The Dublin European Council on December 13-14, 1996 marked the culmination of the Irish Presidency and the end of a hectic six months for many Irish officials.[13] The overriding priority of the Irish Presidency had been to present a general outline for the draft revision of the treaty and one that was relevant to European citizens. As the Irish Taoiseach, John Bruton, noted in his letter to the EU's heads of state and government in the week before the meeting, the main challenge of the Dublin summit "is to show our citizens that the Union has the capacity and will to deal with the issue of greatest concern to them, unemployment and personal security."[14] The success of the Irish Presidency, therefore, depended on ensuring that the European Council endorsed its draft proposals and that this was accepted as the framework for discussion by the incoming Dutch Presidency.

A more immediate issue, however, overshadowed the European Council, and that was the need for the European Finance Ministers to reach agreement on a dispute that had arisen over the Irish Presidency package on EMU and a single currency. The controversy largely revolved around German insistence that strict rules be adhered to by the member states after accession to the monetary union on the post-single currency "stability and

growth pact." The question concerned whether state currencies who joined the *euro* could be fined for running deficits in excess of three percent of GDP. After much heated debate, a last-minute agreement was reached on the eve of the European Council which stipulated that penalties would not apply if member states faced a severe economic recession. Integral to this was the definition of what constituted a severe economic recession, which was defined as when a drop of 1.5 percent in GDP occurred (or 0.75-1.5 percent, depending on the advice of the Council of Ministers).[15]

The other main focus of the European Council was on the draft document on the revision of the treaties. Other important issues discussed and agreed upon included the Irish Presidency's texts on EU cooperation on drugs and trafficking in people and a Declaration on Employment. During the European Council some 100 minutes were spent discussing the draft text, which was introduced by John Bruton and then commented on by each of the heads of state and government. There was little overt criticism of the text and only praise for the Irish Presidency. President Chirac, who perhaps felt a need to make amends for M. Charette's critical remarks made during the previous week, was very complimentary, although he did point out that there was still no agreement on institutional reform or on the flexibility clause. Chancellor Kohl responded by suggesting that little agreement was likely to be reached on these areas until the run up to the Amsterdam European Council.

The Presidency also chalked up two further accomplishments. First, agreement was reached on a package of measures to fight drug trafficking by reducing cross-border trafficking and improving police cooperation in the exchange of information and joint operations. The actions in this area represent significant progress in operationalising the third pillar—Justice and Home Affairs—in a way that is of direct benefit to EU citizens. Second, the discussion in the European Council on employment was also positive but with a limited outcome. The "Dublin Declaration on Employment" restates much of what was agreed at the Essen European Council in December 1994 and in President Santer's proposed Employment Pact. Whether this will pave the way for a new chapter on employment policy in the next treaty has yet to be seen, given continuing British opposition to EU action in this area, and Prime Minister John Major's contention that "solutions were not to be found in new treaty language on the issue but in actions in the member states." Indeed, Major only agreed to sign the text provided that it would not be seen as tacit agreement to include a new chapter on employment in the final treaty.

The Draft Document and the Dutch Presidency

The draft document entitled, "The European Union Today and Tomorrow: Adapting the European Union for the Benefit of its Peoples and Preparing It for the Future," is a general outline for a draft revision of the treaties. It is by no means a finished text, but rather it details areas in which there is a consensus and on which action may be taken, and areas in which there is no consensus, and in which various options are open to the member states. The document is therefore an interim one and leaves open many issues for further discussion under the Dutch presidency.

The document comprises three parts and is 140-plus pages in length. Part A, by far the longest part of the document, is devoted to the main areas of discussion in the IGC: freedom, security and justice; the Union and its citizens; an effective and coherent foreign policy; the Union's institutions; and enhanced cooperation by means of flexibility. Part B briefly notes other issues raised at the IGC but not yet discussed, and Part C touches on the simplification of the treaties. Part A is the most important part of the document, as it establishes the basic priorities for reform, and while the level of detail and overall agreement over the priorities varies, it does represent the best efforts of the Irish Presidency to provide a draft document. The five priorities include:

- freedom and security in the Union
- bringing the Union closer to its citizens
- enhancing the Union's capacity to act in international affairs
- reform of the EU's institutions
- enhanced cooperation by means of flexibility

The initial order of the priorities may seem somewhat unexpected, as the draft emphasizes fundamental rights, free movement, and safety and security, as well as a desire to bring the Union closer to its citizens, but this reflects the Irish Presidency's objectives. The emphasis on these areas may also reflect Ireland's own concerns as a small state and one used to fighting to establish its rights and those of others in international affairs. While the third pillar on Justice and Home Affairs is the least developed of the three pillars, it may also be the least controversial compared to the other areas being discussed (e.g., foreign policy, institutional reform and enhanced cooperation). For example, on institutional matters there was no agreement on the further use of Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) or the reweighting of votes under QMV, and there remains no agreement on the size of the Commission, whereas there is some agreement on the simplification of the co-decision procedure. The issue of flexibility receives little or no substantive treatment in the text, perhaps reflecting Ireland's own fears and concerns as a small state that such a clause might diminish its own role in the EU. Such are the sensitivities on these issues that the Irish Presidency did not pursue them but preferred to leave them to the Dutch Presidency in the hope that agreement might be reached by the Amsterdam European Council.

The reaction by the member states to the draft was largely positive if not by any means enthusiastic. The general view was that the Irish Presidency had done a good job during a difficult period and had avoided any major pitfalls. On the other hand, the French Foreign Minister, Herve de Charette, may have voiced what many were thinking when he described parts of the document concerning institutional reform, flexibility and foreign policy as "mediocre in ambition." The underlying problem, however, remains the degree to which there is a political commitment among the member states to move forward on the more contentious institutional issues and foreign policy.

The Dutch Presidency will have to try to reach agreement on some of the more difficult issues left unresolved during the Irish Presidency. It also has among its other priorities to finalise preparations for EMU, prepare for enlargement, as well as to deal with external relations problems. Whether the Dutch will be able to find agreement on a new treaty at the Amsterdam European Council is difficult to say; in any case, the Presidency will face a challenging task. In the final analysis, it is more than likely that a number of issues will be fudged and what emerges will be a new treaty that incrementally moves the Union forward in some less

contentious areas, while those issues on which no agreement can be reached may provide the rationale for a further IGC in the early part of the next century.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Antoaneta Dimitrova for her helpful comments and ideas on this article.
2. See Article N of the Maastricht Treaty which provides that "a conference of representatives of the governments of the member states shall be convened in 1996."
3. See Fulvio Attina's article, "Italy's EU Presidency," *ECSA Review*, Vol. IX, No. 3 (Fall 1996), 9-14.
4. *The Irish Times*, December, 1995.
5. 1996 Intergovernmental Conference, Reflection Group Report General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, December, 1995.
6. The Reflection Group comprised the personal representatives of the member states' foreign ministers, two representatives of the European Parliament and a member of the European Commission.
7. See the Report of the Council on the Functioning of the Treaty on European Union, 1996 Intergovernmental Conference - Commission Report to the Reflection Group; European Parliament Resolution on the Functioning of the Treaty on European Union - implementation and development of the Union, as well as the reports by the Court of Justice, Court of First Instance, Court of Auditors, Economic and Social Committee, and Committee of the Regions.
8. The group was originally chaired by Silvio Fagiolo during the Italian Presidency and the Noel Dorr, former Secretary to the Department of Foreign Affairs, during the Irish Presidency. The group was made up of a mix of junior ministers, diplomats and one MEP. The Commission was represented on the working group by Commissioner Marcelino Oreja, while the two MEPs associated with the process were Elmar Brok and Elizabeth Guigou.
9. See Conference on the Priorities of the Irish Presidency. Dublin: Institute of European Affairs and the Trans-European Policy Studies Association, May, 1996.
10. For further details see IGC Update, No.1, September 14, 1996, p. 4. (Dublin: Institute of European Affairs).
11. See IGC Update, No.2, September 17, 1996. (Dublin: Institute of European Affairs).
12. See IGC Update, No.3, October 11, 1996. (Dublin: Institute of European Affairs).
13. Presidency Conclusion, Dublin European Council, December 13-14, 1996.
14. *The Irish Times*, December 11, 1996.
15. *The Irish Times*, December 14, 1996.

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

Valerie Staats, Managing Editor
ESCA Review
405 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

E-mail <ecsa+@pitt.edu>

Motivations and Long-Term Significance of the New Transatlantic Agenda

Anthony Gardner
Hogan & Hartson, LLP, Brussels

The New Transatlantic Agenda signed with much fanfare at the US-EU Summit in Madrid on December 3, 1995, differs from previous platitudes about common transatlantic values and traditions; rather than being inspired by nostalgia, it is a concrete blueprint for action in response to the fundamental truth of today's interdependent world that many of the most important challenges facing the United States and the European Union cannot be addressed satisfactorily by either acting alone. These challenges—such as international crime, terrorism, environmental destruction, poverty and disease—are transnational in scope and require human and financial resources which exceed those at the disposal of Washington or Brussels at a time of increasing budgetary austerity.

Rather than review the content of the Agenda, which is already well known, this article gives a brief summary of two aspects of the Agenda which have received less attention: the motivations of the US and EU in launching it and the reasons why the Agenda is likely to be of long-term significance.

Motivations Leading to the Agenda

The Agenda was born of common concerns in Europe and the United States, as well as concerns specific to each. On this side of the Atlantic, the most important motivation was to ensure continued US engagement in Europe. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, a growing chorus of leaders and commentators in Europe expressed concern that the end of the Cold War would weaken the transatlantic link by diminishing the importance of Washington's security guarantee which had underpinned US-European relations since 1945. President Clinton's emphasis on domestic economic and social renewal and US free trade initiatives with Asia and Latin America, were widely misinterpreted in Europe as being further evidence of a drift of the United States from Europe. This concern became acute after the November 1994 Congressional elections which appeared to indicate a turn of US public opinion toward isolationism and unilateralism.

The United States was attracted to the New Transatlantic Agenda for rather different reasons. Europeanists within the Clinton Administration have not, by and large, believed that the United States is drifting away from Europe. However, many have been preoccupied by the potential threat that transatlantic trade disputes may re-emerge as major irritants in the transatlantic relationship (as they were before the Uruguay Round) if they cease to be imbedded in a broader relationship. As trade gradually assumes a higher profile than security in transatlantic relations, according to this view, NATO is destined to lose some of the utility it has had as the central institution for promoting and symbolizing common interests. There is, therefore, a need to

---

Anthony Gardner, an attorney with Hogan & Hartson in Brussels, served as Director for European Affairs in the European Directorate of the National Security Council between 1994-95. He is the author of a forthcoming book, A New Era in US-EU Relations? The Clinton Administration and the New Transatlantic Agenda (Avebury Press).

update and reinforce the structures of transatlantic cooperation which were forged during the Cold War.

One of the main reasons why the White House took a close interest in the New Transatlantic Agenda had to do with domestic politics: following the election of hostile Republic majorities in the House and Senate in November 1994, the White House found that its room for maneuver on its domestic agenda had become rather restricted and that foreign policy had become doubly important as an arena for the president to look "presidential." The Agenda also appealed to those within the administration who felt that Clinton, as the nation's first post-Cold War president and the leader of the Free World, needed to articulate a vision of US foreign policy and a New World Order in which the containment of Soviet power ceased to play a dominant role.

An important part of this vision was a Europe united around the principles of democracy and free markets and of a larger transatlantic community embracing Central and Eastern Europe through its integration into Western institutions. Inspired by the history of the transatlantic partnership, which had been the strongest force in the world over the last half century for the strengthening of democracy, the liberalization of trade and the promotion of global development and prosperity, the Clinton Administration sought to identify those areas where the US and EU supplement their consultations with joint actions to achieve common objectives.

The New Transatlantic Agenda also responded to the perception in Washington that the US-EU relationship should be adapted to reflect the EU's newly acquired powers under the Maastricht Treaty, particularly those aimed at achieving a common foreign and defense policy and an economic and monetary union. The need for a structured transatlantic relationship was becoming increasingly important as the member states pooled ever more economic and political competencies in the EU.

By defining a wide range of collaborative projects between the US and the EU in Europe and globally, the New Transatlantic Agenda also served to encourage the EU to assume greater international responsibility. The United States had already been pushing the EU to assume primary responsibility for assistance to Central and Eastern Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall and had supported its desire to lead international efforts at resolving the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. The EU's timid approach to the integration of Central Europe and its inability to cope with the conflict in Bosnia underscored the need for an initiative that would encourage the EU to apply its financial and diplomatic resources internationally in partnership with the United States.

Although strengthened transatlantic relations clearly responded to a need, launching a major new initiative just before the opening of the Inter-Governmental Conference was clearly a risk from Washington's perspective: the EU might become entirely self-absorbed with the task of defining the proper balance between inter-governmentalism and supranationalism within the Union; even if the EU has sufficient energy to devote to the initiative, it was uncertain whether the member states would permit the Community, and the Commission in particular, to enhance its foreign policy profile. Indeed, the near failure of Maastricht ratification and growing opposition to further European economic and political integration indicated that the Conference might impose limits on the expansion of the Community's competence and maintain the dominance of member states over foreign and security policy.

Notwithstanding this danger, Europeanists within the Clinton Administration were generally of the view that the United States should not wait until the end of the Inter-Governmental Conference in 1997 before beginning to engage the EU in a more structured partnership; key US interests, including NATO and EU enlargement, the stabilization of the new democracies and market economies of the former Soviet bloc, the opening of new export markets and the stabilization of the Third World were at stake in the short term. At the same time, however, the experience with the working groups confirmed that engaging the EU on some of the areas over which the member states retained competence under the Maastricht Treaty would be a slow and laborious process.

Although the motivations of the US and the EU to engage in the New Transatlantic Agenda were partly distinct, they were also partly identical. The critical motivation for a strengthened transatlantic partnership arose from the common conviction that the most pressing problems facing the US and the EU in an increasingly interdependent world are of a transnational character and cannot be addressed satisfactorily by either acting alone. On both sides of the Atlantic there is a growing desire to cooperate more effectively to combat international crime, terrorism, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to prevent or control environmental degradation, and to respond more effectively to humanitarian crises. Although the degree of transatlantic consensus is not nearly as high in the area of trade, it is important to note that the Commission, supported by most of the EU member states, shares the Clinton Administration's strategy of pursuing further trade liberalization as a way of promoting growth and creating jobs.

Shrinking foreign affairs budgets on both sides of the Atlantic—resulting from efforts to reduce public debt and government deficits—have convinced many policy makers that independent action to address transnational crises is a wasteful luxury of the past. After the November 1994 Congressional elections giving rise to hostile Republican majorities which endorsed isolationist or unilateralist foreign policies, the Clinton Administration came under particularly severe pressure to further reduce the budget for the State Department and the Agency for International Development. The New Transatlantic Agenda offered the prospect of helping the United States to maintain its superpower status "on the cheap" in the 1990s.

Long-Term Significance of the Agenda

Many observers have concluded, based on the frictions caused by the Helms-Burton and D'Amato legislation, that the Agenda has been a failure and that serious rifts are appearing in the transatlantic relationship. As a former official in the Clinton Administration who was closely involved in the elaboration of the Agenda, I share in the disappointment that not more has been achieved toward carrying out some of the joint actions set forth therein. But it is important to recall that the Agenda was intended to be an ambitious project to take the already close US-EU relationship to qualitatively new levels over the long term, rather than a short-term panacea for occasional transatlantic frictions. The Agenda should therefore be judged according to its long-term potential rather than according to its mixed record thus far.

The fact that the record is mixed should not obscure the significant progress which has been achieved in several areas.

Most significantly, at the December World Trade Organization Ministerial in Singapore the US and the EU forged a plurilateral agreement to eliminate duties on a wide range of electronic products—including computers, software, semi-conductors, telecommunications equipment, computer monitors, fiber-optic cables, capacitors, and digital photocopiers—by the year 2000. This Information Technology Agreement will cover trade worth up to $600 billion annually, including nearly $30 billion in transatlantic trade per year. The agreement is likely to boost further US export of information technology products, thereby generating more high-wage jobs in this critical sector.

Although the US and the EU are still having difficulty concluding a Mutual Recognition Agreement on pharmaceutical products, the two sides are close to concluding agreements covering telecommunications and information technology equipment, electrical and electronic products, and recreational craft. Progress has also been made on concluding agreements on science and technology cooperation, veterinary equivalence, customs cooperation and the control of chemical precursors used in narcotics. Finally, it is likely that an agreement will be reached by February 1997 to engage in global liberalization of telecommunications services.

The most significant impact of the Agenda, however, will be over the longer term. In my opinion, there are four main reasons for believing that the impact will be substantial.

Perhaps most important, the Agenda has led to a "widening" and "deepening" of contacts between US an EU officials. Before the launching of the Agenda, consultations remained focused between a few institutional actors: Directorate-General I (External Economic Relations) of the European Commission and the foreign ministry of the EU presidency country, on the side of the EU, and the White House, the Department of Commerce and the Office of the US Trade Representative, on the side of the United States.

Examples of the wider contacts encouraged by the Agenda include the cooperation between the US Department of Education and Directorate-General XXII (Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth) of the European Commission, leading to an agreement on higher education and vocational training signed in December 1995 between US Education Secretary Robert Reilly and EU Commissioner Edith Cresson. There has also been cooperation between the US Department of Labor and Directorate-General V (Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs) of the European Commission, leading to a memorandum of understanding signed between Secretary of Labor Robert Reich and EU Commissioner Padraig Flynn launching a US-EU Working Group on Labor and Employment Issues. This "widening" of transatlantic contacts is particularly significant because it will enrich the dialogue and create new constituencies for US-EU cooperation.

The Agenda has also led to more contacts at deeper levels than had previously been the case. In addition to the traditional meetings at the head of state, ministerial and trade negotiator levels, the Agenda has generated regular meetings in a Senior Group Level between Under-Secretaries and Political Directors and between mid-level officials who do the large bulk of the day-to-day work set forth in the Agenda.

Second, the Agenda has altered the tone and substance of transatlantic contacts. The Helms-Burton Act and the D'Amato Bill have, of course, been the object of strong criticism in the EU. But frictions over this legislation, as well as over the implementation of peace plans in Bosnia and the Middle East, obscure the fact the the US and the EU are talking to one another more intensively than ever before. In its report to the June 1996 summit, the Senior Level Group reported that "a new spirit of cooperation and commitment to joint action pervades the relationship." This was not simply public relations. Before the launching of the Agenda in December 1995, transatlantic consultations had tended to be briefing sessions given by US officials for their European counterparts, with little substantive dialogue and even less follow-up. By engaging both the US and the EU in a common enterprise of long-term perspective and broad scope, the Agenda has generated a true exchange of views and has strengthened the reflexes of officials to think in terms of transatlantic, rather than purely national, interests and objectives.

Third, the Agenda has vastly increased the range of areas for transatlantic cooperation. Whereas transatlantic consultations used to be focused principally on contentious issues of bilateral trade, the issues on which the United States and the EU are pledged to take joint action cover a vast spectrum—security, international trade, the environment, science, health, education and humanitarian assistance and development, to name just a few. These issues are noteworthy because they are of global rather than just transatlantic interest. Moreover, some of the regions of the world toward which the United States and the EU have pledged to coordinate their foreign policies—such as the Middle East and Russia—are noteworthy because they have often been the source of serious transatlantic disputes in the past.

The United States and the European Union have often pursued divergent policies with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict and Russia; at certain moments, including during the Yom Kippur War and President Reagan's effort to impose sanctions on European companies participating in the construction of the Siberian pipeline, these divergences have severely strained the transatlantic relationship. Many of the other regions of the world toward which the United States and the EU have pledged in the Agenda to coordinate their foreign policies—such as Central America, the Caribbean and the Horn of Africa—have never previously been the source of systematic transatlantic cooperation.

Finally, unlike the 1990 Transatlantic Declaration and other US-EU agreements, the Agenda was conceived as a flexible document whose Action Plan would be regularly modified at every US-EU summit to reflect progress that has been achieved since the prior summit, the current context of transatlantic relations and different priorities for action in the future. The flexibility of the Agenda, coupled with the task of the Senior Level Group to monitor US-EU relations and to update and revise priorities in the Agenda for consideration at the semi-annual summits, enable the US and the EU to devote as much attention to conflict prevention through 'early warning' as to conflict resolution. It may, therefore, succeed in taking US-EU relations well beyond the sterile model of ad hoc summit meetings and make transatlantic relations more responsive to changing concerns and events—as well as more immediately relevant to the lives of individuals—in Europe and the United States.

Both the US and the EU need to bear in mind that their relationship is and will remain central to the key economic and political challenges facing both sides of the Atlantic into the next century. The New Transatlantic Agenda has charted the course for

a more effective transatlantic partnership to cope more effectively with those challenges. Progress under the Agenda toward closer US-EU relations will not always be linear or rapid; occasional disputes will continue to arise. But by keeping such transitory issues which divide them in the perspective of those wider, more significant and enduring interests which bind them together, the US and the EU will be more likely to fulfill the great promise contained in the Agenda.

Europeanization of Internal Security Policies in the Framework of the EU

Albrecht Funk
University of Pittsburgh

Internal security firmly belongs to the realm of national sovereignty. For this reason member states of the European Community had been reluctant to extend cooperation in the European Community to the field of law enforcement and policing. Starting with a declaration of the Head of States in 1983, proposing a closer cooperation in this area, a radical shift took place. Only ten years later, "cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs" between the member states was institutionalized as a third pillar of the Union in the Treaty of Maastricht (TEU).

This development is based on the political agreement of West European governments that illegal immigration, terrorism, drug trafficking and transnational crime represent security risks that require closer cooperation and joint actions of national agencies, irrespective of the position governments adopt toward a further "communitization" of policies in the EU. In contrast to other areas, a large majority of the citizens of the member states seem to support a transfer of powers to the Union in order to combat drug trafficking and to control immigration, according to a poll of the public opinion monitoring unit of the EU.[1]

At the same time, however, the third pillar of the EU reflects the difficulties of nation-states to establish a European framework that enables bodies of the EU to initiate efficient joint actions. Member states clearly tried to retain their formal decision making power in the TEU as far as possible. Title VI of the TEU only provides regulations for intergovernmental cooperation in areas that are defined as "matters of common interests" and that are not related to and integrated in the well established Community structure. The structure of the third pillar is essentially intergovernmental. According to Article K.3(1) the member-states have to inform and consult one another in order to coordinate their action in the loosely-defined nine areas of common interest: asylum and immigration policy, external border control, combating drug addiction and fraud on an international scale, judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, customs and police cooperation for the purposes of preventing terrorism, drug trafficking and other serious forms of international crime.

For this reason the legal and organizational provisions of the third pillar are ambiguous, complicated and hardly compatible with those of the Community. The inefficiencies of cooperation under the TEU are hard to miss. The Europol Convention, legalizing the already established institution, finally was signed in June 1996 only after the UK refused to confer powers to interpret the convention to the European Court of Justice in a dubious deal on British beef. Other important conventions such as the pre-Maastricht Dublin convention on asylum, or the External Frontiers Convention, are not yet ratified by all member states, while COREPER (Committee of Permanent Representatives of the Council of EU Justice and Interior Ministers)—responsible for the implementation of the cooperation—has passed mostly technical conventions and agreements since Maastricht.[2] The General Secretary of the Commission had to draw the conclusion that "cooperation in the framework of the Third Pillar is not very successful up till now" (Lobkowicz, 1994, p.48).

For this reason a revision of the regulations of Title VI are the focus of attention at the intergovernmental conference. Austria, the Benelux countries and Germany are pushing toward a "law and security union," (the Belgium proposal) that looks for a gradual communitization of the third pillar and extends the areas of cooperation. Other states (Spain, the UK and France) stress much more the intergovernmental character and subsequently the unanimity rule for the adoption of acts under Title VI.[3] The European Parliament and the Commission, on the other hand, demand a stronger involvement in the decision making process and jurisdiction for the Court of Justice over all acts adopted and conventions concluded.

It is less this actual debate on the revision of Title VI of the TEU, however, that is of interest to academic scholars of the European Union. It can already be predicted that the revisions will be only half measures. The IGC will agree on some improvements in several matters of detail, but it will not abolish the specific type of intergovernmental cooperation.

To the extent that collaboration between member states on internal security gradually intensified, the traditional inter-governmental character changes. It is exactly the emergence of new governance structures in the third pillar that makes this type of cooperation so interesting for scholars of European integration. Consequently, it is fruitless to debate about the "inter-governmental" versus the "community" character of the third pillar in deducing the further path of development from some general "neofunctionalist" or "realist" assumptions about (European) integration. In order to discuss "Europeanization" and the modes of police and juridical cooperation, it is first of all important to analyze the processes in which the EU emerged as the crucial institutional setting. The legal structure and the organization of the third pillar do not reflect a sudden deliberate transfer of policies from the national to the European level. Europeanization emerged, first of all, from a gradual incorporation of already existing networks of international cooperation under the auspices of the Council of Ministers.

Legal and Organizational Structure of Cooperation in the Third Pillar

Organized outside the community structure as a field of intergovernmental cooperation, the third pillar raises enormous problems for policy makers and Community experts. They have to redefine and reinvent the legal instruments of cooperation and cannot rely on already-existing concepts. On one hand, the

Albrecht Funk is a Professor in the Department of Political Science and the Center for West European Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Council of Ministers acts as central decision-making power in the same way as in the Community; on the other hand the Council can not use the legal instruments of Community law defined in Article 189, EEC Treaty.[4] Instead ,the TEU refers to classical instruments of international law (conventions, resolutions, declarations) and introduces new ones (joint positions or actions) in K.4 of the TEU, but the legal character of these instruments in the context of the third pillar remains unclear and causes controversy. For this reason it is no surprise that the Council has not yet implemented the working program adopted by the European Council in 1992.

The reasons for this failure seem to be obvious. The structure of the third pillar represents the final compromise between member states—like the Netherlands and Germany—pushing toward a police and juridical cooperation in the Community and those— like France and Great Britain—which want to preserve an extensive prerogative for national governments in a policy area crucial for their legitimacy. While those member states in favor of broad Community competencies extracted a concession from those states insisting on their sovereignty that at least six of the nine fields of cooperation could gradually be communized (asylum and immigration policy, combating drug addiction, international fraud and judicial cooperation in civil matters), the latter ones achieved their objective to organize police, customs, and judicial cooperation in criminal matters under exclusive "intergovernmental responsibility."

For this reason the competencies of the Community are strictly restricted. Since the third pillar is not part of the Community, the Commission or the ECJ cannot assert the primacy of Community law in this field. The legal jurisdiction of the ECJ is reduced to those areas where nation-states deliberately open up the possibility of reviewing specific regulations and their administration in a separate agreement (Müller-Graff, 1996, p.31). The European Parliament has not gained much more in Maastricht than the right to be informed about the work of the Council on Justice and Home Affairs.

The Commission can participate in the meetings of working groups, the committee of the "haute-functionaries" coordinating the working groups on justice, internal security and immigration (K.4 committee) and the Council. The Commission gained the right to introduce joint positions, actions and conventions, but it is restricted to those six areas which may be shifted to the Community (Article K9 and 100c of the TEU). The decision making process remains under the exclusive control of national representatives and is organized by the Council in a strictly intergovernmental way. Consequently, even the Council of Ministers only acts as a clearing house of the member states in this field, not as an organ of the community (Lobkowicz, 1994, p.99).

The Origins of the Third pillar

The legal structure and the organization of the third pillar do not reflect a transfer of national policies to the European level. "Europeanization" emerged, first of all, from several efforts of nation-states and their security organizations to overcome frictions in existing networks of international cooperation under the auspices of the Council of Ministers (Anderson et al., 1995). Superior to other existing options, a path dependent development took place in which the Council of Ministers gradually hosted an intense European network of police cooperation.

How can one explain the accumulation of these cooperative structures in the EU which were obviously not induced by endogenous developments in the Community, in particular the move toward a single European market? As far as the decision-making process can be reconstructed from the literature and assessments of experts, it is futile to look for deliberate political decisions of the Council to bring about this shift from traditional institutions—Interpol and Council of Europe—toward the Community. The shift was, first of all, the result of deficiencies in existing cooperation structures for which the professional elite of police cooperation tried to compensate with a whole set of new informal networks. One of these—the so-called TREVI group—had been established after 1976 under the umbrella of the Council of Ministers of the EU.

Until the 1970s European cooperation in IS matters took place in several overlapping circles in which the EU played a minor role—as a regional entity as well as an institutional actor. The highly-formalized exchange of police intelligence and search requests was carried out in the global world of Interpol; the difficult and lengthy negotiations on common norms and standards were organized in the Council of Europe. The third pillar does not respond to a definite challenge and does not refer to a coherent policy. The legal structure and organization emerged from various processes in which national actors looked for an institutional framework in order to discuss common problems and to coordinate policies. In this way a working group on terrorism was established in 1976 under the auspices of the Council. Later, groups dealing with drug trafficking, organized crime, soccer hooliganism and finally, in 1988, immigration and asylum followed. In the 1980s the SEA initiative gave birth to the additional and far-reaching project of common (external) border controls. The fall of the Berlin Wall finally forced even those nation-states like the UK that had been reluctant to define immigration as asylum problems toward closer cooperation.

In this perspective TREVI and the third pillar represent, first of all, a "sui generis cooperation structure," which can be used to coordinate national policies and joint actions in all those "internal security matters" relevant for one of the member states.[5] However, this framework makes a difference. Cooperation under Title VI is superior to other alternative options available in international arenas: it permits the extension and intensification of coordination of internal security policies, makes joint actions in policing possible for sovereign nation-states, and will finally change the legal and political character of negotiations and operations in this institutional setting.

The Prospects of the Third Pillar

The growing transatlantic and European police cooperation originates, first of all, from radical changes in the social space of human actors: growing mobility and the overcoming of concrete space and distance in global communication systems hamper the effectiveness of traditional modes of control, which are oriented toward the supervision of territories (precincts, districts, counties, nation-states, Europe), the identification of subjects and finally, of suspects. Transnational actors are hard to control and even harder to subject to national rules.

This intensified the inherent limits of sovereign territorial rule much further. In some areas national policing no longer works; the current debate on the rules of cyberspace is only one

example. Dealing with international migration is another one. The openness of borders, which is indispensable for the success of European nation-states in a global economy, forces them to harmonize their visa, admission and control policies because any policy shift in one country tends to affect the flux of migrants in the whole region. Finally, expansion of international trade and business opened up new opportunities for transnational crimes such as money laundering, subsidy fraud and illegal waste dumping.

The loss of territorial control in policing forced the national police authorities to develop new types of cooperation which went beyond traditional bilateral agreements and aimed at common operational regimes of control. Initiatives of various countries, including Great Britain, resulted in a whole set of new networks in which national actors tried to facilitate information exchange, surveillance and agreements. Besides the Council of Europe for judicial and the EU for police cooperation, a modernized Interpol became more significant again as an institution which integrates East and West Europe and guarantees at least basic information exchange with third world countries. Drug-related policies in Europe are discussed in the "Pompidou group" in the framework of the Council and includes the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Norway, and Switzerland, besides the EU countries. Concrete transatlantic cooperation of police forces in this area is organized in the "Star group" which has its offspring in US/German cooperation between the US Drug Enforcement Agency, Customs Service and military police, and the German federal and state police. In the meantime, France, Austria, Switzerland and the Benelux countries, as well as Interpol, joined this network. In a similar way, two networks on immigration control emerged after 1989: the extended "Vienna group" —including besides Eastern Europe, the Council of Europe, the US, the UNHCR and, on the other hand, a more specific "Berlin group," which coordinates the "fight against uncontrolled migrations" (comprising the EU as well as the countries of the former eastern bloc, Switzerland, Turkey and Norway). European intelligence services gather in the "Bern club," whereas public knowledge on "the Killowatt group" is restricted to the statement that it deals with Middle East terrorism (Bigo, 1996).

The national officials in the working groups of the third pillar continue their cooperation with the same strategies they worked with before in different informal policy networks. At the same time, the third pillar framework overcomes the limits of isolated ad hoc cooperation typical of the "informal policemen clubs" and the difficulties of reaching binding agreements in international settings like the Council of Europe or the UN. Cooperation in the EU context makes it much easier for the police experts, higher civil servants and politicians to develop a common perception of threats and challenges that require joint actions than in broader international arenas. Finally, policy makers can rely on an already existing decision-making structure of the Council of Ministers, that allows them to convert ad hoc cooperation into institutionalized forms of policing.

The dual definition of the Council of Ministers as an intergovernmental body and an institution of the Community allowed the policy makers and political actors to start negotiations and cooperation without deciding the delicate question of its final legal character at the beginning. In contrast to many policy experts who complain about the ambiguous structure and apparent deadlocks in the third pillar, I would like to argue that it is exactly its ambiguity which enables the Council to transgress traditional limits of intergovernmental cooperation and to institutionalize cooperation "halfway between classical cooperation and community law" (Lobkowicz, 1994, p.100). Every approach that starts out with definite assumptions on the structure of the third pillar in the EU runs the risk of overdetermining the outcome and underestimating the complexity of factors in play.

Notes

1. European Parliament, Task Force on the IGC, No.26, Briefing on Europol, PE 166.291.
2. The External Frontier Convention was delayed due to disputes over Gibraltar; in addition the member states cannot agree on the role to be given to the Court of Justice. Europol passed only after COREPER excluded this critical problem. See O'Keefe, 1994, p. 135, Lobkowicz, 1996, p.48.
3. European Parliament, Task Force on the IGC, No.9, Briefing on the Communitization of the third pillar of the TEU, PE 166.292.
4. Müller-Graff, 1996, pp 11-40, 1994, pp. 21-36; Bieber, 1994, pp. 37-48; Hedry, 1993, pp.295; Monar, 1994 , pp.69-84; McMahon, 1995, pp. 51-64.
5. Lobkowitcz, 1994, p. 107. The garbage can model of Cohen, March and Olsen may be the best analytic description of this "sui generis cooperation structure" of the third pillar.
6. Others are mass communication systems via satellite or the investigation of crimes committed by transnational corporations such as BCCI, drug cartels or weapons dealers.

Bibliography

Anderson, Malcom et alia (1995). Policing the European Union, Oxford: Claredon Press.

Bieber, Roland (1994). "Links between the 'Third Pillar' (Title VI) and The European Community (Title II) of the Treaty on the European Union," in J. Joerg Monar and Roger Morgan (Eds.), The Third Pillar of the European Union, Brussels: European Interuniversity Press, 37-48.

Bigo, Didier (1996). Polices en réseaux: l'expérience européenne. Paris: Presses de Sciences Politiques.

Cohen, M.D. et alia (1972). "A garbage can model of administrative choice," in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.

Hedry, I.D. (1993). "The third pillar of Maastricht: cooperation in the fields of justice and home affairs," in German Yearbook of International Law, Vol. 36, 295-325.

Lobkowicz, Wenceslas de (1996). "Der 'dritte Pfeiler' des Unionvertrages in der Perspektive der Regierungskonferenz 1996," in Peter Christian Müller-Graff (Ed.), Europäische Zusammenarbeit in den Bereichen Justiz und Inneres. Der Dritte Pfeiler der Europäischen Union, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 41-62.

—— (1994). "Intergovernmental cooperation in the field of migration: From the single European act to Maastricht," in Monar and Morgan (Eds.), *op.cit.*, 99-122.

McMahon, Richard (1995). "Maastricht's Third Pillar: Load-bearing or purely decorative?" in *Legal Issues on European Integration*, 1, 51-64.

Müller-Graff, Peter-Christian (Ed.) (1996). Europäische Zusammenarbeit in den Bereichen Justiz und Inneres. Der Dritte Pfeiler der Europäischen Union. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

O'Keeffe, David (1995). "The new draft external frontier convention and the draft visa regulation," in Monar and Morgan (Eds.), *op.cit.*, 135-177.

Book Reviews

Fiona Hayes-Renshaw and Helen Wallace. The Council of Ministers. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997, 340 pp.

The Council of Ministers cannot be ignored but it is not well understood. While being recognized as a pivotal institution, it has been under-studied. The scholarly literature on the European Community has focused on the other Community institutions to a much greater degree than on the Council. Fiona Hayes-Renshaw and Helen Wallace have now produced a book which goes a long way toward helping both specialists and non-specialists understand the Council's operational procedures, its extremely important inter-institutional linkages, and the central role that it plays in the dilemmas facing the Union.

This book will become a standard—and invaluable—text, for all of us who teach and write about the European Union have long desired such a volume. (In fact, as soon as I received my review copy it was immediately borrowed by my graduate students from whom I had to retrieve it in order to write this review.) It is a comprehensive examination of the Council of Ministers which embeds the Council in its inter-institutional context as well as describing its internal activities and operational characteristics. It is detailed enough to be useful for the specialist and yet general enough to serve as an excellent introduction for the non-specialist. It will profitably be read by upper-level undergraduates as well as by graduate students. It references major analytic works and applies their insights to the Council so that the analysis is clearly, but unobtrusively, tied to major work in the discipline of political science.

One of the strengths of this volume is that it is permeated with a sense of the history of the Community while simultaneously dealing with issues which students will be reading about in the newspaper. Its historical sensitivity encourages nuance in analysis and caution in generalization where appropriate. Discussions about the relationship between the Council and the Commission, for example, avoid the kinds of simple, typically very time-bound, generalizations found in much ahistorical analysis.

The book itself is divided between analysis of the Council's internal operations (with the chapter on the Secretariat in particular providing much that is new) and discussions of the Council's relationships with the Commission, the Presidency, the European Parliament, and the member states.

A theme running through the book compares and contrasts pillar one—involving the institutionalized relationships associated with the Treaty of Rome—with pillars two and three. The different role of the presidency vis a vis the three pillars, for example, is particularly interesting. In fact, students will find the book especially helpful in understanding how a "pillarized" European Union works (or does not work).

The co-authors possess an unusually keen and perceptive understanding of how practical organizational details matter, particularly in shaping the inter-institutional dialectic. In fact, I wish the authors had highlighted such insights in a more striking fashion, for much of the literature on the Community lacks that nuance. For example, the fact that the Parliament has to translate so many documents affects the timing of Parliamentary interventions and timing, under certain conditions, is critical to shaping policy.

While the volume incorporates the existing literature on the Community institutions exceedingly well, it also provides a great deal of new information. There is much that is new, even to specialists. The chapter on the Council and the member states, for example, will be of interest to scholars of the European Union as well as to those who have focused on national politics and are now interested in better understanding the linkages between a particular national system and Brussels. In fact, the entanglement of EU and national politics comes through time and time again in this analysis of the Council of Ministers. In the authors' words, "there is an intimacy, directness and tangibility to the impact of domestic politics on European integration and vice versa" (p.273).

The overall contours of the Council of Ministers are, according to the authors, "perplexing." From a theoretical point of view, rational choice explanations capture only a slice of reality, but so do analyses which focus on the transformation of national preferences. In a similar vein, the authors argue that although states are represented in the Council, "its proceedings diffuse rather than concentrate state power" (p. 277). Thus, the Council's negotiations are about both cooperation and interests.

The authors are skeptical about current proposals for reform, arguing that procedural and organizational reforms cannot substitute for substantive agreement on policy or for mutual trust among the member states.

Readers will come away from this volume feeling that they have learned a great deal about one of the least-understood institutions within the European Union, as well as having acquired a much greater understanding of the political and institutional dilemmas facing the Union. Many of the strategic and political choices which eventually must be made will be centered around the Council, and the authors do an excellent job of linking specific issues to broader questions and dilemmas.

Fiona Hayes-Renshaw and Helen Wallace have written a volume that will deservedly become a standard text, be very widely used, and shape our core understandings of the Council of Ministers. They have done an excellent job.

Alberta Sbragia
University of Pittsburgh

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

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

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

R. Amy Elman (Editor). Sexual Politics and the European Union: The New Feminist Challenge. Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1996. 178 pp.

Sexual Politics and the European Union is an anthology of papers offering feminist commentary on the status of sexuality issues in the context of the European Union's institutions, laws

and processes. If, upon reading this, you think, "The EU has a mission to promote economic issues. What does this have to do with sexuality?" you are aware of the contribution of this book to the field; it uses feminist analysis to stimulate new thinking about government and politics.

The authors take the conventional assumption as a starting point. Yes, the EU's agenda is primarily about economies and the social issues that pertain to economic prosperity, and it does little to recognize gender beyond the acceptance that sex discrimination is a barrier to its overall goals. Then they set about showing that advocates for women have already launched campaigns to convince leaders that exploitation of women's sexuality, through prostitution, pornography, rape, reproductive engineering and harassment, is directly related to sex discrimination and thus a legitimate part of the EU's mission.

Articles describe EU efforts to address some of these issues: policy initiatives in the areas of sexual harassment, violence against women, trafficking in women and sex tourism. They identify areas where attention is, thus far, insignificant, such as reproductive tourism and pornography. These essays show the limits of EU's capability to act in ways that will empower women to fight back against sexual coercion. At this point, the most the EU can do is to identify an issue. This can provide a justification for feminist activists in the various member states to bring it to the attention of their national governments to secure better laws and better enforcement of existing laws. As an international stimulus for national action, however, the EU is still behind that activism of the United Nations agencies on many of these issues.

The authors in Sexual Politics and the European Union first presented their essays at an international conference convened by Amy Elman at Kalamazoo College's Center for European Studies. Many new directions in research on gender and politics topics arise from conferences and are found in edited volumes such as this. Unfortunately, systems of indexing currently used often relegate the individual articles and their authors to oblivion, at least as far as the Social Science Index and PAIS are concerned. Therefore, this review concludes with a description of each of the essays.

"The European Union and the Women Within: An Overview of Women's Rights Policy," by Catherine Hoskyns, provides an excellent summary of the development of women's policy at the European level since the 1960s. A more expanded version of her research on the topic may be found in her book, Integrating Gender: Women, Law and Politics in the European Union (Verso, 1996) [Editor's note: Amy G. Mazur reviewed this title in *ECSA Review*, Vol.IX, No.3 (Fall 1996), pp.29-30].

"European Union Sexual Harassment Policy," by Evelyn Collins, is a study of policy making on the issues of sexual harassment and the campaign to define it as an issue of sex discrimination in employment.

Amy G. Mazur writes about what happens to EU actions when they reach the member state political arena in "The Interplay: The Formation of Sexual Harassment Legislation in France and EU Policy Initiatives." This case shows that the government's official attention to women's status in general issues plays a significant role in their response to a specific policy proposal.

In "Pornography and Sexual Harassment in the EU," Susanne Baer describes how the narrowness of legal and political traditions in Europe make it difficult for political leaders to recognize that pornography as well as harassment have a significant economic impact.

"Pornography, Harm and Human Rights: The UK in European Context," by Catherine Itzin, is a persuasive argument for considering pornography as a major barrier to advancement of women's condition. She bases her conclusions on the harm principle and a civil rights/human rights approach.

Dorchen Leidholdt, in "Sexual Trafficking of Women in Europe: A Human Rights Crisis for the European Union," more than does Itzin, recognizes the conflict among feminists over prostitution as a women's rights issue and the difficulty of finding a European solution to the increases in prostitution and sexual trafficking.

Ute Winkler, in "Reproductive Technologies in Germany: An Issue for the European Union," has found an issue where there is an absence of EU guidelines and shows that the effect of this absence is exploitation of women's bodies and manipulation of their reproductive choices.

"'And Nobody Was Any the Wiser': Irish Abortion Rights and the European Union," by Ailbhe Smyth, focuses on the role of the EU in the campaign for abortion rights in Ireland. It reveals the limits due to the policy mandate, democratic deficit, and shortcomings of the institutions and procedures of the EU.

"The Common Market of Violence," by Jalna Hamner, describes patterns of state attention to violence and shows the difficulty in generalizing across European countries on this issue. Christine Delphy questions the potential for common European efforts on any of these sexuality issues in "The European Union and the Future of Feminism." She argues that the lack of agreement on the content of feminist ideology handicaps efforts to move the policy makers to effective action. Critical of recent efforts to accept relativism of the feminist agenda, she asserts that European feminists need a more coherent world view to guide campaigns across the various countries.

Dorothy McBride Stetson
Florida Atlantic University

Jaap de Wilde and Håkan Wiberg, Editors. Organized Anarchy in Europe: The Role of States and Intergovernmental Organizations. New York: I. B. Tauris, 1996, 354 pp.

The salience of international organizations (IOs) continues to rise, particularly in post-1989 Europe. Yet, the literature on IOs remains surprisingly thin. Perhaps the problem, as suggested by one of the contributors to this volume, is that "intergovernmental organizations" (IGOs, as they are called in this book) are "relatively unimportant" from the point of view of international relations (IR) theorists, a majority of whom draw on state-centric neorealist or rationalist paradigms. The result is that most "do not wish to invest their time or resources in studying these creatures" (p.74). This collection of essays represents a worthwhile investment of time and resources, mostly by continental European scholars whose past work often has been unavailable to an English-language readership.

The volume acts as an antidote to the 'billiard ball syndrome' which plagues much of the IR literature. At the same time, most of its authors caution against the assumption that IGOs are rapidly taking over terrain previously occupied by states, or the

prerogatives traditionally guarded by national governments. Even in Europe, where transnational institution-building has proceeded the furthest and deepest, the autonomy of IGOs from the wills of their constituent states is strictly limited.

Inevitably, any book with seventeen chapters contains some that are better than others. Highlights include a genuinely comparative legal perspective on European IGOs by Ramses Wessel, and a fascinating historical treatment of European integration and disintegration (since the year 950!) by Jaap de Wilde. A series of chapters on new (post-Cold War) European institutions are quite short and vary in quality. They range from a lucid analysis of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development by Andrew Williams to a rather discursive chapter on the Conference (why not 'Organisation' for a book published in 1996?) on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Some of the book's most perceptive contributions concern the role of IGOs on Europe's peripheries. Peter Volten's chapter on Central and Eastern Europe is beautifully written and effectively foreshadows the practical problems of NATO enlargement. Perhaps the book's single most useful offering is Håkan Wiberg's comprehensive examination of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Wiberg highlights the European Union's extraordinary paucity of expertise on the Balkans, as well as the extent to which the EU's behaviour was driven by domestic politics in its major states. Eventually, having locked themselves into so many untenable positions within the EU and United Nations (UN), the major powers showed "an increasing tendency to sidestep the EU and UN altogether" (p.212). This chapter is marred by an "analysis and prognosis" at the end of each section, which makes it read like a civil service report. Still, it is an essential piece for anyone trying to assess the meaning of the war in the Balkans for IR, the role of IGOs, and the future of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy.

Other chapters are less successful. The one devoted to the CFSP is very brief, overly legalistic and analytically thin. Mouritzen's two essays gamely attempt to develop and apply a general state allowance model of IGO behaviour. But its distinction between "high" and "low politics" is not entirely convincing nor very original. A chapter on NATO's "out of area problem" is extraordinarily Hungary-centered, as if it were written on behalf of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A final contribution on "new dimensions of security" starts with a thoughtful treatment of the rise of environmental considerations on the security agenda, but suddenly shifts to the future of NATO for no clear reason.

Ultimately, if for no other reason, this book is worth having for its two provocative, eccentric, but often brilliant contributions by Ole Waever. The first gives an overview of the national perspectives of Germany, France and Russia on the state of post-Cold War Europe, which provides an essential starting point for understanding the most important constraints on the activities of leading IGOs. Waever's second chapter argues that, for all the criticism of Europe's "inter-blocking institutions," a logical European security triangle has emerged with NATO, the OSCE and the EU at its corners. The author's frequency of self-citation occasionally grates, but his analysis is undeniably sharp and incisive.

Unfortunately, this book is unlikely to find as large an audience as it deserves for three reasons. First, its opening contributions are not very effective, thus making it unlikely that a casual reader will be tempted to read beyond them. In particular, a chapter on the role of IGOs in international theory is very derivative, list-prone, and does not provide much added value. Second, the book is sloppily edited, to the point where one would hesitate to put it on an undergraduate reading list. The final phase of the project, we are told, took place at the University of Twenty [*sic*] in the Netherlands (p.20). One wonders whether or not Renaud Dehousse or Grace Skogstad will be pleased that they are cited in the book as "Renoud Dehausse" (p.62) and "G. Skogmo" (p.84). Third and finally, the book is priced at $59.50 US (ouch!), yet seems a rather low-budget production. Sadly, shabby presentation and outrageous prices increasingly appear to go together in the world of academic publishing.

On balance, this collection is a welcome addition to the literature. Its strengths outweigh its flaws. It may be recommended to a wide range of scholars, including those preoccupied with the study of contemporary Europe, the evolving roles of IGOs, and international relations more generally.

John Peterson
University of Glasgow

Michael Newman. Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996, 236 pp.

Jack Hayward, Ed. The Crisis of Representation in Europe. London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1995, 226 pp.

The Maastricht referenda have engendered a lot of political and academic interest into the democratic deficit of the European Union. This attention has been reinforced by the increasing popularity of non-traditional political parties in many European states and the general feeling of popular resentment towards politics in Europe. Two recent books have tried to analyze these phenomena. Whereas Hayward's edited collection, The Crisis of Representation in Europe analyzes the problem of European democracies in general, Newman's Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union deals with the democratic deficit of the European Union. Both books show the complexity of the problem of democracy and lead, therefore, to both clarity and confusion—clarity in the analysis of the democratic deficit, and confusion in how this problem has to be assessed and how it should be dealt with. Both books recognize that the assessment of the democratic deficit and its causes is far from evident, just like the means to cope with it.

In The Crisis of Representation in Europe this is recognized as far as the analysis of the problem is concerned, including the question of the real meaning of the referenda in France and Denmark on the TEU (see the chapter by Van der Eyk). In Democracy, Sovereignty and the European Union much emphasis is put on what is probably the core of the problem: the fact that to a large extent the assessment of democracy is a normative problem. What some perceive as evidence of a democratic deficit in the European Union, is assessed by others as evidence of the contrary. This is especially true for the role of the European Parliament in EU decision making. Some ask for the reinforcement of the role of this institution, whereas others point to the risks of such a reinforcement for the legitimacy of the Union.

In The Crisis of Representation in Europe this problem is emphasized in the chapters that deal with European democracy and its critique (Weiler et alia) and with constitutional reform in the European Union (Dehousse). Whereas the first points to the problem of the absence of a European nation and its possible consequences for the reinforcement of the European Parliament (the strange thing is that the authors did not come to a real conclusion), the second deals more with the problem of the application of the majority principle in a multi-state EU. Such a principle inevitably leads to a domination of minorities by the majority. What is needed, therefore, is a system in which both state legitimacy (through the Council) and democratic legitimacy (through the European Parliament and the Commission) are secured. Concerning the last one, the author seems to be too optimistic about the effects of the Maastricht Treaty on European Parliamentary control over the Commission. Although Parliament may have acquired more control in the appointment of the Commission, its role remains restricted to the assent of the appointment by the member states. This makes the emergence of a party logic at the Commission level, which is supposed to contribute much to the reduction of the democratic and political deficits of the European Union, improbable.

But what about the deficit itself? Is it necessary to look at the role of the European Parliament only? Is a national strategy not better? There are arguments to defend this. First, as has been done in The Crisis of Representation in Europe, European elections seem to concentrate on national rather than European issues. As Julie Smith shows, the 1994 elections have confirmed this tendency. This because of the lack of a real European party system in Europe. In the chapter, "Reshaping National Party Systems," the difficulties in creating such a system are outlined. Rather than hoping for such a system, it would be more realistic to strive for a "split-level party system" in which the transnational parties fight the European elections under the same label as national elections, but on European grounds. According to Andeweg, this could resolve the current problem that the European elections don't deliver legitimacy because they don't function as an instrument of representation. The problem goes deeper, however. As Peter Mair has pointed out, the problem is partly due to the increasing problems of political parties to play the role of representation. The alienation of these parties, which is due to their simultaneous loss of capacity to play their representative role and their increasing role as public office holders, is part of a problem which goes beyond the scope of a European democratic deficit.

It remains a question, however, as to whether the European Parliament has the capacity to deliver a legitimacy altogether. In the chapter, "Failures of National Parliaments?," David Judge emphasizes the role of the national parliaments in providing the "democratic base of the European Union." The problem of the European democratic deficit is partly due, therefore, to the failure of these parliaments to control their executives. As such, the European democratic deficit is just part of the general problem of domestic democratic accountability.

Is it possible to overcome this problem of representativeness by mobilization of subnational actors? Liesbet Hooghe answers this question negatively. Admittedly, there is an increasing mobilization of such actors that can partly bridge the gap between the European Union and its citizens, but their access to the EU is too unevenly distributed to allow it to be genuinely representative.

The conclusion can only be, therefore, that the problem of representativeness and democratic accountability is endemic to the current process of European integration. This is emphasized by William Wallace and Julie Smith. In their chapter, "Democracy or Technocracy," they point to the technocratic and elitist logic of European integration. Legitimacy was only indirect in so far as it was provided by the national governments. But "as political leaders have lost the deferential respect their predecessors commanded from electors at the national level ... ," it can no longer be presumed that indirect legitimacy still exists. The resolution of this problem, therefore, remains an open question.

Bart Kerremans
Universiteit of Leuven

Jeffrey Harrop. Structural Funding and Employment in the European Union: Financing the Path to Integration. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1996, 169 pp.

Jeffrey Harrop has written a pithy overview of the structural funds that will serve as a useful introduction for those unfamiliar with this area of Community activity. Setting the structural funds in the larger context of unequal regional development in Europe, Harrop presents detailed descriptions of the policy instruments and the politico-administrative process associated with them. He draws useful linkages to related EC/EU problems—specifically unemployment—and policy areas, such as the Common Agricultural Program, Community budgeting and finance, and social policy. Harrop also presents a comprehensive survey of the latest research on the efficacy of European-level regional policies.

To scholars already steeped in the history, mechanics and debates connected with structural funds, this book will probably be a disappointment. The ground covered is familiar, even well known, and the sheer scope of this short survey prevents the author from exploring any of these subject areas in depth. For the expert, perhaps the most frustrating aspect of this volume will be the short shrift given to politics. The following quote is emblematic of the brisk pace set by the author; commenting on the persistence of regional dualism in Italy, he concludes, "[Dualism] continues to exist, with the main change being faster developments in central Italy (for example, through successful SMEs), giving rise to the wish by some writers to redivide into three Italys" (pp.41-42). Even a single additional sentence might have been sufficient to complete the thought and draw out the larger implications of Harrop's observation.

That said, the mere appearance of this book is a sign that the regional dimension of European integration has come of age as a subject of scholarly inquiry. A decade ago, one would have been hard pressed to fill out a respectable bibliography on the topic. The increasing importance of supranational regional policies during the 1980s—as programs in their own right, as lubricant for integration, and as impetus for a flowering of regionalist sentiment on the continent—has sparked a welter of academic books, journal articles, doctoral dissertations, working groups and conferences. The collective results of this intellectual endeavor, many of which are reviewed in Harrop's volume, effectively rebut those scholars engaged in traditional Community studies who deride the structural funds and their associated networks of multi-

level interaction as policy sideshows that can tell us nothing about the high-profile "big bangs" and "grand bargains" of European integration. To understand the Union and its many dimensions, we need to study the Union in its many dimensions.

Jeffrey Anderson
Brown University

Michael Calingaert. European Integration Revisited: Progress, Prospects and U.S. Interests. Boulder, CO and London: Westview Press, 1996, 225 pp.

European Integration Revisited is several books in one. As its title implies, part of it takes the form of an update on Europe now, in the aftermath of the dramatic changes brought about by the implementation of the single market and the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty. In that sense, it will appeal to students of the EU's extraordinarily rapid development over the past decade: it recounts the story of the changes that have been wrought first by the 1986 Single European Act and then by the transformation of the EC into the EU by the Treaty on European Union.

But another part of Michael Calingaert's book is more in the nature of a guide to the present state of the Union than a review of recent changes. It presupposes neither a knowledge of, nor an interest in, the EU's history or evolution. In a logically ordered sequence of sections and chapters covering the economic, commercial, social and political state of the contemporary European Union, it sets out for the lay reader just where the EU stands in the mid-1990s, how it got there and where it's going.

Two-thirds of Calingaert's book, then, can be read as history, guide, state-of-play and commentary. How did the collapse of Communism, EU enlargement, the Yugoslavian war or the emergence of new economic blocs like NAFTA impact on the European integration process? What is the EU's competition policy and how does it function? Does the single market really work, and has it been fully implemented? What are the criteria for economic and monetary union (EMU), and is the project still on track? Why hasn't political integration kept pace with economic union? There are answers to all these questions and more. The book's final third, however, analyzes just what all this means for the United States. What are the economic implications? How do the US and EU interact at the international level in the economic, political and security fields? And what US policy responses are appropriate in dealing with this new arrival on the international scene? The book thus has a special relevance for Americans—businesspeople, scholars, policy-makers—who deal with Europe, and indeed for Europeans involved with the United States.

But it's not just this three-in-one approach that makes European Integration Revisited different from other works on the contemporary EU; it is also the author's unique perspective on Europe. A former US diplomat specializing in economic and commercial affairs, and more recently author, scholar and consultant, Calingaert sees the emergence of the EU from the viewpoint of observer and practitioner rather than academic or theorist. An aura of practicality pervades the book. Whether commenting on the problems caused by the EU's plethora of languages ("linguistic diversity limits, in a political and practical sense, the extent to which integration will take place") or explaining why single market measures have not been uniformly implemented by all member states ("... failure to carry out EU legislation [reflects] genuine differences among the member states in the level of administrative competence and reliability of enforcement"), the author identifies issues which go to the heart of the European dilemma: namely, how can such a diverse group of states work together, and how far can integration go?

Calingaert's response to these fundamental questions is essentially twofold. First, he notes that there is an increasing trend towards intergovernmentalism in the EU. If this was apparent in the 'pillar' structure of the Maastricht Treaty, which saw foreign policy and home affairs issues kept outside the traditional Community institutional framework, it remains true today in the Intergovernmental Conference where, he concludes, the status quo "seems the course the EU is most likely to adopt as it approaches the twenty-first century." Second, he argues that this does not matter all that much because—certainly as far as the outside world is concerned—the degree of European integration and joint action already in place is too substantial to be ignored.

Indeed, that is the thrust of the whole book. Integration as it stands at the present time, including all the ramifications of the single market (as well as earlier achievements such as the CAP, and more recent ones like the CFSP), has a profound effect on the EU's partners, especially the United States. Two hundred billion dollars in annual two-way trade across the Atlantic, massive US investment in the EU (and vice versa), shared political and foreign policy interests—all make it essential to understand the implications that the integration process in Europe, and the legislation and policies that result from it, has beyond its borders.

Inevitably, the book contains the odd error of fact or interpretation. For example, Calingaert implies that qualified majority voting was a novelty introduced under the Single European Act, when in fact Article 148 of the original EEC Treaty introduced it back in 1958 (what the SEA did was provide for decision-making procedures that obliged the Council actually to use the system). Elsewhere, he suggests that Turkey's chances of ever joining the EU are limited by a Greek veto, when in fact it is clear that none of the existing member states has any interest in Turkish membership (on which the Commission delivered a negative opinion in 1989).

But these are minor quibbles. Overall, Calingaert pursues his agenda consistently, comprehensively and with the seasoned eye of a Brussels insider who happens also to be a Beltway pro (or should it be the other way around?). The book is full of useful information and informed speculation that cover both specifics (such as a comprehensible summary of the EU's decision-making procedures) and conjecture (for example, the likely impact of a British Labour election victory on the future of European integration). The book is also remarkably up to date, describing events occurring until the beginning of 1996. When his publisher's deadline gets the better of him, Calingaert resorts to informed clairvoyance: "The United States," he writes, "will more likely favor stronger policy responses (e.g., on issues of state terrorism), while the EU will give greater priority to the economic implications of such action." With the passage by the US Congress of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Bill in July 1996, roundly condemned by an indignant EU, he gets it exactly right.

European Integration Revisited is a shrewd and perceptive analysis of what's going on in the European Union today. The book's conclusion is pragmatic and not particularly surprising: for all its failings, the EU as an entity has to be taken seriously. The

United States—at both official and private sector levels—will do well to seek cooperation and dialogue with Europe as a genuine partner. Moreover, the US must continue to give encouragement to the EU's development. Calingaert quotes the former US Ambassador to the EU, Stuart Eizenstat: "We support European integration ... because it is in our own, most fundamental interest." There is little doubt that the author agrees with him.

Christopher Piening
European Parliament Secretariat, Brussels

Publications

The following is a list of EU-related publications or publication notices recently received in the ECSA Administrative Office:

Occasional Papers in European Studies (University of Essex)

Papers can be ordered directly from the Centre for European Studies, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, Essex, UK, for £2.50 (Sterling or Euro), postage included:

No.10: "Intergovernmental Conference 1996: Which Constitution for the Union," by Michael Nentwich and Gerda Falkner.
No.11: "Threats to the Security of Central and Eastern Europe: Security Options for Poland," by Longin Pastusiak.
No.12: "Poland's Strategy for EU Accession: Trade-Related Problems," by Anna Zielinska-Glebocka.
No.13: "Visegrad Countries: Political Profiles in 1995," by Frantisek Turnovec.
No.14: "Perception of Socio-Economic Changes: Hungarian Experiences in the Early 1990s," by Gyorgy Lengyel.
No.15: "Problems of Economic Migration in Central and Eastern Europe: The Case of Poland," by Stanislawa Golinowska.
No.16: "The Challenges of Region Building: EU Relations with the Baltic Sea Region," by Thomas Christiansen.

Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies (Sussex European Institute)

The Sussex European Institute has released new Working Papers: No.18, "Constitution Making and Citizenship Practice—Bridging the Democracy Gap in the EU," by Vince Della Sala and Antje Wiener, and No.19, "Balancing Private and Public Interests Under Duress," by Helen Wallace and Alasdair R. Young.

To order, send £5.00 to the Sussex European Institute, University of Sussex, Arts A Bldg., Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN. Add £1.00 postage per copy (Europe) and £2.00 outside Europe.

Network on Enlargement and New Membership of the European Union (NEMEU)

NEMEU has announced the first in its new series of working papers, available free of charge while supplies last:

No.96-1, "A Theory of the Conditional Influence of the European Parliament in the Cooperation Procedure," by Peter Moser.
No.96-2, "Constitutional Power in the EU," by Jan-Erik Lane and Reinart Maeland.
No.96-3, "Some Elements of a European Federal Union: A Public Choice Approach," by Friedrich Schneider.
No.96-4, "Commission Discretion, Parliamentary Involvement and Administrative Policy Making in the European Union," by Bernard Steunenberg.
No.96-5, "Districts and the Coordination of Monetary Policies in the European System of Central Banks," by Jordi Bacaria and Andreas P. Kyriacou.

To order, write NEMEU, Faculty of Public Administration and Public Policy, P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands.

"Bulgaria in an Integrated Europe"

This is the title of a collection of articles previously published in the Bulletin Europa Monthly Newsletter in 1995, and reissued here in June 1996 as the Centre for European Studies Working Paper No.1/96. This 64-pp. collection of ten articles is edited by Krassimir Y. Nikolov and comes from Sofia, Bulgaria with the ISSN 1310-151X (no ordering information given).

European Programme, Royal Institute of International Affairs

The European Programme of the Royal Institute of International Affairs announces the recent launch of a series of working papers, with No.1, "The Impact of Enlargement on EU Trade and Industrial Policy," by Heather Grabbe and Kirsty Hughes. To order, write The European Programme, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, 10 St. James Square, London SW1Y 4LE, UK, or fax 44 171 957 5710 (no price given).

Collegium, News of the College of Europe

The College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium, has released a Special Edition (No.4, 1996) entitled "Democratic Deficit" of *Collegium*, their bi-monthly periodical, which contains two articles in French and an editor's note in English. The articles are, "La crise de la democratie en Europe: le deficit democratique" by Jean-Louis Quermonne and "La democratie dans l'Union europeenne: deficit ou reformulation?" by Sylvain Giraud. Contact by fax 50 34 31 58 or by e-mail <collegium@alpha.coleurop.be> (no price given).

European University News

This French-English bilingual monthly publication is produced by the Jean Monnet Project-Universities, DG-X (Information, Communication, Culture, Audiovisual) of the European Commission. Edited by Anne Serizier, *European University News* contains a wealth of information on scholarly activities, programs and publications. ECSA-USA members resident in the United States may request a sample copy from Valerie Staats at the ECSA Administrative Office by e-mailing <ecsa+@pitt.edu>.

The European Union Review

ECSA-Italy announces the launch of its new periodical, *The European Union Review*, to be published three times yearly and edited by Dario Velo (ECSA-USA member). The debut issue

includes articles by Pierre Maillet, Dario Velo, Tibor Palankai and others. To subscribe or submit articles, contact Silvia Bruzzi, Editorial Coordinator, Consorzio Pavese per Studi Post-Universitari, V. le Cesare Battisti 54, 27100 Pavia, Italy.

The European Legacy

The MIT Press announces the 1996 launch of a journal to be published eight times yearly, *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms*, devoted to the study of European intellectual and cultural history and the new paradigms of thought involved in the making of the New Europe. The official journal of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas, it is edited by Ezra Talmor and Sascha Talmor, who can be reached at Kibbutz Nashshonim, D. N. Mercaz 73190, Israel, or fax 972 3 902 44 02.

EDRC Newsletter

The most recently-received issue of this 16-pp. newsletter contains articles on EMU, the Block Exemption Regulations, the Equal Treatment Directive and more. It is published by the European Documentation and Research Centre (EDRC) in Malta, which also publishes information papers and research papers. The address is EDRC, University of Malta, Msida MSD 06, Malta.

European Parliament, Task Force on the IGC

The European Parliament, Secretariat Working Party, Task Force on the Intergovernmental Conference, has issued Briefing No. 40, "Briefing on Social Exclusion and the IGC" (PE 166.462). The purpose of this briefing series is to gather together, in an organized, summary form, the proposals and suggestions which the authorities in the member states, the Union's institutions and specialist commentators have put forward on issues likely to be on the IGC/96 agenda. Briefings will be updated as negotiations proceed. For further information, contact Alain Barrau, DG-IV, Brussels, at fax 322 284 49 55 or telephone 322 284 36 16.

New and Recent Book Titles

David K. Begg et alia. (1997). EMU: Getting the Endgame Right. (Monitoring European Integration 7). London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Richard Caplan and John Feffer, Eds. (1996). Europe's New Nationalism: States and Minorities in Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press.

Andrew Duff (1997). Reforming the European Union. London: Federal Trust.

The EU Institutions' Yellow Pages 1996. (Available in English or French). Genval, Belgium: Euroconfidentiel.

Ahmed Galal and Bernard Hoekman, Eds. (1997). Regional Partners in Global Markets: Limits and Possibilities of the Euro-Med Agreements. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Frederick K. Lister (1996). The European Union, the United Nations, and the Revival of Confederal Governance. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.

Who's Who in European Integration Studies (in Non-EU States) 1996. Baden-Baden, Germany: Nomos.

State of the European Union, Volume IV

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

Introduction

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

The Backdrop

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

Monetary Union

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

Security

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

Enlargement

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

Special Agendas

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

The Main Actors

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

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

Miscellany

Association des Etats Generaux des Etudiants de l'Europe (AEGEE)

Founded in 1985 in Paris as an independent, non-profit and multi-disciplinary organization with the aim of promoting European integration among the youth of Europe, AEGEE comprises 15,000 members across Europe, "from Cork to Ankara." The organization hopes to promote European integration through education and information sharing, and current activities include programs such as "Understanding Europe," "IGC Conferences," and a "Case Study Trip" program. AEGEE organizers would like to make contact with interested individuals and associations outside Europe. Contact Sergio Caredda, General Secretary, AEGEE, P.O. Box 72, Brussels 1040, BE, or fax 32 2 649 54 80.

Network on Enlargement and New Membership of the European Union (NEMEU)

Also mentioned in the Publications list on page 22 of this issue, NEMEU is a European research network on enlargement and new membership of the European Union, supported by the European Science Foundation. The network aims to enhance understanding of EU enlargement and the extent to which enlargement will induce change, and to contribute to the literature in economics and political science by focusing on the role of institutions in political decision making. NEMEU seeks to analyze alternative institutional arrangements concerning European integration in a comparative way and to focus on institutional change. Scholars from various European universities participate. For information, contact the network coordinator, Bernard Steunenberg, NEMEU, University of Twente, Faculty of Public Administration and Public Policy, P. O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, Netherlands, or fax 31 53 489 1150, or e-mail <b.steunenberg@bsk.utwente.nl>.

International Faculty Development Seminars in Europe

The Council on International Educational Exchange (Council) is please to offer three faculty development seminars in Europe in June 1997. The seminar destinations, themes and fees are:

1) "Germany in the New Europe," hosted by the Free University in Berlin ($1850).
2) "Hungary and Central Europe: A Region in Transition," hosted by the Budapest University of Economic Sciences ($1800).
3) "Theater and the Arts in London," hosted by the University of Westminster ($1400).

Council has designed these seminars for U.S. university faculty and administrators in an effort to stimulate university initiatives toward internationalizing curricula. The themes are explored through a series of lectures, site visits and faculty interchange. For information, contact the Council at 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017, by telephone at 212 822 2747, or e-mail <ifdsregistrar@ciee.org>.

Summer Program in EU Studies

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, in collaboration with the European University and the Universite Francois Rabelais in Tours, France, is pleased to announce a special six-credit undergraduate course entitled, "The Development of the European Union." This summer program, taught in English, aims to promote the study of contemporary European issues. It will take place in Tours, France, from June 23-July 25, 1997, and fees are $2100 for New Jersey residents and $2350 for residents of other states. For information, contact the Rutgers Study Abroad office by telephone at 908 932 7787, by fax at 908 932 6959, or by e-mail at <ru_abroad@email.rutgers.edu>.

Europa: World Wide Web Server

As many active Web browsers know, the European Union now has its own server on the World Wide Web, accessible at <**http://europa.eu.int**>. Praise is coming in from various quarters as to this server's up-to-date and comprehensive information. ECSA-USA members have recently recommended that Web browsers visit Europa's "What's New" links, in particular "The 1996 IGC," which includes recent documents, and "Together in Europe: European Union Newsletter for Central Europe," a brief overview of issues concerning the CEECs and broader EU developments. Visit <**http://europa.eu.int/en/whatsnew.html**>.

Euristote: University Research on European Integration

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

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

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

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

Grants and Fellowships

ECSA Graduate Fellowships in European Integration

Contingent upon the approval of funding from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, European Commission Delegation, Washington, DC, ECSA hopes to offer three M.A. level Graduate Fellowships for the 1997-1998 academic year. These Fellowships provide support toward tuition, living, and travel expenses. The Fellowships will be located at the College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium, the Institute of European Studies, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, and the European Law Program at the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain.

Students *must* possess a high level of proficiency in the appropriate language, have completed a university degree (B.A. or B.S) by August, 1997, and be U.S. citizens to apply for these fellowships:

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 (J.D. required for admission) and Studies in Human Resources Development.

The Institute of European Studies, Université Libre de Bruxelles is exclusively devoted to postgraduate teaching at the Master's level. The Academic Program is divided into four parts: European Law (J.D. required for admission), European Economy, European Policy, and a Complementary Diploma in European Studies.

The European Law Program, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y Jurídicas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid includes an externship with a Spanish law firm, multinational corporation, or European university. Program coursework provides comprehensive coverage of the institutions and policies of the European Union. Unlike the programs above, which are completed in one year; the European Law Program is of eighteen months duration.

To Apply

Students may apply simultaneously for the Fellowships at the College of Europe and the Université Libre de Bruxelles. However, students doing so must provide a clear explanation for why their qualifications and interests are suitable for each program. Students applying for more than one program must also indicate which is their preferred Fellowship location.

Applications for the ECSA Graduate Fellowships at the College of Europe and the Université Libre de Bruxelles must include *all* of the following:

1. Letter of application from the student, addressed to Graduate Fellowship Selection Committee, addressing:
   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(s) of specialization at the program(s) chosen.
2. Three letters of recommendation which commenting 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.

Applicants to the European Law Program, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid should submit the same application materials as above, with the exception that their certification of proficiency (item 4) must be in Spanish.

The application deadline is **April 7, 1997**. All application materials must be postmarked by that date. Please send all application materials directly to:

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

Facsimile (412) 648-1168
E-mail: ecsa+@pitt.edu

ECSA Graduate Fellowship Program at the Delegation of the European Commission

Contingent upon funding approval, ECSA announces a fellowship program providing graduate students with the opportunity to work as information officers in the Press and Public Affairs division of the Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, DC. Under the supervision of permanent staff, fellowship recipients will respond to inquiries on EU matters from U.S. government agencies, the U.S. Congress, international organizations, embassies, academics, think-tanks and the general public.

Two fellowships are planned for each of the Fall (September to December) and Spring (January to May) 1997-98 semesters. Students will be able to gain academic credit if provided for by their academic institution. Applicants must be citizens of the United States, currently enrolled in a graduate program in the United States. Knowledge of the French language is preferred but not mandatory. Applicants should send the following materials directly to the ECSA Administrative Office:

1. Letter of application, addressed to the Graduate Fellowship Selection Committee, explaining the applicant's interest in the Fellowship. Applicants should be able to demonstrate an interest in EU studies or related areas, or in a combination of EU studies and library science studies.
2. Three letters of recommendation;
3. Undergraduate and graduate academic transcript(s); and
4. Resume or curriculum vitae.

The application deadline for the Fall 1997-98 academic semester is **April 7, 1997**. Women and minority candidates are strongly encouraged to apply.

ECSA Curriculum Development Grants

Contingent upon available funding, the European Community Studies Association (ECSA) will offer curriculum development grants for the 1998-1999 academic year. These grants may be used to create new courses on the European Union, or to enrich existing courses with material on the European Union.

This year's competition is particularly concerned with promoting the use of innovative technologies in the classroom. Release time for instructors engaged in course development may be included in grant proposals. A maximum of four grants of up to $3,000 will be awarded. Courses developed or enriched through this program must be taught in the United States. Applicants must be ECSA members, or affiliated with institutional ECSA members.

The application deadline for this program is **April 15, 1997.** For application guidelines and further information, please view our Web site at <**http://www.pitt.edu/~ecsa101**> or contact the ECSA Administrative Office, 405 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260,or e-mail <ecsa+@pitt.edu>.

ECSA Doctoral Fellowship at the European University Institute

With support from the Office of Press and Public Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, DC, this Fellowship at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy was established in 1995 to commemorate fifty years of transatlantic cooperation. The Fellowship enables an advanced graduate student to pursue coursework and dissertation research on the European Union. Discussions are underway to continue this Fellowship during the 1997-1998 academic year. Interested students should contact the ECSA Administrative Office or consult the ECSA Web site at <**http://www.pitt.edu/~ecsa101**> for updates. Application deadline is **April 7, 1997**.

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

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

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

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

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

4) Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Regional Research Program. One award is available for an established scholar or a promising younger scholar to conduct research for up to ten months during the 1998-99 academic year on a project that relates to the mission and goals of the OSCE The research may take place in any of the 15 European participating states. Preference will be given to proposals requiring work in two or more countries, including at least one location in eastern Europe or the states of the former Soviet Union. Interdisciplinary proposals are welcome. Application deadline: August 1, 1997.

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

ECSA-USA Notes

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

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

The **ECSA List-Server** was launched in Fall, 1996 to be a forum for discussion, debate, and information sharing among ECSA-USA members. Currently 170 Association members, both in the United States and in Europe, have subscribed to the list, which is also used as an information dissemination resource by the ECSA Administrative Office. The list is open to ECSA-USA members only; to subscribe, send an e-mail message to <ecsa+@pitt.edu> with this one-line message in the text area: "subscribe ecsa@list.pitt.edu." It will take several days to process the request and subscribers know they are on the list when they have received a welcome message from Pitt's majordomo.

As announced in the previous *ECSA Review*, the most recent volume in ECSA's State of the European Community, Volume 3: Building a European Polity? is now available at a 20% discount price of $39.95 (shipping included) for ECSA members. Order directly from Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1800 30th Street (314), Boulder, CO 80301; fax 303 444 0824; telephone 303 444 6684.

ECSA Review

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

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

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

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

ECSA Executive Committee

ECSA-USA thanks the following organizations for financial support of program activities in 1996:

Delegation of the European Commission, Washington, D.C.
The Ford Foundation
Siemens Corporation

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

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

Name _____ Date _____

Affiliation _____

Address _____

_____
City State Zip/Postal Code Country

Telephone _____ Fax _____

E-Mail: _____

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

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

Card number _____ Expiration _____ ___ VISA ___ MC

Signature _____ (Please do not send cash.)

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