EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION
Vol. 13, No. 3 ISSN 1090-5758
Summer 2000 www.ecsa.org

ECSA REVIEW

IGC 2000 Watch (Part 2): The Opening Round

Desmond Dinan and Sophie Vanhoonacker

Editor's note: This is the second of a series which will run concurrently with the 2000 IGC and conclude with the signing of a new Treaty, which is expected to take place at the Nice European Council in December 2000.

THE PORTUGUESE PRESIDENCY'S PAPER on the IGC, prepared for the Feira Summit of June 19-20, 2000, is a discouraging document. Its 118 pages of tables and text (admittedly including a lot of blank spaces) illustrate the complexity of the institutional issues on the agenda, the deep divergence of opinion among member states, and the extent to which the IGC has yet to get off the ground. Negotiations to put together a package deal on the Amsterdam leftovers and related institutional questions have not really begun. Instead, the nine Preparatory Group meetings and four ministerial meetings of the IGC held under the Portuguese presidency have been exploratory sessions in which each delegation has laboriously outlined its positions. Nor have the two discussions on the IGC at the level of the European Council—at Lisbon in March and Feira in June—amounted to much, although the Feira European Council endorsed a presidency recommendation to include closer cooperation formally in the IGC's agenda.

Closer cooperation was already included implicitly in the IGC because, under certain circumstances, its use is conditional on a unanimous decision in the Council (meeting in the form of the Heads of State and Government). The triggering mechanism for closer cooperation was therefore one of many items automatically included in the IGC's coverage of the possible extension of qualified majority voting (qmv). Given the sensitivity and potential importance of closer cooperation, however, most member states were unwilling to approach it in such a restrictive and technical way. Some of the more integrationist of them, as well as the Commission and the European Parliament (EP), had raised the possibility late last year of including closer cooperation in the IGC in its own right. The momentum to do so gathered pace in the first round of the conference, culminating in a discussion of it at the informal (Gymnich-type) foreign ministers' meeting in the Azores on May 6-7. By the time of the Feira summit, even the most skeptical member states (Britain, Spain, Denmark, and Sweden) conceded that closer cooperation should indeed be on the agenda.

The arguments in favor of loosening the enabling clauses for closer cooperation (i.e., making flexibility more flexible) are intellectually unassailable but politically controversial. Regardless of how far qmv is extended as a result of the IGC, recourse to a functional method of closer cooperation seems essential in an ever-larger, more diverse EU. Without it, the EU is in danger of stagnating or disintegrating, and the more integrationist member states will be tempted to cooperate more closely outside the Treaty framework. Counter arguments that an extension of qmv would obviate the necessity for recourse to closer cooperation, that the existing provisions should not be altered until they have been shown in practice to be unworkable, that a revision of closer cooperation would alarm applicant countries, and that closer cooperation could undermine the internal market, highlight the need for credible assurances and safeguards concerning the purpose and consequences of less-restrictive enabling clauses. A compelling rationale for a revision of closer cooperation, produced in March by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (a Dutch government-sponsored think tank), gave ample ammunition to advocates of that option behind the scenes at the IGC.

Apart from the intrinsic merits of revising the enabling clauses, closer cooperation emerged as a key item in the IGC because of the link that it represents between a conference otherwise devoted to narrow—albeit politically important—technical changes, and a growing debate outside the IGC on the EU's future. Jacques Delors initially launched the debate, before the IGC began, with calls for an *avant garde* of member states to accelerate the pace of European integration. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Helmut Schmidt, two elder statesmen whose reputations belie the reality of their limited enthusiasm for European integration when they were leaders of France and Germany, made a similar call in a widely reproduced newspaper article in April. The debate did not take off, however, until Joschka Fischer, Germany's foreign minister, advocated a new form of European federation in a speech in Berlin on May 12.

Fischer's speech was born of frustration: frustration with the poor state of Franco-German relations; with a lack of vision and leadership in the EU; and with the slow pace of enlargement. Undoubtedly he was frustrated also with the IGC. Ministerial sessions were perfunctory, while confidential reports from the Preparatory Group can only have irritated a foreign minister noted for flair and imagination. For their part, many members of the

(continued on p.8)

ECSA Review Forum

The Lisbon European Council and the Future of European Economic Governance

THE PORTUGUESE PRESIDENCY, WHICH organized the work of the Council during the first six months of the year, was tasked with the heavy responsibility of organizing the opening months of the 2000 IGC (see Dinan and Vanhoonacker, this issue), yet the Portuguese also embarked on a major campaign to sponsor an academic and political debate on economic reform, and on the future of European economic governance.

Throughout their presidency, the Portuguese sought to stimulate a debate on both the substance and process of European economic policymaking, proposing a "new strategic goal for the Union in order to strengthen employment, economic reform and social cohesion as part of a knowledge-based economy." Toward this end, the presidency commissioned a series of papers from both distinguished academics and EU institutions on subjects ranging from employment policy to the reform of the welfare state, modernization of public services, social inclusion, and the information society and e-commerce (for an on-line listing and texts of these reports, see Portuguese Presidency 2000). In March, the presidency organized a special European Council in Lisbon, which largely endorsed the Portuguese program of economic reform, with particularly detailed statements on the information society and the promotion of e-commerce.

As important as the substance of the proposed reforms, however, is the process proposed by the Portuguese presidency, and endorsed by the Lisbon European Council, dubbed "open coordination." As Jim Mosher explains below, open coordination involves the establishment of common social policy guidelines, indicators and "benchmarks," which are intended to guide national policies through a process of policy coordination and peer evaluation. Although the practice of open coordination is not itself new, having been pioneered in recent years in a trio of joint policy processes (namely the Luxembourg Process on employment, the Cardiff process on structural reforms, and the Cologne process on macroeconomic policy coordination), the explicit endorsement of open coordination in Lisbon raises a number of important questions about the future of European economic governance, which are addressed by three ECSA members in this *ECSA Review* Forum.

In the first essay, Martin Rhodes analyzes the outcome of the Lisbon European Council as a pragmatic effort by the EU to find a "Third Way" between the traditionally conflicting imperatives of economic efficiency and equality, and between the extremes of European harmonization and national autonomy. In the process, he suggests, the presidency has created a "new European architecture for social policy" which will rationalize existing processes under the umbrella of a broader economic strategy and an annual Spring meeting of the European Council. In the second essay, Janine Goetschy looks back at the record of open coordination in the most developed of the three current processes, the European Employment Strategy, noting both the strengths and the weaknesses of the process during its formative years. In the third and final essay, Jim Mosher places the emerging process of open coordination in the context of a broader move to "post-regulatory governance," which promises both functional and political advantages to member governments eager to cooperate in a flexible fashion, but also the familiar dangers of "voluntarism" and weak or uneven national implementation of common EU goals. Despite differences in emphasis and in levels of optimism about the future, all three essays echo Rhodes' conclusion that the Lisbon European Council is likely to emerge as a watershed in EU social policy, in terms of both the articulation of a new set of common policy goals for the member states, and the endorsement of new policy processes which may—or may not—serve to facilitate the achievement of those goals in the coming years.

—Forum Editor

Lisbon: Europe's "Maastricht for Welfare?"

Martin Rhodes

THERE HAS BEEN MUCH vacuity in discussions of "progressive" or "Third Way" approaches to policy in Europe. Yet there is a very clear sense in which the Portuguese presidency of the EU has confirmed a search for a new, pragmatic way forward for Social Europe, in at least two key respects.

First, against the background of new challenges to social cohesion, there has been a quest for a new synthesis in EU social policy, reconciling flexibility and security in labor markets, and solidarity and sustainability in broader welfare programs. In so doing, an implicit objective has been the conciliation of efficiency imperatives with social justice. This has led to the emergence in EU policy discourse of what Ronald Dworkin has called "a unified account of equality and responsibility"—one which bridges the traditional concerns of egalitarians and conservatives by embracing both the individual and collective rights and responsibilities of citizens (see Dworkin 1999).

Although not explicitly using such language, the special meeting of the European Council in Lisbon on 23 and 24 March emphasized the need to create an "active welfare state" via a "positive strategy which combines competitiveness with social cohesion." And while the Presidency Conclusions of the March European Council talk in the guarded "Euro-speak" of "modernizing social protection" for a "knowledge-driven economy," a brief glance at the Commission's Broad Economic Policy Guidelines published shortly before the Lisbon Summit presents a rather clearer recipe for reform. Alongside stability-oriented macroeconomic policies, sound and sustainable public finances and ensuring efficient product (goods and services) markets, the emphasis in the social and employment sphere is very much on the following:

- reducing the tax burden on low-wage labor;
- encouraging real wages to increase in line with labor productivity;
- facilitating access to training;

- reforming tax and benefit systems to ensure appropriate incentives and rewards for participation in active working life; and
- negotiating a modernization of labor markets including flexible working hours and a review of tight job protection legislation and high severance payments.

In essence, the aim is to marry a shift towards a more liberal social policy and employment system—as long advocated by the OECD, for example—with a more traditional European emphasis on social dialogue and solidarity.

Second, there has also been a search for a middle path between EU intervention via directives and the alternative (given the long history of blockages in the Council) of leaving policy instruments in the hands of the member states, thereby renouncing broader social policy ambitions. The "Third Way" in EU policymaking amounts to a "soft" and as yet underdeveloped form of governance now referred to as "open coordination." This new approach to policymaking and implementation is simultaneously more ambitious in terms of objectives than previous social action programs (no less than a gradual convergence of welfare outcomes across Europe) and more flexible with regard to the methods (see also the essay by Jim Mosher below).

In this respect, the Portuguese presidency made a major contribution (for a fuller analysis, see Ferrera, Hemerijck, and Rhodes 2000). By further refining and stressing the centrality of "open coordination," the Lisbon Labor and Social Affairs Councils consolidated a process of transformation in European policy style which began in 1992 with recommendations on social protection "convergence." "Soft" policy innovation then occurred in two main areas: gender, where a series of initiatives have "mainstreamed" gender equality across a wide array of EU programs; and employment, where the "Luxembourg process" (launched in 1997) seeks a "management by objective" coordination of national policies. In July 1999, the Commission proposed a "concerted strategy for modernizing social protection," and under the Finnish presidency in 1999 a group of high level officials was asked to take the process forward. That group's first major report (May 2000) was submitted by Coreper and the Council to the European Council meeting held in Feira, Portugal, on 19 and 20 June, and its conclusions now underpin official EU policy.

Most observers of the Portuguese EU presidency have praised its energy but bemoaned its lack of headline-grabbing initiatives. Yet almost by stealth, there has been a surprisingly rapid set of advances in putting in place a new European architecture for social policy. A summary of the Council and high level working party's initiatives suggest that—if the political will is there—then Lisbon may one day be considered Europe's "Maastricht" for the welfare state.

First, on the procedural front, there has been a much-needed rationalization of decision making. The Broad Economic Policy Guidelines have become an umbrella for strategic planning, with a greater involvement of Council ministerial groupings other than Ecofin in order to encourage a better management of policy interdependencies. Social protection is now to be considered the "third side of a triangle with other interrelated but separate sides being macro-economic policy and employment policy" and the European Council will now meet every Spring to address economic and social questions. Member states will have to prepare each year a document illustrating their own social policy agenda (with indicators and targets), and this will contribute to greater continuity and coherence in Council deliberations.

Second, the notion of an "open method of coordination" has been further refined to include: fixing guidelines for social policy combined with specific timetables for achieving short, medium and long term goals; establishing quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks tailored to the needs of different member states and sectors; translating European guidelines into national and regional policies by setting specific targets and measures; periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review as mutual learning processes; and benchmarking best practices on managing change to be devised by the Commission, networking with companies, social partners and NGOs. In effect, this is the Luxembourg process writ large for the modernization of the welfare state.

And third, the high level working party is charged with setting the agenda for change in two priority areas of welfare state reform—social exclusion and the sustainability of Europe's pensions systems. National reports on both areas will be submitted by December this year to enable the working party to draw up recommendations. But it is already clear from its first report where the emphasis for future policy will lie. In social protection, the extent to which activation measures are provided as an integral part of minimum income schemes will receive close attention; while in pensions there will be a stress on "active ageing"—extending the retirement age—alongside an examination of the implications of second and third tier pensions. These innovations are potentially far-reaching in their implications, both for the architecture of European policy making and the future of European welfare states.

As far as policy making is concerned, the rationalization of decision-making procedures helps overcome the rather complex and baroque processes and initiatives launched during the 1990s, while the new Spring Council could help provide the missing institutional hub of Social Europe, around which other processes and initiatives can effectively rotate. Social protection issues will move much closer to the center of European policy making—helping to correct the asymmetry between positive and negative integration—and their interdependencies with other areas of employment and macro-economic policy making will be explicitly acknowledged. As in the past, questions of national sovereignty will inevitably be raised, but this is unavoidable as action on the broad employment policy front logically spills over into related areas of social security and taxation policy where member state autonomy is still jealously guarded.

As for "open coordination," there is also a logic in the extension of the Luxembourg process from labor market issues strictly defined to other dimensions of the welfare state. The new focus on benchmarking and the definition of qualitative and quantitative indicators for cross-national coordination, coupled with deadlines for the achievement of short, medium and long-

term objectives, provides the basis for an EMU-style approach to European welfare state convergence. Granted, there are enormous problems in store in terms of policy design, actor coordination and monitoring reform across highly diverse systems, not to mention the legitimacy of a process which seeks explicitly to penetrate previously protected national policy domains. And yet, in most member states there are already processes in place, frequently involving social partner concertation, which are tackling the complex interdependencies between social protection, employment and broader economic policies upon which a new coordinated policy for the EU can build.

As for the nature of welfare reform itself, it is obvious that there is a risk that national conflict over the direction of change (e.g., in pensions systems) will transfer to the supranational arena, creating the prospect of new policy blockages and joint decision traps. But a stable system of multi-level and multi-actor interaction may also help "de-politicize" the issues at stake, shielding them from national political cycles and encouraging a problem-solving style in their management. As with the EMU process, governments may be able to use a coordinated European strategy to engage in a certain degree of "blame avoidance" to force through controversial reforms. But given that the reform of most European welfare states requires confrontation with often well-organized vested interests, it is essential that mechanisms of concertation are reinforced without, however, giving the parties involved the power of veto on decisions.

Of course, enormous political will is required even to initiate the new approach implied by the Lisbon initiatives. And there are numerous pitfalls in its path. Nevertheless, unless progress is made in the general direction embarked upon, there is a real danger that the structural asymmetry between negative and positive integration will remain uncorrected.

Martin Rhodes is a Professor at the European University Institute, Florence.

The European Employment Strategy
Janine Goetschy

THE EUROPEAN EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY (EES) was initiated by the Delors White Paper on "Growth, Competitiveness and Employment" (1993), made operational by the Essen procedure following the European Council in December 1994, formalized within the employment title of the Amsterdam Treaty (June 1997) and put into practice before the official implementation of the Treaty on the basis of the employment guidelines of the special Luxembourg summit (November 1997). Indeed since the 1980s and especially in the 1990s, a majority of member states have had to face high levels of unemployment and decreasing employment rates. However, employment situations and performances demonstrate considerable diversity among EU member states.

The annual EES process, as specified in the Treaty of Amsterdam, is the following. Each year common European employment guidelines are proposed by the Commission and elaborated and adopted by the Council (Social Affairs and Ecofin) by qualified majority vote. Afterwards they have to be translated into national employment policies on which each member state must report to the Commission and the Council in their yearly "national action plans" (NAPs). An annual evaluation takes then place on the basis of which recommendations can be addressed by the Council to member states. Such recommendations to individual states deemed not to have followed the guidelines would have no obligatory effect but could be symbolically powerful. Governments are expected to associate trade-union and employer organizations at various levels both when elaborating and implementing their NAPs.

Three elements characterize the employment title in the Treaty: the employment title of the Treaty is based upon the previous experience of the Essen procedure; the approach to employment is inspired by the already existing convergence process in the macro-economic field; and, although employment is an issue of common concern for both the national and the community level, it is the national level which remains primarily responsible for employment policies and achievements.

Since 1997, the annual European employment guidelines have been organized under four pillars: improving employability; developing entrepreneurship; encouraging adaptability both for employees and in businesses; and strengthening equal opportunities between men and women. Around twenty such EU guidelines are set up each year, although only a few of them correspond to specific, quantified targets. Until now there has been great continuity as to the EU annual guidelines, with only minor changes from year to year.

What do the preliminary assessments of the EES carried out in the successive EU Joint Employment Reports teach us? Though all member states have fulfilled the obligation to deliver a national plan each year, the following shortcomings have been underlined:

- The main focus of most NAPs was on "employability" and "entrepreneurship," with considerably less attention given to measures concerned with "adaptability" and "equal opportunities."
- Most plans consisted of a mere list of discrete initiatives, often not specific responses to the guidelines, and without overall integration.
- Despite the emphasis in the EU guidelines on prevention of long-term unemployment through targeting those at risk of social exclusion, the majority of measures reported tended to focus on those already unemployed for a long period.
- The contribution of the European Social Fund (ESF) to the various national measures was, in general, insufficiently addressed.
- Most NAPs failed to define precise quantitative objectives, the resources allocated to the measures, the timetable for implementation and the statistical tools which would enable evaluation of the outcome; in most cases the NAPs largely reflected national employment plans which had already been adopted or were on the drawing-board. Labor market flexibility and the reduction of working time remain in general the issues which give rise to most disagreement

between unions and employers, whereas training and employability are more consensual topics.

- Both at the elaboration and implementation phase, the social partners have been insufficiently associated with the process, which has often remained a governmental issue. On the whole, the consultation process over NAPs has not really generated new initiatives from the social partners or new national strategies towards unemployment. Though consultations over NAPs generally took place at central level only, it was not usually the top officials on each side who were involved. This contrasts with experience in negotiating social pacts at national level; in such cases, top representatives of the union and employers' organizations are invariably the protagonists.

In 1999, following the second evaluation exercise of national action plans, recommendations were issued to member states for the first time. The Commission has identified eight areas where national implementation remained insufficient: the fight against youth unemployment (Belgium, Greece, Spain, Italy); preventing long-term unemployment (Belgium, Germany, Spain, Italy); tax reforms and unemployment benefit reforms (Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Austria); job creation in the service sector (Belgium, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, Portugal); making the tax system more employment-friendly (Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Finland, Sweden); modernizing the organization of work (Greece, France Portugal, UK); the fight against gender inequalities (Germany, Spain, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Austria, UK); improving indicators and statistical tools (Germany, Greece, Spain, Italy, Netherlands, UK). Altogether, 55 recommendations were issued to all fifteen member states. Among the least criticized countries, one finds the three Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Sweden, Finland) and those where unemployment is currently fairly low (Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Austria).

Overall, the EES is characterized by systematic strengths and weaknesses. The strengths of the EES are linked to the fact that it is an iterative process, which provides an opportunity to tackle employment issues in a medium-term perspective and relies on an elaborate method implying targets, deadlines and an evaluation process.

First, the fact that the EES is an *iterative process* between the EU and national levels, which combines an intergovernmental logic with an EU community logic, presents a number of advantages: it enhances member states' political commitment in EU decision-making, since they are in a better position to control, accept and implement EU guidelines; it implies decisions which are better adjusted to the national diversity of institutions and employment policies; and it enables the involvement of a multitude of economic, social and political actors at various levels (supranational, national, regional). These features provide an opportunity for real national social priorities (employment, but later on also social protection issues) to figure on the EU agenda: social issues of "high politics" which are not really fully acknowledged EU competences and which are highly contentious, can thus be dealt with at EU level. Ideally, the EES encourages at the same time a "Europeanization" and "renationalization" of employment policies through a mutual learning process; and it should increase the legitimacy of decisions, both by input (since more actors are involved) and by output (since better employment performances are to be expected).

Second, the aim of the EES is to integrate member state policies with Community-level guidelines in a *medium-term, pluriannual perspective*, with results of an incremental nature which transcend short-term political gains and can solve progressively the more fundamental problems of unemployment within the EU. One can say that the EES is a way to "depoliticize" the unemployment problem from its immediate national contingencies and to address it in a longer-term perspective: implicit in this orientation (as with EMU and its convergence criteria) is the belief that politicians need to be detached from their immediate national constraints and political contingencies. The fact that the EES is designed as an enduring process means also that the nature of transactions between member states is different from that which applies in the case of the adoption of directives. In the latter instance, the diplomatic mode of interaction—where utilities are exchanged, involving trade-offs among a variety of issues, and where short-term political conjunctures are often decisive—tends to prevail; this is less so with the EES.

Third, the *method itself* of the EES is meant to serve as a catalyst for the efficiency of national employment policies in several ways: by establishing external constraints and targets to be reached within a specified timetable (a method which had proved successful for setting up the European monetary union); by aligning such targets on the best performing countries (benchmarking); and by putting employment policies to the test of national comparison, submitting them to the examination of a wide range of EU institutions and subjecting them to public EU recommendations. Tough monitoring and a real evaluation culture are at the heart of the EES.

However, the EES is not without a number of serious weaknesses, including: the lack of real sanctions; the subordination of EU employment guidelines to monetary and economic guidelines, a situation which the Cologne (June 1999) and Cardiff (December 1998) processes, and the new commitments of the Lisbon summit (March 2000) have been trying to change; the scarcity of EU financial resources for facilitating the development of an active EU employment policy; the complexity of the multi-level governance process which the EES implies; and the nature of jobs created (not only the number of jobs created, but also their substantive quality and their duration which should be examined).

The foregoing analysis suggests, in turn, four general conclusions. First, seen as a process or mode of governance, the EES has been rather well received and has even inspired other EU policies. Indeed, the EES appears to have "fait école" in fields such as the broad economic policy guidelines, innovation policy, the fight against poverty, and the social protection convergence process, and remains a sort of model for ETUC's claims in other policy spheres.

Second, at this stage, assessments of the EES as to its quantitative and qualitative impacts on national employment

policies and performances, must remain cautious: the process is still recent and it is quite difficult to separate the effects of EU guidelines from autonomous national policies.

Third, the spillover effects from the EES to other national policy fields (wage policy, social protection, tax policy, administrative reforms, etc.) will have to be examined very carefully in the future.

Fourth and finally, more general questions will have to be raised. To what extent are EU employment guidelines able to reshape the triangle of preferences of each nation-state relative to its employment levels, its desired degree of social justice and its tax policy preferences (Scharpf 1999)? To what extent is the EES a solution to offset "beggar-thy-neighbor" competitive employment policy developments (Streeck 1999)? The increasing interconnection of policy fields and the better knowledge of their mutual links (between employment, economic guidelines, social protection, training and education, innovation policy, etc.), the multiplicity of actors involved in the various EU coordination policies, and the multiplicity of discussion/negotiation forums and coordination procedures (Luxembourg process, Cologne process, Cardiff process, and Lisbon conclusions) open up different sort of perspectives: Will some guidance levels become more important than others? Will the traditional spearhead function assumed by the European Commission in the monitoring of social Europe's policies remain important, or will member states be tempted to take over with a view of "reinforced cooperation" constellations in the social field in mind?

Janine Goetschy is senior research fellow at CNRS-University of Nanterre, France, and scientific collaborator at the Institute for European Studies, Free University of Brussels, Belgium.

Open Method of Coordination: Functional and Political Origins

Jim Mosher

AT THE CONCLUSION OF the Lisbon Summit (23-24 March 2000), the Portuguese Presidency advocated implementing a "new open method of coordination" to facilitate reaching the EU's strategic goals in the areas of building knowledge infrastructure, enhancing innovation and economic reform, and modernizing social welfare and education systems. The open method of coordination is intended to spread best practice and help achieve greater convergence towards these goals. Its fullest current implementation is in the European Employment Strategy, described above by Janine Goetschy.

The announcement of a push to expand the use of the open method of coordination suggests several questions. What forms of governance is open coordination intended to replace or to supplement? Why is this new method being adopted? What are its potential advantages over alternatives?

The open method of coordination, as outlined by the Portuguese presidency, is composed of four elements: 1) fixed guidelines set for the Union with short, medium, and long term goals; 2) quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks; 3) European guidelines translated into national and regional policies and targets; and 4) periodic monitoring, evaluation, and peer review, organized as a mutual learning process (Portuguese Presidency 2000).

Open coordination is a post-regulatory approach to governance (Teubner 1983; Sabel 2000). While traditional regulation imposes mandates that are relatively specific and uniform, hierarchically determined, static, and substantive, in post-regulatory governance there is a preference for procedures or general standards with wide allowances for variation rather than detailed rules, for intensive consultation to set and modify standards, for standards that are wholly or partly voluntary, and for adjustment over time in response to feedback. Post-regulatory governance is flexible in the face of different conditions across space and time and may foster mutual learning over time that improves policy.

For much of its early history, the EU relied heavily on traditional regulation through harmonization directives to coordinate actions of the member-states and secure regulatory uniformity. Although some progress was made, many proposed directives were stillborn. By the 1970s, the resulting stagnation in the integration process revealed the limits of harmonization in a diverse polity such as the European Community. The solution advanced in the 1980s was mutual recognition, which allowed the Union to surmount many trade barriers caused by variation in legal arrangements. In addition, many saw mutual recognition and intensified trade and capital flows setting in motion regulatory competition. Proponents championed the resulting regulatory competition as a learning process in which the "best" regulation would eventually prevail. Others were far more skeptical, observing that regulatory competition could lead to a race to the bottom that would undermine social and consumer protection and put the European social model in jeopardy. Eventually, it also became clear that in many policy areas regulatory competition would have less impact than first expected.

Governance through the post-regulatory approach of open coordination may provide some potential functional advantages over traditional regulation by harmonization on the one hand and mutual recognition with regulatory competition on the other.

Open coordination allows policy initiatives to be adapted to the diverse institutional arrangements, legal regimes and national circumstances in the EU. It also allows member states to move at different speeds in reforming policy, while attempting to keep the member states moving together in the same direction.

With open coordination, member-state governments are able to opt-out, permitting them to respond to future unexpected real shocks. Member states that might oppose regulation that permanently takes away policy responsibility may be more willing to grant supranational input and guidance into policymaking through open coordination.

Many of the issue areas proposed for the new open method of coordination are policy areas where member-states seem capable of proceeding individually but may be unsure of the best path to take. Thus, while supranationalization may not be

necessary for the member states to act in a given area, open coordination at the EU level institutionalizes the sharing of member states' experiences with reform experiments. This organizes and institutionalizes cross-national learning without the risks present in regulatory competition.

Finally, while reforms in individual member-states may need to be adapted to specific circumstances, there may be collective action problems blocking reform or increasing returns to policy reform. In such cases, it may still be necessary for several or most member states to move at the same time for the reforms to be most effective or beneficial. Open coordination permits simultaneous movements that are also adapted to local circumstances.

Compared to traditional regulation, open coordination seems to offer the possibility of acting in areas where full harmonization is blocked. Compared to mutual recognition and regulatory competition, it can facilitate learning while also allowing policy coordination and possible convergence.

While these functional advantages may be significant, the political advantages may be as important or more important in explaining member-state support for this new method of open coordination.

As a corollary to the first functional advantage, flexible governance may overcome member states' opposition to EU mandates that they find too disruptive or too alien to national arrangements. To that extent, flexible governance may allow more EU action in policy areas that are sensitive politically and previously gridlocked. Any action taken, though, is likely to be more diffuse and uneven. In addition, the generally voluntarist nature of the mandates may leave weak actors subject to exploitation by stronger actors when member states decide on implementation, even when the mandates are intended to help weak actors.

Possibly the most important political reason for the expansion of open coordination is that it may allow domestic political actors to shift blame for unpopular decisions to the EU, without having to shift real control. In the area of employment policy, many member-state governments, even Social Democratic governments, see a need to reform and adjust some labor regulation. One could interpret the European Employment Strategy as designed primarily to help overcome domestic opposition to "necessary" reforms. In this sense, open coordination may indeed serve to strengthen the state, insofar as member governments gain leverage to pursue their preferred policies against domestic opposition.

Finally, open coordination may be a new means to pursue symbolic politics, giving the appearance of responding to policy crises without having to carry out any action.

A diverse polity such as the EU certainly requires flexible governance tools to function successfully. In addition, the advantages in the effectiveness of these flexible governance mechanisms may be significant enough that the EU would adopt them even in areas where it is politically capable of pursuing traditional regulation. However, at this point, the effectiveness of this new approach is unproven. It is also too early to tell whether the functional advantages are driving these developments or whether the political advantages are the real driving force. If the latter is closer to the truth, open coordination, rather than generating more effective governance for everyone, may instead create new winners and losers within member states.

Jim Mosher expects to receive his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin Madison in Fall 2000 and will be a Jean Monnet Fellow at the European University Institute, Florence, in Spring 2001.

References

Dworkin, Ronald (1999) "Does Equality Matter?" in European University Institute and New York University, *Progressive Governance for the XX1 Century, Conference Proceedings*, Florence, November 20-21, 1999.

Goetschy, Janine (1999) "The European Employment Strategy: Genesis and Development," *European Journal of Industrial Relations,* 5 (2): 17-137.

Ferrera, Maurizio, Anton Hemerijck, and Martin Rhodes (2000) *The Future of Social Europe: Recasting Work and Welfare in the New Economy: Report for the Portuguese Presidency of the European Union*, May 2000.

Portuguese Presidency of the European Union (2000) *Employment, Economic Reforms, and Social Cohesion—Towards a Europe Based on Innovation and Knowledge* (special page of the presidency Web site featuring the Presidency's overview, reports and contributions by academics and by EU institutions, and the Presidency Conclusions of the Lisbon European Council), at www.portugal.ue-2000.pt.

Sabel, Charles (2000) "A Quiet Revolution of Democratic Governance: Towards Democratic Experimentalism," Presented at the EXPO 2000, OECD Forum on the Future, Conference on 21st Century Governance, Hannover, March 25 and 26, 2000.

Scharpf, Fritz (1999) *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Streeck, Wolfgang (1999) "Competitive Solidarity: Rethinking the 'European Social Model,'" paper presented at the 11th annual meeting of SASE, June 8-11, 1999, Madison, Wisconsin.

Teubner, Gunther (1983) "Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law," *Law & Society Review,* 17 (2): 239-285.

(continued from p.1)
Preparatory Group were equally frustrated, prevented as they were in the narrow confines of the conference from seeing the broader picture. By stressing the importance of closer cooperation as a building block for a future EU federation (whether or not that federation ever materializes), Fischer indirectly injected some life into the IGC.

More important, perhaps, Fischer challenged France publicly to revive its axis with Germany in order to provide joint leadership in the IGC and in the EU as a whole. Eager to ensure the success of its upcoming Council presidency and having privately approved the Fischer initiative, the French were eager to do so. An informal France-German summit in Rambouillet on May 19 proved unusually fruitful, as did the regularly-scheduled semi-annual summit in Mainz on June 9. There France and Germany decided to act in concert in the IGC and announced an agreement in principle on the main agenda items. No details of the agreement emerged, however, ostensibly because of sensitivity to the other member states (France and Germany did not want to be seen to be presenting a *diktat*). It is equally plausible, however, that in practice France and Germany are having difficulty reaching an agreement on a final IGC package. Despite seeing eye to eye on the need to reduce the Commission to a maximum of 20 members and to revise the closer cooperation clauses, they remain quite far apart on how to reweigh Council votes and reapportion EP seats and on how far to extend qmv, not least because Germany has not yet formulated its own position on these issues.

Needless to say, the presidency paper was anodyne in the extreme. It did not mention the Franco-German axis and alluded only slightly to the wider debate on the EU's future. Nor, in its extensive treatment of the discussions so far, did it identify any member state by name. Instead, reminiscent of the report of the Reflection Group that met before the 1996-1997 IGC, the presidency report repeatedly referred to "most delegations" or "some delegations," and occasionally to "a majority of delegations" or "one delegation." Similarly, it reported "broad agreement," "fairly broad agreement," "no significant support," and, on a rare occasion, "almost unanimous agreement" on the plethora of issues under discussion. Informed observers could read between the lines and figure out which member states stood where. In general, the report gave a strong impression that decisions were still a long way off on the Commission's size (one Commissioner per member state or a restricted Commission?) and internal structure (a Commission of equals or a hierarchy?); the modalities of weighted voting (simple reweighting or a double majority based on population and number of votes?); the extension of qmv (into all or part of sensitive issues such as taxation, social security and the environment?), the possible extension of the co-decision procedures (to most decisions that are subject to qmv?), and the allocation of seats in the EP (maintain categories of delegations and allocate seats accordingly or apportion seats strictly on the basis of population?). On these and other issues, there is a wide divergence of opinion among member states.

The presidency report did not refer either to the IGC's potential to divide the EU into ins versus outs (on closer cooperation) and big versus small (on the Commission, EP seats, and Council votes). In fact, the emerging divide is between original and subsequent member states, a divide reinforced by the closer cooperation and qmv issues. The original Six are conspicuous by their advocacy of closer cooperation (they see themselves as the EU's natural *avant garde*) and greater recourse to qualified majority voting. But they are deeply divided on questions of institutional representation, especially in the Commission. The original three small member states (like the small member states that joined later) are determined to keep their right to nominate a Commissioner. This is the most visible and politically-charged issue in the IGC. It will take considerable skill on the part of the French presidency and the Franco-German axis to maintain the cohesion of the Six as the EU's unofficial core group by reconciling the big-small divide among them.

As expected, there is almost no public interest in the IGC, despite occasional media alarms about the loss of a "national" Commissioner or a precipitous decline in a member state's EP representation. Commission efforts to foster a public debate on the IGC turned into a parody of EU elitism: the inaugural "Dialogue on Europe," held in Brussels on March 8, was attended almost exclusively by *stagiaires* (well-connected young Europhiles doing internships in EU institutions). Yet public opinion haunts the IGC in the form of the pervasive fear of a ratification crisis. Member states that usually ratify treaty changes by referendum are desperate to avoid having to do so at a time of rampant public cynicism about the EU. Concern about ratification is also one of the main reasons why many member states want to minimize the possible treaty changes, being discussed outside the IGC, needed to flesh out the Common European Security and Defense Policy.

The German Länder are the other ghosts at the IGC. The Länder mobilized in the early stages of the conference to demand a strict delimitation in the treaties of regional, national, and EU competences. Given their ability to thwart ratification by rejecting the IGC's outcome in the upper house of the German parliament (the Bundesrat), the Länder are extremely influential. Pressure from the Länder is shaping Commission President Prodi's promised white paper on EU governance, and accounts in part for the timing and content of Fischer's speech. Both Prodi and Fischer have signaled their willingness to address the concerns of the Länder as part of a long-term reconceptualization and reorganization of the EU, hoping that in the meantime the Länder would go along with the results of a much more limited IGC.

The EP is more involved in this than in previous IGCs, although for the first time the EP's powers will not be enhanced appreciably by the IGC's outcome. Two MEPs (Elmar Brok and Dimitrios Tsatsos) participate in the work of the Preparatory Group: the EP calls them "representatives," the member states call them "observers." They have not been particularly influential in the discussions to date. Because they report frequently to the EP and the media, the MEPs are an important source of public information on discussions within the Preparatory Group (much to the chagrin of some national delegations). A short report by Brok and Tsatsos to the EP just before the Feira summit, on the IGC's progress to date, is well worth reading.

Brok and Tsatsos were at a disadvantage early in the conference because the EP had not yet adopted a comprehensive report on the IGC pursuant to its brief opinion of February 3. Differences within and among the EP's political groups on a variety of possible agenda items delayed adoption of the report until April 13. By that time the report contained demands which Brok and Tsatsos, having participated in the Preparatory Group for two months, knew to be unattainable. Nevertheless Brok and Tsatsos have pushed, for instance, for a more radical extension of qmv than seems likely to happen, and for the even less likely application of the codecision procedure to all qmv decisions.

The Commission has adopted a more realistic approach than the EP, although its influence inside the conference is less than might be inferred from the high profile outside it of Michel Barnier, the Commissioner with responsibility for the IGC. This is partly because of the relative strength of intergovernmentalism in the EU at the moment, compounded by the weakness of Prodi's leadership. A major Commission initiative, to simplify and restructure the treaties, is a victim partly of poor timing and partly of the member states' impatience with the Commission. Even the Commission recognizes that the report on reorganizing the treaties, which it solicited from the European University Institute, is unlikely to have a bearing on this IGC.

The Portuguese are relieved to hand over responsibility for managing the IGC to a new presidency. Francisco Seixas da Costa, Portugal's State Secretary for European Affairs, worked hard on the opening round of the conference, often without much backing from the Foreign Minister and Prime Minister, whose priorities for the presidency lay elsewhere. There is widespread unease in most member states—not only in the small ones—about how the French presidency will handle the IGC. The French made it clear that they did not want their hands tied by the Portuguese presidency report, and their maneuverings with Germany suggest that a reform package to conclude the IGC will be in the works. The French may not have any scruples about merging their national interests with the Council presidency's prerogatives, but other member states are unsettled by that prospect.

The wild card in this IGC may not be the French Presidency, pervasive Eurocynicism, or resurgent German regionalism, but the on-going Austrian question. This has already had a direct bearing on the conference, albeit of a minor nature (there is a proposal to amend Article 7 TEU on the suspension of a member state's rights in the event of a "serious and persistent violation" of the EU's fundamental principles). More important, the Austrian government is seething against the sanctions imposed by the Fourteen, whose unity on the matter is far from solid. This is a festering sore in the EU, which erupted at the Feira summit and will erupt again in Nice unless the Fourteen find a mutually acceptable way out of a political dead end. The potential consequences for the IGC, and for the conduct of everyday EU business, are obvious and disturbing.

References

Brok, Elmar and Dimitrios Tsatsos, *Summary of the proceedings of the Intergovernmental Conference between 14 February and 6 June 2000 on the eve of the Feira European Council to be held on 19 and 20 June*, European Parliament, Notice to Members, Brussels, June 7, 2000.

European Commission, *Supplementary Contribution of the Commission to the Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional Reforms: Qualified majority voting for Single Market aspects of the taxation and social security fields*, Brussels, March 14, 2000.

European Commission, *Supplementary Contribution of the Commission to the Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional Reforms: Reform of the Community Courts*, Brussels, March 1, 2000.

European Council, *Presidency Conclusions: Feira European Council,* June 19-20, 2000.

European Parliament. *Report on the European Parliament's proposals for the Intergovernmental Conference*, Brussels, April 13, 2000.

European University Institute, *Reorganization of the Treaties: Final Report*, Florence, May 11, 2000.

Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional Reform: Presidency Report to the Feira European Council, CONFER 4750/00, Brussels, June 14, 2000.

Philippart, Eric and Monika Sie Dhian Ho, *The Pros and Cons of 'Closer Cooperation' Within the EU: Argumentation and Recommendations*, Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR), Working Document 104, The Hague, March 2000.

Report of the Reflection Group on the Future of the Judicial System of the European Communities (Due Report), Brussels, February 4, 2000.

Most IGC official documents, including presidency papers on specific agenda items, are available at <www.db.consilium.eu.int/cig/>.

Desmond Dinan is Associate Professor, School of Public Policy, George Mason University. Sophie Vanhoonacker is Senior Lecturer, European Institute for Public Administration, Maastricht.

Publications

New Books and Monographs

Ackrill, Robert (2000) The Common Agricultural Policy. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

Brine, Jacky (2000) The European Social Fund and the EU. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

Cottam, Martha L. and Richard W. Cottam (2000) Nationalism and Politics: The Political Behavior of Nation States. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

de Burca, Grainne and Joanne Scott (eds.) (2000) Constitutional Change in the EU: From Uniformity to Flexibility? Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Field, Heather (2000) Gender and European Integration. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

Fischer, Thomas C. (2000) The United States, the European Union, and the 'Globalization' of World Trade: Allies or Adversaries? Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Lantis, Jeffrey S. *et alia* (eds.) (2000) The New International Studies Classroom: Active Teaching, Active Learning. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Lo Faro, Antonio (2000) Regulating Social Europe: Reality and Myth of Collective Bargaining in the EC Legal Order. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Mayhew, Alan (2000) "Financial and Budgetary Implications of the Accession of Central and East European Countries to the EU," Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies No.33. Sussex, UK: Sussex European Institute.

Mancini, G. Federico (2000) Constitutionalism and Democracy in the European Union. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Molyneux, Candido Garcia (2000) Domestic Structures and International Trade: The Unfair Trade Instruments of the United States and EU. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Sakwa, Richard and Anne Stevens (eds.) (2000) Contemporary Europe. London: Macmillan.

Schelkle, Waltraud (2000) "Welfare Reform in the United States: Lessons for a Future Social Federation of the EMU," AICGS Seminar Paper. Washington, DC: American Institute of Contemporary German Studies.

Shaw, Jo (ed.) (2000) Social Law and Policy in an Evolving European Union. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Snyder, Francis (ed.) (2000) The Europeanisation of Law: The Legal Effects of European Integration. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.

Szczerbiak, Aleks (2000) "Public Opinion and Eastern Enlargement: Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership in Poland," Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies No.34. Sussex, UK: Sussex European Institute.

von Dosenrode, Soren and Anders Stubkjaer (2000) The European Union and the Middle East. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

Zito, Anthony R. (2000) Creating Environmental Policy in the European Union. New York: St. Martin's.

Journal News and Calls

Journal of European Integration is now being published by Harwood Academic Publishers for Volume 22 and beyond. The peer-reviewed journal focuses on pan-Europe, with topics related to European integration from politics, economics, law, history, and sociology. Senior editors include ECSA members Emil J. Kirchner and Hans J. Michelmann. For more information visit the Web site at <www.gbhap.com/European_Integration>.

Kogan Page is publishing a new journal devoted to the European view of global management issues, ***European Business Forum***. The quarterly features views from academia, business, and consulting, including essays and case studies on topics such as the euro and the European management model. The Spring 2000 debut issue has an interview with Commission President Prodi. Visit the Web site at <www.europeanbusinessforum.com>.

Sage Publications, UK, publisher of European Journal of International Relations, European Journal of Social Theory, European Union Politics, and others, now offers a new, on-line, and free of charge ***Sage Contents Alerting Service***. Readers can now receive advance notice of forthcoming contents for publication for pre-selected Sage journals. To sign up and select journals, visit the Web site at <www.sagepub.co.uk>.

The German journal ***Internationale Politik*** has recently released the first two numbers of its new ***Transatlantic Edition***, with articles by Joschka Fischer, William E. Paterson and Charlie Jeffery, Pascal Lamy, Karsten D. Voigt, and many others. ECSA member Elizabeth Pond is the editor of the Transatlantic Edition, which aims to familiarize English speakers with German and European views, interpretations, and analyses. Visit the Web site at <www.dgap.org/english/indexe.htm>.

Collegium: News of the College of Europe has published a special issue (No.19, II.2000) on European Security, with articles on the EU and the CFSP, the Mediterranean and European security, NATO enlargement, the European security dimension and Ireland, Norway, and more. Contact by e-mail <collegium@coleurop.be>.

Call for Papers: The ***Journal of International Relations and Development*** (JIRD) will publish a special issue on "Preparing the Council of the European Union for Enlargement," to be guest-edited by ECSA member Madeleine Hosli (University of Michigan). Authors are invited to contribute their views on a specific aspect of the current IGC, especially the redistribution of votes in the Council and introduction of a double majority clause, respectively. To what extent is it possible to maintain the current balance of relative voting power of larger and smaller EU states? Would reducing the relative voting weight of smaller states be detrimental to an ever closer Union? Topic proposals welcomed. Contact the JIRD, P. O. Box 2547, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia, or e-mail <jird.fdv@uni-lj.si>. Telephone 386.61.1805.198. Deadline: November 15, 2000.

Book Reviews

Mike Mannin, ed. Pushing Back the Boundaries: The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe. Manchester, UK/New York: Manchester University Press, 1999, 352 pp.

THIS BOOK DEALS WITH the different aspects of the Central and Eastern European countries' (CEECs) transition from Communism and their movement toward accession to the European Union (EU). The topics addressed include current and future relations between the EU and the CEECs, these states' economic and political transformation, and also the role and status of women in the CEECs, and environmental and security issues. It consists of an interdisciplinary series of studies by specialists of political science, social policies and geography. All of the contributors are academics from Liverpool John Moores University (with the exception of Lazlo Czaban, Technical University of Budapest).

The eleven chapters focus on the relations between both parts of Europe, East and West. This is certainly the main interest of the book, which proposes broad views on these relations, including the former Yugoslavia and the CIS countries. In addition, particular attention is paid to the future accession of the Central European states (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia) and some of the Eastern European countries (Baltic Republics, Bulgaria, Romania) to the EU. First (Chapters 1 and 2) the different European agreements are presented, showing the aid and cooperation programs which have been granted to the CEECs, according to these states' proximity and capacity to join the EU. Also, the different steps, which began with the Lisbon (1991) and Copenhagen (1993) summits and led to the first accession negotiations (1998), are scrutinized.

Chapters 3-7 are devoted to economic, political, environmental and security issues, as well as to the discrimination against women in the CEECs, and also concentrate on the links between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe. Indeed, in the conditions for accession, the EU has introduced economic, political, environmental, and equal opportunity "criteria." The achievements of the applicants, as well as the aid which is provided by the EU to meet these criteria, are analyzed

It is made clear that in all these fields, the capacities of the CEECs to fulfill the criteria set by the EU are very unequal. In general, the achievements of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and to a lesser extent Slovakia are more favorable than those of Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania. So it can be understood why the former group of countries was selected for the first round of accession negotiation (with the exception of Slovakia which until 1998 was negatively evaluated because of its treatment of cultural minorities).

The first part of the book ends with a chapter on security issues. When the communist regimes fell, and with them the Warsaw Pact, the CEECs (except those belonging to the New Independent States) disclosed their intention to apply for NATO membership. The Madrid Summit (1997) restricted this membership to the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, thus excluding temporarily other applicants (which have also applied to the EU). However, since 1994, these countries have been members of the Partnership for Peace, which involves a series of bilateral arrangements between NATO and the CEECs. Finally, the most important security problem facing Europe is the economic, political and social capability to absorb the newcomers.

The second part of the book includes a series of country studies, and is made up of four chapters on the Czech and Slovak Republics, Hungary and Poland. The choice of these countries is questionable, considering the scope of the book, which also covers the other applicants to the EU, namely: the Baltic Republics, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Romania. Two countries from this latter group (Estonia and Slovenia) have also been included in the first round of negotiations.

The very important results of the Helsinki Summit (December 1999), which paved the way for accession negotiations with Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, are not taken into account for obvious reasons (the book was already published). This summit constitutes new proof that the enlargement process is proceeding rapidly in Europe. In this respect, a prospective (or conclusive) chapter might have been included in the book, focusing on the main challenges and obstacles the EU will have to cope with in the years to come, to integrate the very diversified set of countries which make up Central and Eastern Europe.

Dominique Redor
University of Marne La Vallee

Wim Meeusen, ed. Economic Policy in the European Union: Current Perspectives. Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 1999, 254 pp.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIRTEEN European experts from six different countries have been collected in this volume by Wim Meeusen (University of Antwerp, Belgium). In Part I, the book deals with classical problems of economic policy in an integrated economic area (including monetary union): exchange rate issues, the impact of monetary union on regional convergence, and the relations between economic integration and trade growth.

On this first subject, Chapter 2 (by G. Pugh, D. Tyrral, and L. Tarnawa) analyzes the relations between the suppression of exchange rates in a monetary union and international trade. Although theoretical arguments against exchange rate variability are difficult to find, the authors point out that the stability (and *a fortiori* the suppression) of exchange rates creates a positive environment for the convergence of the expectations of economic agents, and hence for improving the credibility of national and Union economic policies.

However, monetary integration can create economic disturbances: rapid restructuring and concentration of activities

and increasing regional and national imbalances, for example (analyzed in Chapter 3, by C. Costa and P. De Grauwe). But nation-states have declining possibilities to soften the shocks that hit their economies. For this reason the power of political institutions should be strengthened. This last recommendation seems now to be accepted by most experts, after nearly two years of European monetary integration.

Chapter 6 deals with popular support of the euro. Not surprisingly the survey carried out by R. Pepermans reveals that popular support of the common currency is minimal in the UK and rather small in Germany. The highest support is seen in France, Ireland, Italy and Spain. Pepermans concludes that "elements of national cultures, represented by national features and their perceptions" (p. 98) affect support for the euro, and that the less citizens are proud and satisfied about the economic situation of their country, the more they accept the euro.

In Chapter 7, S. Hellemann and L. Hens try to build an econometric model of the euro-U.S. dollar exchange rate using the German mark as a proxy (for the period 1979-1998). They estimate an "extended monetary model" which takes into account not only monetary but also "real" variables, namely government spending and labor productivity. If we add that speculative elements should also be integrated in the model, it can be understood why central banks, and especially the European Central Bank, which only uses monetary instruments, cannot control the evolution of exchange rates.

National and regional convergence is studied in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. F. Barry determines that national differences in the standard of living have been reduced during the last decade, but that monetary union could reverse this evolution if fiscal policies are not coordinated in the EU to diminish asymmetric demand shocks. For "periphery countries" the capacity to attract foreign investments will be fundamental. In this respect only Ireland has been very successful. J. Villaverde and B. Sanchez Robles are pessimistic about the reduction of regional imbalances within Spain. It is likely that monetary union will deepen these imbalances because of agglomeration effects and spatial concentration of activities. So these authors suggest that national and EU efforts should be made to direct the flows of technical spill-overs towards less developed regions.

H. Glejser (Chapter 8) studies the impact of the different European enlargements on the international trade of Belgium and the Netherlands. The results of the econometric models presented here show that, not surprisingly, each enlargement was followed by a rapid increase in trade between the two countries under consideration and the newcomers. In addition it is noteworthy that trade with the USA did not suffer from these developments. This result discloses important dynamic effects of international trade during the European integration process.

The second part of the book is much more diversified than the first, since it concerns "public policies," that is to say RTD, labor market and environment regulations and programs promoted by the European institutions. Thus it gives very useful examples of public and "central" interventions in the economic and social activities within the European Union. But these examples are subject to different interpretations. Indeed the development of Union labor market policies and regulations are very limited, at least compared with national continental policies. In addition, the efficiency of EU RTD policies is questionable, and subsidies granted to common RTD projects did not systemically induce technological collaboration between European firms.

The issue of environmental policy raises the question of external effects at the level of the EU, and thus there are strong theoretical arguments in favor of Union public regulation. However, even in the field of water and river pollution the coordination of national policies is not sufficient, according to K. Buysse, C. Coeck and A. Verbeke.

This book is a very good consideration of the uncertainties and difficulties involved in the intervention of EU institutions in Europe. These difficulties are linked with two very important debates. The first one concerns the free market economy model, opposed to the alternative model in which public bodies indirectly influence some strategic sectors of the economy. The second concerns the distribution of powers between nation-state and Union institutions. No doubt Europe will continue to walk in the "middle of the road," trying to accommodate these opposing positions.

Dominique Redor
University of Marne La Vallee

Carol Cosgrove-Sacks, ed. The European Union and Developing Countries: The Challenges of Globalisation. London/New York: Macmillan/St. Martin's, 1999, 365 pp.

THIS COLLECTION HAS APPEARED at a critical time of change and reform, both on the inside of the European Union (EU) and regarding its more clearly pronounced external role and ambition. A number of closely interwoven contemporary developments form the essential background to this compilation: EU development and foreign aid policies are being fundamentally overhauled, in order to restore them to some degree of credibility

ECSA members interested in reviewing recent, EU-related books should contact the Book Review editor:

Professor Jeanie Bukowski
Institute of International Studies
Bradley University
1501 West Bradley Avenue
Peoria, IL 61625 USA
E-mail jbukow@bradley.edu
Fax 309.677.3256

Publishers should send review copies of books directly to Professor Bukowski.

and to a position that matches the Union's economic clout and newly-found external muscle. Moreover, the 1996 ACP-EU Green Paper and the attempts to bridge the divide over the search for an eventual successor agreement to Lomé IV has already demonstrated that, apart from the EU itself, the ACP grouping is also endeavouring to adapt to enhanced globalisation as it seeks to carve out a more powerful profile for itself on the world stage. Seeking to assure observers that its concern with Africa was not just a 30-day wonder, the EU connected with African leaders during the first-ever inter-regional summit in early April 2000. The resulting Cairo Declaration, as well as the 1999 negotiations for a Trade, Co-operation and Development Agreement with South Africa, have provided opportunities for catching up, but have also exposed old wounds and missed chances.

In general, the EU is re-asserting competencies and forging new alliances on a global scale. Developments following the foundational EU-Latin American summit and the EU's more involved partnership with Asia are evidence of emerging priorities in EU foreign policy, against the background of a new Patten-Solana duality. The concern of this book, however, is primarily with the developing world, and the 23 contributors to the volume approach this topic within the framework of five parts. The first of these sections briefly introduces the functions of the Commission and the much less well-known competencies of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in this area. Subsequent chapters investigate Member State (MS) perspectives on EU development policy and the Lomé Conventions. Given the legacy of Europe's colonial rule in Africa and Asia, the abiding history of bilateral trade patterns, and the fact that the Member States continue to have the most prominent influence on EU development policy, this is a stimulating method of setting the scene for further analysis. It also goes a long way towards explaining some of the root causes of the numerous contemporary conflicts and the absence of any 'African Renaissance,' from Uganda and Sierra Leone to Ethiopia and Zimbabwe. It is interesting to see some of the text being organised around geographical foci, with summary chapters on Mediterranean and Nordic contributions to EU development policy.

The second part of the book traces the evolution of the framework of EU-ACP related instruments, from the Yaoundé Convention and Lomé I in the 'euro-sclerotic' 1970s, to the aspirations of, and problems with, Lomé IV, and the attempts, during and before February 2000, to finalise a successor framework for a new Lomé regime, suitable for the 'post-Cold War' 1990s. The analysis of the work of the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), partly discredited in last year's Commission crisis, the European Development Fund (EDF) and the European Investment Bank (EIB) provide much-needed research material here, and the reader will find interesting short case-studies on South Africa and Zimbabwe. The development of the concern with human rights constitutes a particularly salient aspect in this context, given the new Amsterdam provisions, the implications of the Council of Minister's first *Human Rights Report* and the recent draft for a *European Union Human Rights Charter*. Differences in interpretation between EU and ACP participants in this process, over issues such as 'good governance' and the standing of human rights in development policy, arguably form one of the most contentious aspects in this area, with a Union often finding itself criticised for its home-grown 'democratic deficit' and lack of transparency after the shameful demise of the Santer College. For these and other reasons, one would have expected the coverage given to human rights, and to the question of shared and competing values and the way they shape negotiations, to have been given more than occasional and rather patchy attention in this collection.

The progress of the Barcelona Process, a new candidate status for Turkey, and the Enlargement negotiations with Cyprus and Malta provide the setting against which the material in part three of the book should be read. Loosely revolving around the themes of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the Middle East Peace Process, this section significantly adds to—and compares well with—the intense current publication activity relating to the EU's relationship with both the Maghreb and Mashraq countries. The multi-layered and intricate interplay of problems relating to Greece, Turkey, Cyprus and the Union make for historically accurate and revealing reading. The penultimate section of this informative collection shifts the focus of attention to the two world regions which EU watchers and policy analysts can expect to hear a lot more about in the future: Asia and Latin America. While the use of the term 'periphery' in this context may be partly justified in a geographical sense, it is less accurate when referring to the intensity of the Union's involvement in these regions. A redefined external role for the EU and changing patterns in the global equilibrium have made the EU's dealings with Asia and Latin America into more than just fledgling partnerships, as the recent EU-Latin America, EU-China or ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting) summits have amply demonstrated. As the most intensely institutionalised aspect, the EU-ASEAN dialogue has to take centre stage here. However, it is dealt with in a rather perfunctory way, which does not always do justice to the relative importance of this area. This is thrown into relief by the points—made, with good reason, in other sections of the work—about Asia's stronger response to globalisation when compared with Latin America, Africa or the near-abroad of the Mediterranean. A separate chapter on the many other manifestations of the European Union's 'New Asia Strategy,' on the eve of the ASEM III summit in Seoul, in November 2000, and of China's impending accession to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) would have been easily justifiable, even necessary here. The inclusion of the EU-India relationship in a collection like this, on the other hand, is inspired and long overdue, and the remaining parts on Latin America are valuable reading at a time when the EU strengthens its relationship with the Andean Pact countries or the members of the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) and other regional sub-groupings. Here, more so, perhaps, than in other parts of the book, the text is well-supported by statistics, which considerably enhance understanding and contextualisation.

The concluding part, surrounding the Commercial Instruments of EU Policy, provides persuasive additional data supporting the characterisation of EU trade relations as a

'pyramid of preferences,' to be found elsewhere in the work. The solid chapters on 'Globalisation,' 'The EU and the WTO' and on 'Trade Policy and Preferences' lend themselves more readily to being considered as introductions to some of the preceding sections. They might therefore have sat more comfortably at an earlier point in this collection, providing current information and analysis when the abolition of Third World debt hit the headlines and the Seattle WTO Meeting struggled with issues of trade regulation and bad public image.

Regular readers of the *Courier* are often prone to complaining that good-quality books on Lomé and related areas, which can also be used meaningfully in teaching and research, are exceedingly rare. This collection, however, must count as an exception to this rule. Methodically sound, it takes into account all but the very recent of developments in EU-ACP relations and manages to assemble a composite picture which is coherent, comprehensive and interesting.

Georg Wiessala
University of Central Lancashire

Thomas C. Lawton, ed. European Industrial Policy and Competitiveness: Concepts and Instruments. New York: St. Martin's, 1999, 264 pp.

Andrew M. McLaughlin and William A. Maloney. The European Automobile Industry: Multi-level Governance, Policy and Politics. New York: Routledge, 1999, 256 pp.

WHAT IS THE RESPONSE of European policy makers to the challenges posed by globalization and rapid technological change? Guided by the need to enhance industrial competitiveness, according to the authors and editor of both books, policy makers have inherited and developed a tool kit that promotes the twin pillars of corporate competitiveness and European integration. Lawton and his colleagues describe the tool kit at the European level, while McLaughlin and Maloney focus on the transition from national to European policy networks and the implications for industrial competitiveness. While both books agree on the need firstly, to analyze industrial policy at the European as opposed to the national level, and secondly, to develop a better and clearer understanding of the determinants and outcomes of policy-making between the two levels, they ultimately reach sharply different conclusions. While Lawton (p. 226) argues that "the emphasis of public intervention in the market has shifted from vertical actions promoting or protecting specific companies or business sectors, toward horizontal measures which encourage trans-sectoral functional development," McLaughlin and Maloney point to the usefulness, and indeed the primacy, of the policy network approach which centers on sectoral characteristics and explores the linkages between macropolitical factors and sector-specific outcomes. Understanding why they reach different conclusions sheds light on important controversies surrounding government-industry relations.

There is much to recommend about both books. Each makes the case cogently and persuasively offering detailed supporting documentation. But precisely the strength of each argument illustrates the limitations of each approach. Theory is somewhat underdeveloped relative to the empirical material while the scope of each approach limits the generalizations that can be derived. Lawton's work may be too broad to provide hypotheses for investigation in specific cases, and McLaughlin and Maloney's study too narrow to generalize over a broad array of sectors.

Lawton provides a framework within which to analyze industrial policy and competitiveness at the European level. The book begins with three arguments. First, industrial policy at the European level includes a mix of various instruments with different economic, social, and political goals. Second, industrial policy affects both industry and the broader economic and regulatory frameworks. Third, recent policy activity has shifted away from traditional *ad hoc* sectoral measures favoring specific firms toward more systematic horizontal measures designed to facilitate economy-wide market adjustment. The main thrust of the book identifies and evaluates these measures in terms of ten instruments. They include R & D initiatives, competition rules, trade policy, export promotion, tax incentives, procurement, transport and infrastructure, training and education, inward investment incentives, and enterprise policy. Each chapter, written by a different author, traces the evolution of policy in each of these areas at the European and, where appropriate, at the national levels. For example, R & D policy is reviewed from a European perspective, given pan-European initiatives such as the Eureka program, as well as national initiatives within each country. The end result is a collection of valuable information with solid documentation and detailed accounts of successes and failures.

The problem with this book is that it tries to cover a lot of ground and gets a bit too general in the process. For example, the ten instruments cover an enormous number of areas. Take tax policy as a case in point. A good treatment involves a description of developments at the European and national levels, which already includes 16 cases, in addition to some theoretical work on why specific instruments work well and how. That's too much to do in a short chapter of 20 pages. So each author has to trade depth for breadth. Moreover, it is important to include some quantitative analysis on the effects of each instrument. This type of information is important in the discussion of using instruments because it alerts the reader to their effectiveness. A good way to tie this discussion to theory (the book suffers from lack of theory) is to examine the policy tools literature developed with national contexts in mind. Two examples are Lester Salamon's Beyond the Privatization Debate and Chris Hood's The Tools of Government. Both give an excellent description of the various tools resting more or less on theoretically important dimensions. What they both lack and what Lawton could expand on is a theory of choice. Under what conditions will government employ them and how successful are they? All this can be adapted nicely to the European level.

While Lawton stays mostly on the European level, McLaughlin and Maloney attempt to link the national and transnational levels in an interconnected, but not nested, process

of coordination and communication between actors in identifiable policy networks. Using the automobile industry as a case study, they reach several important conclusions. First, national factors rather than sectoral characteristics have shaped policy in the postwar period. This argument goes contrary to conventional wisdom that policy in sectors across countries is more likely to converge than policy across sectors in the same country. Second, the balance in favor of macropolitical factors can be explained partly by the sectoral characteristics of the automobile industry. This is an important and brave qualification to their previous argument. Third, the need for a national response to EU directives resulted in strengthening the links between domestic producers and the state. Fourth, the shift to a transnational European policy network resulted in a bigger role for the Commission, but one that is steering rather than directing in nature. The expectation is that the Commission will seek regularized and negotiated relationships with resource-rich actors. The implication of this expectation is that policy networks at the European level will be more cohesive than most national networks, more dense—meaning more contacts between actors—and potentially on a collective level more powerful in ways producers could not possibly get from their national civil servants.

It is a very interesting argument because it seeks to tie multilevel governance as it exists in the European Union with theoretical insight from government-industry relations as it applies to national contexts. The end result is a satisfying study, which draws important conclusions and provides ample "food for thought." But it is not without problems. Three are worth mentioning. First, there is no justification for the selection of sector and country. Why study automobiles and how does this hamper, if in any way, the ability to generalize to other sectors? If it is not generalizable, which is something they allude to in chapter five, would another sector have been a better choice? Also the United Kingdom may be an anomaly insofar as automobiles are concerned, given the decline of domestic producers and the domination of foreign multinationals in the postwar period. Second, there is a need for specific hypotheses to be explicitly stated in the beginning to give the reader a clear road map as to what to expect. More importantly, they would enable the authors to tie their argument more lucidly to the theoretical literature of interest. Third, the structure of the analysis is somewhat peculiar because as it currently reads, the book has two concluding chapters. The first is chapter five, concluding the discussion on national networks, and the second is chapter ten, exploring the implications of network development at the European level. At one level, this makes sense, but at another it does not. Surely, there are two levels worth discussing, but the point is to show how they are linked and what difference this makes. What matters is not the number of levels but their linkages. This should have been the primary focus of only one concluding chapter.

The two books also represent two interesting ways of analyzing industrial policy in highly integrated systems. The first seeks to explore issues and prospects at the highest level, EU, implying that this is the most fruitful and analytically important level at which policy is made. Lawton's work exemplifies this sort of study. The second looks at the linkages between levels implying that vertical linkages across levels matter more than horizontal exchange at any one level. McLaughlin and Maloney follow this route. Moreover, Lawton contributes to the debate by viewing industrial policy as a "manager." He and his colleagues try to describe the tools available to the manager and their effectiveness. Moreover, the contributors build their case by arguing that broader, macroeconomic measures are becoming more important than sectoral ones. McLaughlin and Maloney don't see it this way. They build their case from the particular to the general suggesting that sectoral analysis is important to understand the complexities and most importantly the environment within which network participants operate. Both approaches have their benefits and drawbacks, but in its own way, each sensitizes us to the complexity of industrial policy, the wide gaps in our knowledge, and the need for more research to adapt literatures developed at the national level to an integrated, multilevel European system. For this reason, both books should be read and widely debated.

Nikolaos Zahariadis
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Miscellany

The Brussels-based **European Federation of Accountants** (FEE) offers a free monthly (e-mail) newsletter on the euro that can be subscribed to by visiting their Web site at **www.euro.fee.be/newsletter.htm**. The Web site also offers case studies, position papers (in handy PDF formats), and other substantive documents focusing on the changeover to the euro from the implementation perspective, aimed primarily at businesses but also for consumers. The latest of their Europapers (No.37, May 2000), covers the forthcoming introduction of the euro coin.

The **Union of International Associations** (UIA) has established a new dissertation prize "in order to stress the importance of the associative phenomenon in what is rapidly becoming a worldwide society." The prize of 6,000 euro will be awarded for a thesis prepared on a subject concerning the life, operations or work of international non-governmental organisations. Students of all nationalities are eligible, and the dissertations must have been completed and defended in 1999 or by November 1, 2000, at the latest. Manuscripts must be in English or French. Based in Brussels, the UIA publishes the journal *Transnational Associations*, and collects and disseminates data on some 50,000 international governmental and non-governmental organizations worldwide. Prize information is available at **www.uia.org/prize/prizndx.htm**

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY STUDIES ASSOCIATION
Seventh Biennial International Conference
"Globalization, European Integration, and Domestic Transformation"
May 31-June 2, 2001
Madison, Wisconsin

Call for Paper and Panel Proposals
Deadline for *receipt* of all proposals is November 1, 2000.

The European Community Studies Association invites scholars and practitioners engaged in the study of Europe and the European Union to submit panel and paper proposals for the 2001 Seventh Biennial International Conference. The general theme of the conference will be: "Globalization, European Integration, and Domestic Transformation." The Program Committee hopes to promote broad exchange of disciplinary perspectives and research agendas, and is particularly interested in work that relates issues of European union to country-level politics and policies and to the broader international context. The Committee actively seeks proposals relevant to the European Union from scholars from a variety of disciplines, including work that places the EU in comparative perspective. Participation by graduate students is welcomed.

The 2001 Conference Program Committee members are:

Martin Schain, Politics and European Studies, New York University (Chair)
George Bermann, School of Law, Columbia University
Russell Dalton, Department of Political Science, University of California Irvine
Jytte Klausen, Department of Government, Brandeis University
Helen Milner, Department of Political Science, Columbia University
Mark Pollack, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin Madison

For complete guidelines on the proposal process as well as general information about the Conference and its location, please visit the ECSA Web site at **www.ecsa.org/conf2001.html**

Panel proposals must be accompanied by the Panel Proposal Cover Sheet, available on the ECSA Web site. Individual paper proposals are also welcomed, and the Program Committee will assign those individual papers accepted to appropriate panels. Paper proposals must be accompanied by the Paper Proposal Cover Sheet, also available on the Web site. The Proposal Cover Sheets may be printed from the Web site or photocopied as need be, or you may send a self-addressed, stamped envelope to the ECSA office to receive cover sheets.

Panel and paper proposals should be submitted by regular mail (not by fax or e-mail) to **ECSA, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA**. We regret that we won't be able to consider proposals received after the November 1 deadline. Proposers will receive responses in writing no later than the end of January 2001. For questions about the Conference, please visit the ECSA Web site or send an e-mail to <ecsa@pitt.edu>.

NETWORK OF EUROPEAN UNION CENTERS

News and Notes for Summer 2000 **www.eucenters.org**

The EU Center of North Carolina has added two new features to their Web site. A European Union Online Resource Guide, is a comprehensive resource intended for classroom use and general pedagogical purposes. The guide includes over 70 pages of readings, fact sheets, teaching modules, role-play and games on the European Union and EMU; materials on EU enlargement and CFSP will be added in fall 2000. Center personnel also research U.S. and European newspapers bi-weekly and select one U.S. and one European article on transatlantic relations for direct link to the Web site. The news articles can be found on the Center's home page at www.unc.edu/depts/eucenter. Links are archived for the remainder of the academic year.

The European Union Center in Georgia will sponsor two conferences: "Shaping Biotechnology in the 21st Century: A Joint European and American Workshop on Policy, Legal, and Ethical Issues" (June 17-18), featuring William J. Todd, President and CEO, Encina Technology Ventures; LeRoy Hood, President and Director, Institute for Systems Biology; Patrice Laget, Counselor, Science, Technology and Education, European Commission Delegation; and Kenneth Keller, Professor of Science, Technology and Public Policy, University of Minnesota; and "EU-U.S. Data Privacy Policy" (June 28). American and European policymakers and experts will discuss a U.S./EU compromise on data protection for area businesses. Keynote speaker is Barbara Wellbery, Counsellor to the Undersecretary for Electronic Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The European Union Center at the University of Illinois awarded nine research grants to select graduate students to conduct research in Europe and Cuba this summer. Students will examine various socio-economic and environmental issues associated with the unification of Europe such as central banks, harmonization of products and securities laws, social protection systems, and peoples' attitudes toward Parliament. One student will research the impact of the Helms-Burton law on EU investments in Cuba. In August, the EU Center will highlight France at the Illinois State Fair, which over 6,000 people are expected to attend.

The Boston Working Group on European Integration and Changing Democracy, sponsored by the European Union Center at Harvard and the Forward Planning Unit of the European Commission, are holding a two-day conference in Brussels on "Women and Changing Democracy in the EU." Experts on Gender and Democracy from both sides of the Atlantic will present papers. EU Commissioner for Social Affairs and Employment, Anna Diamantopoulou, will attend as will Gerome Vignon, recently designated by Commission President Romano Prodi to write a Commission white paper on governance in the EU.

The EU Center of New York will sponsor lectures this summer at CUNY: Wouter Wilton, Head of Information and Press at the EU Commission's Delegation in New York, will speak on "EU: Current Developments." Pavel Telicka, Chief Negotiator with the EU, Secretary of State for European Affairs and First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, will speak on "Accession Talks Between the EU and the Czech Republic." This lecture is co-sponsored by the Consulate General of the Czech Republic. Francisco Seixas da Costa, Secretary of State for European Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Portugal, will deliver the address, "The State of the EU." Dagmar Boving's paper, "Germany's Presidency of the EU and the Start of Euro," was added to the Occasional Paper Series and can be accessed at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/eusc.

NETWORK OF EUROPEAN UNION CENTERS

News and Notes for Summer 2000 **www.eucenters.org**

University of Pittsburgh Chancellor Mark Nordenberg, accompanied by Alberta Sbragia, Director of the University's European Union Center and Center for West European Studies, and Ronald Brand, Director of the University of Pittsburgh School of Law's Center for International Legal Education, will be visiting with several Luxembourg officials on July 10-11. These officials include the Crown Prince, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Education, as well as Justices from the European Court of Justice. The purpose of the trip is to cement strong academic and policy research ties between the University and Luxembourg.

The European Union Center at the University of Missouri awarded six research grants to advanced undergraduate and graduate students for the summer months. The students are working toward their European Union Graduate Certificate, and represent diverse programs of study in agricultural economics, history, journalism, marketing, and political science. The Center also awarded three research grants and one curriculum development grant to faculty conducting original research on the European Union in criminal justice, rural sociology, and health management. For information on these research initiatives, as well as research opportunities available for the 2000-2001 academic year, visit the Center's Web site at http://eu.missouri.edu/research.

The European Union Center of Seattle is sponsoring three graduate students conducting research in Europe on EU topics this summer: Christian Kaschuba from the University of Washington's School of Communications will be researching German broadcasting in the aftermath of the Television Without Frontiers directive; David Winterstein, also from the School of Communications, will be doing dissertation research on language and media in the promotion of regional identities in Europe; and Phil Lyon from the UW's History Department will do research in Germany and Prague on the impact of the EU accession process on East European countries.

The European Union Center of California announces the availability of research support for faculty at the Claremont Colleges examining topics broadly related to the European Union, especially interdisciplinary and intercollegiate collaborative work. The Center's support for faculty research in 2000-01 will assume four primary forms: seed funding for basic research; awards for contributors to the Center's working paper series; curriculum development awards; and, support for the creation of research circles of faculty working on similar topics. The EU Center also announces the availability of financial support to cover some research expenses for students at the Claremont Colleges, with preference given to proposals for research projects with direct relevance to the current situation of the European Union, including its member states.

The European Union Center at the University of Wisconsin Madison is preparing for its 2000-2001 programs and activities to be devoted to the theme, "Identity and Citizenship," in which the Center will explore questions of European identity—who belongs to Europe and who does not?—from a cultural perspective including such subjects as intellectual life, film, education, painting, literature, theater, music, and sports. To that end, the EU Center has organized talks on "The Unintended Consequences of Union Citizenship," given by Antje Wiener, Reader in European Studies, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, and "Citizenship and Constitutionalism in the European Union," given by Renaud Dehousse, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Centre Européen at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris.

Conferences

July 6-9, 2000: "Russia and the European Union: Towards Strategic Partnership," Novgorod, Russia. Organized by the Center for Integration Research & Programs, St. Petersburg. Contact e-mail <cirp@softhome.net> or visit <www.cirp.edu>.

July 17-20, 2000: "The Intergovernmental Conference 2000: The European Union at the Crossroad of Institutional Reform in the Face of Enlargement," Maastricht, Netherlands. Organized by the European Institute of Public Administration and the Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University. Contact by e-mail <mireya@amsu.edu> or visit <www.amsu.edu>.

September 8, 2000: "Taste, Technology, and *Terroir:* A Transatlantic Dialogue on Food as Culture," Madison, Wisconsin. Examine the ways in which food, science and politics come together in the arena of genetically modified foods, especially between France, the European Union, and the U.S., with a focus on Wisconsin. Sponsored by the European Union Center, the Center for German and European Studies, and the Center for European Studies, in the International Institute of the University of Wisconsin Madison. Contact by e-mail <eucenter@intl-inst.wisc.edu> or visit <http://wiscinfo.doit.wisc.edu/eucenter>.

September 11-12, 2000: "EMU Halfway Through the Transition Period: Experiences and Perspectives," Barcelona, Spain. Organized by the European Institute of Public Administration and the European Centre for the Regions. Contact by e-mail <a.barragan@eipa-nl.com> or visit <www.eipa.nl>.

October 2-3, 2000: "Dimensions of Organizational Change: The European Union, The Global Corporation and Cultural Complexity," Columbia, Missouri. Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Organizational Change and the European Union Center at the University of Missouri. Contact by e-mail <CenterEU@missouri.edu> or visit <http://eu.missouri.edu>.

October 5-7, 2000: "New Europe, New Challenges, New Generations," Paris, France. With the endorsement of French President Jacques Chirac and support of the European Commission. Organized by NewRopeans for students and young professionals in all sectors. Contact by e-mail <contact@newropeans.org> or visit <www.newropeans.org>.

November 9-10, 2000: "State Aid Policy and Practice in the European Community," Maastricht, Netherlands. Organized by the European Institute of Public Administration. Contact by e-mail <s.vandepol@eipa-nl.com> or visit <www.eipa.nl>.

November 14, 2000: "European Studies Research Students Conference," UACES, London, UK. Fourth annual conference for all graduate research students of European studies. Contact by e-mail at <admin@uaces.org> or visit <www.uaces.org>.

Grants and Scholarships

The **DAAD Prize for Distinguished Scholarship in German Studies** will be awarded in Politics and Foreign Policy for 2000. Awardees must be members of a university faculty or research institute staff in the United States at mid-career, U.S. citizens or residents, and holders of a doctoral degree from a university in the U.S., with an outstanding publication record of scholarship in the field of German politics and/or foreign policy in the post-World War II period. For information, contact the DAAD Prize Selection Committee, American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, via e-mail at <info@aicgs.org> or visit the Web site at <www.aicgs.org>.

The **Fulbright Scholar Program** is accepting applications for lecturing and research grants, worldwide, and for spring and summer (2001) seminars in Germany, Korea, and Japan for international education and academic administrators. Opportunities are open to college and university faculty and administrators at 2-year, 4-year, and graduate institutions, professionals from business and government, artists, journalists, lawyers, independent scholars, and others. Contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden Street NW, Suite 5L, Washington, DC 20008; by e-mail at <apprequest@cies.iie.org>, or visit <www.cies.org>. Application deadline for Fulbright lecturing/research grants: August 1, 2000; for seminars in Germany, Korea, and Japan: November 1, 2000.

"Fellowships in the Social Sciences and Humanities 2001-2002," sponsored by the **Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**. Academic year residential fellowships for outstanding project proposals in the social sciences and humanities on national and/or international issues. Projects should have relevance to public policy, and Fellows are expected to interact with policymakers in Washington, DC and with Center staff working on similar issues. Fellows are provided offices, access to the U.S. Library of Congress, computers, and research assistants. Persons from any country and any academic discipline may apply. Contact via e-mail at <fellowships@wwic.si.edu> or visit <www.wilsoncenter.org>. Application deadline: October 1, 2000.

"TransCoop: Across the Atlantic," sponsored by the **German Federal Ministry for Education and Research**, offers support to researchers from Canada, Germany, and the U.S., for joint projects in the humanities, social sciences, economics, and law. Funding may be used for short-term research visits, other travel, organizing conferences, material and equipment, printing, and research assistance, for a maximum of three years total. Each project must be matched by host-country funds applied for in advance of and identified in the joint TransCoop application. Applicants must hold a Ph.D. Contact the German American Academic Council for information and application, via e-mail at <taumann@gaac.org> or visit <www.gaac.org/transco.html>. Application deadline: October 30, 2000.

Academic Programs

8th Annual European Summer School, July 3-8, 2000, Spetsae Island, Greece: "The European Union in a Changing World: Global and Regional Challenges." Courses given by ECSA members Philippe Schmitter (European University Institute), Clive Archer and Neill Nugent (both of Manchester Metropolitan University), Miroslav Jovanovic (United Nations), and others. View this year's program at <www.ecsanet.org/spetsae/>.

Graduate Institute of European Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland, is organizing a summer program on "EU External Capability and Influence in International Relations," August 28-September 9, 2000. Co-sponsored by the Free University of Brussels and the University of Catania, it is the first of the rotating summer schools of the European Consortium for Political Research's standing Group on the European Union. Faculty are expected to include ECSA members David Allen (Loughborough University); James Caporaso (University of Washington); Roy Ginsberg (Skidmore College), Andrew Moravcsik (Harvard University), and others. For M.Phil. and Ph.D. students and post-doctoral researchers; English is the working language. For information, application and application instructions, e-mail Willa Pierre at <willa2@etu.unige.ch> or visit the Web site at <www.unige.ch/ieug/summer.htm>.

LL.M./M.A. in European Union Law, a two-year distance learning master's degree offered through the International Centre for Management, Law and Industrial Relations, University of Leicester, UK. For lawyers and others with an interest in Europe. Core modules include courses on law making in the EU, application of Community law in the member states, Economic and Monetary Union, free movement in the Single Market, consumer and environmental law, and fundamental rights and citizenship. Optional course units include competition policy, intellectual property, and company and commercial law, as well as employment law, labour market policy, equalities law, and occupational health and safety. Contact Susan Thornton, Course Administrator, at e-mail <st22@le.ac.uk>, fax 44.116.252.2699, or visit the Web site <www.le.ac.uk/depts/ic>.

European Master of Public Administration, a one-year advanced academic training program (in English) in comparative public administration, public policy and public management, is offered by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in Leuven, Belgium. Open to students from all countries, the program concentrates on the institutions of the EU and the comparative analysis of public administration issues in European countries within the context of internationalization and European integration. The program is aimed at graduate students in the social sciences who have training in public management, public policy, and public administration. Contact by e-mail to <yulia.chernova@soc.kuleuven.ac.be> or visit the Web site <www.kuleuven.ac.be/facdep/social/pol/ieb/empa.htm>.

M.A. in European Legal Studies (a specialist program), **M.A. in EU Law and Policy**, and **M.A. in the European Union** (the latter by distance learning), all offered by the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence/Centre for the Study of Law in Europe, Department of Law, at the University of Leeds, UK. For information, contact by e-mail <G.Craven@leeds.ac.uk> or visit the Web site <www.leeds.ac.uk/law/csle/csleindex.htm>.

M.Econ.Sci. in European Economic and Public Affairs and **M.A. in European Studies**, programs of the Dublin European Institute at University College Dublin, Ireland. The former is based in the social sciences and the latter, in the arts/humanities. For more information contact by e-mail <dolores.burke@ucd.ie> or visit the Web site <www.ucd.ie>.

TransAtlantic Master's Program, a 14-month degree program in which students study at 2-4 universities in the U.S. and Europe, focusing on the politics, policies, and societies of the emerging transatlantic market. Participating universities are the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, University of Washington Seattle, Duke University, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, University of Bath, Free University of Berlin, Université de Paris III, Humboldt University of Berlin, Charles University (Prague), and Sciences-Po, Paris. Visit the Web at <www.unc.edu/depts/tam>.

Master of Advanced European Studies, Europainstitut, University of Basel, Switzerland, is an interdisciplinary post-graduate degree conferred by the Faculties of Law, Economics, and Philosophy. Courses are given in German and English, with electives given in French, and students generally can use any of the three languages in oral participation and written assignments. The program may be completed intensively over one year or spread over two years for those who wish to continue their professions while pursuing the degree part-time. Contact by e-mail <europa@ubaclu.unibas.ch> or visit the Web site at <www.unibas.ch/euro/>.

The Faculty of European Studies at the Universitatea Babes-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, with consortium support from universities throughout Europe, offers two undergraduate-level programs, the **B.A. in European Studies** and the **B.A. in Management of European Institutions**. The interdisciplinary programs focus on economics, law, and the social and political sciences. The Faculty also offers several master's level degree programs, including the **M.A. in Comparative European Studies**, the **M.A. in European Cultural Anthropology**, and the **M.A. in European Construction**. In addition, the Faculty offers a **Ph.D. in European Studies**. Contact via e-mail at <euro@euro.ubbcluj.ro> or fax to 40.64.190.251.

Summer Course in European Competition Law, July 10-13, 2000, Academy of European Law Trier, Germany. For newly qualified lawyers with some knowledge of general Community law and business law. Conducted in English. Contact the Academy of European Law (ERA) by e-mail at <info@era.int> or visit the Web site <www.era.int>.

ECSA Prizes 2001

The ECSA's 1997-99 Executive Committee established a set of prizes to be awarded henceforth biennially at each ECSA Biennial International Conference. The aim of the prizes is to recognize and encourage excellence in scholarship in the field of European Union studies. Each prize carries a small cash award and will be presented to the recipients at the ECSA Conference luncheon. The prize selection committees are comprised of ECSA Executive Committee members and established EU scholars. The prizes and their stipulations are:

ECSA Prize for Best Conference Paper

The ECSA Prize for Best Conference Paper will be awarded in 2001 to an outstanding paper presented at the 1999 Biennial Conference in Pittsburgh. All those who presented an original paper at the Conference and who deposited copies of their paper with the ECSA office either in person at the Conference, or by mail to the ECSA office by July 31, 1999, are eligible. The prize carries a cash award of $100. To apply for the prize, please send three paper copies of the version of the paper that you presented at the 1999 ECSA Conference, to the ECSA Administrative Office (address given below). Papers may not be submitted by e-mail, facsimile, or on diskette. Deadline for *receipt* of nominated papers for the ECSA Prize for Best 1999 Conference Paper is September 15, 2000.

ECSA Prize for Best Dissertation

The ECSA Prize for Best Dissertation in EU studies will be awarded in 2001 to a dissertation on any aspect of European integration submitted in completion of the Ph.D. at a U.S. university between September 1, 1998 and August 31, 2000. The student must have defended and deposited the dissertation and graduated during this period, and the dissertation must include a signed, dated dissertation committee approval page. Only one dissertation per department at an institution may be nominated for this prize. The prize carries a cash award of $250. Department chairs should send one paper copy of the dissertation with a cover letter from the chair to the ECSA Administrative Office (address given below). Dissertations may not be submitted by e-mail, facsimile, or on diskette. Deadline for *receipt* of nominations for the next ECSA Prize for Best Dissertation is September 15, 2000.

Send ECSA Prize nominations to:

Valerie Staats, Ph.D., Executive Director
European Community Studies Association
University of Pittsburgh
415 Bellefield Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

For questions about the prizes or the process, please contact ECSA via e-mail at <ecsa@pitt.edu>. Further information about the ECSA prizes, including the 1999 recipients, may be found at <www.ecsa.org/prizes.htm>.

ECSA Interest Sections

ECSA Political Economy Interest Section

The second ECSA Interest Section has been established (June 2000), by co-organizers Erik Jones and Amy Verdun, who have contributed this working mission statement for the Section: "Economics plays a central role in what the European Union is doing and in how we understand it. Therefore, the Political Economy interest section will bring together ECSA members who take an interest in the impact of European integration on the performance and functioning of Europe's economies, and the influence of ideas, preferences, and motivations on the structure, content, and progress of European integration.

Clearly this is substantial terrain. Nevertheless, the overlap between subject matter and methodological preference is considerable. Therefore, the primary function of this interest section is to help crystallize political economy discussions as they relate to the European Union. The motivation for doing this is both to facilitate interaction among political economists and to make it easier for ECSA members focusing on other areas of interest to identify, access, and draw upon the insights that such analysis has to offer."

ECSA members who wish to know more about the Political Economy Interest Section should visit the Section Web pages at **www.ecsa.org/pesection.html**, or e-mail the Section organizers at <ejones@parachute.com> and <averdun@ uvic.ca>. Section members will be added to a dedicated e-mail distribution list, and the Political Economy section will have, beginning in Fall 2000, an auxiliary set of Web pages to be hosted by the University of Nottingham, UK.

ECSA EU Law Interest Section

The ECSA EU Law Section working mission statement reads, "All European Union scholars readily acknowledge that a significant element in the development of the European Community is the caselaw of the European Court of Justice. The ECSA EU Law Section will concern itself with the interplay between the judicial decisions of the ECJ and the Court of First Instance and the political and economic concerns of the EU. While our focus is primarily on legal developments within the Community, the Section encourages the involvement of political scientists, economists, social scientists, policy makers and law practitioners to develop a broad interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral working group on EU law." Visit the Section's Web pages at **www.ecsa.org/eulawsection.html**, or e-mail Section organizer D. Bruce Shine at <shimas@chartertn.net>.

New Sections: ECSA members wishing to organize an interest section should review the section proposal guidelines which may be found at <www.ecsa.org/interestpolicy.html>, or may be had by contacting ECSA via e-mail at <ecsa@pitt.edu>. All ECSA Interest Sections will have the opportunity to hold meetings at ECSA's 7th Biennial International Conference in Madison, Wisconsin, May 31-June 2, 2001.

ECSA Review

The *ECSA Review* (ISSN 1090-5758) is published four times yearly by the European Community Studies Association, a membership association and non-profit organization founded in 1988 and devoted to the exchange of information and ideas about the European Union. We welcome the submission of scholarly, EU-related manuscripts. Subscription to the *ECSA Review* is a benefit of Association membership.

Managing Editor
Valerie Staats
Forum and Features Editor
Mark A. Pollack (University of Wisconsin Madison)
Book Reviews Editor
Jeanie Bukowski (Bradley University)
Editorial Assistant
Rachael Riemersma

European Community Studies Association
415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA
E-mail ecsa@pitt.edu
Web www.ecsa.org
Facsimile 412.648.1168
Telephone 412.648.7635

European Community Studies Association
New Membership or Renewal Form *(Please type or print)*

Name _____
Address _____
_____
City _____
State/Province _____ Postal Code _____
Country _____
Work Telephone _____
Work Facsimile _____
E-mail _____
Your Professional Affiliation _____
_____

Do you wish to be subscribed to
ECSA's e-mail List Server? _____ yes _____ no

Membership dues (please check as appropriate):

Institutional	$75 _____	*Outside the USA:*	
Individual	$35 _____	Individual	$45 _____
Student	$20 _____	Student	$30 _____
Three-year membership *at USA addresses only*			$100 _____
Three-year membership *outside the USA*			$130 _____

EU Law Interest Section $5 _____ (per year)
Political Economy Interest Section $5 _____ (per year)

Note: U.S. citizens may make a tax-deductible contribution to support the work of ECSA in any amount over membership dues:
ECSA Grants and Scholarships Fund $ _____
ECSA Endowment Fund $ _____

Total amount enclosed: $ _____

If paying by check, please make check payable to ECSA. Checks must be in US$ and drawn on a USA bank. We also accept international money orders and MasterCard or Visa credit cards.

MasterCard # _____
Visa # _____
Expiration Date _____
Signature _____

Mail or fax this form (please do not mail *and* fax this form) to:
European Community Studies Association
415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA
Facsimile 412.648.1168

Thank you for your support of ECSA and EU scholarship across the disciplines!

Inside the Summer 2000 *ECSA Review*:

Founded in 1988, ECSA is a non-profit academic and professional organization dedicated to the exchange of information and ideas on European Union affairs. ECSA coordinates the Network of European Union Centers in the United States.