



**EUROPEAN UNION  
STUDIES ASSOCIATION**

Vol. 14, No. 4  
Fall 2001

ISSN 1535-7031  
www.eustudies.org

**EUSA  
REVIEW**

***EUSA Review Forum***

**The Commission White Paper  
and European Governance**

FIRST PROPOSED BY COMMISSION President Romano Prodi in February 2000, the Commission's White Paper on European Governance was designed to examine and make proposals about the concept of European governance, which was taken to encompass "rules, processes and behavior that affect the way in which powers are exercised at European level" (Commission 2000: 4). As Daniel Wincott recounts below, the White Paper itself was drafted by a "Governance Team" within the Commission, which in turn consulted widely among academics as well as government experts and civil society. For many observers, the White Paper promised a fundamental reconsideration of the aims of European governance; the respective roles of EU, national, and subnational institutions; the role of civil society in EU policymaking; and the possible development of new forms of governance including self-regulation, co-regulation, the open method of coordination, and independent regulatory agencies.

After extensive consultation outside the Commission, and debate within it, the White Paper was finally released on 27 July. As per its mandate, the 35-page document discusses five principles of good governance—openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness, and coherence—and offers broadly formulated "proposals for change" in four areas: better involvement; better policies, regulation, and delivery; the EU's contribution to global governance; and refocused policies and institutions (Commission 2001). As Les Metcalfe points out in his essay below, the White Paper is less specific in its proposals than previous White Papers (such as Lord Cockfield's famous 1985 White Paper, *Completing the Internal Market*), but rather presents a broad analysis and calls for a period of public consultations, to continue through the end of March 2002, on the principles and proposals of the White Paper. Unfortunately, the timing of the White Paper's release, just before the August holidays, has meant that the public debate on its contents has begun slowly, with little press coverage or public debate. The Forum section of this issue of *EUSA Review* is therefore devoted to a preliminary analysis of the White Paper, with essays by Daniel Wincott, Les Metcalfe, Michelle Everson and Kenneth A. Armstrong. The first two of these essays examine the drafting

and content of the White Paper against the political background of the Commission and the EU in recent years, while the last two examine two of the most important substantive issues raised by the White Paper (executive agencies and civil society, respectively). It is hoped that these essays—together with the on-line symposium established by the Harvard Jean Monnet Program (Joerges, Mény and Weiler 2001; Scharpf 2001) and other scholarly contributions—will stimulate an active academic debate on the contents of the White Paper and the reform of European governance.

— Forum Editor

**The White Paper, the Commission and the  
"Future of Europe"**  
**Daniel Wincott**

THE EU IS ON THE CUSP of major changes. Enlargement poses huge challenges. It must be considered alongside the bedding down of monetary union and the associated strong emergence of questions of (re)distribution on the EU's policy agenda (one cause of the development of new forms of policy cooperation) alongside traditionally central issues of market regulation. Equally the EU's profile in internal affairs and foreign and security policies has become clearer. In these areas decisions already taken and processes already underway mean that fundamental change cannot be avoided. Despite numerous statements about its destination from the likes of Gerhard Schröder, Jacques Chirac, Lionel Jospin and Tony Blair, however, the EU seems to be backing into its future. A sense of common purpose is lacking, even at the elite level. Indeed pronouncements on the future of Europe by major political leaders are usually interpreted as their last words on the issue, not as preliminary statements intended as part of a constructive debate. Rather than helping us out of the "trenches" of the last European debate, too often they lead these trenches being dug deeper. Such a situation begs questions about political leadership. No political leader or figurehead seems available of the stature of a Delors or Monnet, an Adenauer or Spaak to help to unify the Union around a resonant and persuasive project.

If difficulties exist in achieving agreement at the elite level, these problems are exacerbated by the traditionally somewhat detached relationship between the general public and the EU. The apparent decline of popular participation in and engagement with politics in "western" nations generally adds a further twist.

(continued on p.3)

## EUSA Review

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

© 2001 European Union Studies Association™

### Managing Editor

Valerie Staats

### Forum and Features Editor

Mark Pollack (University of Wisconsin Madison)

### Book Reviews Editor

Mitchell P. Smith (University of Oklahoma)  
2001-2003

Jeanie Bukowski (Bradley University) 1999-2001

### 2001-2003 EUSA Executive Committee

MARTIN A. SCHAIN, Chair

(New York University)

M. DONALD HANCOCK, Vice-Chair

(Vanderbilt University)

JEFFREY ANDERSON\*, Secretary

(Brown University)

MARK A. POLLACK, Treasurer

(University of Wisconsin Madison)

KAREN ALTER\* (Northwestern University)

GEORGE A. BERMANN (Columbia University)

GEORGE ROSS\* (Brandeis University)

ALBERTA SBRAGIA (University of Pittsburgh)

*Ex Officio*

(\* elected to a four-year term till 2005)

### Network of EU Centers Committee

GEORGE A. BERMANN, Chair

M. DONALD HANCOCK

GEORGE ROSS

### European Union Studies Association™

415 Bellefield Hall

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

E-mail eusa@pitt.edu

Web www.eustudies.org

Facsimile 412.648.1168

Telephone 412.648.7635

## From the Chair

### Martin A. Schain

THIS IS NOT A NORMAL "letter from the chair." This week the city I love was attacked, as was the Pentagon in Washington, DC, and four commercial airplanes of civilian passengers were used as instruments of destruction in New York City, Washington, DC, and rural Pennsylvania. We still do not know how many lives were lost—certainly more than 5,000—but reality is just beginning to set in. Nor was this just an attack against Americans—we now know that hundreds of Europeans and persons from dozens of other countries have also died. Of course we will recover, but the terrorists succeeded, perhaps beyond their wildest dreams. We have been told that the most powerful country in the world cannot be thrown off course by this act. Nothing can be further from the truth. We have been badly hurt, and we are just beginning to experience the short-term repercussions of what has happened. Certainly our sense of invulnerability will never be the same again. Nothing here is "normal," and I suspect that our very notion of normal will be changed as a result of this attack. The economy will certainly suffer, but I fear more about the compromises in civil liberties that we may be asked to make in order to be more secure.

The personal and institutional responses from our European friends and colleagues have been moving and overwhelming—messages both to me and the Center for European Studies at NYU and to the EUSA office in Pittsburgh. The early statements from NATO and the Council of the European Union were unusually open-ended in their pledges of cooperation, but these pledges are being rapidly redefined as the United States prepares to react to these terrorist attacks. I hope that this response will be measured, as well as collective, but nothing seems assured in this latest version of the "New World Order." It does seem that a new era in transatlantic cooperation, at least in the area of prevention of terrorism, may be developing. Please see pp.12-13 in this issue for the key European Union's statements regarding U.S.-EU cooperation on combating international terrorism in the days following September 11th.

While these concerns certainly dominate all of our thoughts this week, I am also aware that the business of EUSA goes on. We have a few items of good news at the European Union Studies Association to announce to you. First, in August the EUSA Executive Committee approved the launching of what is our third member-driven interest section, this one on "Teaching the EU." With the leadership of long-time EUSA member Peter Loedel (West Chester University), the section will be undertaking the collecting and disseminating of teaching materials (including both the traditional and the non-traditional classrooms such as simulations and distance learning) on the European Union for all levels, secondary, post-secondary, and post-graduate. It is the hope of the Executive Committee that this section in particular will be able to make the fruits of its work available to all Association members. For more

*(continued on p.23)*

(continued from p.1) Although it seems to be a common feature of these nations, in the member states the EU itself sometimes seems implicated as a symbol—and perhaps even a cause—of “distance” between governors and the people.

Correctly identifying the significance of the current political moment—and seeking to re-establish the credibility of the Commission and its reputation for innovation—President Prodi made the development of new forms of governance a major strategic priority of his term of office. The main vehicle for the exploration of these new governance modes was to be a White Paper. Led by Jerome Vignon (former head of the Forward Studies Unit) a small “Governance Team” was charged with drafting it. The core team was supported by twelve “inter-service” working groups designed to cut across the established hierarchies of authority within the Commission. Initially, the mission of this “team” was to improve the effectiveness of the EU and develop strategies to improve its communication and engagement with the wider European public(s). The key concept of “governance” seemed to draw these two elements together. Rather than focusing on traditional authoritative “governmental” modes of operation, “governance” was used by the White Paper team to suggest that a wider range of policy instruments and modes should be deployed, including many which engaged those “regulated” in the determination and operation of modes of regulation.

Thus the White Paper proposes greater clarity about (1) the overall purposes of “governance” and (2) the role of each institution and each mode of governance in achieving these purposes. From co-regulation to the open method of co-ordination and from targeted tripartite contracts to regulatory agencies, the White Paper welcomes new developments while making a series of interesting and thoughtful proposals of its own. In turn these are to be based on better assessment of policy needs and evaluation of outcomes, together with much greater consultation (indeed perhaps too much) in these areas.

The flexible conceptual framework of “governance” appears to suggest modesty about the role of formal rulemaking. However, the White Paper concludes by making an enhanced (more “supranational”) “Community Method,” with an augmented executive role for the Commission itself, the cornerstone of its model for the future of the EU. The result seems somewhat unbalanced, with new modes of governance—the exploration of which was the apparent purpose of the exercise—defined so to limit their encroachment on the Community Method and relegated to a secondary role. Moreover, although numerous proposals for new action by the Commission are made, none is backed by clear criteria against which their results could be evaluated subsequently (except in the very limited sense of examining whether the Commission had actually produced documents or engaged in processes of consultation). Does the White Paper itself live up to the standards of policy-making that it suggests should be adopted by the EU?

Additionally, while the member states and “intergovernmental” institutions are subjected to searching analysis and sharp criticism (some of which is surely deserved) the Commission itself is largely exempt from such attention. For example, while the Council certainly contributes to the

“sectoralization” of EU policy and thus undermines its overall coherence, so too does the Commission. Should the first institution be criticized more harshly than the second? This is hardly a strategy to persuade other institutions and actors to join with the Commission in a process of collaborative reform. Indeed, the Paper seems to have been written more to avoid upsetting the established institutional form and practices of the Commission than to engage the member states in a constructive debate.

In the midst of all the change that the Union confronts, at least one thing is sure. For the Union to make the most of its potential a self-confident but modest Commission has a vital role to play. Too often commentators and political actors pit intergovernmental against supranational methods. The Union works best when intergovernmental and supranational influences complement one another, not when they are seen to compete. This is as true in the newly emerging “Open Method of Co-ordination” as it is in the established “Community Method” (although of course, the role of the Commission is different in the two areas). Whatever its flaws, the White Paper makes many constructive points. The period of consultation on the White Paper may provide an opportunity for a new balance can be struck between the various modes of governance it considers, and the somewhat defensive quality of its discussion of the Commission could be stripped away. If these modifications can be achieved then the broad understanding of “governance” that motivated the White Paper team can make a useful contribution to the developing debate on the “future of Europe.”

*Daniel Wincott is Senior Lecturer in Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham.*

### **More Green than Blue: Positioning the Governance White Paper** **Les Metcalfe**

THE PUBLICATION OF THE Governance White Paper has been eagerly awaited since reform of European governance was proclaimed to be the “big idea” of the Prodi Commission early last year. The EU has outgrown its established institutions. The impending eastward enlargement adds urgency to the task of replacing obsolescent governance structures with new ones appropriate to continent-wide integration. This transformation requires both a new vision of the future architecture of the EU and the means of putting it into effect. In considering whether the White Paper meets this need it is essential to recognize that bringing new frameworks of governance into being and making them work effectively requires sophisticated management capacities as well as political will. Reforms should address the EU’s management deficit as well as its democratic deficit. This is partly recognized in the White Paper’s statement of five principles of good governance: openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence. But it is far from providing a blueprint for reform.

In making an assessment of the White Paper it is useful to consider not just how far it *is* an adequate blueprint for reform but also whether it *should be*. This can be done by positioning it

on a green-blue spectrum of consultative (Green Paper) to prescriptive (blueprint) reform options, each requiring a different management of change strategy for successful implementation. A standard definition of a White Paper is a public statement of governmental intent whereas a Green Paper is designed to elicit opinions, stimulate debate and generate new information and ideas prior to formulating political conclusions. A blueprint prescribes a detailed programme for action based on well-defined general principles and seeks to anticipate all significant contingencies. The strategy for managing such programmed changes can be characterized as "Tell and Sell" and assumes that reformers have the credibility and the power to make things happen. The White Paper does not meet these substantive and process "blueprint" tests. Granting the importance of the five "principles" of good governance, they have not been crafted into a new model of EU governance and specified in a detailed programme of reform. Individually, they are not precisely formulated. The first two, openness and participation, are not just proposals for change they are also invitations to a wide range of stakeholders to participate in defining the direction of change. The principle of accountability is equated with clearer definition of individual institutional responsibilities and does not really address the difficult problems of designing frameworks of accountability where there are shared responsibilities in multilevel systems of governance. Presenting effectiveness as a principle avoids dealing with the thorny conceptual and practical problems of determining what effectiveness criteria are applicable to governance networks. Moreover, relying on a limited management-by-objectives model carries the risk of ignoring important dimensions of effectiveness and creating rigidities that make adaptation to change costly and slow. Finally, the principle of coherence is a watered-down version of the earlier commitment to "radical decentralization." Its vagueness is symptomatic of the lack of a model that explains how new forms of governance based on partnerships and horizontal coordination can manage interdependence in multilevel organizational networks.

Does it matter that the White Paper fails to measure up to blueprint criteria? Perhaps not if it gave a clear direction for reform by stating guiding principles and setting in motion the processes for implementing them. It is instructive here to compare the governance White Paper with two landmarks in the integration process; the White Papers on the completion of the Internal Market (1986) and reforming the Commission (2000). The former was based on the "four freedoms" and included nearly 300 specific measures to be implemented by the 1992 deadline. The latter aims to make the Commission better equipped to play the roles that it was originally set up to perform by implementing a comprehensive reform package for modernizing the internal organization of the Commission and its personnel and financial management systems. It sets out a tightly defined "route map" and "time table" for reform. In these cases the management of reform used a "Tell and Listen" change strategy, combining firm political leadership with willingness to revise the means of achieving objectives. While this is closer to the blue part of the spectrum it is based on a clear recognition that successful reform involves building support from the bottom up.

By contrast the governance White Paper is positioned in the green part of the reform spectrum because it does not provide a guiding concept or plan of action. Instead it invites participation in the process of developing them. Although in accord with its democratizing intent, this has difficult implications for the management of reform. It leaves open questions about the ends as well as the means of reform. The White Paper does not give a good foundation for handling such a process. It is ambivalent about the connections between the principles of good governance and the positive examples of innovation in EU governance it draws from recent experience such as co-regulation, open coordination and executive agencies. Indeed the lack of a new vision, a big idea, is evident in a reluctance even to see them as innovations. Instead they are presented defensively in a back-to-the-future perspective as means of "reinvigorating the Community Method." This is unnecessary. The published papers of the Commission working groups that contributed to the White Paper shows forward thinking and a recognition that innovation is essential to meet new challenges. Possibly because publication was rushed to meet the summer deadline the results of these investigations could not be assimilated intellectually and politically within the Commission. Any organization needs time to adjust to change. The publication of the "Next Steps" White Paper (1988) that led to agency-based reforms of British central government was delayed for a year because of political infighting among ministries as they came to terms with the implications of structural change. The potential impact on the Commission of reforms of European governance is so far-reaching that it is inconceivable that it will not trigger similar bureaucratic politics.

This leads to a strategic question. Can reforms of European governance be implemented without redefining the role of the Commission as well as changing its internal organization? The lack of a blueprint for reform and the clear commitment to extensive consultation in designing new forms of governance as well as operating them appears to place new responsibilities on the Commission for ensuring the development of capacities to make them work. This is not a role the Commission was originally established to perform. But it now works in a drastically different environment where fixed patterns of responsibilities and sharply demarcated jurisdictions are giving way to needs for greater organizational flexibility and ability to manage interdependence. A blueprint would be out of date before it was implemented. In this environment, rather than a once-for-all reform there is a recurring need for organizational capacities to design and develop adaptive European governance networks. Governance reform will always be a combined effort, but the Commission should develop the core competences to manage—not direct—the processes of change. Perhaps the appropriate motto would be "Look and Learn."

*Les Metcalfe is Professor of Public Management at the European Institute of Public Administration in Maastricht, The Netherlands.*

## European Agencies: From Institutional Efficiency to “Good” Governance

Michelle Everson

WITH ITS WHITE PAPER ON European Governance, the European Commission would seem at long last to have accepted the importance of independent agencies within the regulatory and policy-making framework of the European Union. Once seen simply as *ad hoc* institutions—given a legal basis by that catch-all competence-competence of European legal expansion, Article 308 [ex 235] EC, and subjected to Commission direction—that were deployed to tackle diffuse tasks (such as the gathering of environmental information (EEA) or the regulation of the admissibility of pharmaceutical products (EMEA)) if and when the need arose, agencies would appear now to have been given a planned role within a comprehensive vision of overall EU policy-making and implementation.

The EU and, more particularly, its polity, demands “confidence in expert advice” (p.19), clamors for “better and faster regulation” (p.20), requires a simplified legal system (p.22) and needs “better application of its rules” by means of “regulatory agencies” (p.24). Similarly, the Commission must use scarce resources wisely and agencies, “with their ability to draw on highly technical, sectoral know-how” and the “cost-savings that they offer to business” prove to be its preferred means of “focusing resources on core tasks” (p.24). Seen in this light, the proposed increased recourse to ‘regulatory agencies’ at European level represents a masterpiece of institutional rationality. With their ability to network continuously with national and commercial expertise and to instigate agencies, research will surely prove to be more efficient and consistent providers of the increased scientific expertise demanded by the EU’s commitment to risk assessment and management (p.19) than obscure, often improvised committees. Likewise, with a permanent staff, agencies will supply speedy decision-making. Equally, agencies present the public with a visible regulatory interface and increase the capacity of the EU to oversee national implementation of Community policies. Nonetheless, institutional rationality is perhaps not the sole guiding principle of European governance and it may thus be doubted whether the Commission has given a comparable degree of thought to the normative place of European agencies within the European order: alternatively, although the Commission’s existing and envisaged agencies may have found their niche within the Commission’s preferred institutional organigram, they may still be found wanting when measured against yardsticks of democratic control and accountability. “Good” governance, least we forget, is not merely about finding and speedily implementing efficacious solutions to regulatory problems. Instead, it also encompasses conflict resolution and requires that the institutions of governance possess sufficient normative authority (legitimacy) to induce a habit of compliance amongst member states, their citizens and (perhaps most importantly) economic corporations.

In this regard, the Commission’s vision of a brave new world peopled by European regulatory agencies would appear to be fatally flawed: (i) by the Commission’s foolish assumption that

a clear distinction may be made between policy-making and the application of rules; and (ii) by its (related) reluctance to cede any part of its overall treaty-based competences to such new European institutions.

Famously, the debate on the place of independent regulatory agencies within government has long been characterized by vigorous conflict between two distinct groups. On the one hand, the “regulatory” theorists (powerfully represented in Europe by Giandomenico Majone) who argue that once a firm (legislative) commitment has been made to dispense with corporatist economics and to regulate economic processes in line with “rationalizing”—rather than redistributive—principles of regulation, democratic governance is best served by isolating regulators from (transient) political interests. And, on the other, the “skeptical realists” (led by Martin Shapiro) who maintain that agencies have historically proven themselves (mainly in the U.S.) to be, at the worst, inherently politically motivated, and at the best, vulnerable to political manipulation.

Interestingly, however, diverse as these two groups may be, there has been one point upon which they have, to date at least, agreed (though recent wavering—presumably prompted by a political desire to see the preliminary development of “some” form of European agency—has been visible in the regulatory camp): policy-making cannot be distinguished from the application of rules. In a complex modern economy, the regulation of ostensibly technical issues, such as market entry and exit, may not be conceived of in terms of a clear framework of regulatory rules stipulating the exact circumstances of entry and exit, and must instead be understood as a on-going partnership between regulator, market and society to determine the policy governing entry and exit in the light of prevailing economic and conditions. Equally, modern concerns such as risk regulation inevitably entail redistributive and thus political concerns: will markets, consumers or governments (through the costs of regulation) bear the costs of risk?

To the skeptical realist, such a finding is a reason to dispense with the services of independent, non-political, regulators altogether. For the regulatory theorist, it first restricts the operation of regulatory agencies to areas where no redistributive concerns are present, and secondly demands that agencies operate under very distinct normative conditions. Remaining with the regulatory theorists, however, the primary such condition is (as noted) the “complete” independence of the regulator from political control. Granted, the democratic accountability and control of the independent agency is generally secured by a whole host of institutional mechanisms (parliamentary budgetary control, judicial review, the political appointment of the head of the agency, public visibility of the agency, etc.). Nonetheless, the primary instrument of democratic control has always been, and forever remains, a higher legal guarantee of institutional independence: a guarantee which ensures that, whilst technocrats will necessarily be engaged in policy-making, such policy will always be made with a eye to is whether this responsiveness to the sub-national tier of government is also intended to include broader participation of non-governmental actors in the policy-making, such policy will always be made with a eye to the terms

of the agency's democratically legitimated mandate and will not be diverted to other ends by the presence within the agency of overt and transient political interest.

The Commission's stubborn determination that *its* agencies will engage only in the implementation of rules and will be shielded from regulatory areas that may involve "conflicts of interests" (p.24) is reflected in the absence of a proposal in the White Paper for a treaty revision that will at last give agencies their own basis in European law and free them from the control of an increasingly politicized Commission. It is also presumably motivated by the Commission's reluctance to cede any part of its treaty-based competences. At this stage in the evolution EU governance, however, one is nevertheless drawn gently to remind the Commission that its responsibility to supply Europe with "good" governance extends far beyond the simple task of securing institutional efficiency: it is to be hoped that its 2002 guidelines on the nature of the independence of agencies will effectively, if not normatively, free them from Commission control.

*Michelle Everson is Jean Monnet Lecturer in European Law at Birkbeck College, University of London.*

## **The White Paper and the Rediscovery of Civil Society**

**Kenneth A. Armstrong**

THE WHITE PAPER ON EUROPEAN Governance is, perhaps, at its most revealing in its conclusion that "The Community method has served the Union well for almost half a century" (p.34). It is hardly the clarion call for radical change. However at numerous points the White Paper talks of the "reinvigoration" of the Community method, stating that, "The Union must renew the Community method by following a less top-down approach and complementing the EU's policy tools more effectively with non-legislative instruments." But in focusing upon reforming "the Community method" (i.e., policy initiation by the Commission with legislative decision by the EP and Council, together with the Commission's role in the adoption of implementation measures), the White Paper struggles to cast its gaze beyond the EU institutional context. Indeed, there is much in all its talk of "better policies, regulation and delivery" which would not look out of place in any one of the annual "Better Lawmaking" reports. To this extent, the White Paper seems like yet another strategy by which the Commission aims to do better but without really contemplating fundamental change—it is like *déjà vu* all over again.

Nonetheless, the corrective to this top-down tendency is the White Paper's call for the greater involvement of two constituencies of actors: (1) regional and local actors, and (2) civil society. As regards the former the White Paper identifies the need for a greater policy dialogue with sub-national actors as well as proposing more flexible implementation of EU policies through tripartite contractual relationships between the Commission, national and local government. What is not clear

is whether this responsiveness to the sub-national tier of government is also intended to include broader participation of non-governmental actors in the policy-influencing or policy-implementing process at these levels. The lack of this sort of discussion points both to the inadequacies of a working methodology which placed "civil society" and "decentralization" in different conceptual compartments of the work programme, but also a more problematic difficulty of extending the normative gaze of a "European" debate on governance into the national and sub-national spheres (as I have argued elsewhere, this is the problem of conducting a debate about multi-level constitutionalism from the sole perspective of one level; Armstrong 2000).

Our concern here lies principally with the role constructed for civil society actors within EU governance. The White Paper struggles to identify a conceptualization beyond the ambiguous statement that, "Civil society plays an important role in giving voice to the concerns of citizens and delivering services that meet people's needs" (p.14). We shift from a construction of civil society as a sphere of communication and of discourse to one in which civil society provides for the material welfare of its citizens through its role as service provider. To be sure, both constructions can be identified in relevant literatures. But it is one thing to see civil society as reinforcing the democratic process and, therefore, giving strength and vitality to public institutions and quite another to conceptualize civil society as a service-provider if that means the absence or withdrawal of public institutions from the task of providing for the material welfare of citizens.

The ambiguity continues with the difficulty in reconciling the statements that civil society's engagement with the EU provides "a chance to get citizens involved in achieving the Union's objectives and to offer them a structured channel for feedback, criticism and protest," while also suggesting that "Participation is not about institutionalizing protest. It is about more effective policy shaping based on early consultation and past experience." The point is quite important given that the rush to embrace civil society (whether by the EU or the WTO) arises in part because of the wide-scale protests which have attended meetings of the European Council, the WTO, the World Bank, etc. One might also take the Irish "no" vote as its own form of protest. The dilemma of whether to embrace dissent and to use it to reflect upon the nature of EU governance, or whether to shun "uncivil" society in favor of harnessing "civil" society towards the (unchallengeable) objectives of the Union becomes apparent. The resolution of the dilemma largely seems to lie in the assumption that if only citizens can be made to understand the EU better, they will grow to accept rather than protest against it. The possibility that this might have precisely the opposite effect does not seem to have been contemplated.

But exactly how is European civil society constructed in the discourses surrounding the White Paper? The clear emphasis within the White Paper and in the report of Working Group IIa ("Consultation and Participation of Civil Society") is upon *organized* civil society operating at the EU-level (i.e., organizations which are transnational rather than only operating in one or a few Member States). It is the relationship between

the EU institutions (more particularly the Commission) and these transnational organizations that the Commission is seeking to better structure. Thus, what we have is a conceptualization of participatory democracy rooted strongly in structured processes of consultation. What is not envisaged in the White Paper is that the Community method will itself be displaced by a transfer or sharing of governance activities with civil society actors (although this might be the result of the open method of coordination or the possibilities of co-regulation discussed elsewhere in the White Paper). Instead what is offered is structured “civil dialogue.”

Following up on the ideas presented in the Working Group report, the White Paper proposes the compilation of an on-line database of European civil society organizations; the adoption of a (non-legally binding) Code of Conduct setting out minimum standards for consultation processes; and, where processes are well established, the possible use of “partnership arrangements.” However, the central message that emerges from the discussion of structuring consultation and dialogue processes is that “[W]ith better involvement comes greater responsibility” (p.15). This responsibility takes on different forms. For example, in indicating that the Commission will establish an on-line database of civil society organizations, the White Paper considers that, for listed organizations, this “should act as a catalyst to improve their internal organization” (p.15). The introduction of a Code of Conduct is considered as providing standards that “should improve the representativity of civil society organizations and structure their debate with the Institutions” (p.17). Moreover, the White Paper is even more blatant in the idea that there is a *quid pro quo* for enhanced consultation rights when it comes to proposed partnership arrangements: “[I]n return, the arrangements will prompt civil society organization to tighten up their internal structures, furnish guarantees of openness and representativity, and prove their capacity to relay information or lead debates in the Member States” (p.17). And as the Working Group IIa report also suggested, partnership arrangements, “obviously constitute an incentive for the NGO community to organize themselves in pan-European structures.” These themes of the need to structure the civil society relationship through the imposition of responsibilities upon civil society actors as regards their internal organization and representativeness, while also pushing towards the Europeanization and federalization of organized civil society have developed as key frames through which the role of civil society is being constructed within the White Paper discourse.

That civil society organizations have responsibilities finds more general expression in the White Paper’s view that civil society actors must also be subject to the principles of good governance set out in the White Paper, *viz.*, openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence. Thus, the concerns with internal organization, openness and representativity are the surface forms of this deeper desire to ground civil society in these norms of governance. While we expect that the exercise of public power will be conducted in light of values and principles associated with a normativized public sphere of decision-making, why and when should such principles attach to civil society?

If we think of civil society as largely a discursive, communicative or deliberative sphere then any attempt to normativize civil society must primarily attend to the preconditions for discourse, e.g., freedom of speech and voluntary association; openness to plural voices and participation of actors within discourse; removal of barriers to inclusion or marginalization. While to some extent obligations are placed on civil society actors the thrust of this normativization lies with extending *rights* to individuals and groups, normally to be enshrined in law while the state takes on certain responsibilities both negatively (non-interference with the autonomy and self-organization of civil society) and positively (ensuring that the legal order upholds the rights of civil society while also attending to the barriers to the full enjoyment of the rights of citizenship). Curiously enough, the White Paper says little about the civil and political rights of civil society, nor the preconditions for the effective enjoyment of such rights. And in any event the rights which are seen as incurring responsibilities are merely consultation rights which the White Paper itself is keen to ensure take the form of a non-legally binding Code of Conduct. The thrust of the approach, therefore, is less about the conferral of rights and more about the imposition of responsibilities that are suggestive of a governmentalization of civil society in the sense of the use of rationalities and techniques through which civil society actors alter their behavior and expectations to facilitate the exercise of governmental power.

To be sure, once we begin to talk of civil society actors being involved more directly in the delivery of governance either alone or together with political institutions then such new modes of governance pose real challenges to how we have traditionally normativized government based on classical divisions between public and private law. But the response of the Community legal order thus far to such new approaches to governance like the Article 139 EC “social dialogue” mechanism has been to place the obligations on the *political institutions* to check the collective representativity of the social partners rather than to insist that such social partners make themselves representative (see Case T-135/96, *UEAPME v. Council of the EU* [1998] ECR II-2335). Indeed, the values associated with social dialogue—the free will of the partners to negotiate, the mutual recognition of the parties and the autonomy of the negotiation process from the legislative process—have been respected. If this is true of a process which we might describe as involving civil society actors directly in the governance process, it is hard to see any justification for imposing the principles of good governance in what is simply a structured consultation process. Rather, and rightly, it is the duty of the EU institutions to ensure the openness of the consultation process; to facilitate the participation of relevant actors through appropriate mechanisms; to make the Institutions accountable for the structuring of consultation processes; to ensure the effectiveness of the consultation process measured not simply in terms of its policy-effectiveness but also in terms of its democratic effectiveness; and, to provide coherent consultation mechanisms across the fragmented structure of the Commission.

*Kenneth A. Armstrong is Senior Lecturer in Law in the Department of Law at Queen Mary, University of London.*

## **EUSA Review Forum References**

(for the essays appearing on p.1 + 3-7)

- Armstrong, Kenneth A. (forthcoming). "The White Paper and the Rediscovery of Civil Society," *Law and New Approaches to Governance*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2000. *Regulation, Deregulation and Re-Regulation: Problems and Paradoxes of EU Governance*. London: Kogan Page.
- European Commission, 2001. *European Governance: A White Paper*, COM(2001) 428; available on the *Europa* Web site at: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/white\\_paper/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/white_paper/index_en.htm)
- European Commission, 2000. *White Paper on European Governance: "Enhancing Democracy in the European Union" Work Programme*, SEC(2000)1547/7; available on the *Europa* Web site at: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/work/en.pdf>
- Ibbs, Sir Robin, 1998. *Improving Management in Government: The Next Steps* (HMSO London).
- Joerges, Christian, Yves Mény, and J.H.H. Weiler, eds., 2001. *Responses to the European Commission's White Paper on Governance*, on-line symposium on the Commission White Paper on Governance, available on the Web site of the Harvard Jean Monnet Programme at: <http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/01/010601.html>
- Metcalf, Les, 2000. "Reforming the Commission: Will Organizational Efficiency Produce Effective Governance?" *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38: 5, 817-841.
- Scharpf, Fritz W., 2001. *European Governance: Common Concerns vs. The Challenge of Diversity*, available on the Web site of the Harvard Jean Monnet Program at: <http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/01/010701.html>
- Wincott, Daniel (Forthcoming, December 2001). "Looking Forward or Harking Back? The Commission and the Reform of Governance in the European Union," *Journal of Common Market Studies*.

### **APSA Interest Section for Europeanists**

As an official section of the American Political Science Association (APSA), formerly known as "Politics and Society in Western Europe," we have expanded our organization and purpose to be a broad umbrella group for all Europeanists. To better reflect the changing facts of the European political map and intellectual exchange in the field, the section is changing its name to "European Politics and Society." We sponsor panels at the Annual Meeting, represent the interests of Europeanists within APSA, produce a biannual newsletter, and maintain an electronic bulletin board. For more information on the section and the call for papers for the 2002 Annual Meeting, visit [www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org) or contact Jytte Klausen, Section Chair, e-mail <[klausen@brandeis.edu](mailto:klausen@brandeis.edu)>.

## **Spotlight on Germany in the USA**

Many EUSA members focus on EU member states, inter alia. This feature gives an overview of individual EU member states' official presences in the USA.

### Important Web sites:

- ◆ Primary diplomatic Web site (primary pages in English; some pages in English and German): [www.germany-info.org/](http://www.germany-info.org/)
- ◆ German Studies Web, reviewed set of scholarly resources compiled by the West European Studies Section, Association of College and Research Libraries [www.dartmouth.edu/~wess/](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~wess/)
- ◆ Goethe-Institut, for the teaching of German language and culture, with institutes in seven USA cities [www.goethe.de/uk/enrindex.htm](http://www.goethe.de/uk/enrindex.htm)

Missions: German Embassy, 4645 Reservoir Road, Washington, DC 20007; Tel 202.298.4000; Nine consulates: Boston, New York, Washington, Chicago, Atlanta, Miami, Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco

### Official publications:

Two publications available free by e-mail subscription: *Week in Germany* and *Deutschland Nachrichten*  
On-line subscription forms on the "News and Publications" page of the Web site noted above

### German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Founded in 1947, with regional offices throughout the USA, promotes U.S.-German trade relations and publishes annual U.S.-German Economic Yearbook [www.gaccny.com/](http://www.gaccny.com/); also, [www.gaccsouth.com/](http://www.gaccsouth.com/) [www.gacc.com.org/](http://www.gacc.com.org/); also, [www.gaccwest.org/](http://www.gaccwest.org/)

### German American Business Association

Promotes trade and fosters economic, commercial, and financial relations between the two countries [www.gaba.org/](http://www.gaba.org/)

### Selected scholarly resources in the USA:

- ◆ German Studies Association, for scholars of German, Austrian, and Swiss history, literature, culture studies, political science, and economics; publishes the journal *German Studies Review* [www.g-s-a.org](http://www.g-s-a.org)
- ◆ DAAD German Academic Exchange Service, an association of higher education institutions in Germany with exchange programs [www.daad.org](http://www.daad.org)
- ◆ American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, for non-partisan, advanced research on Germany's politics, economy, culture, and society [www.aicgs.org](http://www.aicgs.org)





**NETWORK OF EUROPEAN UNION CENTERS**  
*News and Notes for Fall 2001* [www.eucenters.org](http://www.eucenters.org)

The European Union Studies Association is delighted to recognize and congratulate the following fifteen European Union Centers in the United States for 2001-2004:

<i>California</i>	University of California Berkeley
<i>Florida</i>	Florida International University and University of Miami
<i>Georgia</i>	University System of Georgia
<i>Illinois</i>	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
<i>Michigan</i>	University of Michigan
<i>Missouri</i>	University of Missouri Columbia
<i>New York (2)</i>	New York City Consortium (New York University, New School University, City University of New York) Syracuse University
<i>North Carolina</i>	University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
<i>Oklahoma</i>	University of Oklahoma
<i>Pittsburgh</i>	University of Pittsburgh
<i>Texas</i>	Texas A & M University
<i>Washington</i>	University of Washington Seattle
<i>Washington, DC</i>	Washington, DC Consortium (American University, George Mason University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, The Johns Hopkins University)
<i>Wisconsin</i>	University of Wisconsin Madison

European Union Centers are devoted to promoting the New Transatlantic Agenda, in particular the "people to people" objective of building bridges across the Atlantic. The Network of European Union Centers (NEUC) project was launched by the European Union in Fall 1998 and is supported by the European Union, the host institutions, and other donors and institutions. For more information on the NEUC in the United States and the activities of the individual EU Centers, please visit the Web site [www.eucenters.org](http://www.eucenters.org).

EU Center programs supported by the European Union during 1998-2001 continue in Los Angeles, CA (Scripps College and the Claremont Colleges, University of Southern California), Cambridge, MA (Harvard University), and Durham, NC (Duke University).

The European Union Studies Association Executive Subcommittee for the NEUC is comprised of George A. Bermann (Columbia University School of Law), Chair, M. Donald Hancock (Vanderbilt University), and George Ross (Brandeis University).

## Teaching the EU

*Editor's note: This column will henceforth be written by members of EUSA's new "Teaching the EU" Interest Section. For more details about the Section, please visit the Web page [www.eustudies.org/teachingsection.html](http://www.eustudies.org/teachingsection.html)*

### Embracing Collaboration and Technology: Georgia's EU Studies Curriculum Brian Murphy

#### Introduction

THIS ARTICLE PROVIDES AN OVERVIEW of an initiative by the University System of Georgia (USG) to introduce an undergraduate certificate in European Union (EU) Studies. The certificate was three years in development and was officially launched during Spring Semester 2001.<sup>1</sup> A program in international studies with a narrow scope like EU studies confronts a set of obstacles that makes implementation challenging. Three in particular require special consideration:

- attracting a sufficient number of students;
- offering a diversified curriculum of courses focused on the EU; and,
- servicing the courses with qualified faculty.

A two-fold solution to these dilemmas was adopted by USG: institutional collaboration and utilization of technological advances.

An adequate pool of students could be generated by aggregating interest from multi-institutional cooperation. We were successful in soliciting the involvement of twenty-six institutions within USG (see box at right) and, after only the first semester in operation, over fifty students returned applications to enter the program. The high level of grassroots interest is reflected in the establishment of a state-wide student association that will function as a bilateral communication resource.

Institutional collaboration also furnished a vehicle that combined faculty numbers to yield a staff large enough to cover the specialized nature of courses focusing on the EU. In 1998, a survey across USG identified 370 faculty with expertise classified as Western European studies. The problem is that "Western European" is not synonymous with "European Union." Thus it became necessary to retool the skills of a select group of faculty—distributed among institutions—to equip them to add at least a dimension on the EU to existing courses. This objective was accomplished by sponsoring two annual workshops, starting in 1998, on developing course material relevant to the EU. Each workshop is followed by an academic conference aimed at improving knowledge about current issues and scholarly research.

Aside from collaboration, the second solution in making the certificate operational was reliance upon technology. Collaboration among institutions dispersed across the largest state—in geographic terms—east of the Mississippi River presented a host of impediments that technology was able to

resolve in a way that would not have been possible several years ago. A common curriculum can now be delivered despite wide spatial distances separating students and faculty. Two types of technology are integral to this effort: video-conferencing and the Internet.

The State of Georgia maintains the world's largest two-way interactive compressed video network, consisting of 411 installations. This system enables leading scholars and practitioners to be transmitted to sixteen classrooms at a time. Since the technology is interactive, a two-way dialogue can be conducted between the speaker and any student at any site. For upper-level courses, the video-conferencing system allows an instructor with specialized credentials to broadcast a course state-wide, maximizing the depth and breadth of qualified faculty in the program.

The Internet, however, constitutes the cornerstone of the curricular initiative. Web-based applications have the dual advantages of being cost-effective and serving a pedagogic function by challenging students to acquire new skills: independent learning, cross-cultural communication, and technological sophistication. The program's steering committee decided to develop a series of Web-based courses so that students could enroll on a transient basis when no classes appropriate to the certificate were provided on their campuses.

Since the Internet makes geographic proximity less relevant, the possibility presented itself to invite European universities to become fully integrated into the program. The University of Munich agreed to participate as the program's first European partner and, more significantly, to award the certificate in tandem with USG institutions. Similar partnership relationships will be arranged with universities in other member states of the EU in the near future. In 1999, the program received a grant of \$430,000 to create nine Web courses during the 2000-2001 academic year;<sup>2</sup> an additional fifteen courses are planned over the next two years to comprise the nation's largest catalog of undergraduate courses devoted to the EU.

Course content is formulated by teams composed of one faculty member from USG, one from Munich, and an outside expert. No course is offered until an assessment (consisting of a written evaluation of each course in terms of its coverage of the material, incorporation of resources, and ease of technical usage) by the Council for European Studies certifies that its quality satisfies prevailing professional standards and that recommended changes are addressed. It is significant that the Web courses are not only jointly developed with Munich, but jointly taught as well, with USG and Munich students and professors interacting in a shared virtual classroom.

#### The Electronic Strategy

A uniform format for the Web courses was important to ensure a consistent learning experience for students so widely dispersed. Standardization harmonizes what could otherwise disintegrate into a fragmented knowledge base at the various institutions of the program. EUSA member Michael Baun of Valdosta State University directs the faculty teams preparing the courses. He issued a set of guidelines on how to structure courses into a compatible format:

- Comparative focus. Where appropriate to the material, courses should be comparative in nature, examining similar issues and policies in the U.S. and EU separately as well as in the transatlantic context.
- Modular structure. Courses should consist of a series of one- and two-week modules. Modules are self-contained course segments dealing with particular topics that include their own learning objectives, reading assignments, case studies, means of assessment, etc.
- Multi-media approach. A multi-media approach to teaching and learning—visuals (maps, graphics, videos), simulations, audio supplements (music, interviews)—should be utilized to make courses as stimulating as possible.

Each principle was introduced to accomplish a pedagogical objective. A comparative focus enhances the transatlantic character of the program and fosters cultural sensitivity. Students gain a broader understanding of the similarities and differences between two areas of the world and the problems faced in unison. The modular structure allows individual modules to be separated from the Web course and “plugged in” to other courses, infusing them with an EU component. These modules—password protected on a centralized server—are available for adoption as supplements to courses, much like outside reading, and with no investment by an instructor. The multi-media approach adds an experience beyond what could be achieved in a typical classroom and furnishes a means of maintaining student interest.

#### **Conclusion**

The electronic format is in its infancy. Technology is advancing and, in turn, so is our capacity to employ it successfully. Despite scattered resistance, faculty and institutions are adopting Web-based instruction at an accelerating pace.

The EU Studies Certificate is inventing a model on how to deliver a curriculum in a collaborative framework that could not have been contemplated a decade ago. The experiment is adding value to the professional and academic lives of its students. That’s the bottom line on which the initiative should be evaluated. Interested institutions should contact us for more details on participating in the program or developing a similar one at their own institutions. We would like to be considered a resource on the use of Internet and distance learning technologies for the study of the European Union.

---

*Brian Murphy, Co-Director of the European Union Center of the University System of Georgia, is a past recipient of an ECSA Curriculum Development Grant partly used to help develop the above program, and a member of EUSA’s new “Teaching the EU” interest section.*

1. The EU Studies certificate has a six-course requirement: Introduction to the European Union, four courses selected from a multidisciplinary menu, and a capstone seminar. In addition, students must perform either an internship or overseas experience appropriate to the program. See the program’s Web site at [http://www.inta.gatech.edu/eucenter/certificate/sc\\_home.html](http://www.inta.gatech.edu/eucenter/certificate/sc_home.html)

2. The nine courses under development are the following: Introduction to the European Union, EU-U.S. Relations, European Monetary Union, Federalism and Multilevel Governance, Environmental Policy, Science and Technology Policy, Communication and the Media, Law and Legal Systems, Doing Business in the EU and U.S.

#### **Participating Institutions: Georgia’s EU Studies Curriculum**

Map of State of Georgia, USA  
Courtesy of [www.50states.com](http://www.50states.com)



**Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College**  
**Albany State University**  
**Armstrong Atlantic State University**  
**Augusta State University**  
**Coastal Georgia Community College**  
**Columbus State University College & State University**  
**Dalton State College**  
**Darton College**  
**East Georgia College**  
**Floyd College**  
**Fort Valley State University**  
**Gainesville College**  
**Georgia College & State University**  
**Georgia Institute of Technology**  
**Georgia Perimeter College**  
**Georgia Southern University**  
**Georgia Southwestern State University**  
**Georgia State University**  
**Kennesaw State University**  
**Macon State College**  
**Middle Georgia College**  
**North Georgia College & State University**  
**South Georgia College**  
**State University of West Georgia**  
**University of Georgia**  
**Valdosta State University**

## ***THE EUROPEAN UNION RESPONDS ...***

Following are the texts of the early responses of the European Union to the September 11th attacks on the United States; more documents are collected and available on the European Union Delegation to the United States Web site at <http://www.eurunion.org/partner/EUUSTerror/EURespUSTerror.htm>

### **STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT PRODI on the attacks against the United States**

Brussels, 12 September 2001

Please observe a minute's thoughtful silence in memory of the victims of this dreadful and tragic event.

This morning the Commission held an extraordinary meeting.

We observed a minute's silence and then discussed various political aspects for which the Commission has particular responsibility.

This afternoon I shall go to the European Parliament and the General Affairs Council (Foreign Ministers). The Commission stressed, and I shall reaffirm, the need to send the strongest possible signal of European solidarity with the American people and I will call for a common European approach to all aspects of this tragedy.

The Commission expressed its horror at these acts of barbaric crime, its compassion for the victims and their families and its solidarity with the American people.

We share their grief, mourn with them and commit ourselves to working together with President Bush and the U.S. Government to build a safe, democratic world for all our peoples.

We have acted to protect our own staff and interests in Europe and in our overseas delegations. We stand ready to offer any practical assistance we can. I conveyed this message to the U.S. Ambassador yesterday evening. Our economy and social structures are strong and resilient and we remain calm and confident. Our co-operation with the USA in the fight against terrorism is more necessary than ever and must be pursued with renewed vigour.

This barbaric attack was directed against the free world and our common values. It is a watershed event and life will never be quite the same again. European Institutions and Governments will work closely together with our American friends and partners in the defence of freedom.

We shall not allow terrorism to triumph. We shall not allow terrorism to divide the world, as its perpetrators intend it to. We shall deny them this victory.

In the darkest hours of European history, the Americans stood by us. We stand by them now.

### **DECLARATION BY THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 12 September 2001

The Council of the European Union, meeting in special session today, in the presence of the Secretary General of the Atlantic Alliance, expressed its horror at yesterday's terrorist attacks in the United States. The Council stressed its complete solidarity with the government of the United States and the American people at this terrible time and extended its deepest sympathy to all the victims and their families. We ask all Europeans to observe 3 minutes of silence Friday, 14 September at 12h00 and we also declare 14 September 2001 a day of mourning.

These horrendous acts are an attack not only on the United States but against humanity itself and the values and freedoms we all share. The life and work of our open and democratic societies will continue undeterred.

The Union utterly condemns the perpetrators and sponsors of these acts of barbarism. The Union and its Member States will spare no efforts to help identify, bring to justice and punish those responsible: there will be no safe haven for terrorists and their sponsors.

The Union will work closely with the United States and all partners to combat international terrorism. All international organisations, particularly the United Nations, must be engaged and all relevant international instruments, including on the financing of terrorism, must be fully implemented.

The Community and its Member States have offered to the United States all possible assistance with search and rescue operations. Discussions are underway to establish what help would be most useful.

Recalling the strong and enduring ties which exist between the European Union and the United States, the Council has asked the Presidency to stay in close contact with the government of the United States in order to convey this message of solidarity.

### **U.S.-EU MINISTERIAL STATEMENT ON COMBATING TERRORISM**

Washington, September 20, 2001

Following is the text of the joint U.S.-EU Ministerial statement on combating terrorism:

In the coming days, weeks and months, the United States and the European Union will work in partnership in a broad coalition to combat the evil of terrorism. We will act jointly to expand and improve this cooperation worldwide. Those responsible for the recent attacks must be tracked down and held to account. We will mount a comprehensive, systematic and sustained effort to eliminate international terrorism — its leaders, its actors, its networks. Those responsible for aiding, supporting or harboring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable. Given the events of September 11, 2001 it is imperative that we continue to develop practical measures to prevent terrorists from operating.

Our resolve is a reflection of the strength of the U.S.-EU relationship, our shared values, and our determination to address together the new challenges we face. The nature of our democratic societies makes it imperative to protect our citizens from terrorist acts, while at the same time protecting their individual liberties, due process, and the rule of law. The U.S. and the EU are committed to enhancing security measures, legislation and enforcement. We will work together to encourage greater cooperation in international fora and wider implementation of international instruments. We will also cooperate in global efforts to bring to justice perpetrators of past attacks and to eliminate the ability of terrorists to plan and carry out future atrocities. We have agreed today that the United States and the EU will vigorously pursue cooperation in the following areas in order to reduce vulnerabilities in our societies:

- Aviation and other transport security
- Police and judicial cooperation, including extradition
- Denial of financing of terrorism, including financial sanctions
- Denial of other means of support to terrorists
- Export control and nonproliferation
- Border controls, including visa and document security issues
- Law enforcement access to information and exchange of electronic data.

### **Conclusions and Plan of Action of the EXTRAORDINARY EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING**

Brussels, 21 September, 2001

Posted as a five-page PDF file viewable with Acrobat Reader at:  
<http://www.eurunion.org/partner/EUUSTerror/ExtrEurCounc.pdf>

## Book Reviews

**John W. Young. Britain and European Unity 1945-1999, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Press Ltd./New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000, 237+ pp.**

**Vassiliki N. Koutrakou (ed.) with Lucie A. Emerson. The European Union and Britain: Debating the Challenges Ahead. *Ibid.*, 2000, 256+ pp.**

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE United Kingdom and the European integration process has occupied many academics, principally historians and political scientists, as well as officials and politicians in Whitehall and Westminster. How do these two books shed light on the UK's relationship with the European Union? What insights do they offer to the prospect of Tony Blair's government making a durable step-change in the relationship?

John Young's book is now in its second edition and offers a panoramic view of the period 1945-1999. Young is a political historian, and is at his best in the period where he has explored public records and in reviewing the work of his peers in their interpretation of those archives. Unlike many of the latter Young does not offer a clear argument of his own. Rather, he seeks to present an objective view of British policy, while weighing up the arguments of others. This approach gives the book an authoritative feel, although it may not satisfy those readers who want a more opinionated approach on a topic which is still contentious in British politics. For the period prior to British accession in 1973 this book is a definitive, balanced account to be highly recommended to student readers. Thereafter Young relies on secondary sources and this book's comparative advantage over other such studies, such as Stephen George's An Awkward Partner, is much less clear. Young does still weigh up some of the arguments of other authors but the range of sources deployed, and even the referencing, is markedly inferior to that of the first four of the eight substantive chapters. Apart from one minor blemish in confusing Nicholas and Christopher Soames (p.73), this book is reliable both factually and in its evaluative judgments.

Koutrakou's book, as is to be expected with an edited collection, is less likely to offer a coherent exploration of Britain and Europe. However, what is most surprising is that much of the book is not about this subject at all despite the twin goals of assessing Britain's membership of the EU and its 1998 presidency (p.xvii). The result is a set of disparate chapters which only fleetingly offer much enduring insight. First of all, there is no historical context on, or interpretation of, British European diplomacy to serve as context for the book. Substantively, only Chapter 3 (by the editor) and Chapter 12 (a revised version of an article by Peter Ludlow published already by the *Journal of Common Market Studies*) really address British policy, but then by confining themselves to the 1998 British presidency. The two chapters make an interesting contrast. Ludlow's is less "academic" but displays a sure-footed feel for the subject.

Koutrakou's, by contrast, is more exhaustive, reliant on newspaper sources and not always so sound in judgement. For example (pp.72-73) we are told: "The Labour Party government machinery, out of power for nearly two decades, inevitably consisted of people inexperienced in dealing with a massive agenda of countless Council of Ministers, committee and subcommittee meetings, official and unofficial networking and policy preparation." With the exception of a few spin-doctors and political advisers, however, the permanent (and neutral) civil service is overwhelmingly responsible for these matters. Many of the same civil servants and diplomats were involved in the 1992 presidency under John Major and, in any event, are involved in preparing British participation in these meetings on a routine basis. Unlike Ludlow's chapter, this one reveals a lack of awareness of the limits and possibilities of the presidency as an office, although—to be fair—the political objectives of Tony Blair and Robin Cook revealed this as well.

The other chapters are what one might expect from a loosely defined conference. The chapters in Part II (on enlargement and security issues) are generally good but only Jackie Gower bothers to situate her chapter—on enlargement—in the context of the UK presidency. The other chapters in Part II (on EU-Russia relations and on security policy) simply illustrate the lack of thematic coherence to the book. Part III is on EMU, but treatment of this topic is particularly weak. Two of the papers are not dealing with that issue centrally, and the other two are either very thin (Gros and Emerson—five pages!) or polemical (Martin Holmes).

Despite their common goal of reviewing Britain's relationship with European unity, these two books are very different in nature. Young's is to be recommended as an authoritative history. Koutrakou's collection has a much shorter shelf-life, for it lacks coherence and does not try to situate the 1998 presidency within longer-term historical trends.

**Simon Bulmer**  
**University of Manchester**

**Éric Philippart and Pascaline Winand (eds.) Ever Closer Partnership: Policy-Making in U.S.-EU Relations. Brussels: P.I.E. -Peter Lang, 2001, 477 pp.**

A STUDY OF THE TRANSATLANTIC relationship is always timely. Europeans have long recognized the critical importance of this relationship. Americans have recognized it less consistently, despite pronouncements by every president since Truman, and U.S. attitudes and perceptions on Europe have fluctuated throughout the post-World War II period. However, the U.S. relationship with Europe—in its various manifestations, but particularly the EU—has become increasingly intense over the past decade, a reflection of many developments in Europe: "completion" of the single market, efforts to enable the former Soviet bloc countries to "re-join the West," disintegration and the outbreak of war in the Balkans, and first steps toward establishment of a European security identity. On the U.S. side, the change was sharper and more recent: the advent of the Bush

Administration, with its more nationalistic and unilateralistic proclivities.

It is thus felicitous that *Ever Closer Partnership* has appeared at this time of questioning and concerns about the nature and future of the U.S.-EU relationship. As the subtitle suggests, the focus of the book is on policy-making, and the editors, academics at the Free University of Brussels, have assembled a high-quality team of well-known American and European experts to provide most of the chapters. The book's genesis was a conference the editors organized in Brussels in 1996. Fortunately, the chapters have been updated so that the book does not suffer from time-lag.

As explained by its editors, the book's main purpose is to describe the structures and processes characterizing U.S.-EU relations and to assess the policy outcomes of the relationship, focusing on the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA) and the Joint Action Plan (JAP). The book does this, and more. Its contents range broadly over many areas, covering historical and theoretical aspects as well as contemporary. Some chapters are closely related to the stated purpose, others less so. This is both a strength and a weakness. There is much for readers with different interests to choose from. On the other hand, the interconnection of the various contributions is at times unclear, in part reflecting the difficulty of packaging papers delivered at a conference. Philippart and Winand have divided the book into three parts: "studying a mature relationship," "actors, interests and issues," and "taking stock of U.S.-EU relations." However, the chapters do not all easily fit into those categories.

More important, of course, is the book's content. *Ever Closer Partnership* makes an important contribution in its treatment of the two central issues: how do the U.S. and EU policy-making systems function and interact, and what have the two sides sought to accomplish and with what degree of success?

Two chapters describe the U.S. side of the "structures and processes." Pascaline Winand has written an account of the inner workings of the U.S. Mission to the EU under the leadership of Ambassador Stuart Eisenstadt, which is detailed and interesting, though tending to overstate its role. John Peterson's chapter on the role of the Congress cogently analyzes the significant but often-neglected input of the U.S. legislative branch. It describes relations between Congress and the European Parliament, though unfortunately not the efforts of the EU (particularly the Commission) to influence Congress. The contributions from the EU side concentrate less on EU "processes and structures," but offer interesting perspectives from the other side of the Atlantic. Although a European contribution, Youri Devuyst's chapter focuses on how the United States has dealt over the years with the EU on trade issues along with some consideration of the interplay between the Commission and Member States in that sphere. Thomas Frellesen's contribution combines a description of the mechanisms of U.S.-EU cooperation with background on activities undertaken under the NTA. The latter complements Anthony Gardner's excellent insider's account of the Clinton Administration's journey from the Transatlantic Declaration it inherited to the NTA it helped create. The two sides are joined in Maria Green Cowles' interesting account of the origins and

development of the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, an important, but by no means overriding, aspect of the transatlantic economic relationship.

The key section of the book—and its main contribution to the study of U.S.-EU policy-making—is the final two chapters. In the first of these Philippart and Winand describe and evaluate the intergovernmental consultative mechanisms that have been developed, the central role of the semi-annual U.S.-EU summit meetings, and the coordination organs for the summit process as well as the new roles assumed by various elements of civil society. The second assesses U.S.-EU cooperation. It does so by comparing the objectives listed in the JAP and those subsequently developed (1995-98), which it classifies on a scale indicating the level of commitment (ranging individual undertakings by each side to joint action), with the achievements reported every six months by the Senior Level Group. The results are broken down among the four parts of the NTA and their subdivisions. While the editors readily concede the limitations to their approach, they have nonetheless provided a rough, but detailed and fascinating, qualitative measurement of the level of U.S.-EU ambitions for cooperation and the degree to which objectives have been achieved. The chapter concludes with some tentative explanations for their findings.

The other chapters of the book run the gamut from the editors' interesting historical survey of the nature of the U.S.-EU relationship, to Michael Smith's analysis of public strategies and private interests, Roy Ginsburg's review of the growth of transatlantic foreign policy cooperation, and Martin Schwok's analysis of dissociative and associative approaches ("pessimistic" and "optimistic" to this non-theoretician) in analysis of the transatlantic relationship. The inclusion of a chapter by Alan Hendrikson on the development of metropolitan regions is mystifying. While Hendrikson covers that subject at considerable length, its relevance to the U.S.-EU relationship and policy-making is left to the readers' imagination.

*Ever Closer Partnership* contains much useful and thought-provoking material. It is well worth the read.

**Michael Calingaert**  
**The Brookings Institution**

---

**Edward Best, Mark Gray and Alexander Stubb (eds.)**  
***Rethinking the European Union: IGC 2000 and Beyond.***  
**Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration,**  
**2000, 372 pp.**

THIS BOOK IS MORE THAN a preview of the intergovernmental conference that resulted in the Nice Treaty. It contains also a number of useful reflections on what the EU might look like after Nice, regardless of the contents of the treaty. Based on a conference held at the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), Maastricht, in November 1999, the book appeared in the summer of 2000, in the midst of the IGC.

The first part, consisting mostly of short articles by practitioners (junior ministers, senior diplomats, and senior EU

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

**Professor Mitchell P. Smith**  
**Dept. of Political Science**  
**University of Oklahoma**  
**455 West Lindsey St. (Rm.205)**  
**Norman, OK 73019 USA**  
**E-mail mps@ou.edu**  
**Fax 405.325.0718**

*Publishers should send two (2) review copies of books directly to Professor Smith.*

officials), provides national and institutional perspectives on what was, at the time that they were written, the forthcoming IGC. The national perspectives come from three small countries (The Netherlands, Portugal, and Ireland), and two big ones (Britain and Spain). A French perspective would have been welcome, and possibly also a German one. The British perspective comes at the end of the section, separated from the other national perspectives by chapters on the European Parliament and the Commission.

Writing before the IGC began, the authors of these chapters deal with such issues as the scope of the conference (should the agenda be broadened beyond the Amsterdam leftovers?), the challenges of reweighting Council votes and reconfiguring the Commission, and the unsatisfactory nature of EU treaty reform. These chapters should not be judged on the basis of the IGC's outcome. Rather, they should be seen as part of the historical record: documents on the outlook and aspirations of the respective member states and institutions on the eve of the IGC. What is striking in retrospect, however, is the complexity of the deal eventually struck on the modalities of qualified majority voting (qmv). In most other respects the results of the IGC were reasonably close to what the practitioners expected it to be.

The second part of the book delves in greater detail into the three Amsterdam leftovers (the weighting of votes, the size and composition of the Commission, and the scope of qmv), as well as the issue of enhanced cooperation, which was later added to the IGC's agenda. Although government officials (members of the Finnish Permanent Representation in Brussels, including Alexander Stubb, one of the book's co-editors) wrote two of these chapters, all four chapters provide academic assessments of the IGC's main agenda items (EIPA staff members, including Edward Best, another co-editor, wrote the other two). Each follows a similar course: history of the issue, nature of the problem, and possible solutions. All are cogent, insightful, and enlightening. Far from losing value because the IGC is now over, they are as relevant to the EU's development today as in the pre-Nice period.

Surprisingly in a section entitled "Issues of Institutional Reform," Part II also contains chapters on the European Security and Defense Policy and the Charter of Fundamental Rights. These developments certainly have institutional implications for the EU, but they are much more than issues of institutional reform. Nevertheless, their indirect relationship to the IGC warrants their

inclusion in the book. The two chapters, by EIPA staff, are highly informative, especially the one on the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the story of which is generally less well known than that of the European Security and Defense Policy.

The third part of the book is especially interesting and important, ranging as it does beyond the institutional debate, with chapters by such luminaries as Helen Wallace, Joseph Weiler, and Philippe Schmitter. Anything that Helen Wallace says or writes about the EU is worth paying attention to. Her short contribution here is no exception. In it, she discusses a number of issues, including the EU's institutional balance (or imbalance), the representation of the member states, and the link between the tasks facing the EU and the institutional mechanisms available for performing them. Her guiding principles for the EU's development transcend the IGC itself and resonate in the post-Nice period.

Weiler's contribution on the EU's constitutional agenda is more relevant to the next IGC than to the last one. There is so much talk now about a new constitution for Europe that Weiler's chapter, in which he argues against such a development, makes salutary reading. Weiler argues that, in effect, the EU already has a constitution: "unwritten but addressing all the issues which more formal constitutions address" (p.221). Moreover, a formal constitution could rob the EU "of its most important constitutional innovation: the principle of Constitutional Tolerance" (p.223). Weiler dismisses the prevailing arguments in favor of officially constitutionalizing the EU. Instead, he says, the EU should reform its judicial architecture and, far from drafting a Charter of Fundamental Rights, should develop a Community policy of human rights.

In his short chapter, Schmitter makes various proposals to improve the quality and quantity of democracy in the EU. Most are politically impractical, but are interesting nonetheless. Next, Mark Gray (the book's third co-editor), a Commission official and, by now, an IGC veteran, makes the case for a new approach to treaty reform. The prospect of another conference in 2004 must fill him and other members of the IGC priesthood with dread, despite the next IGC's more ambitious agenda. Yet it is hard to see how the current method of treaty reform could be substantially revised. The way in which the Charter of Fundamental Rights was drafted is instructive, but is hardly applicable to the process of formal treaty change. Member states' entrenched interests in the content of the treaties means that they are unlikely to adopt the Charter method in place of the IGC method.

There are two other chapters in Part III of the book. As a contribution to the debate on legitimacy building, one presents various democratic models that can be used to characterize the EU. The other synthesizes institutional aspects of Scenarios Europe 2010: Five Possible Futures for Europe, a working paper of the Commission's Forward Studies Union originally presented in July 1999.

Finally, the book contains almost one hundred pages of annexes, including the Amsterdam Treaty's protocol on enlargement, key European Council conclusions, and summaries of relevant reports and opinions on the IGC. Documentary



annexes were a great strength of EIPA publications on previous IGCs, notably the two books by Finn Laursen and Sophie Vanhoonacker on the Maastricht Treaty (The Intergovernmental Conference on Political Union, Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration, 1992; and The Ratification of the Maastricht Treaty: Issues, Debates and Future Implications, Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration, 1994). In the age of the World Wide Web, however, which provides instant access to a plethora of EU documentation, a documentary section is a luxury rather than a necessity in a publication of this kind. An index, by contrast, remains a necessity, but there is none in the book.

In conclusion, this collection of articles and essays makes a fine contribution to the growing literature on EU treaty reform. It whets the appetite for a similar book on the next IGC.

**Desmond Dinan**  
**George Mason University**

---

**Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso and Thomas Risse (eds.) Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001, 272 pp.**

**Eleanor E. Zeff and Ellen B. Pirro (eds.) The European Union and the Member States: Cooperation, Coordination, and Compromise. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001, 354 pp.**

THESE TWO VOLUMES REPRESENT the first trickle of material on the Europeanization of national governments in the European Union (EU). All the runes suggest that very soon, this will expand into a river of paper. What is the Europeanization “turn” in EU scholarship likely to produce? A lot depends on how one interprets the term “Europeanization.” It could be viewed as a symptom of the restless urge to find neologisms to populate the social sciences. Or it may reflect a desire for “meta-concepts” capable of linking previously unconnected sub-communities of scholars. Or, finally, does it herald the opening of an exciting new research frontier in EU studies?

The editors of Transforming Europe clearly subscribe to the second and third of these views. They are obviously excited by the new research opportunities created by the unfolding impact of the EU on its member states, and express a strong desire to locate and explain patterns of cause and effect in established social science theories. Their theoretical starting point can be broadly described as historical institutional, although they seek to engage with scholars working on both sides of the “divide” between comparative and international politics. The editors are particularly interested in explaining the impact of the EU on domestic *structures*, which they define broadly to include structures specific to particular policy areas (i.e., political, administrative and legal) as well as wider national characteristics such as policy styles, citizen norms and collective understandings of the nation state.

Their basic argument (which is now fairly well known as drafts have been extensively “leaked”) is that the extent of national adaptation will depend upon the “goodness of fit” between EU requirements and state structures. Where the two fit fairly closely, the extent of change at the national level will be fairly limited. Where they “misfit” state structures will come under pressure to adapt to EU norms. Serious performance crises will arise when the gap between the two is extremely large, resulting in radical and rapid transformations. However, the stimulus-response relationship is never simply top down; the pressure to adapt will be mediated in some way by a number of intervening variables, namely national agencies, the position and importance of national veto points and national cultures. In terms of the wider literature on Europeanization, the approach followed is therefore primarily “top down” (i.e., outside in) rather than “bottom up” (i.e., inside out).

Having set out the model, the bulk of the book comprises a loose collection of case studies. Some look at Europeanization in one sector (e.g., gender, telecommunications, transport, finance and environment) across three countries, whereas others focus in much greater detail on the national impacts of one EU policy area in one country. The editors openly concede that the cases are not strictly comparable, but feel there is just about enough overlap to generate a number of valid comparisons. This task is undertaken in the final chapter, which looks across the national adaptations and draws a number of important conclusions, which I suspect will be formulated into hypotheses guiding the next phase of Europeanization research. First, *all* states have had to adapt to EU rules, even the largest and most powerful ones. The editors exploit this particular point to attack state-centric theories of the EU. Second, the impact is highly differentiated across countries and policy sectors (telecommunications being the most convergent and equal pay being the least). Rather than continuing divergence or wholesale convergence, the overall pattern is one of “domestic adaptation with national colors” (p.1). Third, the softer, policy aspects of national structure are more likely to converge than national legal systems (p.231) (which is slightly puzzling given the supposed “constitutionalization” of EU law). Finally, the overall pattern can be explained by historical institutional theoretical concepts such as path dependence and the endogeneity of national preferences.

It is always difficult to use edited books as a vehicle for good comparative research, but Transforming Europe performs significantly better than the norm. Admittedly, some chapters utilize the goodness of fit concept rather more intensively than others, and some important conceptual questions are left hanging (e.g., convergence-divergence compared to what?). Critics will probably argue that the dependent variable is defined far too broadly. Rather annoyingly, the final chapter also introduces many new analytical questions without adequately working through those developed in the introduction. But these are minor quibbles. This book is certain to serve as an important benchmark against which the next tranche of Europeanization research will be judged.

It is difficult to ascertain where the editors of The European Union and the Member States stand in relation to the

Europeanization “turn” in EU studies because they eschew any reference the term. In as much as there is a stated aim it is to understand national adaptation to European integration, as well as the reciprocal (“bottom up”) impact of particular states on the EU. The book, which covers all fifteen Member States briefly and concisely, will certainly service those looking for a short, thumbnail sketch of a country (or countries) to mine for their purposes, but it does very little else—at least not systematically. The book is almost certainly about Europeanization, but the opening chapter is analytically thin and there is no overall conclusion. No attempt is made to theorize Europeanization, compare national experiences or test hypotheses. And somewhat bizarrely, the dust jacket carries an advert for another book written by a completely different author! The best that can be said of this loose-knit collection is that it might contribute indirectly to the Europeanization “turn” in EU scholarship, but it will not shape it.

**Andrew Jordan**  
**University of East Anglia, UK**

---

**Michael J. Baun. A Wider Europe: The Process and Politics of European Union Enlargement. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000, 257 pp.**

THIS DETAILED AND METICULOUSLY researched book is a very welcome addition to the sparse literature on enlargement of the European Union. It is also only the second book on the subject to be published in the United States, although by a British-based publisher. It is primarily a detailed, richly documented and relatively up-to-date (closing in March 2000) account of the ongoing process of enlarging the EU to include the former East Bloc countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEEC), the islands of Cyprus and Malta, and Turkey. This discussion takes up seven of the nine chapters of the book, which are organized chronologically to cover the pre-accession strategy, the critical summits in Copenhagen, Madrid, Luxembourg and Helsinki, and the actual accession negotiations beginning in November 1998. There are also two interesting chapters on “Preparing the EU for Enlargement,” one on the reform of key common policies and the EU’s financing system, and the other on institutional reform. The entire book is written from a consciously EU perspective and confesses openly to being “...one-sided in its attention to the EU side of the enlargement equation” (p.vii).

The story of the eastern enlargement gets longer and longer. It is only when one reads a detailed study such as A Wider Europe that one becomes fully cognizant of how laborious the process has been, much more so than for any of the previous enlargements (even Spain and Portugal, for which the process lasted nine years). Due in part to the magnitude of the exercise (at least 13 applicant countries in question), and a level of economic development way below that of even the least developed of the current 15 member states, the applicants have been promised accession in 2000, 2002, 2004 and now 2005 for just the most advanced. Baun has left nothing out of his account and I applaud his attention to

detail. The range of his documentary sources is wide: official documents of the European institutions, press reports and articles, in large part from the Financial Times and Europe Daily Bulletin and for the more recent events, Web sites. From time to time, he also refers briefly to some of the recently published monographs on enlargement and to the theoretical literature on European integration. The enlargement process has now dragged on so long that Baun’s consistent attention to detail is extremely valuable, since most of us rarely think back to 1989 and acquire thereby a solid historical perspective.

The book is clearly and pleasingly written and will be valuable to the experienced scholar, practitioner, or student. It is copiously endnoted (although I, personally, wish that publishers would return to footnotes) and contains a useful chronology of the “main events in the eastern enlargement process” (p.x). It also has a helpful list of acronyms.

What then is there to criticize, if anything, in the book? I suppose it is unfair to say that it is one-sided. The author tells us up front in the preface that he does not intend to “give sufficient attention to what the applicant countries of Central and Eastern Europe have done to prepare for membership and to the impact of these efforts on their economies, societies, and domestic policies” (p.vii). I do not really buy the rationalization that “this is a massive subject that requires a volume of its own” (p.vii). It is indeed a massive subject, but above all it does *not* require a volume of its own. Only when we start looking at enlargement from *both* EU *and* applicant country perspectives will we start getting the true picture. I do not agree either with Baun’s contention that, because enlargement is an ongoing, dynamic process, a scholarly work can only be a “snapshot of the process at a particular point in time” (p.vii). He has in fact written a history, by definition ongoing, of this process. Agreed, he cannot see into the future, but probably more harm than good has been done already by attempts to predict or promise when the first accessions will occur as others have done.

The chief problem with A Wider Europe is one that is beautifully underscored by Helen Wallace in her recent piece on “EU Enlargement: A Neglected Subject” (in Cowles and Smith, eds., State of the European Union Vol. 5, Oxford University Press, 2001, pp.149-150 ). “[I]t is an oddity of the literature on the EU ...” she writes, “that so little effort has been made to theorize about the enlargement of the EU ... the literature on the EU has in the main treated enlargement as an episode, or succession of episodes, rather than as a phenomenon somehow intrinsic to the integration process itself.” We are still waiting for a book on enlargement that will give us history, process and theory. In the meantime, A Wider Europe is a fine book to work with.

**Glenda G. Rosenthal**  
**Columbia University**

## Publications

### New EU-Related Books

- Attina, Fulvio and Stelios Stavridis (eds.) (2001) *The Barcelona Process and Euro-Mediterranean Issues from Stuttgart to Marseille*. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Baimbridge, Mark and Philip Whyman (eds.) (2001) *Economic and Monetary Union in Europe: Theory, Evidence and Practice*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Brine, Jackie (2001) *The European Social Fund and the EU*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dickinson, David G. and Andrew W. Mullineux (eds.) (2001) *Financial and Monetary Integration in the New Europe: Convergence Between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Ginsberg, Roy H. (2001) *European Union in International Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Greenwood, Justin (2001) *Inside the EU Business Associations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (2001) *The Effectiveness of EU Business Associations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Kassim, Hussein *et alia* (2001) *The National Co-ordination of EU Policy: The European Level*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Martin-Das, Jennifer C. (2001) *The European Monetary Union in a Public Choice Perspective: A Political-Economic Approach to the Implications of Macroeconomic Shocks*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Nicolaïdis, Kalypso and Robert Howse (eds.) (2001) *The Federal Vision: Legitimacy and Levels of Governance in the U.S. and EU*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pentecost, Eric J. and Andre Van Poeck (eds.) (2001) *European Monetary Integration: Past, Present, and Future*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Sweet, Alec Stone *et alia* (eds.) (2001) *The Institutionalization of Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- von Dosenrode, Soren and Anders Stubkjaer (2001) *The European Union and the Middle East*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

### EU-Related Journals

*Asia-Pacific Journal of EC Studies*, is a new journal launched by the EC Studies Association of Asia-Pacific, focusing on European integration, EU and Asia-Pacific relations, and comparative policy studies. To be published in June and December; editorial deadlines in March and September. Contact executive editor Hee-Yul Chai via e-mail at <hychai@kyonggi.ac.kr>.

*International Affairs*, Vol.77, No.3 (July 2001) is a special issue, "Changing Patterns of European Security and Defence," with articles on the transatlantic relationship and on Saudi-Europe relations, *inter alia*, with an article on the development of an "EU strategic culture" co-authored by EUSA member Geoffrey Edwards. Visit <www.blackwellpublishers.co.uk/online>.

## The State of the European Union (Volume 5): Risks, Reform, Resistance, and Revival

Oxford University Press

www.oup-usa.org and www.oup.co.uk

Edited by Maria Green Cowles, Assistant Professor, School of International Service, American University, and Michael Smith, Jean Monnet Professor of European Politics, Dept. of European Studies, Loughborough University, *The State of the European Union* offers an insightful and up-to-date examination of the challenges facing the European Union. The Amsterdam treaty, monetary union, future enlargement, as well as global economic and political developments pose new risks and opportunities for EU institutions and policies. Chapters by leading scholars explore different conceptual approaches to the emerging European polity, needed reforms of European institutions, difficulties awaiting monetary union, risks of enlargement, and the resulting implications for the development of European policies.

—Oxford University Press

This fifth and latest volume in the EUSA series, launched in 1991, features nineteen chapters by EUSA members Stefani Bär, Elizabeth Bomberg, Miriam Campanella, Alexander Carius, J. Bryan Colleser, Lykke Friis, David Michael Green, Sieglinde Gstöhl, Martin Holland, Erik Jones, Sophie Meunier, Paul Fabian Mullen, Anna Murphy, Kalypso Nicolaïdis, John Peterson, Mark Pollack, Roger Scully, Ulrich Sedelmeier, Jo Shaw, Mitchell Smith, Amy Verdun, Ingmar von Homeyer, Helen Wallace, and Antje Wiener, and an introduction by Maria Green Cowles and Michael Smith. Sections cover enlargement, policy-making, monetary union, institutions and identity, and conceptualizing the European Union.

Order from Oxford University Press:

Paperback, 0-19-829757-2

Hardback, 0-19-829752-1

In the USA and Canada:

On-line <https://www.oup-usa.org/order/>

Call toll-free 1-800-451-7556

In Europe:

E-mail [book.orders@oup.co.uk](mailto:book.orders@oup.co.uk)

## Calls for Papers

**Towards Regional Currency Areas**, March 26-27, 2002, Santiago, Chile, international conference co-organized by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Santiago), the Centre d'Etudes Prospectives et d'Informations Internationales (CEPII, Paris), and others. Theoretical and empirical paper proposals sought on themes of exchange rate regimes and emerging countries; dollarization; future currency areas in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; regional currency areas and international monetary system; European Monetary Union and the euro experience; policy mix in a currency union; regional macro-economic coordination and cooperation; and others. Proposals in English, French, or Spanish of 2 pages maximum should be sent to P. Artus, A. Cartapanis, and L. Fontagne, CEPII, UMR 6126, CNRS - Université de la Méditerranée, Château La Farge, Route des Milles, F-13290 Les Milles, France. For information e-mail <cefi@univ-aix.fr> or fax to 33.(0)4.42.93.59.93. Deadline: *November 1, 2001*.

**Transatlantic Studies Conference**, July 8-11, 2002, The University of Dundee, Scotland, launch conference of the Transatlantic Studies Association (TSA) and *The Journal of Transatlantic Studies*. The Atlantic region has been defined by a history of economic, political and security links, migration and cross-fertilization, and growing interdependence. The TSA and its new journal aim to stimulate cooperative, multi- and inter-disciplinary research in this field. Paper synopses of 200 words are sought in the topics (1) Diplomatic, Political, and Bilateral Relations, (2) Economic Relations, (3) Defence, Security, and Intelligence Relations, (4) Literature and Cultural Relations, (5) Transatlantic Area Studies, (6) Race and Migration, (7) Comparative Constitutionalism, and (8) Planning, Regeneration, and the Environment. For details visit <www.dundee.ac.uk/~awparker/transatlantic.html>. Deadline for proposals: *February 22, 2002*.

**European Culture in a Changing World**, 8th International Conference, International Society for the Study of European Ideas, July 22-27, 2002, Aberystwyth, Wales. To deal with European culture in a changing world is to deal with the reciprocal relation between politics and economics on one hand and culture on the other. In an era when economic forces are pushing towards European economic unity or the globalization of national markets, it is difficult to demarcate the role of culture. While the European Narrative may have been written by Monnet, De Gaulle, Adenauer, the Global Narrative is written by an unknown author, or rather by Adam Smith's Invisible Hand. Paper proposals sought for workshops in five tracks: History, Geography and Science; Economics, Politics, and Law; Education, Women's Studies, Sociology; Art, Theatre, Literature, Religion, Culture; and Language, Philosophy, Psychology. For specific topics, the proposal process, and further details, visit <www.aber.ac.uk/tfts/issei2002/>. Deadline for proposals: *Varies*.

## Conferences

*November 2-3, 2001*, Annual meeting of the International Studies Association Midwest, St. Louis, MO, co-sponsored by the European Union Center at the University of Missouri Columbia. EUSA member Marijke Breuning, Truman State University, is Program Chair. Visit <www.isanet.org/Midwest/AnnualMeeting/> or e-mail <mbreunin@truman.edu>.

*November 5-6, 2001*, "Implementation of European Environmental Directives: Difficulties with the Birds and Habitats Directives," Maastricht, Netherlands, European Institute of Public Administration. For information contact Winny Curfs at e-mail <w.curfs@eipa-nl.com> or visit <www.eipa.nl>.

*January 3-6, 2002*, 116th Annual Meeting, American Historical Association, on the theme, "Frontiers" (spatial, national, intellectual), San Francisco, CA. Visit <www.theaha.org/annual/> or e-mail <aha@theaha.org>.

*February 7-10, 2002*, "The European Union's Eastern Enlargement: Surveying the Social and Economic Divides," University of Toronto Junior Scholars Conference, Toronto, Canada. For recent PhDs and senior PhD students. For more information visit <www.chass.utoronto.ca/jiges/euconfer.html> or e-mail to <eu.enlargement@utoronto.ca>.

*March 14-16, 2002*, 13th International Conference of Europeanists, Chicago, IL. Council for European Studies biennial conference. For further information visit <www.europenet.org> or e-mail to <ces@columbia.edu>.

*March 19-23, 2002*, 98th Annual Meeting, Association of American Geographers, Los Angeles, CA (has a Specialty Group on Europe). Visit <www.aag.org> or e-mail <meeting@aag.org>.

*March 24-27, 2002*, 43rd Annual International Studies Association Convention, "Dissolving Boundaries: The Nexus Between Comparative Politics and International Studies," New Orleans, LA. Program chairs are Suzanne F. Werner and David R. Davis, Dept. of Political Science, Emory University. Visit <www.isanet.org/neworleans/> or e-mail <isa@u.arizona.edu>.

*March 25-26, 2002*, "European Studies in the 21st Century: The State of the Art," Loughborough, UK, co-organized by University Association of Contemporary European Studies and the Standing Conference of the Heads of European Studies. For details visit <www.uaces.org>.

*July 8-11, 2002*, Launch Conference, Transatlantic Studies Association, The University of Dundee, Scotland, co-sponsored by Baylor University, Texas. See call for proposals at left. Visit <www.dundee.ac.uk/~awparker/transatlantic.html> or e-mail to organizer Alan Dobson at <a.p.dobson@dundee.ac.uk>.

## Fellowships

**Robert Bosch Foundation Research Scholars**, Program in Comparative Public Policy and Institutions, American Institute of Contemporary German Studies (AICGS), Washington, DC. For four six-month periods beginning July 2002, candidates in political science, economics, business, sociology, and interdisciplinary studies are sought for in-residence fellowships tenable at AICGS. Topics include welfare systems, environmental policy, labor market issues, immigration policy, transatlantic regularly cooperation, new economy issues, intergovernmental relations, and others. For more details contact Jeff Anderson, Director of Studies, via e-mail <anderson@aicgs.org>, or write Bosch Research Scholars Committee, AICGS, 1400 Sixteenth Street NW (Suite 420), Washington, DC 20036. Deadline: *Ongoing*.

**European University Institute (EUI)**, Jean Monnet Fellowships 2002-2003. Applications are invited for post-doctoral research fellowships in economics, history and civilization, law, political and social sciences, and the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. The Jean Monnet Fellowships support post-doctoral research and should lead to publication in comparative research on European perspectives, on the EU or on a topic of interest for the development of Europe, or, fundamental research in one of the disciplines contributing to the development of Europe's cultural and academic heritage. The Fellowships are open to those having a post-graduate degree or equivalent research experience. Visit <www.iue.it/JMF/Welcome.html> or e-mail <applyjmf@iue.it>. The Forum of the Robert Schuman Centre at EUI also offers post-doctoral fellowships on the 2002-2003 forum theme of international regulatory policy. Visit <www.iue.it/RSC/EF> or e-mail Claudio Radaelli at <claudio.radaelli@iue.it>. Deadlines: *October 25, 2001*. The EUI also offers three-year post-graduate grants to begin September 2002 in law, economics, history, and social and political sciences, for study leading to the doctoral degree from the EUI. Contact e-mail <applyres@iue.it> or telephone 39.055.46.85.373. Deadline: *January 31, 2002*.

The **Centre for Studies on Federalism** offers two one-year post-graduate research fellowships (€15,000) at the Centre in Moncalieri (Torino), Italy, on the topics of supranational and infranational federalism, European integration, or the evolution of international organization. Candidates must be university graduates in economics, law, humanities, political science, or similar fields with top marks, of no more than 35 years old, and must have a working knowledge of English and Italian. The fellowships may be renewable for up to four additional years. For more information e-mail <csfederalismo@tin.it> or telephone 39.011.640.2998. Deadline: *October 30, 2001*.

**Körber-Stiftung's Transatlantic Idea Contest USable**, solicits essay submissions giving the American perspective on civic engagement in Germany, with three prizes of US\$5,000 each, ten prizes of US\$1,000 each, and ten special youth awards of

US\$500 each. Anyone familiar with Germany is welcome to participate. Essays should be based on personal research on existing initiatives or institutions, must correspond to the topic of "civic engagement," and should not exceed 4,000 words. Essays may be submitted in English or German and must not have been published prior to submission to this contest. Essays that cover ideas outside of Germany or that are not based on personal experience are excluded from participation. A German-American jury of journalists will evaluate the entries. For more information and application materials, visit <www.usable.de/usable/index\_e.html>. Deadline: *October 31, 2001*.

**TransCoop Program 2002, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation**, provides funds for cooperative research between German, U.S., and/or Canadian scholars working at universities or other research institutions in the fields of humanities, social sciences, law, and economics. Priority is given to new research cooperation. Amount of funding is variable and may be up to €45,000 granted for a maximum of three years; grants must be matched by funds from U.S. and/or Canadian sources. For more information contact Christine May at e-mail <my@avh.de>. Application forms may be downloaded from <www.humboldt-foundation.de>. Deadline: *October 31, 2001*.

The **European Union Fulbright Program** offers various fellowships for 2002-2003: The **Fulbright European Scholar-in-Residence** program strengthens expertise in EU affairs by bringing to U.S. campuses scholars and professionals from the European Union. Proposals are welcome from research and graduate institutions with established programs in international affairs, business, political science, or related fields, in which the presence of an EU expert would be beneficial. For information, visit <www.iie.org/cies> or e-mail <scholars@cies.iie.org>. Deadline: *November 1, 2001*. **Grants for Citizens of Member States of the EU**: At least two one-semester awards for research on EU affairs or U.S.-EU relations at an accredited institution in the U.S. (candidates must arrange their own affiliation including a letter of invitation), and four one-semester awards are also available for lecturing on EU affairs at selected U.S. universities (institution placement will be provided for successful candidates). Candidates must be professionals, policy makers or academics involved in EU affairs and proficient in English. For information, visit <www.kbr.be/fulbright>. Deadline: *March 1, 2002*.

The **German Marshall Fund Fellowship Program for Dissertation and Advanced Research** (German Marshall Fund of the United States) offers dissertation fellowships (\$20,000) and advanced research (up to \$40,000) to improve the understanding of significant contemporary economic, political and social developments relating to Europe, European integration and relations between Europe and the United States. Graduate students, recent PhD recipients, and more senior scholars may apply. Applicants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents. Visit <www.gmfus.org>, send e-mail to <info@gmfus.org>, or contact the GMF at 11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20036. Deadline: *November 15, 2001*.

## EUSA News and Notes

Please take a moment to update your e-mail address books and Web site hyperlinks for the European Union Studies Association, following our long-awaited name change that became effective July 1, 2001. Our new e-mail address is [esa@pitt.edu](mailto:esa@pitt.edu) and our Web site URL is [www.eustudies.org](http://www.eustudies.org). If you haven't visited our Web site in recent months, you'll find there the major features from the *EUSA Review*, annotated Web site links organized by category, information about our 2003 conference and the EUSA interest sections, and much more. In other housekeeping matters, please be sure to let us know (preferably via e-mail or letter) of any new contact coordinates, should you move or change jobs. We work hard to keep our e-mail List Serve up to date and we also pay a fee for each address change sent to us by the U.S. Postal Service, who then discard rather than deliver your *EUSA Review* sent to your former address. Thank you!

Should there be a new EUSA Interest Section on the **EU, Latin America, and the Caribbean**? "Latin America and the Caribbean regions are close to Europe in terms of cultural and historical links. More inter-American integration has been prompted by the development of the EU after the Single European Act. NAFTA, MERCOSUR and now the FTTA are in essence a response to the perceived success of the European Union, which has become a point of reference, if not a model, for the Americas. The EU is the major development donor in this region, and European investment is ahead of the U.S.' in most countries of this region. The EU and Mexico have signed an ambitious agreement and the Second European-Latin American summit will take place in Madrid in 2002 during the Spanish EU Presidency. As a result of conversations at the ECSA Conference in Madison, the establishment of an interest section covering some of the above topics is recommended. We need a minimum of 10 current EUSA members to indicate their interest in order to prepare a formal proposal for the Section. Also, if any EUSA member, particularly from a Latin American or Caribbean country, would wish to join me in co-organizing such a section, I would welcome hearing from you." Send your comments and reactions to Joaquín Roy (University of Miami) via e-mail to [jroy@miami.edu](mailto:jroy@miami.edu).

The *EUSA Review*, beginning with its next (Winter 2002) issue, will follow an annual calendar of announcements and listings organized in four topic areas: Winter (December 15): EU-Related Academic Programs (degree or certificate-granting, worldwide); Spring (March 15): EU-Related Web Sites (preference given to primary sources such as databases, electronic publications, and bibliographies); Summer (June 15): EU-Related Organizations (academic and professional associations, research centers, and institutes with significant EU aspects in their missions); and Fall (September 15): EUSA Members' Research Notes (EUSA members' current EU-related research projects, with particular attention to funded projects). As always, we will continue to list EU-related Conferences and Calls, Fellowships and Scholarships, and Publications (books, journals, working papers), in every issue of the *Review*. Please send your brief announcements to arrive before the above-mentioned deadlines, preferably by e-mail to [esa@pitt.edu](mailto:esa@pitt.edu) or by regular mail to EUSA, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA. We reserve the right to edit for length, and we cannot guarantee inclusion in the listings, though we will do our best to include all received. We do not accept unsolicited e-mail attachments. Thank you!

## Miscellany

The **Council for International Educational Exchange (CIEE)** announces its European 2002 seminars, one-/two-week intensive overseas programs designed for U.S. faculty and administrators, to help stimulate initiatives toward internationalizing curricula. Hosted by academic communities, the programs include lectures, study tours, and opportunities to meet scholarly communities. For Summer 2002, destinations include Croatia, England and Northern Ireland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, The Netherlands, and Spain. For faculty and administrators from Historically Black Colleges and Universities, CIEE has received a grant from the ExxonMobil Foundation to fund participation in the 2002 seminars. Contact CIEE's Faculty Programs Department, telephone 800.40.STUDY or 212.822.2782; visit the Web site [www.ciee.org/ifds](http://www.ciee.org/ifds) or e-mail [ifds@ciee.org](mailto:ifds@ciee.org). Deadline for the ExxonMobil participants: *February 1, 2002*; deadline for all other participants: *March 15, 2002*.

In a pilot project for 2001-02, the **Jean Monnet Project of the European Commission** (DG for Education and Culture) made awards available for the first time to scholars from countries outside the EU/EU applicant countries. The European Union Studies Association is delighted to congratulate the following EUSA members in the above category who have recently been awarded the prestigious "Jean Monnet Chair" designation from this Jean Monnet Project pilot:

Australia: **Philomena Murray**, University of Melbourne, Jean Monnet Chair. Canada: **Amy Verdun**, University of Victoria, Jean Monnet Chair in European Integration Studies. USA: **George A. Bermann**, Columbia University School of Law, Jean Monnet Chair in European Community Law; **Desmond Dinan**, George Mason University, Jean Monnet Chair in Public Policy; **Joaquín Roy**, University of Miami, Jean Monnet Chair in European Union Studies, and **Vivien A. Schmidt**, Boston University, Jean Monnet Chair in European Political Integration. For more information on the Jean Monnet Project, including other types of awards and a world-wide list of all recipients for 2001-02, please visit [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/university/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/university/index_en.html).

(continued from p.2) information on the new section, please visit our Web site at [www.eustudies.org](http://www.eustudies.org). We hope to evaluate proposals for other interest sections over the coming months, and we welcome new proposals from EUSA members.

We are also pleased to announce the appointment of EUSA member Mitchell P. Smith (University of Oklahoma) as the new Book Reviews editor for the *EUSA Review*. This voluntary, two-year position is one of great value to the Association, as we aim to bring to you information and analysis of the ever-growing body of academic literature on all aspects of European integration. See the Book Reviews section of this issue for full contact details for Mitchell. We want to take this moment to recognize and thank outgoing Book Reviews editor Jeanie Bukowski (Bradley University), who has been an active EUSA member since her graduate school days and whose contributions to the Association have been numerous. Jeanie's commitment to the Book Reviews editor role for the past two years made our jobs much easier, and we wish her continued success in her other endeavors.

Finally, we have been informed by the European Commission that the European Union Studies Association has been selected once again to perform the coordinator role for the growing Network of European Union Centers in the United States (see p.9 in this issue for the new and continuing European Union Centers in the U.S. for 2001-2004). This project, started at the European Union's initiative in 1998 with the overall aim of building stronger ties among Europeans and Americans, is one that we support, as awareness about and interest in the European Union grows here in the U.S. The EU Centers, located at universities across the United States, perform valuable educational and outreach roles in their regions and conduct an impressive array of activities. Please visit the Web site dedicated to them at [www.eucenters.org](http://www.eucenters.org). All these new structures and appointments contribute to the growing strength and stability of the European Union Studies Association.

MARTIN A. SCHAIN  
New York University

## EUROPEAN UNION STUDIES ASSOCIATION

### New Membership 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 EUSA's e-mail List Serve? \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

**Membership dues** (please check as appropriate):

<i>USA addresses only:</i>		<i>Outside the USA:</i>	
Individual	\$35 _____	Individual	\$45 _____
Student	\$20 _____	Student	\$30 _____
Three-year membership <i>at USA addresses only</i>		\$100 _____	
Three-year membership <i>outside the USA</i>		\$130 _____	

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

Note: U.S. taxpayers may make a tax-deductible contribution to support the work of EUSA in any amount over membership dues:

EUSA Grants and Scholarships Fund	\$ _____
EUSA Endowment Fund	\$ _____

**Total amount enclosed:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

If paying by check, please make check payable to EUSA. 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 Union Studies Association**  
 415 Bellefield Hall  
 University of Pittsburgh  
 Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA  
 Facsimile 412.648.1168



*Thank you for your support of EUSA!*

Inside the Fall 2001 *EUSA Review*:

<b><i>EUSA Review</i> Forum: The Commission White Paper and European Governance</b>	<b>1</b>
“The White Paper, the Commission and the ‘Future of Europe’” by Daniel Wincott	
“More Green than Blue: Positioning the Governance White Paper” by Les Metcalfe	
“European Agencies: From Institutional Efficiency to ‘Good’ Governance” by Michelle Everson	
“The White Paper and the Rediscovery of Civil Society” by Kenneth A. Armstrong	
<b>From the Chair</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Network of European Union Centers News and Notes</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Teaching the EU:</b>	<b>10</b>
“Embracing Collaboration and Technology: Georgia’s EU Studies Curriculum” by Brian Murphy	
<b>The European Union Responds (to the events of September 11, 2001)</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Book Reviews</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Publications</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Calls for Papers; Conferences</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Fellowships</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>EUSA News and Notes; Miscellany</b>	<b>22</b>

*Founded in 1988 (and formerly called the European Community Studies Association), the European Union Studies Association™ is a non-profit academic and professional organization devoted to the exchange of information and ideas on the European Union.*

**European Union Studies Association**  
*Information and ideas on the European Union*



***Established in honor of our Tenth Anniversary in 1998:***

**EUSA Grants and Scholarships Fund**  
to support EU-related scholarship and education,  
travel to the biennial EUSA Conference, and more

**EUSA Endowment Fund**  
to ensure the long-term viability and  
independence of our non-profit organization

Your gift is tax-deductible to the extent allowable  
by U.S. tax law. Gifts of \$25 or more will receive a receipt  
for income tax purposes. All contributors to either Fund  
will be listed in the *EUSA Review*'s annual list of supporters.

Include a contribution with your membership renewal,  
or contact the EUSA Office to make a contribution.

Call 412.648.7635 or e-mail [eusa@pitt.edu](mailto:eusa@pitt.edu)