



Carrefours

EUROPEAN SCIENCE AND CULTURE

FORWARD STUDIES UNIT

Editorial

• With the discussion of the European confidence pact, presented by President Santer at the Florence summit in June, the tension between two views of employment, the one based on mobility and flexibility, the other on confidence and quality, has remained strong. The third report by the Competitiveness Advisory Group (Ciampi group), based mainly on case studies of businesses, offers lessons in how to overcome this tension in practice. The existence of a company philosophy geared to employability and involvement is a condition of success. Hence the importance of publicising the dynamism and viability of companies operating with such philosophies, by programmes for exchanging experiences and by European charters. The decentralisation of social dialogue to the level of individual companies is a tendency with implications which we must take into account in conducting this dialogue at national and European level.

• The fact that good practices exist in human resource management does not mean that they constitute a dominant tendency. The Unit's research into the welfare state and its adaptation in the context of a European model of society is, on the contrary, a source of pessimism, and this at a time when budgetary constraints are leading all over Europe to very uneven reforms without a common plan of action. The thoughts on corporate governance reflect a realisation of the excesses that the exclusivity of shareholder value entails. But the alternatives remain theoretical or controversial: the «Rhine model» hardly seems operational any more. In the meantime, the labour force is increasingly being restructured by means of external flexibility.

• The two social issues of unemployment and the poverty of marginalised groups appears much more serious now than in 1992, when the Union was already in recession. They constitute the main direct and indirect threat to the European project. The Union is sharply criticised for not generating growth, yet much is expected of it because it is thought to possess a capacity which the Member States no longer seem to have: to get economic and social policies onto the path towards significant structural reform. The most crucial of these reforms concern labour legislation, anything affecting the organisation of work and working hours and the reform of pension schemes. The IGC's debates on «employment» or «social affairs» are the reflection of this expectation. It is clear that legal obligations will not do anything for employment, but it is essential to show a social sensitiveness at the European level. Hence the strategic importance of other key areas where the Union really can implement policies with a strong structural impact affecting social cohesion, such as in the field of taxation (Monti Group) and in the case of universal service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>OUR SYMPOSIA:</u>	• Environmental Governance	page 2
	• Reducing Environmental Risks in Democratic Societies	page 4
<u>OUR STUDIES:</u>	• New Principles and Instruments for Urban Renewal in Europe	page 7
	• Comparison of East Asia Policies of the USA and the EU	page 11
<u>MISCELLANEOUS:</u>	• To Be Published Soon	page 12
	• Personalia	page 12

Our symposium

ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE,
Odense, 9-10 October 1996

Historic Hollufgård Park in the heart of the Danish island of Fyn was the venue for a gathering of twenty-four lawyers, philosophers, political scientists, economists, NGO activists and political leaders brought together by Ritt Bjerregaard.

The theme of the seminar was both austere and passionate: if we are to take sustainable development seriously, will we not have to reform the very methods of government or, in other words, in the «greening» politics are we not embarking upon a reform of democracy?

A PAINSTAKING DIAGNOSIS

Whenever people from so many different language communities and from so many different European regions - from Fyn of course, but also Catalonia, Frankfurt, Greece, Norway, Austria, Berlin, Flanders and at least two varieties of French culture - get together around one table, it is perfectly natural to spend some time agreeing on the nature of the problem in hand or gauging our differences. Do we or do we not agree with Christoph Bail's introductory paper according to which the achievement of the objectives of environment policy in Europe depends less on how firm States are in their judgement and action, and depends more on the way in which the various players in the field - be they businesses or ordinary individuals - can be involved in the process of framing and enforcing laws?

It took us a whole day to hear and understand each other's views on this question.

The first difficulty sprang from the vocabulary invented by political scientists and philosophers of law to denote the transformations affecting the «art of governance» in Europe today. The term «proceduralisation» was coined to describe the growing tendency to extend prior consultation to the formulation of environmental standards, and the development of framework legislation which leaves maximum autonomy for decentralised forms of organisation and participation. As one of the participants at the seminar, the leader writer of the Irish Times Frank MacDonald judiciously remarked, the term itself is a challenge to the transparent, pedagogical approach it purports to describe. In Denmark, a country which is far ahead in the institutional organisation of participatory democracy, people are wary of using the word «proceduralisation»; NGOs prefer the term «constructive dialogue». «New governance» is another possibility.

Objections of more substance, raised primarily by environmental activists, were that there was no need to change the forms of government. Louise Gale of Greenpeace wondered whether it was not more urgent to harden the determination of the political executive to enact and enforce high standards in spite of opposition from industrial lobbyists, who were still extremely powerful and well qualified to turn over-accommodating consultation procedures to their advantage. Ove Pedersen, a political scientist, suggested that the main reason for the ineffectiveness of environmental regulations was perhaps the very complexity of the armoury of legislation, an armoury which was overstocked because the executive was unable to make choices. The situation could not be improved, and indeed might be aggravated, by attaching an extra procedural apparatus.

THE MEASURE OF THE PROBLEM

These objections had already set us thinking about the limits to «proceduralisation». However, we also heard other views from participants who were perhaps worried less about the protection of the environment than by what they saw as a fundamental difficulty for European democrats to gain acceptance for long-term objectives regarding «common goods». The stagnation of environmental policies was a sign of a malaise in democracy itself - indeed some observers had no hesitation in calling it a crisis: a crisis of authority, in particular scientific authority; a crisis of rationality, which was no longer an absolute value; a crisis of citizenship, which had supposedly been enhanced but which was in fact being diminished in the media and in the exercise of power. A combination of all these factors was provoking a silent revolution being played out most visibly at local level. As Tom Koenigs remarked, «it is thinking locally which enables us to act globally»: if the aim of the silent revolution is to allow each one of us to give a meaning to our actions, then it is at local level that we can at last develop a collective meaning and thereby act more effectively at global level.

Between these two opposing diagnoses, there finally emerged concept which was acceptable to most of us. «Yes, there is a fundamental problem preventing our democratic societies from truly getting to grips with long-term environmental issues. In view of this difficulty we should examine ways of ensuring that the various players involved, including ordinary citizens, can be implicated in the objectives and not just in the contents of environmental rules».

However, we cannot develop methods of government allowing more collective action, greater decentralisation and wider participation without institutional safeguards, without - so to speak - «institutionalising»

the very phenomenon of proceduralisation. Having thus put into perspective the scope of new methods of government, participants were then able to discuss freely for the rest of the seminar, which was devoted to the lessons to be learned for European policies.

NEITHER REVOLUTION NOR PLACEBO

First of all, proceduralisation is not a revolution. There will be no before and after. It is rather a new way for governments in particular to look at existing forms of consultation and participation which are often considered of secondary importance. From this new perspective, it is important that the procedures used should be in proportion to the size and to the nature of the problems we face. A good example is the use of scientifically based decision support tools to assist public decision-making on the environment. We learned from Sylvie Faucheu that the basic economic hypotheses underlying models which are used for certain methods of cost-benefit analysis, are unsuitable for obtaining multiple solutions. They are only able to recommend a single solution in cases where a variety of intermediate policies and objectives need to be laid down because so many different interests are involved. This does not mean that traditional cost-benefit analysis methods are automatically obsolete. However, it is generally felt that scientists, and in particular economists, are being asked to get down off their pedestals and pay more heed to the real situation experienced on the ground.

This example regarding the role of scientific evaluation led us to a broader observation. Procedural innovations, whether they occur upstream or downstream from public decision-making (legislation, approval or launch of programmes), should not be placed side by side with the democratic process, but integrated into it in a visible and foreseeable fashion, hence the importance of, for example, standardised methods of prior

consultation and institutional guarantees as to the fairness of the consultation process. Thus, the Commission is asked to help weaker players gain recognition by according them a special status, and to be more systematic in its consultation methods, for which it uses a variety of different-coloured «papers».

If we improve our consultation methods and leave wider scope for decentralised measures in pursuit of common objectives, this does not mean that the political authorities must take a back seat. On the contrary, an increase in decentralisation and feedback will require a greater strategic capacity and responsibility on the part of central government. The Danish experience recounted by Lohne Johnsen is valuable here. It shows that NGOs are now so involved at all stages of collective action that there is a risk of government responsibility being diluted. As a result the onus is increasingly on Europe to indicate a clear way forward and to choose priorities which lend consistency to action by national, regional and municipal authorities. We know that in the environmental field the choice of priorities is not easy.

POLITICS IS STILL AN ART

This question of choosing priorities appears even more urgent when we consider how much time is taken up by the open consultation and evaluation process. For these procedures to be genuine, the number of issues dealt with by legislation must be limited. In the case of the European Union, this raises the thorny question of the hierarchy of norms: how can we best draw a distinction between public acts which require real parliamentary debate and those which come under the direct responsibility of the executive? Finally, the rigours of proceduralisation will be felt not only by political decision-makers. Those who now have the ear of Environment Ministers will also have to pay a price, as we are talking here about

the real break-up of a monopoly, both for scientists and for the representatives of environmental pressure groups. Both will have to work together with other disciplines and take on board the environmental viewpoints of non-environmental partners.

Odense has helped extend the democratic «toolkit» available in Europe by showing the gain in efficiency that can be achieved by acting on the basis of constructive dialogue and «active subsidiarity», a concept dear to Pierre Calame, who is not content to just separate spheres of responsibility, but wants to encourage co-operation between different tiers of authority.

In passing, this move towards a new way of conducting environment policy may, at first sight, make the task of political leaders, Ministers and Commissioners well-nigh impossible. How can we invest in the long term, encouraging a more open dialogue with science and staking more on public education, and at the same time take practical, day-to-day decisions to assuage voters' fears? Neither Ritt Bjerregaard nor Joan Ruddock appeared to be disheartened by the prospect, quite the opposite.

Jérôme VIGNON —■

REDUCING ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS IN DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES¹

As fundamentally and rationally justified as it might appear to scientists, green movements and enlightened public opinion, the concept of sustainable development remains a top-down concept. This is not without creating difficulties in our societies both characterised by increased self-assertiveness by individuals and by diminishing capacity of science to provide public opinion and governments with clear-cut answers

when confronted with risks and uncertainties. This new situation might explain why, at least in respect to environmental issues, policy makers are less faced with choices between different options as to what to do, and are faced more with choices as to how to present an option and to follow it through.

FROM GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNANCE

The traditional and still dominant political culture in European countries relies largely on a strictly defined separation of powers between legislative, executive and judiciary institutions. In that framework, the task of governments becomes very clear: once democratically established, the legislative has the responsibility of formulating laws and then the executive implements them and the judiciary ensures their consistent application.

The example of environment shows us that this clear division might be less effective in our time :

- Firstly, the approval by Parliament might not be enough to ensure full legitimacy. In fact, Parliaments, before approving an environmental legislation, increasingly rely on the expertise of a number of non-elected bodies, some of them very closely linked to the governments, and others being part of civil society.

- Secondly, the complexity of environmental issues tends to reduce our ability to define any «right» decision or law or regulation on an a priori basis. That means that participation, collective learning processes, assessment procedures, become part of the legislative process.

These evolutions have led to the concept of «governance». It might be defined as: *«the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process*

through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and a co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest»².

The move from government to «governance» is relevant beyond the field of environment policy, but environmental problems may make the issue more visible than in any other field. Firstly, because they confront us with both considerable uncertainties and considerable risks. In fact, we live in a «risk society». Secondly, to deal with these challenges, it is insufficient to create new laws. We need to change our production and consumption patterns, our ways of thinking and behaving, our models of society. Thirdly, in the face of global competition and powerful special interest groups, the democratic political process seems paralysed. On the other hand, as «Brent Spar» may have demonstrated more recently, the new forms of governance involving informed and motivated citizens directly at all levels of policy making, may also provide new opportunities for the evolution of environmental policy in the face of increased complexities, uncertainties and risks.

NEW POLICY APPROACH FOR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

The new approach to policy formulation and implementation the face of increased complexities, uncertainties and risks is «proceduralisation».

Environmental policy may be the prime example or test case the new thinking on procedural governance. Its most demanding yardsticks, the «precautionary principle» and the principle of environmental «integration» seem to plead for an approach in which substantive decisions, laws or regulations

are no longer in the centre of attention, but in which the decision-making process is shaped in a way to allow for permanent updating and taking into account of feed-back and new developments. The new paradigm can be called «self-organising» or «experimenting» society where the learning process takes a central place in decision-making. The more recent eco-instruments (eco-auditing, eco-labelling, eco-reporting) are an articulation of this new orientation; Voluntary agreements, green accounting, cost internalisation and liability schemes point in the same direction.


However, «proceduralisation» also has its limits and problems and, in any event, is not uncontested. It tends to obscure notions of substantive justice and (inter-generational) equity. It also contributes to the tendency towards «de-responsibilisation» in an age of ever increasing individualism. Proceduralisation often provides only appearances of progress rather than real solutions. It may thus reinforce the perceived crisis of democracy.

The new «procedural approach» can therefore hardly stand on its own, but requires clear objectives/targets, frameworks and normative principles. It raises, however, a number of fundamental questions:

How is it possible to combine this new approach to government, with the need for objective targets and principles?

Which processes are appropriate for involving the civil society, both in the process of preparation of laws and of implementation? How can political decision makers take decisions without having to rely on clear-cut scientific support?

EUROPEAN DIMENSION

conomic and social governance within a globalised economy, and in particular

environmental governance, requires interactive and mutually supportive processes of policy formulation and implementation at all levels of government: local, national, regional and global. Such governance, moreover, increasingly needs to involve civil society and interest groups or stakeholders to be effective.

The European «communitarian» approach in many ways has its own particularities: it is institutionally driven by a consensus-building logic (through the combination 'Commission initiative, rotating Presidency, majority voting, co-decision'); it provides the political link between the citizen-centred national process and the state-centred international process, its most original and astonishing feature - the quasi-monopolistic initiating function of the European Commission composed of nominated, rather than democratically elected politicians - is conceived to institutionalise an innovation and forward planning capacity beyond the short-term political and mediatic constraints under which national governments operate.

This European specificity, if properly used, should provide considerable added value in environmental governance within a globalised economy. However, this requires a pro-active (rather than defensive) interpretation of the principle of subsidiarity in the sense of enabling the level of government closest to the citizen to implement its public policy objectives effectively.

The European dimension can thus support a «bottom-up» approach to government because it requires - in environmental matters most clearly - co-operation, co-ordination, common frameworks and even a degree of harmonisation of norms and standards to achieve real results.

Rigid delimitations of powers and competencies, legitimate as they may appear in the effort to prevent excessive centralisation,

often only result in immobility at all levels. Environmental policy in an age of ever increasing technological risks can hardly tolerate a «bottom-down» approach (i.e. inactivity) as a result of institutional stalemates.

- ¹ Introductory paper for the Odense Symposium
- ² Report of the Commission on Global Governance: «Our global neighbourhood» p.2, Oxford University Press, 1995

Christoph. BAIL —■



Ritt Bjerregaard and the participants of the Odense Carrefour in front of the XIV-century Castle of the Kings of Denmark in Hollufgård.

Our Studies

THE EMERGING NEW PRINCIPLES AND INSTRUMENTS FOR URBAN RENEWAL IN EUROPE

To develop the potential of job creation implied by the satisfaction of the new needs of their inhabitants, European cities have little room for manoeuvre, since they can claim neither to change the organisation

of the existing professional sectors, nor to escape from the financial and legal rules, adopted at regional, national or European level, and which apply to private companies and to the public sector.

However, the experience acquired over the last 10 years by the European Union, in particular thanks to the programmes «Poverty II and III», «urban pilot Projects», «RECITE» and

to the operations financed within the framework of the Structural Funds (Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4) provide a wealth of information on the conditions which enable cities to offer new job opportunities to the largest possible number of their inhabitants, at the same time as improving their living and working conditions (please refer to the Commission paper SEC 95/564 «Local development and employment initiatives, a survey in Europe»).

The analysis of some successful experiments gives a good idea of the extent of innovations at work; it demonstrates the existence of differentiated strategies that illustrate new principles for urban management and the use of new instruments.

It would be optimistic to think that today these new principles are unanimously recognised and that the investment decisions are no longer guided by the effects of imitation. The inertia of traditional practices, the lack of training and technical competence still represent major obstacles to their general application.

Nowadays, it seems that urban management is developing in a context which is characterised by the constraints of efficiency, but also by a desire to be less wasteful with financial, natural and human resources. It also fits with a logic of diversity and realism. The watchword is to do better with less.

URBAN AND TERRITORIAL PLANNING

With regard to town planning, the limits of functionalism are now acknowledged. Modernism, the design «in abstracto» of new cities, the gigantic building sites (total destruction of a district and its rebuilding) are gradually replaced by the concept of urban «mixture». It seems desirable to encourage dwellings, shops, industry and leisure activities to coexist in a single area. This «mixture» is also sought through architectural forms and, if possible, the social make-up of residential areas. This is the price that the city has to pay for reclaiming one of its first vocations, that is the place of where individuals

and communities meet, and for regaining its innovative capacity.

The urban planners' second leitmotiv is linked to the method by which the city is rebuilt, which is becoming more economic in its use of space. The task of the urban planner is very close to that of the surgeon, as he is asked to distinguish between the healthy «urban fabrics», to be preserved, and those that must be destroyed, so that the existing urban balance is disturbed as little as possible.

In the light of recent economic and demographic changes (since 1985), to make a contrast between town and country is no longer realistic; the old idea of a town like an island independent of its surrounding territory has to be dropped. In the old days, this idea might have worked for some towns, despite having highly debatable consequences for the surrounding and the rural zones. Nowadays, it is downright counterproductive and dangerous because it leads straight on to damaging territorial imbalances, the asphyxiation of the built-up zones, and to a waste of natural resources (diseconomies of scale). It is finding the symbiosis between a town and its surroundings which determines the economic and social prospects for the locals.

THE PROJECT

Drawing up a project for a city requires a minimum of method: firstly, the specific identity of the city has to be defined, according to its history, its geography, but also the strengths and weaknesses of its residents and its companies. The development of endogenous potential is the guiding concept in this respect. This project has also to take into account the external potential and the economic or legal context at the regional and national level. It has to make it possible to manage the city as a «whole», made up of interdependent geographical entities (districts) or economic entities (companies and administrations), and not as an aggregation of isolated entities each ploughing own furrow.

Lastly, the project allows one to look into the future. If one is to overcome the tensions resulting from the slowness of the implementation of various decisions on the one hand, and the speed of the economic developments and the residents' impatience on the other hand, a project is the only answer; only it will provide a shared time horizon. It makes it easy to settle a common commitment of operators who otherwise would immediately be tempted to go their own way. Concretely, the process of social insertion is a long one, beginning with the establishment of an identity and the setting up of a collective organisation, before coming onto the matter of providing jobs.

The choice of a relevant territory for action is particularly important. Administrative areas are in general of no aid in this exercise. If the relevant area generally corresponds to political and economic logic for the overall urban project (the basis for an election or the organisation of the services for companies, or opportunity to build an external and coherent image), the scale can vary according to the issues; it may be either the neighbourhood, the town or the conurbation.

CO-OPERATION

The third major principle seems to be that of co-operation, which may create synergy effects. International competition between cities too often leads to a zero-sum game, and even negative repercussions when one takes into account the polar migration of the human and financial resources that it induces, often to the detriment of the quality of the inhabitants' life.

This co-operation is expressed, in its external aspect, by participation in international information and co-operation networks, which make it possible to avoid isolation, to check out new methods, to learn from others and to progress. Membership of trans-regional and transnational project networks can greatly facilitate access to information and thus enable better choices with regard

to strategy or investment. The European Union has thus been covered for a number of years by an increasingly dense web of informal relations between cities, links which are superimposing themselves on the more traditional ties established between universities and companies.

Co-operation is also a source of inspiration for local life. Overcoming legal, professional or financial obstacles calls for a broad local partnership. This partnership has to involve several types of actors: the locals, young people, women, employees, education and research organisations, public authorities, NGOs and the business world.

MANAGEMENT INSTRUMENTS

European cities today are not at all making the same use of the instruments which they adopted in the 19th century and the immediate post-war period. While some proven methods are already widely used, they remain unknown in certain countries. Other methods are still in their experimental phase or being improved. They are all directed at concerns for efficiency and an ability to adapt to the economic climate of the day. Although certain instruments are inspired by techniques used in American cities; they differ from them in that in Europe, urban decision-makers are keen to preserve a certain sense of social cohesion. The political will to make the common interest prevail over the narrow guidance of market forces is alive and well in Europe.

- Legal instruments: first and foremost there are the procedures which support the decision-making with regard to big investments and to facilitate urban development projects and which, on occasion, require that individual property rights be bypassed over. This involves for example, public purchase orders and the procedures for public enquiries and impact analyses. Medium term or long term contracts between the private and public sectors ensure that things are done within a fixed time span and stable framework, and that the required financial or

regulatory means are provided. Such procedures are often used between several public authorities of different levels and are designed to be a complement to decentralisation. They encourage greater autonomy of the actors and facilitate an inter-sectoral approach. Delegated management, practised in particular in the form of public service concessions has the advantage of providing an intermediate formula between pure and simple privatisation and direct public control. The fields of action where this formula can be applied are particularly numerous; they testify to the flexibility of this system which appears to be a good catalyst to the development of both private and public initiative.

- **Financial instruments:** in the financial field, private-public partnerships open interesting prospects for the cities subject to serious financial constraints. It makes it possible on the one hand to maximise urban services without necessarily imposing too high a tax burden. On the other hand, it allows companies to get directly involved in the social development of the city. Local embellishments to taxation can be particularly appropriate for developing certain sectors, which can gather their own resources from certain categories of users (e.g. touristic visitors' taxes, waste disposal taxes and revenues from public transport services).

- **Public management methods:** the success of the urban regeneration often depends on the intervention of local co-ordinators, or project managers, mediators within the resident population and the other people (shopkeepers, employees, tourists etc.). These functions are handled by generalists who have mastered certain techniques of project management. Whether they come from the local administrative staff or external companies, these people often share common characteristics, such as an aptitude for developing partnerships between many sectors or competences in various disciplines, such as economics, commercial management, sociology or architecture. These specific competences remain difficult to recognise and codify, but their rapid development testifies to the emergence of veritable «city skills».

- **Information:** the cities confronted with important investment decisions, are often dependent on the political preferences of the centre, and have to negotiate with major and relatively inflexible industrial groups. Better access to technical information, to decision-making and management advice appears increasingly essential. The new technologies of today are apt at responding to these needs and make it possible to overcome the handicap of remoteness. As these technologies may now be provided at a relatively low cost, new opportunities are open to medium-sized cities. Finally, the information may be a helpful instrument to improve local democracy. Beyond the technological hype, information technologies may make it easier to consult various categories of local residents. They also help to create new links between residents and new points of attraction.

– WHAT ROLE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION ?

Despite the importance given to fighting unemployment, and to the recognition of the contribution of local initiatives to job creation, Community involvement is still held back in the name of subsidiarity. Although there is no question of the European Union galloping to the rescue of cities in the throes of national government relations, it does nevertheless have a specific role to play:

- as a guide for medium-term territorial development. European involvement is particularly relevant here as it is involved in developing a concept of land use planning which will promote balance in urban areas and good relations between cities and their surroundings.

- as a scout and catalyst, to encourage cities to draw up development strategies; this support for innovation could go even further, with a view to lending credibility to «disturbing» infra-urban ideas;

- as an arena for discussion of local and national experiences - a neutral ground for debate and comparing notes.

The EU could thus provide indirect methodological support to cities, helping them to understand new ways of doing things, and

could distribute the benefits to other cities which are not members of Community networks.

Marjorie JOUEN —■

COMPARISON OF EAST ASIA POLICIES OF THE USA AND THE EU

This study is undertaken in co-operation with the Brookings Institution which allows direct contacts with policy-advisors and policy-makers in Washington DC and also easy access to research materials at renowned universities, institutes, libraries in the United States.

The subject is currently of particular interest for both partners given the recent rapid emergence of the Asian economies on the global scene and the new initiatives to revitalise the transatlantic relationship. The research is an attempt to compare the very comprehensive policies of the two main partners of global scale vis-à-vis the third player in the «Triad». It thus covers a wide diversity in the ways of policy-making in the USA and in the EU, as well as in the ways of these policies towards East Asia are implemented, which itself is a highly heterogeneous set of countries and economies in terms of geography, state of development and of their own policies towards the West. Furthermore, the policies of each of these two partners, on issues ranging from human rights to trade, often seem to be hardly consistent or complementary. Playing to different interests and lobbies, they appear at times even contradictory in themselves in order to pursue particular goals at particular points in time and space.

This apparent incoherence in the policies may lead to some generalisations, for instance concerning the overall consistency of both partners' foreign policies. Some people might argue that there is a greater continuity in the long-term objectives as well as in the

implementation of the policy of one partner, while more pragmatism and flexibility is displayed by the other on the other side of the Atlantic.

To substantiate these and other general statements, one has to first analyse what are the objectives of both partners, and whether and how they implement them in practice. In this analysis, one can expect often to find common aims, as well as frequent divergences which should be questioned and further examined.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The objectives of European East Asia policies are put in a nutshell by the keywords of the recent communications and relevant declarations of the Commission: The overriding themes in most of these documents seem to be co-operation and equal partnership as the recurring terms of significance. Of course, in the background of such slogans vis-à-vis East Asia are predominantly economic interests which are brought in the open by themes such as «market access», «business opportunities» etc. However, the co-operative intentions of the EU go clearly beyond the strictly economic fields into areas of Science and Technology, environment and even into political dialogues which take up multilateral issues such as disarmament and non-proliferation with East Asian countries.

Turning to the objectives of US policy, the analysis is even more difficult. Not only because of an apparent lack of continuity, but also in view of the less dogmatic and more case-oriented approach of the Americans in general. Thus US objectives are less clearly defined in official documents, but have to be sifted out from statements by policy-makers and sometimes even retrospectively, after execution. In terms of methods and means of implementation, certain differences between the American «superpower» and the European «soft power» are rather obvious, but need clarification in particular in connection with reactions from within Asia itself.

Following an in-depth evaluation of the success or failure of these policies in the various sectors, tentative conclusions should

be drawn for future policy-formulation vis-à-vis East Asia.

Wolfgang PAPE — ■

M i s c e l l a n e o u s

TO BE PUBLISHED SOON

The first issue of the «Reports of the Forward Studies Unit» of the European Commission will deal with «*Future of the North-South relations, promoting sustainable economic and social development*». It will be on sale through the Office for Publications (OPOCE).

This will be the beginning of a series destined to inform the general public of research work done by, or at the initiative of the Forward Studies Unit.

Editor for the reports: Agnès Hubert

PERSONALIA

Female staff quota in the Forward Studies Unit on the rise: *Agne Pantelouri* (external relations, security), *Agnès Hubert* (gender, information and publications), *Isabel Alonso Luzuriaga* (social cohesion), *Anna Michalski* (Central and Eastern Europe, integration process) and *Ann Grossi* (library, documentation), have recently joined this Unit.

Departures: *Christoph Bail* (now in DG XI as Head of Unit for «global aspects of environ-

mental policy»), *Paul Löser* (joined the European Investment Bank in Luxembourg where he is in charge of information policy) and *Gianni Contestabile* (documentalist at the Observatory for Drugs and Addictions in Lisbon, Portugal).

Wolfgang Pape has left for the USA where he will spend a semester as guest scholar at Brookings Institution in Washington (cf. his article on page 11)

Not to forget those who stay on: *Jérôme Vignon* (Acting Director General), *William Floyd* (environment, agriculture, energy), *Guy Wilmes* (administration, organisation), *Claudine Buchet de Neuilly* (archives), *Luc Wagner* (computer support), *Alexis Jacquemain* (welfare policies, competitiveness), *Thomas Jansen* (relations with universities and research institutes, dialogue with religions and humanism), *Notis Lebessis* (governance, South-West Europe), *Gilles Bertrand* (scenarios Europe 2010), *Marjorie Jouen* (local employment initiatives), *Marc Luyckx* (cultural change and new economic theories), *Lucio Pench* (macro-economics, globalisation and competitiveness) and *Michael Rogers* (Science and Technology).

Director of publication: Jérôme VIGNON

Chief editor: Thomas JANSEN

Editorial committee: Agnès HUBERT
Anne GROSSI, Anita BRAUN

Design and layout: Graphic Art Pattern ■ Liège

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the Commission.

In the near future you will be able to retrieve the contents of literature associated with the European Carrefours on Science and Culture from the server Europa: (<http://www.cec.lu>)

Cette publication existe également en français.

© Forward Studies Unit - European Commission 1996