



**EUROPEAN UNION
STUDIES ASSOCIATION**
Vol. 17, No.2 ISSN 1535-7031
Spring 2004 www.eustudies.org

**EUSA
REVIEW**

EUSA Review Forum

Transatlantic Relations: A Year Later

AFTER THE BOMBINGS IN MADRID ON March 11, 2004, presented in the press as “Europe’s September 11th,” U.S. and EU leaders will intensify cooperation in the area of Justice and Home Affairs. Yet, in other policy sectors, the EU and the U.S. publicly voice their differences. The declarations of the next head of government, the Socialist José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, regarding Spanish troops in Iraq suggest that the “pro-Bush” coalition in the EU is about to change. A year after the beginning of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq and the intra-EU and transatlantic tensions that resulted from the build-up to the war, it is time to assess the state of EU-U.S. relations. Two of the contributions to this Forum on transatlantic relations are adapted from talks delivered by board members John Keeler and Sophie Meunier at the workshop that EUSA and Sciences Po organized in Paris in November 2003. They respectively focus on defense and trade issues. They make us understand that the lines of cleavage are not the ones that receive the most media and popular attention and that we should rethink the way we rank the intensity of disputes and explain them. We conclude with an area where cooperation is both new and successful: border controls.

—*Virginie Guiraudon, EUSA Forum Editor*

Transatlantic Trade Issues Sophie Meunier

IN THE GOOD OLD DAYS of pre-Iraq transatlantic union, it was trade disputes between the European Union and the United States over issues such as beef and bananas which made headlines. Fast-forward a few years later: Most of these disputes still exist, and new ones have emerged, but they may now seem minute in the broader framework of bilateral discord. Indeed, transatlantic commercial relations are revealing two regions deeply intertwined. The EU and the U.S., the world’s largest players in global trade, are each other’s main trading partners, accounting for around one fifth of each other’s bilateral trade (about euros 1 billion a day). These extremely significant trade flows are supplemented by an even bigger investment relationship, as each region holds major stakes in the other’s market. The EU is the host for 53% (726 billion) of all U.S. direct investment abroad

and contributes 72% (\$947 billion) of all foreign direct investment in the U.S.. As a result, about one third of transatlantic trade is conducted between U.S. or European parent firms and their subsidiaries.¹ Yet new challenges are now facing the transatlantic trade relationship. From bilateral disputes with increasingly higher stakes, to the collapse of the Cancun meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the enlargement of the European Union, and the EU institutional reform, let alone a divergence of visions on how the international system should be managed and the negative pull of domestic politics, the EU and the U.S. have many problematic issues with which to deal simultaneously.

Bilateral EU-U.S. Trade Disputes

Ask any American or European official about the state of the Transatlantic trade relationship, and they will always start with a reassuring claim that 98% of the trade that occur between them is absolutely fine. As Pascal Lamy, the EU Trade commissioner, puts it: “If you look from the moon, things don’t look so bad.”² And it is true that even in a tensed geopolitical environment, for European and American traders and investors, it is business as usual. During the first half of 2003, in spite of the Transatlantic rift over Iraq, U.S. corporations invested \$40 billion into Europe, a 15% increase from 2002, and European companies invested \$36 billion into the U.S. Moreover, when frictions arise, they can now be mediated and solved within the framework of the World Trade Organization dispute settlement procedure. Indeed, of the fifty-four completed WTO cases that went to dispute settlement panels from 1995 to 2001, sixteen were EU-U.S. disputes. Several of the famous bilateral disputes have been settled recently—such as bananas, beef hormones, and even steel. Other ongoing EU-U.S. disputes are far from being resolved, however, especially when they result not from sheer protectionism but from regulatory differences.

Tax breaks: In 2000 the EU asked the WTO to adjudicate on the so-called Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC) dispute—an American law taxing exports more favorably than production abroad. In subsequent rulings, the WTO confirmed that the FSC indeed constituted an illegal export subsidy and authorized the EU to impose \$4 billion in retaliatory sanctions if the U.S. law was not brought in compliance with WTO obligations. In March 2004, the Europeans decided to phase in the retaliatory measures, which will hit a wide range of goods, including textiles, jewelry and toys, until Congress repeals the trade-distorting regulations.

(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) 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.

© 2004 European Union Studies Association

The European Union Studies Association®, Information and Ideas on the European Union®, State of the European Union®, and www.eustudies.org® are all registered trademarks of the European Union Studies Association, Inc.

Managing Editor

Joseph A. Figliuolo

Forum and Features Editor

Virginie Guiraudon (Université de Lille II)

Book Reviews Editor

R. Daniel Kelemen (University of Oxford)

Editorial Assistant

Shannon Speakman

2003-2005 EUSA Executive Committee

GEORGE ROSS, Chair (Brandeis University)

JOHN T. S. KEELER*, Vice-Chair
(University of Washington)

KAREN ALTER, Secretary
(Northwestern University)

JEFFREY ANDERSON, Treasurer
(Georgetown University)

GRAINNE DE BURCA*
(European University Institute)

VIRGINIE GUIRAUDON* (Université de Lille II)

SOPHIE MEUNIER* (Princeton University)
(* Term runs 2003-2007)

ALBERTA SBRAGIA (University of Pittsburgh)
Ex Officio

Immediate Past Chair (2001-2003)

MARTIN A. SCHAIN (New York University)

European Union Studies Association®

415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA
Web www.eustudies.org®
E-mail eusa@pitt.edu
Facsimile 412.648.1168
Telephone 412.648.7635

From the Chair

George Ross

SPRING HAS COME TO THE EU replete with *sturm und drang*. The horrible Madrid bombings prodded new reflections on the Union's readiness to deal with terrorism and also produced a new Spanish government that may open prospects for a constitutional deal before the end of the Irish Presidency. The Union, prompted by the Commission and Mario Monti, has issued a monumental anti-trust ruling against Microsoft that, if upheld on appeal, is certain to stir up new transatlantic controversy. Another kind of Mayday will enlarge the Union to 25, with all the accompanying uncertainty. June brings new elections to the European Parliament, after which the June European Council will name a new Commission President, with a new 25 member Commission not far behind. Beneath the surface we also hear rumblings of a coming, conflictual, and all-important new budgetary package. We have a lot to keep track of!

We are pleased to announce the Program Committee and Call for Proposals (details in this issue on p.8) for our Ninth Biennial International Conference to be held March 31-April 2, 2005, in Austin, Texas. The 2005 Program Committee Chair is Mark Pollack, Professor of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, a rising star in EU studies whose efforts to advance our collective work have already been remarkable. Mark will lead a strong and diverse Program Committee whose membership is listed in the Call and on our Web site. A relatively early conference means that the deadline for proposals will be Friday October 15, 2004. We encourage proposals from all disciplines, graduate students and non-traditional scholars, all our EUSA Interest Sections, National Resource Centers and EU Centers, and practitioners in government, law, business, and elsewhere. Thanks to generous gifts from EUSA members, we will again offer modest conference travel grants to encourage student participation. Please watch our Web site and e-mail List Serve for further details.

Each conference year EUSA offers prizes for excellence in the field (established by the 1997-1999 Executive Committee and first awarded in 1999). In 2005 we will recognize the best dissertation in EU studies at a U.S. institution, the best paper presented at our 2003 Conference in Nashville, and an award for lifetime contribution to EU studies. The 2003-05 Executive Committee is also pleased to announce the launch of the EUSA Book Prize, to be awarded at each biennial EUSA conference. Information about the nomination process for these prizes is included in this issue on p. 21 and is posted on our Web site. We take pride in honoring those who have made exemplary contributions to knowledge and inquiry about the European integration process. We also recognize the (*continued on p. 22*)

(continued from p. 1)

Anti-Dumping: In 2000 the WTO condemned the U.S. 1916 Anti-Dumping Act for allowing sanctions against dumping not permitted under WTO agreements and gave the U.S. one year to repeal the Act. Since the matter was originally brought to the WTO in 1998, the U.S. brought four new complaints against EU companies on anti-dumping grounds. In February 2004, given the non-compliance of the U.S., the WTO allowed the EU to retaliate by implementing a mirror regulation that would be applicable to American products.

Genetically modified organisms: Since 1998, the EU has observed a moratorium on the approval of GMO products, and some member states banned the import and cultivation of some crops that had been approved prior to that date. The EU made this decision in response to popular concern about the long-term impact of GMOs on human health and the environment, although there was little scientific evidence to support these concerns, but no evidence either that GMOs are harmless. In May 2003, the Bush administration decided to finally file the suit against the EU at the WTO.

The Doha Round

Transatlantic trade relations are also being challenged by the current state of the WTO multilateral negotiating process. The “Doha development agenda”, as the current round of trade talks is formally called, is about negotiating away trade barriers with the goal of improving general economic welfare, in particular for the developing countries. Agriculture is the key variable in this round, with developed countries being asked to reduce (if not eliminate) their trade-distorting subsidies for farmers and the tariffs, quotas, and non-tariff barriers that they use to protect their domestic agriculture. Among the other central issues are the so-called “Singapore issues” pushed by the EU—investment, competition policy, government procurement, and trade facilitation. By August 2003, the EU and the U.S. had reached a common proposal on reform of the protection of their agriculture. This was not enough, however. The collapse of the WTO Cancun meeting in September 2003 was due mainly to differences over agricultural reform, especially over the issue of cotton, between the U.S., the EU and a group of developing countries led by Brazil and India (called the G-22). The abrupt end of the meeting left great uncertainty concerning how to proceed with talks on agriculture, industrial goods, and the Singapore issues, especially during an electoral year in the U.S.

EU Enlargement

The EU will enlarge to ten new countries in May 2004. They will increase the size of the single market, augment the geographical size of the EU by 34%, and boost the total population by 105 million to a total of \$450 million. Structurally, enlargement will make the EU stronger in relation to its trade negotiating partners, because a larger single market is both more attractive to outside economic players and the threat of being cut out more costly. By joining the EU, however, the new entrants are bringing in a wealth of different histories and cultures, which also means different interests and sensibilities. These will have to be included and amalgamated in the definition of a common European position on trade. Diversity could incapacitate the EU’s

ability to make decisions and bog down multilateral trade liberalization. It could also lead to common positions which are invariably the lowest common denominator and, therefore, to a protectionist bias of the EU in international trade negotiations. The EU enlargement also poses legal issues for the Transatlantic trade relationship. For instance, the U.S. and the new entrants have bilateral agreements on investment protection that do include provisions contrary to Community law (for instance with respect to investments in the audiovisual sector). Another problem results from the extension of the customs union to ten currently autonomous territories. In most cases, third countries will benefit from a drop in custom duties. In some highly visible cases, however, such as banana imports, the current custom duties of the new entrants are lower than those of the EU—which presumably will lead to trade frictions, in particular with the United States.

The EU Constitution

During the European Convention, many voices demanded a greater role for the European Parliament in trade policy, since trade now covers politically sensitive issues that used to be the exclusive domain of domestic regulation, such as food safety and culture. In response, the Convention introduced many important institutional changes with respect to trade policy. First, the Constitution project opens up great avenues for parliamentary control. Trade-related legislation, such as antidumping rules, will now be adopted according to the co-decision procedure—that is, jointly by the Council and the Parliament. The second institutional problem currently faced by the EU is how to keep an efficient decision-making system in an enlarged Europe of 25 or even 30 member states. The proposed Constitution simplifies the complex policy-making apparatus in trade, clarifies that trade policy is an exclusive Community competence, and broadens the use of qualified majority voting.

Overall, the transatlantic trade relationship is based on mutual commercial interests that serve as an anchor of stability in the world. For a long time, the EU and the U.S. were almost the only players in the multilateral negotiating system—or at least they were the ones who called all the shots. The Doha round shows that they now share the leadership, but that they cannot ignore the other players. On most trade issues, the U.S. and the EU have interests closer to each other than they do with the rest of the world. The escalation of transatlantic trade disputes, and in particular the imposition of retaliation measures, should therefore be undertaken with extreme political caution. Still, the U.S. and the EU should also play according to the rules of the game, whether in steel or in agriculture. Europe and America realize that they are benefiting immensely from globalization, yet there is a need for rules to manage this globalization.

Sophie Meunier is research associate in public and international affairs at the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies.

Transatlantic Relations and European security and defense

John T. S. Keeler

IMPLAUSIBLE THOUGH IT WOULD HAVE seemed when the EU's two leading military powers—the United Kingdom and France—were bitterly divided over the issue of launching war against Iraq, it is now possible that 2003 will eventually be viewed mainly as a year of pivotal progress in the development of the common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP).³ Indeed, it has been argued that “2003 may yet go down in the annals as the year when the European Union finally came of age as an international actor.”⁴ Grudging validation of this assessment may be found in the comments of officials across the Atlantic. “There are few topics that unsettle the Pentagon more,” one journalist recently wrote in early 2004, “than the creeping advance of the separate defense and security identity of the European Union countries.”⁵

In what ways has ESDP advanced over the last year? How has progress been possible in the wake of the Franco-British confrontation over Iraq? And why has the United States grown concerned about the evolution of ESDP? The rest of this essay will briefly answer each of these key questions.

The Progress of ESDP: From Institution-Building to Action

The recent rapid succession of ESDP developments began on December 16, 2002, when the EU and NATO issued an important joint Declaration on the European Security and Defense Policy. The culmination of more than six years of negotiation, this agreement provided a framework for EU-NATO cooperation and, most importantly, provided the EU with “assured access” to NATO's planning facilities for the conduct of EU-led crisis management operations.⁶

Two weeks later, on January 1, 2003, commenced the first EU-led civilian crisis management mission, the European Union Police Mission (EUPM) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The EUPM followed on from a UN International Police Task Force and consists of approximately 500 police officers from all 15 EU member states and 18 other countries. The EUPM functions with a 3-year mandate and is supervised by an EU Special Representative who reports to the Council through the High Representative for CFSP.⁷

In March 2003 the EU initiated the first Union-led military operation, Operation Concordia in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Following on a NATO Operation, Concordia involved 400 military personnel (from 13 EU member states and 14 non-EU countries) and lasted for 8.5 months. In line with the EU-NATO agreement of 2002, this operation was the first to make use of SHAPE planning and command capabilities and was commanded by Admiral Rainer Feist (Germany), NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR).⁸

In June 2003, responding to a call from the UN Secretary General for an interim emergency multinational force to bring stability to Bunia in the Congo, the EU launched Operation Artemis, its first autonomous military operation and the first ESDP operation to be deployed outside of Europe. Artemis lasted less than three months, but it accomplished its goal—paving the way for a UN mission in Bunia—and served as a successful test

of the EU Framework Nation concept adopted in July 2002. France served as the framework nation in this case, providing the command and control capabilities for the mission as well as the majority of the 1400 personnel; a total of five EU member states and four non-member states contributed personnel to the operation.⁹

In December 2003, with the completion of Operation Concordia, the EU made the transition to a Police Mission—code-named PROXIMA—in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. This mission was slated to last for a year and to involve 200 personnel from EU member states and other countries.¹⁰

Modest though the four ESDP operations of 2003 were in some respects, together they represented a major step toward establishing the EU as a military actor on the world stage. The EU's seriousness of purpose in this realm was underscored by the publication in June 2003 of the Union's first security strategy report, *A Secure Europe in a Better World*, which portrayed the EU as a “global actor...ready to share in the responsibility for global security.”¹¹ A similar signal was sent by the completion, in November 2003, of the first ever joint EU-NATO crisis management exercise, CME/CMX 03.¹²

Despite the many advances noted above, the Achilles heel of ESDP remains the limited resources at its disposal. While progress was noted at the May 2003 Capabilities Conference, some analysts argue that EU member states have failed to meet the targets of the Helsinki Headline Goal and few expect that the EU will have the capacity to engage on high-end military operations before 2010.¹³

Intra-European and Transatlantic Tensions over ESDP

Skeptics have long argued that the fundamental political vulnerability of ESDP is the fact that, even after St. Malo, the British vision remains far more Atlanticist or less autonomous than the French vision.¹⁴ A vivid illustration of this problem was provided on April 29, 2003 when the prime ministers of France, Germany, Belgium and Luxemburg announced an agreement to enhance their collaboration on defense and jointly proposed the establishment of an EU operational planning cell (as an alternative to the NATO facility) in the Brussels suburb of Tervuren. The idea made considerable sense in technical terms and had been discussed as a possibility for several years, but as Charles Grant has argued, “given the context in which the initiative was launched—with Europe split into two hostile camps—the timing was unbelievably foolish.” Given that the four governments involved were the leaders of the anti-war camp and had also blocked NATO aid for Turkey before the war, it was inevitable that the proposal would appear to be an effort to undermine NATO. The British and American reactions were both understandably hostile.¹⁵

On this issue as on others before, however, ESDP proved more resilient than the skeptics lead one to expect. With the passage of time came a growing recognition of the need for compromise by all concerned. The Tervuren plan was abandoned by its proponents, while the Blair government accepted the notion that the EU needed to enhance its operational planning capacity. In December 2003, Britain, France and Germany jointly proposed

the establishment of an EU planning cell within SHAPE, NATO's military headquarters near Mons, as well as the addition of a small unit of planners to the EU military staff in Brussels to allow for coordination of military missions run by French, British or German national headquarters when NATO is not involved; NATO liaison officers were to be based at the EU to further mitigate Atlanticist concerns.

While resolving the Tervuren controversy, the British, French and Germans also agreed to a compromise regarding two key defense-related items in the EU's draft constitution. First, the section on "structured co-operation" would be revised so as to require unanimity for the establishment of what has been termed an "avant-garde group" for European defense. Second, the section on mutual military assistance would be revised to acknowledge that NATO will continue as the means for collective defense.

Even with these compromises, as noted at the outset, ESDP has become an increasingly contentious issue in transatlantic relations. "That is the consequence," notes Charles Grant, "of the Francophobia that is particularly strong in the Pentagon, where European defense is seen—wrongly—as a French invention."¹⁶ It remains to be seen whether this perspective would change substantially with the defeat of George W. Bush in the 2004 presidential election. However, it is clear that American officials need to recognize that public support for ESDP is broad within the EU and that it seems to have been enhanced by the confrontation over the Iraq War. A survey conducted March 10-17, 2003, demonstrated that U.S. and European citizens diverged enormously on the question of whether U.S.-European diplomatic and security ties should remain close: 62% of U.S. citizens said yes, but this view was held by only 40% of British, 30% of French, 33% of Germans, 30% of Italians and 24% of Spanish. A plurality (48%) in Britain and a majority in every case on the Continent (France 67%, Germany 60%, Italy 63% and Spain 60%) stated that their countries should strive to be "more independent" of the U.S. rather than remaining as close as in year's past.¹⁷

John T. S. Keeler is professor of political science and director of the European Union Center at the University of Washington in Seattle.

Archive of European Integration <http://aei.pitt.edu>

THE ARCHIVE OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION (AEI) is an on-line repository for non-commercial, non-governmental publications (short monographs, working or policy papers, conference papers, etc.) dealing with any aspect of European integration. The AEI is hosted by the University Library System at the University of Pittsburgh with the co-sponsorship of EUSA and the Center for West European Studies/EU Center, University of Pittsburgh. Anyone can access and download materials on the AEI. The search engine allows searching by author, title, keyword, year, etc.

Transatlantic Cooperation in the Area of Border Control

Virginie Guiraudon

AFTER THE BOMBINGS of the World Trade Center, bureaucrats responsible for "Justice and Home Affairs" in the EU and "homeland security" in the US soon met. On 26 October 2001, at a closed meeting of the EU Strategic Committee on Immigration, Frontiers and Asylum, the head of the US delegation informed EU member state officials that "since the events of 11 September 2001, the whole system of visas, border control, management of legal migration, etc. had come under close scrutiny and there was a consensus in the US on the need for a more effective system across the board, not targeted specifically at terrorism but taking the events of 11 September as the trigger for developing a new approach."¹⁸

The U.S. policy changes in the area of border controls directly concerned EU-based companies, EU citizens and EU laws. Following the November 2001 US Transportation Security Act, airline companies have been asked to provide US authorities with extensive information on passengers flying to the U.S., personal data known as PNR (passenger name record). Moreover, to allow EU citizens to travel to the U.S. under the visa waiver program, a reform is under way, since all EU passports must be machine-readable and integrate biometric identifiers such as fingerprints and iris scans.¹⁹ The 26 October 2003 deadline has been postponed for a year.

Both the Council of Ministers and the European Commission have tried to cooperate in a diligent manner with U.S. authorities. U.S. tactics have been heavy-handed at times. Given the state of the transport industry after 9/11 and the beginning of the economic slump, EU leaders could not ignore U.S. threats to refuse landing rights to airlines. Whereas transatlantic trade disputes continued and tensions grew over the build-up to the war in Iraq, there was a clear political will of the EU Commission and Council to comply with US demands that affected the movement of people between the EU and the US.

Antiterrorism justified the fact that measures be adopted quickly without taking into account the opinion of the relevant interest groups, non-governmental associations, and experts, respectively airlines, civil liberties groups, and computer security analysts. More importantly, the sense of urgency after 9/11 and the rapid passing of new US legislation that included "exceptional" measures led the EU officials in charge of responding to U.S. pressures to ignore "normal" procedures and the EU legal framework.

The U.S.-EU agreement on the transfer of PNR data by air carriers to U.S. authorities is a case in point. Several points stand in contradistinction with the 1995 EU data protection directive: (1) the number and type of data that U.S. authorities have direct access to, (2) the purposes for which the data might be used, (3) the type and number of agencies that can access the data, and (4) the lack of redress mechanism for people denied entry to the U.S. In February 2003, the Director General for External Relations and the Deputy U.S. Customs Commissioner met in Brussels

and issued a joint statement on reconciling the new PNR transmission requirements of the 2001 U.S. Transportation Security Act with the requirements of EU data protection law. The statement ignored the October 2002 opinion of the Article 29 data protection Working Party, the independent advisory body that gives opinions *inter alia* on EU data transfer to third parties, whose chair alerted the European Parliament Committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights. The European Commission agreed to cooperate with U.S. customs and told airlines to meet the March 2003 deadline fixed by U.S. authorities whereby they have had direct access to EU airline reservation databases to download personal data on all passengers and crew.

Since then, the EP has acted as a watchdog and no less than three resolutions have been adopted in plenary to invite the Commission to take action so as to ensure adequate protection for personal data.²⁰ The Commission negotiators tried to convince their U.S. counterparts to take into account privacy issues and obtained some minor compromises. Yet, they also agreed that EU passenger data could be used to test a new security profiling system known as CAPPS II, whereby each passenger is associated with a color-coded tag indicating his risk level. Members of the EP have also criticized the Commission's legal solution: a Commission Decision "accompanied by a 'light' international bilateral agreement."²¹ U.S. Customs and the Department of Homeland Security have written out "undertakings" spelling out their intentions regarding PNR data yet this is very different from a Treaty approved by the U.S. Senate, if only in terms of legal redress for individuals. The tension in the area of transport security has been between the Commission and the Parliament – an inter-institutional rather than a transatlantic battle.

The Commission and the Council have expressed divergence in only one instance, which regards goods rather than persons. The European Commission has launched infringement procedures against Germany, France, the Netherlands and Belgium because they have signed individual bilateral agreements giving U.S. Customs agents powers to search all containers leaving EU ports for the USA under its January 2002 Container Security Initiative (CSI). The goal of the CSI is to prevent terrorists from using global containerized cargo. The U.S. has concluded bilateral arrangements with eight EU Member States without taking notice of Community competence. The Commission has argued that this bilateral approach is likely to create competitive distortions between EU ports. There has been no dissensions on the content of this cooperation, only on its form. In July 2003, the Commission adopted a Communication on the role of customs calling for reinforced security checks, including for goods leaving the European Union. On 18 November 2003, the Commission Director General for Taxation and Customs Union and the U.S. Ambassador to the EU initialled an agreement to include transport security co-operation within the scope of the 1997 EU/U.S. customs agreement so as to equalize EU and U.S. levels and standards of control.

What can we learn from the study of post 9/11 transatlantic relations in the area of homeland security? First, they tell us about the U.S. diplomatic strategy to gain leverage in negotiations

with the EU. U.S. diplomats used "divide and conquer" tactics by seeking bilateral agreements with member states. Confronted with the *fait accompli* EU negotiators started talks at a severe disadvantage. U.S. diplomats also knew exactly how to exploit the EU inter-institutional dynamics. Commission officials eager to find a EU-level agreement with the U.S. so as not to let member states act bilaterally sought to bypass legal procedures and parliamentary control. In March 2004, the EP Citizens' Rights Committee met with Stewart Verdery, assistant secretary at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and lead negotiator for the U.S.-EU agreement on passenger data. He said that "air carriers were already transferring personal data . . . [and] Parliament would be well advised to prefer the draft agreement the U.S. and the Commission had reached to no agreement at all."²² He knew that the EP opinion or potential appeal to the ECJ could not threaten the agreement.

U.S. post 9/11 demands have justified and accelerated measures to reinforce EU border controls. U.S. laws have also served as a model for EU legislative proposals. In January 2004, Spain put forward a proposal for an EC Council directive requiring carriers to collect and communicate data on passengers travelling to the EU at the time of boarding to the law enforcement authorities of the destination country. The directive to be accepted before June 2004 resembles U.S. regulations, except that Spain stated that the measures were aimed at fighting illegal immigration not terrorism.

This does not mean that terrorist attacks cannot accelerate the adoption of decisions affecting border control. After March 11 and the attacks on suburban trains in Madrid, the special European Council that met in Brussels issued a Declaration on Combating Terrorism. The statement urged the prompt adoption of the Spanish initiative regarding passenger data and the Commission proposal to upgrade EU passports and visas. There is also now a commitment to early approval of the EU-U.S. agreement on airline passenger data. The Council declaration pledges to "further strengthen cooperation with the U.S. and other partners" and a key objective is to "develop further EU transport security standards in coordination with relevant third countries."²³ After September 11, 2001, U.S. demands have justified EU reforms. March 11, 2004 in turn will hasten the adoption of the measures that the U.S. executive has been asking for.

Virginie Guiraudon is research Fellow at the National Center for Scientific Research in Lille, France.

NOTES

1. Jeffrey Schott and Gary Hufbauer, "Transatlantic Trade Relations: Challenges for 2003", Paper presented at the Transatlantic Strategy Groups, Miami, February 12-14, 2003.

2. Quoted in Shelley Emling, "U.S., European Union toe-to-toe over trade issues," *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 2 November 2003.
3. For a variety of perspectives on the development of ESDP, see Jolyon Howorth and John T.S. Keeler, eds., *Defending Europe* (Palgrave, 2003).
4. Jolyon Howorth, « Au-delà des apparences ou les lents progrès de la PESD, » *Politique Etrangère*, volume 68, numbers 3-4, 2003.
5. Martin Walker, "Walker's World: Pentagon vs. the Europeans," *The Washington Times*, February 11, 2004.
6. *NATO Update*, 16 December 2002, at www.nato.int.
7. "European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina," at ue.eu.int.
8. "EU Military Operation in former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia," at ue.eu.int.
9. *European Security Review*, Number 18, July 2003.
10. "European Union Police Mission in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia," at ue.eu.int.
11. Howorth, op. cit.
12. "First Joint EU-NATO Crisis Management Exercise," 11 November 2003, at www.nato.int.
13. See Howorth, op. cit.
14. See Anand Menon, "Why ESDP is Misguided and Dangerous for the Alliance," in Howorth and Keeler, eds., *Defending Europe*.
15. Charles Grant, "Resolving the Rows over ESDP," Centre for European Reform, October 2003.
16. Charles Grant, "Europe can Sell Its Defence Plan to Washington," *Financial Times*, 2 December 2003.
17. Survey sponsored by the Pew Research Centre for the People and the Press and released March 18, 2003; summary available on the Pew website.
18. Council of the European Union, "Outcome of proceedings of the Strategic Committee on Immigration, Frontiers and Asylum meeting with the United States dated 26 October 2001," doc. 13803/01 ASIM 21 USA 24 Brussels, 12 November 2001.
19. European Commission, "Proposal for a Council Regulation on standards for security features and biometrics in EU citizens." COM (2004) 116 final, doc. 2004/039 (CNS), Brussels, 18 February 2004.
20. The EP has expressed its intention to start legal action before the European Court of Justice against the Commission for failure to act.
21. European Commission, "Transfer of Air passenger Record (PNR) Data: A Global EU approach" COM (2003) 826 final, Brussels, 16 December 2003.
22. European Parliament LIBE committee press release, Brussels, 18 March 2004.
23. European Council, "Declaration on Combating Terrorism," Press release, Brussels, 25 March 2004.

Spotlight on the UK

Many EUSA members focus on EU member states. This feature highlights an individual EU member state's major presences in the USA and beyond.

Web sites

- www.britianusa.com Official website of the British government in the United States.
- www.britianusa.com/consular/embassy/ Official site the British Embassy in Washington, DC.
- www.fco.gov.uk/ Website of the Foreign Office of the UK; includes link to the Britain and the EU website which provides detailed information on Britain's relationship with the EU.
- www.statistics.gov.uk/ Home of official statistics, reflecting Britain's economy, population and society at the national and local level.

Missions British Embassy, 3100 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington DC, 20008, tel: (202) 588 7800.

Information British Information Services, 845 Third Avenue, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10022, tel: (212) 745-0277, fax: (212) 745-0359 Provides comprehensive information on Britain through britainusa.com and its office in New York.

Business UK Trade and Investment has 14 offices around the USA. Its website, <www.uktradeinvestusa.com>, is the British Government's official web site for facilitating business-to-business trade and investment between the UK and the USA.

Selected scholarly resources

- The North American Conference of British Studies is a scholarly society dedicated to all aspects of the study of British civilization. The NACBS sponsors scholarly publications and an annual conference, as well as several academic prizes and fellowships. The NACBS has significant representation among specialists in literature, art history, politics, law, sociology, and economics.
- The *Journal of British Studies*, a publication of the NACBS, is recognized as an important North American publication for the study of British history and civilization. The NACBS announces the merger of its two highly respected journals, *Albion* and the *Journal of British Studies*, into a new publication, known as *the Journal of British Studies*, incorporating *Albion*, beginning in 2005.



European Union Studies Association
Ninth Biennial International Conference
March 31-April 2, 2005 Austin, Texas
Hyatt Regency Austin on Town Lake

The European Union Studies Association invites scholars and practitioners engaged in the study of Europe and the European Union to submit panel and paper proposals for its 2005 Ninth Biennial International Conference. The Program Committee plans to promote the broadest possible exchange of theoretical approaches, disciplinary perspectives and research agendas. The Committee would particularly welcome proposals that examine the impact of the EU's recent enlargement on the functioning of the Union and on the politics and societies of its new and existing member states, as well as proposals that address aspects of the EU's ongoing constitutional debate. Please note the following:

- We welcome both paper and panel proposals, particularly those that foster transatlantic dialogue.
- The Program Committee reserves the right to make changes in panels, including their composition.
- All those appearing on the conference program must be current EUSA members.
- Participants are limited to two appearances on the conference program (two papers or one paper and one discussant role; chair roles do not count toward the appearance limit).
- We cannot honor individual scheduling requests; by submitting a proposal you agree to be available from 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 31st through 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, April 2nd.

The 2005 Program Committee is:

Mark A. Pollack (University of Wisconsin), Chair
Gráinne de Búrca (European University Institute)
Terri Givens (University of Texas - Austin)
Liesbet Hooghe (University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill)
Jolyon Howorth (Yale University)
Frank Schimmelfennig (University of Mannheim)

The firm deadline for **receipt** of paper and panel proposals in the EUSA office is **Friday, October 15, 2004**. We regret that we cannot consider proposals received after this date. You will be notified of the Program Committee's decision regarding your proposal by December 15, 2004.

We will once again have a **poster session** option available for those (1) whose work is not yet ready for a formal paper, (2) whose paper proposals are received after the proposal deadline, and/or (3) whose paper proposal could not be coherently accommodated on an available panel.

How to submit a paper or panel proposal: All proposals must be accompanied by the appropriate cover sheet, posted on our Web site at www.eustudies.org/conf2005.html, and the appropriate abstract (see cover sheet). Proposals must be mailed to:

European Union Studies Association
415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

We do not accept proposals via facsimile, e-mail transmission, or delivery to the EUSA office in person. Address all questions about the proposal process to e-mail eusa@pitt.edu or by telephone to **412.648.7635**.

Teaching the EU

Editor's note: This column is written by members of EUSA's "Teaching the EU" Interest Section. For details about the Section and how to join, please visit www.eustudies.org/teachingsection.html.

Transatlantic Tensions: Opportunities for Learning Judith Kelley

THE INVITATION FOR ARTICLES begged for a reply: Has the current state of tensions between the Europe and the United States created difficulties for teaching the EU? As a European offering a new course in transatlantic relations at Duke University this spring, I in fact find no difficulties at all – only opportunities. The increased attention to the relationship brought about by the disagreement over Iraq has meant several things – all of which are very healthy for conducting a good course: More interested students, more recent academic work on the subject, and more opportunities to engage the students actively in the class room. Although my course is still underway at the time of this writing (March 2004), I can already make some initial assessments that I hope will be useful to other faculty in planning their own courses for the future.

The course is taught as a graduate seminar with students from both Europe and the US. The seminar meets once weekly for two and half hours. Enrollment is by permission from instructor so as to assure a motivated student composition. There are eight Americans and four Europeans in the class, and the students are a mix of political science masters and PhD. students, law and public policy graduate students.

With this mix of students, I find no need to sidestep areas of disagreement, and the students are quite capable of offering informed analytical views, rather than emotionally charged views – as long as the course is structured in a way that encourages such thinking. This point is central to providing an effective environment for student learning. Undergraduate courses with open enrollment might present additional challenges.

The motivating question of the course is assessing the character and future of the Transatlantic relationship. How do the changes underway in Europe in terms of constitution making and enlargement influence the transatlantic relationship? Where is the relationship headed? Are Europe and the US partners or rivals? Will we see convergence or divergence in the future? Can the US and Europe grow apart, while retaining a common foundation?

My course is divided into four parts. The first section of the course provides an introduction to many of the fundamental issues at hand and provides students with background on the EU and transatlantic relations. The second part of the course explores several paradigms of international relations theory and how they might be helpful for the understanding of transatlantic

The co-chairs of the Teaching the EU Interest Section are looking to put together a series of essays that reflect on the challenges and opportunities of teaching the EU in the post-9/11 world. Please contact the section co-chairs Peter Loedel or John Occhipinti (ploedel@wcupa.edu, occhipij@canisius.edu) if you are interested in writing a short essay.

relations. The third part of the course entails an examination of several key issues in this relationship. My seminar concludes with students' presentations of their research papers.

The course begins with a healthy debate framed by the work of Robert Kagan and Robert Cooper, and commentators on their work. Although there are some risks associated with launching right into the central debate and first providing students with more background, I find it useful to set the tone of the engagement in the very first class by getting right to the core issues and getting students excited about the topic. To assist those who have little background in Europe, I emailed all the students suggested background reading that could be done during the break before classes started. The next two classes then provided some background on the EU and the transatlantic relationship, including a brief history highlighted through some documentary film material.

The second part of the course provides an introduction to relevant IR theory to encourage students to think about the usefulness of the different schools of thought regarding transatlantic relations. We also get practical and discuss how to define the "transatlantic relationship?" (Can we measure it?) Here students try to come up with their own definitions, which we then discuss in class. To get involved in the theory and how to write their own research papers for the course, for the first three class meetings the students have to arrive with a hypotheses about the transatlantic relationship. The students must also develop their own conceptualization of how their hypotheses can be tested.

The third part of the course provides an empirical examination of the issues that face the transatlantic relationship: security, trade, environment and international justice. We look at case studies of EU defense development, NATO, Iraq and other security issues, the International Criminal Court, the Kyoto Protocol, WTO etc. The key part to making these highly empirical classes engaging is that, rather than merely assigning a list of readings, different students actually get their own little research assignments.

For example, I might ask students to look into the role of Poland in transatlantic security issues, and another to compare the US and EU security strategy documents. The students then email their papers to each other on the day of the class, and pose a question for discussion. This gives students a chance to explore topics that they are particularly interested in and to be an active participant in finding their own relevant materials, rather than just opening the syllabus and reading. In the last part of the course the students then present their research papers, which are the main assignments of the course. The presentations are before the finished product is due, providing an opportunity for

input rather than a time of judgment. The class then wraps up with a discussion similar to the one with which it began – bringing us full circle to reexamine the prospects for divergence or convergence.

I have found the class to be exciting to teach, the students very motivated, and the atmosphere in the class anything but difficult. There is full attendance at every class, and the discussion and interest is so strong that - although 2 ½ hours is a long time to go on - we are always pushing the clock at 9:30 at night. Discussions have been very engaging, but I would not say heated. That is, students express their views well and in a respectful manner. Some of the disagreements between students have arisen mostly around the role of military power in the transatlantic relationship, and discourse about normative differences between Europe and the US that border on stereotyping, which the class seems to abhor.

Some of the interesting questions students have raised in class and in their papers are:

- Is sovereignty an interest-based instrument to conveniently justify nonparticipation in international regimes, or is it part of a value-system?
- Solana may have been authorized to draft the European Security Strategy (ESS), but he was not required to prepare it when he did. What factors determined the timing of the ESS?
- What does Poland's 'act of defiance' against France and Germany by supporting military intervention in Iraq mean for the future of a Common European Security and Defense Policy?
- To what extent are normative differences between the US and Europe over security issues like Iraq reducible to rhetorical strategy? (e.g., strong versus weak belief in just war theory)
- Is rivalry between GPS and Galileo another example of transatlantic disagreements or merely a classic example of conflict of interests of two sovereign entities?
- Does the European Union need a (united) military? Does it need autonomy from the US/NATO?
- Given the many common interests between the U.S. and Europe in the Middle East (e.g., regarding Iran), how do these two actors reconcile their differences?
- What does the Missile Defense debate suggest about European concerns regarding Russia?
- Is EU ready for Turkey? Will EU take the risk of admitting a country that would become its largest and poorest member, whose people and way of life is still substantially different from most of the European citizens?
- There has been much European criticism of the death penalty in America, but what about Europe's relaxed position on abortion? What does this say about U.S. and EU differences on human rights regimes?

As the class is still underway, I cannot make a full evaluation of its effects yet, but as of now, I have been extremely satisfied with its implementation. The students are now engaged in writing their papers, which, although they are individual projects, are embedded in a process of sharing right from the beginning. Thus, we have spent a good deal of time discussing their subjects in class, offering ideas for one another, and offering feed-

back. One thing I might change is the format of the papers, which so far have consisted of the need to pose a question to the class and then develop two five-page analyses. In the future I might retain this format, but push more for students to also have a go at answering their own questions, to make the papers more of an argument.

The draft syllabus of the course (it is always a work in progress) can be found at <http://www.pubpol.duke.edu/people/faculty/kelley/index.html>. It also includes some links to relevant websites on transatlantic relations.

Judith Kelley is an assistant professor of Public Policy and Political Science at Duke University.

EUSA Haas Fund Fellowship

THE 2003-2005 EUSA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE is pleased to announce the establishment of a new, annual fellowship for a graduate student's EU-related dissertation research. Thanks entirely to contributions to our new Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies—launched in June 2003 to honor the memory of the late scholar Ernst B. Haas (1924-2003), whose work was pivotal in the establishment of the field of EU studies—we will offer one unrestricted fellowship of \$2,000 to support the dissertation research of any graduate student pursuing an EU-related dissertation topic in the academic year 2004-05. Please note the following stipulations for applicants, who must:

- be pursuing the doctoral degree (PhD) at an accredited institution in any country;
- be writing her or his dissertation in English;
- have her or his EU-related, doctoral dissertation topic approved by the professor who will supervise it; and,
- be able to demonstrate clearly the relevance to EU studies of the dissertation topic.

Applicants for this Fellowship should submit in triplicate, hard copy, by regular post to EUSA, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA:

- (1) A one-page letter of application that specifies how the fellowship would be used;
- (2) A two-page (500 words) *précis* of the dissertation research project that also explains its relevance to EU studies; and,
- (3) Two letters of support from professors serving on the student's dissertation committee, one of them its chair.

The firm deadline for applications to be *received* in the EUSA office is **May 17, 2004**. The successful applicant will be notified by July 15, 2004, and will receive the grant as soon as the fellowship award letter has been signed and returned to EUSA. The fellowship will be paid in one lump sum by check and in US\$ only.

Anyone wishing to contribute to our Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies should visit www.eustudies.org/haasfund.html or contact the EUSA office.

Book Reviews

Jonas Tallberg. *European Governance and Supranational Institutions: Making States Comply*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003, 175 pp.

BOOKS ON EUROPEAN GOVERNANCE ABOUND. So do studies of the influence of supranational actors on EU policy-making. Even in this crowded field, there are two reasons why this book is still highly interesting and well worth reading. First, it explores the role of the EU's supranational actors in post-decisional compliance politics. Much of the work on European governance focuses on the agenda-setting phase of EU policy-making. Tallberg's study, by contrast, examines the influence of the European Commission and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in the enforcement of EU decisions. Second, the book derives a theoretical model from principal-agent theory that allows it to explain variation in the autonomy of the Commission and the ECJ vis-à-vis the member states. While most students of European integration would acknowledge that supranational actors may matter (even Moravcsik does), we still face the challenge of specifying the conditions under which they actually do exert independent influence. Why are the Commission and the ECJ able to advance their agendas in some cases, but not in others? (p. 5).

In order to address this question, the book starts by developing a principal-agent model (chapter 2) from which to derive hypotheses on the scope for supranational influence. Tallberg carefully defines his dependent variable by distinguishing three forms of supranational influence: exercising delegated powers contrary to the preferences of member governments; inducing the delegation of powers that member governments would not have conferred otherwise; and creating new means outside the treaties (p. 8; 130-1). Principal-agent (P-A) theory should lead us to expect that the Commission's and the ECJ's capacity to exert independent influence is determined by member state's means for monitoring and sanctioning the actions of these supranational bodies. More specifically, Tallberg advances three sets of hypotheses on the incentives of supranational actors to exert independent influence, on the scope for supranational influence, and on the forms of supervision that the two actors are likely to adopt.

The explanatory power of the model is evaluated in an empirical study of the Commission's and the ECJ's efforts to strengthen the EU's enforcement system in order to improve compliance with the EU's internal market. Their enforcement-enhancing actions followed three parallel tracks, which constitute three cases that vary across key elements of the proposed P-A model. In the first case (chapter 4), the Commission sought to enhance its existing powers under the Art. 226 infringement procedure. Although successful, these attempts do not qualify as supranational influence since the member states largely supported them. The second case (chapter 5) is one of failure. Due to a more even distribution of information about the consequences of

its proposals, the Commission did not succeed in inducing the member states to delegate more far-reaching enforcement powers at the 1991 and 1996-7 Intergovernmental Conferences. The third case (chapter 6), finally, marks a success of the Commission's and the ECJ's collective efforts to strengthen decentralized enforcement through national courts. The ECJ's case law strengthened the remedies which aggrieved parties could seek in national courts against member state non-compliance with EU law. The Commission, in turn, launched several policy programs to inform citizens and companies about their rights.

The case studies present three major findings, which are in line with the P-A model but are not too surprising. First, supranational influence is greater in every-day decision-making than in treaty revisions. Second, the ECJ enjoys more autonomy than the Commission. And third, state control over supranational actions is more effective if the member states take unilateral action rather than acting collectively at the EU level.

While the theoretical argument is convincing and supported by the empirical evidence, the book provides a specific perspective on supranational influence that some may find too narrow to capture the complexity of European governance. The P-A model allows us to identify conditions under which the Commission and the ECJ are able to act against the interest of the member states. Since the model is firmly rooted in rational choice, however, it misses another important source of supranational influence: the Commission and the ECJ may persuade member governments to change their interests using the power of the better argument. Post-decisional compliance takes place in an institutional environment in which actors are much more inclined to employ normative arguments of fairness and appropriateness rather than material threats and concessions. As lawyers remind us, compliance is not so much a dichotomous variable but a discursive process, in which actors with contending interpretations of a given norm or rule, seek to develop a common understanding of how and when the norm or rule is to be applied. While Tallberg may be right that social constructivist approaches have not systematically addressed the question of supranational influence (yet), they certainly provide an alternative perspective that grants supranational actors even more far reaching powers (see e.g. the work on deliberative supranationalism by Christian Joerges and Jürgen Neyer).

Tallberg's book is a fine example of theory guided, methodologically rigorous research that helps advance our understanding of European governance and EU policy-making. It is not only relevant for those of us who are interested in the role of supranational actors and the functioning of the EU's compliance system. The theoretical arguments bear important implications for other forms of governance beyond the nation state. The EU is not the only case in which governments have set up and delegated specific functions to central institutions, such as monitoring, dispute-settlement, and enforcement. Tallberg's findings resonate well with the International Relations literature on legalization and, thus, prove once again that we need not treat the EU as *sui generis*.

**Tanja A. Börzel
University of Heidelberg**

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

Dr. R. Daniel Kelemen
Lincoln College
Oxford University
Oxford OX1 3DR UK
E-mail daniel.kelemen@politics.ox.ac.uk
Fax 44.1865.279.802

Publishers should send two review copies of books directly to Dr. Kelemen.

Justin Greenwood. Interest Representation in the European Union. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 328 pp.

THIS, AS GREENWOOD EMPHASIZES, is a new work. While his knowledge and contacts from the considerable volume of previous work are demonstrably valuable, he has taken the opportunity to review the whole complex of EU interest representation, to describe 'The Brussels Landscape'.

Setting the scene in his introduction, he lays stress on the variety of interests represented. He also conveys the atmosphere of Brussels. He then explores 'EU decision-making and channels of influence'. He examines each institution in turn, exploring 'routes of influence'. These 'routes' provide paths through the complex and multi-level system. He lays great stress on the way in which involvement in 'setting the agenda' enhances the influence of an interest group. He also shows the importance of alliances, formal and informal.

There follow five chapters that substantiate the 'variety' with which he opens. Each describes a different interest and explores the actors and the groups and associations that in many cases represent them. Although the first and by far the longest of these chapters describes 'Business Interests', one of the values of the book is that it places their representation in company and sometimes in conflict with other interests – Professions, Labour, 'Public Interests' and Territorial Interests.

Dealing with business interests, Greenwood examines formal and informal groupings and is revealing on the tensions that arise within industry associations as their more powerful member companies open their own representations in Brussels. (In doing this, he takes the opportunity to debunk the idea that company representations have large staffs). "[Most] corporate public affairs offices are small affairs with two or three people, with anything more than five exceptional." His examination also lays to rest the widely held idea that trade associations generally are weak and becoming weaker. He shows that their role and effectiveness is determined by a range of factors and cites several instances where the trade association clearly is effective.

His discussion of 'professional interests' is well documented. He focuses on their efforts, not always successful, to achieve

recognition of professional qualifications throughout Europe. Greenwood then describes how 'labour interests' balance business interests and also examines the extent to which policy makers seek to ensure that this occurs.

Greenwood sets his discussion of 'public interests' in the context of the 'democratic deficit' debate. He notes that while the EU has "come to be gripped by discourse about its legitimacy" civic interests have flourished. As one response to the democratic deficit critique, he charts the way in which the Commission disburses nearly one billion euros each year to fund NGO activities. He groups the active NGOs into three categories; those that represent consumers, those concerned with the environment and social NGOs. His text benefits from his active approach, as he shows that while the NGOs exercise a considerable and increasing influence they "must come to terms with working with a system where decisions are made which effect [their] patch, and are in turn influenced by [them]."

The chapter on "territorial interests" is again dynamic, showing how these interests are encouraged and rewarded by flows of EU funds and how as the EU expands, cross border co-operation becomes more widespread and complicated. His conclusion focuses on the role of civil society in fostering European integration, and looks forward to its possible future role in the context of the Commission's White Paper on Governance and the proposed Constitutional Treaty.

This is a valuable work for students of the EU and especially for those who are interested in channels of influence and their effect. It is soundly based, thoroughly documented and creatively written.

Robin Pedler
University of Oxford

Trevor C. Salmon and Alistair J. K. Shepherd. Toward a European Army: A Military Power in the Making? London: Lynne Rienner, 2003, 214 pp.

Salmon and Shepherd's Toward a European Army: A Military Power in the Making? is a comprehensive and well organized, yet unpolished survey of European integration in the field of security and defense policy. The book rightly covers the major issues in European defense and security. Beginning with chapters on the relevance of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and the history of failed attempts at defense integration since the end of World War II, the book continues with a description of the contemporary political developments and a richly detailed description of the ESDP's institutions. The authors devote a chapter to the responses of the United States and NATO, which is helpful for understanding the international context of European policies. The book also evaluates the success of these policies by considering Europe's actual military capabilities, and the impact of the ESDP on the European arms industry and the sovereignty of EU member states. For a book of 214 pages, the authors do a superb job of covering the most important issues.

Toward a European Army is comprehensive in scope and well organized.

However, the treatment of some topics is not useful, and the book generally lacks analytic incisiveness. The weakness of analysis is apparent almost from the beginning, when the authors discuss the relevance of European defense policy in terms of its potential impact on the policies of U.S. President George W. Bush. ESDP may indeed give Europe more independence when faced with “the growing unilateralism of U.S. action” (p. 5). But unilateralism is less of an established trend in America than it is a criticism of the current administration. If the word “unilateralism” ceases to be in vogue as a descriptor for American foreign policy, the perspective and argument of the book may seem dated. A book about European defense policy deserves to be more ambitious: if Europe is developing a serious and unified military capability, it could herald the end of a half-century of security dependence on the United States and the unprecedented peaceful unification of European security. ESDP aims to create a military power in what is already the world’s largest economic bloc. The relevance of this development goes beyond temporary political fashions. The authors know this and show better analytic ability in their conclusion, but the beginning of the book gives the sense that Salmon and Sheperd’s analytic aims are somewhat limited.

Similarly, some topics covered in Toward a European Army are unpolished not because their analysis is myopic, but because analysis is altogether missing. The chapter on the history of failure at defense integration after World War II is the best example of this problem. The authors provide a wonderfully detailed and precise account of the diplomatic history. Unfortunately, however, this history is entirely descriptive. There is neither a coherent line of argument nor an explicit discussion of themes present in the history. So while this discussion of the history is factually rich, it adds little to the reader’s conceptual understanding.

Editing is another area of weakness for Toward a European Army. Some aspects of the editing seem amateurish. The single most distracting aspect of the problem is the occasional lack of parenthetical citations for quoted material. Although generally well footnoted, the authors do not explicitly mention in the text the source or importance of some quotes. This makes it very difficult for the reader to assess the validity or purpose of the quotations.

Toward a European Army treats an important subject. ESDP is not well understood by the public and is not well known outside the European Union. Salmon and Shepherd discuss the most important issues in European security policy, and their book is as well organized as it is broad in scope. The authors supply a great deal of factual precision, and their expertise in the field is clear. Unfortunately, however, the book fails to provide penetrating analysis. Toward a European Army is more a well organized catalogue of facts than it is a work of political science. The absence of theoretical framework or explicit themes makes it difficult for the reader to take useful generalizations from the book. Amateurish citations and other editing problems provide further distractions. Dedicated students of European security may

not be able to resist a book like this, but the casual reader is likely to find Toward a European Army too poorly argued and tedious to warrant their attention.

Seth A. Johnston
University of Oxford

Jacques Delors. Mémoires. Paris: Plon, 2004.

Delors on Delors

JACQUES DELORS’ *Mémoires* are an indispensable reference. This readable book, in the form of interviews with Jacques Arnaud (a colleague at *Notre Europe*), is vintage Delors, revelatory, discrete, and strongly argued all at the same time. The volume begins not about the EU, but with Delors explaining why he did not run for the French presidency in 1994. France’s institutionally-driven Left-Right cleavage, he claims, meant that he could not obtain the right majority for his political choices. Why does he start here? We can only speculate, but we suspect that Delors wants us to learn immediately how much he is hurt by the French Left and disturbed by the shape of French politics. The remarks are very useful, however, in guiding readers to the first part of the book about Delors’ French career. The rest, about Europe, shows how Delors’ difficult relationships to French politics paradoxically help explain why he did so well as Commission President.

Delors Becoming Delors: French Stories

Jacques Delors came from a modest Parisian Catholic family. His father, who worked at the *Banque de France*, wanted Jacques to do the same, which he did starting at age nineteen. He did well at the bank, learning lots about financial and monetary matters. Nonetheless, his lack of university training (not to speak of French super-elite credentials) created a lasting complex relationship with “intellectuals” combining reverence, envy, and an iron determination to excel in the realm of ideas. In these early years Delors refined his progressive Catholic religious and political outlooks, focusing upon participation and committed activism to promote solidarity among different social groups. He read and meditated, as he has done ever since, he and his wife engaged in Left Catholic community activities, and he became an unionist in the Catholic CFTC.

Unionism brought Delors to the national stage. His visibility in the “de-confessionalizing” minority of the CFTC (later the CFDT) led to appointment to the French Economic and Social Council. There he authored a report on the evolution of French consumerism that caught the eye of the leadership of the French Commissariat au Plan. Delors was hired in 1962 to develop new approaches to social programming. His work in helping to resolve the 1963 miners’ strike through advocacy of a new public sector incomes policy, behind which were convictions that France’s endemic inflation could be defeated by transparency about wage and productivity growth tied to good faith *concertation* among

“social partners,” first brought him headlines.

Delors’ political views solidified in the 1960s. Admirer of Mendès-France, friend of Michel Rocard, and devoted activist in the “club” movement, he sought a progressivism different from the class struggle outlooks of the traditional Left that expresses impatience with ideological cant. Delors’ desire to be useful led him to cross France’s political divide to become social policy advisor to Gaullist Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas in 1969. Here, as author of the “Nouvelle Société” program, Delors resumed building public sector incomes policies and also produced the important 1971 law on occupational training.

By the early 1970s, Delors and his “second Left” colleagues had lost their bet on a new Left to a revitalized Socialist Party under Francois Mitterrand. Most, including Delors, then had to find their ways into this new PS, often objects of suspicion. Delors was nonetheless welcomed by Mitterrand, particularly after siding against Michel Rocard in the 1978 PS leadership struggle. He was then elected to the European Parliament in 1989 (where he became chair of the economic and monetary committee), became economics “expert” in Mitterrand’s successful 1981 presidential campaign, and then was named Minister of Finance. Mitterrand’s Florentine shrewdness needs little documentation, and this was one of his cleverer gestures. Delors, a dedicated inflation fighter, supplied needed credibility with employers and, as a strong personality, could be expected to stand up to the more wild-eyed Socialists determined to “change life.” Delors’ low protocol ranking in the government – fourteenth – was meant to reassure the same wild-eyed crowd that the new President had political doubts about his Finance Minister. Delors then played his governmental roles to perfection. He was indefatigable in trying to curb Left enthusiasms in the name of economic realism and inflation fighting, organized and negotiated three devaluations, and devised cold-shower economic and budgetary policies to instill “rigor.” Most importantly, he was more important than anyone except Mitterrand for the 1983 policy shift from “social democracy in one country” to deflation and, eventually, renewed European integration.

President Delors: Brussels Stories

Delors’ challenges those scholars, many North American, who minimize the importance of the European Commission and the “Community method” by affirming his belief in functionalism as both a theory and strategy of European integration from the outset. In his eyes, the history of integrating Europe is one of brief moments of dynamism, longer periods of stagnation, and periodic crises. Stagnation, the predominant mode, happens when the “community method” gives way to inter-governmental decision-making. Crisis comes when governmental actors facing important issues realize that stymied inter-governmentalism will not be up to the task. New dynamism comes when crisis establishes conditions for return to the community method. The premise of new dynamism is intergovernmental agreement upon a new “grand bargain” which, because such bargains are inevitably “framework” deals, provides strategic openings to the Commission. If prepared, the Commission can then initiate *engrenage* – engineered spillover – to push integration rapidly

forward.

Delors is proud of his mastery of the art of *engrenage*. The grand bargain around the “1992” program emerged, he claims, from his fall, 1984 tour of EC capitals to canvass leaders about three options; a single currency, a common defense policy, or reconfiguring EC institutions. None received much support, but the idea of completing the Single Market emerged clearly from the conversations. Delors’ creativity here lay in fashioning something new out of the concerns of Community members and then scavenging the parts-bin of unimplemented earlier commitments to shape a new framework deal. He credits Mitterrand for reopening the EC playing field in 1984, Mitterrand and Kohl for supporting “1992” early on, Thatcher for knowing a good liberalizing initiative when she met it, and others, like Ruud Lubbers, for signing on with enthusiasm. Moreover, he gives fulsome praise to Lord Cockfield for the hard work of preparing the 1985 White Paper on Completing the Single Market.

Engrenage, “one measure leading to another in renewed dynamism and a positive-sum game” (p. 206)¹ then began with Delors’ “favorite treaty,” the Single Act. The Commission favored a new treaty for the “1992” program, but it was Bettino Craxi at Milan in 1985 who discovered that the rules allowed an Intergovernmental Conference to be called by simple majority. Mrs. Thatcher, the Danes and the Greeks could thus be drawn into the discussion that they did not want to have. The actual IGC was brief and the SEA succinct, and Delors claims that “we can say, without exaggeration, that we formulated 90% of the propositions that figured in the Single Act” (p. 218). Beyond extending qualified majority voting to single market matters, the Commission argued for new market-framing competencies in research and development, environmental, regional and social policies. Delors is particularly proud of his role in introducing new language on monetary issues.

The 1987-88 Delors budgetary package was the next installment. The Community faced big general budgetary problems, CAP deficits, and unfunded commitments to economic and social cohesion. The Commission combined these concerns into a whole that was much greater than the sum of its parts. CAP reform was begun, the structural funds redesigned and doubled, the size of the EC budget increased, and the budgetary process reformulated into its present multi-year commitment. The European Council at first refused the expensive proposal and it took the last-minute generosity of Helmut Kohl and the Germans to pass it in 1988.

Delors breaks his narrative at this point to discuss institutional issues and the end of the Cold War (chapters 9-12). His argument about the importance of collegiality in making the Commission an effective player in the institutional triangle is of particular interest. In addition, while outlining the dimensions of his Commission Presidency he vaunts his ability to influence the European Council’s agenda, noting that “by multiplying contacts with heads of government I worked extremely hard to earn ‘intellectual’ mastery of 80% of their agenda” (p. 257), a

1. All translations in quotes are by GR.

subject that we would like to know a great deal more about. Delors then reviews the Commission's significant role in paving the way for the inclusion of the former GDR into the EC. He also discusses the "social dimension," including the "Val Duchesse" social dialogue, his trip into Thatcherist heartland to persuade the TUC to change its mind about European integration, and the 1989 Social Charter and Action Program. Interestingly, the "social dimension" is not presented as a major product of *engrenage*. Delors is nonetheless proud of inserting the Social Chapter into the Maastricht Treaty, implying (p. 369) that this was facilitated when he insisted that the European Council make a decision after Chancellor Kohl had announced "Ich bin hungrig."

When Delors decided that EMU was a feasible goal is unclear, although prior experience with EMS certainly alerted him to Europe's monetary problems. In 1985 Delors insisted upon placing monetary matters in his own Commission portfolio, inserted new language about monetary issues into the Single Act, and began assiduously attending meetings of Central Bank Governors in Basel. EMU came onto the agenda in 1987 with French discontent with the ways in which EMS-ERM adjustment costs were being allocated. That the Delors' Committee on EMU was composed of Central Bankers was Delors' idea, supported by Kohl, ensuring that those most threatened by a new monetary order would be brought on board before politicians could spoil things. In general, EMU provoked a battle royal. It was a serious new encroachment on sovereignty at a moment when the heads of government had cottoned to the game of *engrenage*. The battle was made easier by the departure of Prime Minister Thatcher, but the final result, EMU without the "E," was not to Delors' liking, a "bankers' Europe," as he noted to the European Parliament immediately after Maastricht.

There are few revelations about the political side of Maastricht political side beyond Delors' strong feelings about some of the results. His resistance to the three-pillar "temple" and advocacy of a variable geometry "tree" confirming the community method are well known. He denies that the Commission had anything to do with the federalist Dutch proposal of September 1991 that the Council immediately trashed. Most interesting is his skepticism about prospects for a common European foreign policy that, even in its vague Maastricht form and impossible decision rules, he sees as a step too far. He himself proposed a much more modest and ad hoc approach.

Stagnation succeeds *engrenage* when member states anticipate buried spillover and dig in their heels. This began after Maastricht. Reflecting on this period, Delors reflects about the limits of the Monnet method, in his words "a type of enlightened despotism... a St. Simonian approach that consecrates competence and independence of the intellect as principles of legitimacy, often without beforehand seeking the consent of peoples" (p. 406). The new EU had quickly to pay for its inadequate transparency, bad communications, lack of debate, and the impenetrable complexity of its treaties, particularly Maastricht, in the Danish and French referenda of 1992. Painful discussions of subsidiarity, enlargement problems, and tough talks

about the Delors 2 package followed. Delors himself paid part of the price of CAP reform and the conclusion of the Uruguay Round. Surrounding this was recession and a massive EMS crisis that might have destroyed EMU plans without the steadiness of Chancellor Kohl.

Delors, predictably, did not give in, and instead mobilized Commission troops for one last effort to reopen *engrenage* with the 1993 White Paper on *Growth, Employment, and Competitiveness*. This document pointed presciently to things that the EU later undertook – the Luxembourg employment strategy (1997), the Lisbon strategy for new European competitiveness (2000) among them – but it failed at relaunching dynamism. "Neo-Keynesian," the White Paper called for borrowing for large new European projects (notably Maastricht's "Trans-European Networks"). In grim economic circumstances and at the height of their neo-liberal conviction, member states refused to play.

The remainder of *Mémoires* appropriate labels the post-Brussels years as a "return to militancy." Delors founded *Notre Europe*, an excellent think tank promoting high level debate about Europe's choices that Delors notes, ruefully, has been least influential in France. Delors also served as President of the Bruges *Collège d'Europe*, the CERC in France (an agency devoted to accurate and transparent information about wages and living costs), and led a UNESCO project that produced *L'éducation, une utopie nécessaire* (1995), a book exploring global prospects for life-long education. His last two chapters pass in review, too briefly, Delors' proposal for a "Council of Economic Security," his notion of Europe as a "Federation of Nation States," his strong defense of the community method, the desirability of "vanguard" countries pushing ahead in an enlarged Europe, the need for Euro-level industrial policy encouraging Euro-level "champions," plus pleas for France to reform herself through new European initiatives. Why the brevity? Jacques Delors wants us to know that he is still hard at work!

George Ross

EUSA Chair, Brandeis and Harvard Universities

EUSA Interest Sections

The European Union Studies Association now has seven active interest sections based on members' areas of special interest in European integration: EU Law; EU Political Economy; Teaching the EU; EU Latin America Caribbean; EU Economics; EU Public Opinion and Participation; and EU as Global Actor. Each section has its own Web pages (with syllabi banks, textbook lists, and more) and e-mail distribution list, and all will hold business meetings at the EUSA Conference in Austin (March-April 2005). For more information, please visit <www.eustudies.org/EUSAsections.html>.



Now Available from Oxford University Press!

The State of the European Union, 6: Law, Politics, and Society

Co-edited by EUSA members **Tanja A. Börzel**, University of Heidelberg,
and **Rachel A. Cichowski**, University of Washington

426 pages, 234 mm x 156 mm, September 2003
Hardback 0-19-925737-X, paperback 0-19-925740-X

THIS IS THE SIXTH AND latest addition to our book series, *State of the European Union* (launched in 1991 with Lynne Rienner Publishers). The contributors to this volume take the dynamic interaction between law, politics and society as a starting point to think critically about key recent events in the European Union, while bringing to the forefront why these developments matter for ordinary citizens. Contents and authors:

Section I: EU Law and Politics: The State of the Discipline

1. Rachel A. Cichowski and Tanja A. Börzel: Law, Politics, and Society in Europe
2. Alec Stone Sweet: European Integration and the Legal System
3. Gráinne de Búrca: The European Court of Justice and the Evolution of EU Law

Section II: Structures of Governance

4. Fritz W. Scharpf: Legitimate Diversity: The New Challenge of European Integration
5. Adrienne Héritier: New Modes of Governance in Europe: Increasing Political Efficiency and Policy Effectiveness?
6. Lars Hoffman and Anna Vergés-Bausili: The Reform of Treaty Revision Procedures: The European Convention on the Future of Europe

Section III: EU Citizen Rights and Civil Society

7. Stephen Day and Jo Shaw: The Evolution of Europe's Transnational Political Parties in the Era of European Citizenship
8. Kenneth A. Armstrong: Tackling Social Exclusion Through OMC: Reshaping the Boundaries of European Governance

Section IV: EU Law in Action

9. Tanja A. Börzel: Guarding the Treaty: The Compliance Strategies of the European Commission
10. R. Daniel Kelemen: The EU Rights Revolution: Adversarial Legalism and European Integration
11. Lisa J. Conant: Europe's No Fly Zone? Rights, Obligations, and Liberalization in Practice

Section V: Innovation and Expansion

12. Kate R. McNamara: Towards a Federal Europe? The Euro and Institutional Change in Historical Perspective
13. Elena A. Iankova and Peter J. Katzenstein: European Enlargement and Institutional Hypocrisy
14. Terri Givens and Adam Luedtke: EU Immigration Policy: From Intergovernmentalism to Reluctant Harmonization

Section VI: Researching and Teaching the EU

15. Stacy A. Nyikos and Mark A. Pollack: Researching the European Union: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches
16. Michael Baun and Phil Wilkin: Web Teaching the European Union: Online Sources and Online Courses

Section VII: References

Section VIII: List of Contributors

**In the Americas, order from Oxford USA on-line at www.oup-usa.org/isbn/019925740X.html
or call toll-free (USA & Canada) 1-800-451-7556**

**In Europe, order from Oxford UK on-line at www.oup.co.uk/isbn/0-19-925737-X
or e-mail book.orders@oup.co.uk**

EU-Related Web Sites

The following URLs and annotations have been updated as of March 2004. All Web addresses are preceded by <http://> (omitted here for brevity). Copyright © 2004 European Union Studies Association.

Library and bibliographic sources

www.eblida.org

The European Bureau of Library, Information and Documentation Associations represents national library and information associations and institutions in Europe, on issues of copyright, culture, Central and Eastern Europe, information society, and technology.

www.library.pitt.edu/subject_guides/westeuropean/wwwes/

The West European Studies Virtual Library is an excellent World Wide Web resource from the University of Pittsburgh on West Europe (primarily post-1945) and the EU in general.

library.byu.edu/~rdh/eurodocs/ec.html

The History of Europe as a Supranational Region, lists and links to every key historical document in European integration beginning with the 1957 Treaty of Rome and to the present.

www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI/doemoff/gov_eu.html

The University of California at Berkeley Library has an extensive electronic catalog devoted to scores of EU-related sources called European Union Internet Resources.

europa.eu.int/eclas

Register to become a user of the European Commission Libraries Catalogue (ECLAS). Site in French and English.

www.mun.ca/ceuep/EU-bib.html

The European Union: A Bibliography is a very thorough compilation of EU resources, regularly updated.

Official European Union sources

europa.eu.int

Europa is the official server of the EU and is the primary resource on its institutions, goals and policies, documents, news, and treaty texts. Europa has many searchable databases and Web portals.

ue.eu.int

The Council of the European Union has a Web site with information about past and current Presidencies, major treaties and other documents, Intergovernmental Conferences, and more.

europa.eu.int/eur-lex

Eur-Lex is the EU's "portal to EU law," with an electronic archive of legal and juridical texts from all the institutions, the Official Journal, background information on EU legislation in force, links to white papers, and more.

www.europarl.eu.int

The official site of the European Parliament, with full details of the current MEPs and their committees, Parliamentary sessions, hearings, conferences, documents issued, and more.

www.curia.eu.int

The Curia site focuses on the Court of Justice and the Court of First Instance, providing documents on recent case-law (full texts), pending cases, and cases removed from the register.

www.echr.coe.int

The European Court of Human Rights site has information on the current composition and history of the Court, pending cases, judgments and decisions, and basic texts.

www.ecb.int

The European Central Bank's site is the definitive site on the European System of Central Banks, monetary policy and framework of the Eurosystem, and texts of relevant legal documents.

europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo

The Eurobarometer site has downloadable reports (in PDF format) with qualitative and quantitative data as recent as the current month from EU member states and candidate countries.

www.eurunion.org

The European Union in the U.S. is the Web site for all official EU activities in the U.S., with links to their U.S.-based missions.

U.S. Government sources

www.useu.be

The United States Mission to the European Union in Brussels maintains a Web presence with a valuable list of the key documents of the U.S.-EU relationship, current news, and more.

www.buyusa.gov

The U.S. Department of Commerce maintains a Showcase Europe site on doing business in the EU, including country-specific commercial guides, links on the EU and more.

EU-related NGOs (and quasi-NGOs)

www.eumap.org

The EU Accession Monitoring Program, run by the Open Society Institute, monitors human rights and the rule of law in ten CEECs (EU candidates) and the five largest EU member states.

www.tacd.org

The TransAtlantic Consumer Dialogue is a forum of U.S. and EU consumer organizations which makes joint consumer policy recommendations to the U.S. government and European Union to promote consumer interests in EU and U.S. policy making.

EU external relations sources

www.cires-ricerca.it

The Interuniversity Research Centre on Southern Europe studies the impact of Europeanization on southern European countries and the Euro-Mediterranean area. Their bilingual Web site has working papers, a bibliography, hyperlinks, and other resources.

www.ue-acp.org

Actors and Processes in EU-ACP Cooperation (see next entry)

www.acpsec.org

Secretariat of the African, Caribbean, and Pacific States

Resources on the Lomé Convention, renegotiations, and related topics. The first site, above, hosts all historical documents on the EU-ACP Forum; the second site (in English and French), has summit documents, texts of treaties and agreements, etc.

www.abhaber.com/english_nt.htm

Ab Haber is devoted to EU-Turkey relations, particularly news and current developments, in both Turkish and English.

www.europaveien.no

In Norwegian, this site/portal is the gateway to EU information for Nordic and Scandinavian researchers, officials, businesses, and others. It provides searchable EU news sources.

www.canada-europe.org

Site (in French and English) of the Canada Europe Round Table for Business, a forum on major trade and investment matters among Canadian and European business and government leaders.

www.recalnet.org

Recal is a policy-oriented network of research centres in the EU and Latin America who further bi-regional relations through joint study and reflection and the program "Latin America 2020."

EU skeptics sources

www.euroseptic.com

In English (and French in parts), this site focuses primarily, but not exclusively, on the campaign for an independent Britain.

www.teameurope.info

The European Alliance of EU Critical Movements "connects over 40 EU-critical organizations and parties in 14 European countries," groups such as the Green Party, The Bruges Group, the Democracy Movement, and the Norwegian "No to the EU."

On-line archives and publications

aei.pitt.edu

The newly launched Archive of European Integration is an electronic repository for research materials on the topic of European integration and unification. It is fully searchable, and searches of it will also include both EIOP and ERPA (see below).

eiop.or.at/eiop

The European Community Studies Association of Austria publishes a bilingual (German and English), peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary e-journal, European Integration online Papers.

eiop.or.at/erpa/

The European Research Papers Archive is a portal to (currently) nine on-line papers series in the field of European integration studies, primarily, but not exclusively, from European institutions.

www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/index.html

The Jean Monnet Working Papers series (a joint project of the Academy of European Law, European University Institute, and New York University School of Law) covers many issues related to the EU and law, and papers can be downloaded from the site.

uw-madison-ces.org/papers.htm

The Center for European Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison has an on-line European Studies Working Papers series, focused primarily on EU and European integration topics.

www.ejil.org

The European Journal of International Law site provides a fully searchable database of all book reviews published to date, a forum for discussion, and the table of contents as well as a full text version of the lead article in each recent issue.

www.theepc.net

The European Policy Centre, a Brussels think tank that bridges government, business, and civil society publishes an on-line journal title Challenge Europe.

Other EU sources

www.eustudies.org

The European Union Studies Association (EUSA) is the primary academic and professional association, worldwide, devoted to study of the EU and the European integration project. EUSA's Web site describes its programs, publications, and interest sections, and features the main articles from the *EUSA Review*.

www.notre-europe.asso.fr

Led by Jacques Delors, Notre Europe is a research and policy group on European integration; its papers and reports are posted on the Web site in French and English.

www.rome-convention.org

All case law, searchable (by country, e.g.), and a bibliography.

www.ecsanet.org

An interactive communication network for academics working in the field of European integration studies, the European Community Studies Association is organized and funded by the Commission's DG for Education and Culture.

www.fedtrust.co.uk

The Federal Trust for Education and Research, a British think tank focusing on "good governance," provides a forum to explore issues of governance at national, continental and global levels. The Federal Trust helped establish TEPSA (see below).

www.tepsa.be

The Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA) promotes international research on European integration and discussion on public policies and political options for Europe. TEPSA is an association of 20+ think tanks in all EU member states and several of the candidate countries.

www.etsg.org

The site of the European Trade Study Group is a forum of research economists for academic exchange on international trade. Includes downloadable working papers and current trade news.

www.ceps.be

The Centre for European Policy Studies is an independent, international think tank of business, government, interest group and academic members, based in Brussels.

www.sosig.ac.uk/eurostudies

Part of the Social Science Information Gateway, EuroStudies is an expanded index of Europe-related Web sites. Fully searchable, it includes site descriptions, contact information, etc.

www.tiesweb.org

The Transatlantic Information Exchange Service (also known as TIES or TIESWeb) promotes transatlantic dialogue at the people-to-people level; their lively, interactive Web site features provocative op-ed pieces, news, and more on EU-U.S. relations.

www.euractiv.com

Euractiv is a Belgium-based information source focused on "EU news, policy positions, and EU actors," including European politics, broadly defined, with daily news and information on the EU, governments, parliaments, parties, NGOs, and more.

www.fornet.info

The European Foreign Policy Research Network structures and coordinates a network of researchers across Europe focusing on foreign policy governance.

Conferences

- May 7-9, 2004: "Justifying Enlargement," Madrid, Spain. Universidad Nacional de Educacion a Distancia, Madrid, and ARENA, University of Oslo. Contact <helene.sjursen@arena.uio.no>.
- May 28-29, 2004: "A Constitution for Europe? Governance and Policy Making in the European Union," Montréal, Canada. 6th Biennial Conference, ECSA Canada. Contact <jeffrey.kopstein@utoronto.ca> or <isabelle.petit@umontreal.ca>.
- June 11-12, 2004: "A Transatlantic Divide on Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Policies of Canada and the European Union in Light of the New Bush Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Attacks," University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada. Contact <eus@uvic.ca> or <averdun@uvic.ca>.
- June 14-18, 2004: "A Brave New Europe? The Challenges of Enlargement," a conference for students, Maastricht, Netherlands. Concordantia, Universiteit Maastricht. Contact <a.michaelis@student.unimaas.nl>.
- June 24-26, 2004: "Implications of A Wider Europe: Politics, Institutions and Diversity," 2nd Pan-European Conference on EU Politics, Bologna, Italy. ECPR Standing Group on European Union. Contact <ejones@jhuc.it>.
- July 1-2, 2004: "Towards a European Constitution," London, UK. Federal Trust and UACES. Contact <constitution@fedtrust.co.uk>.
- July 12-15, 2004: Transatlantic Studies Association Annual Conference, Dundee University, Scotland, UK. Contact <a.p.dobson@dundee.ac.uk>.
- July 15-17, 2004: "Developments in Economic Theory and Policy, Institutions and European Integration," Bilbao, Spain. University of the Basque Country and the Eastern Economics Association. Contact <ebprogoc@bs.ehu.es>.
- September 6-8, 2004: "The European Union: New Neighbors, New Challenges," UACES 34th Annual Conference and 9th Research Conference, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. <www.uaces.org/D410401.htm>.
- September 18-19, 2004: "The Atlantic Community Unraveling? States, Protest Movements, and the Transformation of U.S.-European Relations, 1969-1983," Nashville, TN. Contact <matthias.schulz@vanderbilt.edu>.
- March 31-April 2, 2005: 9th Biennial International Conference, European Union Studies Association, Austin, Texas, USA. <www.eustudies.org/conf2005.html>.

Publications

- Anderson, Sarah and Cavanagh, John (2004) *Lessons of European Integration for the Americas*. Washington, DC: Institute for Policy Studies.
- Armingeon, Klaus and Beyeler, Michelle (2004) *The OECD and European Welfare States*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Aus, Jonathan (2003) *Supranational Governance in an "Area of Freedom, Security and Justice": Eurodac and the Politics of Biometric Control*. SEI Working Paper 72. Sussex, UK: Sussex European Institute.
- Balis, Christina and Simon Serfaty (eds.) (2004) *Visions of America and Europe: September 11, Iraq, and Transatlantic Relations*. Washington, DC: The CSIS Press, Significant Issues Series Vol. 26/3.
- Christiansen, Thomas and Piattoni, Simona (eds.) (2004) *Informal Governance in the European Union*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Conti, Nicolo (2003) *Party Analysis to European Integration: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Italian Case*. SEI Working Paper 70. Sussex, UK: Sussex European Institute.
- Cowles, Maria Green and Dinan, Desmond (eds.) (2004) *Developments in the European Union*, second edition. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Geddes, Andrew (2004) *The European Union and British Politics*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Knijn, Trudie and Komter, Aafke (2004) *Solidarity Between the Sexes and the Generations: Transformations in Europe*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lewis, Paul G. (2003) *The Impact of the Enlargement of the European Union on Central European Party Systems*. SEI Working Paper 71. Sussex, UK: Sussex European Institute.
- Parsons, Craig (2003) *A Certain Idea of Europe*. Ithaca, NY and London, UK: Cornell University Press.
- Salmon, Trevor C. and Shepherd, Alistair J.K. (2003) *Toward a European Army: A Military Power in the Making?* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Smith, Karen E. (2004) *The Making of EU Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

EUSA Prizes

THE EUSA'S 1997-1999 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE established prizes to be awarded at each EUSA Biennial International Conference. The prizes both recognize and encourage excellence in scholarship in the field of European Union studies. Each prize carries a small cash award, funded by EUSA's Grants and Scholarships Fund, and will be presented to the recipients at the EUSA Conference banquet. The prize selection committees are comprised of EUSA Executive Committee members and established EU scholars. We now seek nominations for the following:

EUSA Prize for Best Conference Paper

The EUSA Prize for Best Conference Paper will be awarded in 2005 to an outstanding paper presented at the 2003 Biennial Conference in Nashville. All those who presented an original paper at the Conference and who deposited copies of their paper with the EUSA at the time of the Conference are eligible. The prize carries a cash award of \$100.

To apply for the prize, please mail three paper copies of the version of the paper that you presented at the 2003 EUSA Conference to the EUSA Administrative Office (address below). Papers may not be submitted by e-mail, facsimile, disk, or delivered to the office in person. Deadline for **receipt** of nominated papers for the EUSA Prize for Best 2003 Conference Paper is **September 17, 2004**.

EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation

The EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation in EU studies will be awarded in 2005 to a dissertation on any aspect of European integration submitted in completion of the Ph.D. at a U.S. university between September 1, 2002 and August 31, 2004. The student must have defended and deposited the dissertation and graduated during this period, and the dissertation must include a signed, dated dissertation committee approval page, and the dissertation nomination must be submitted by the department chair. Only one dissertation per department at an institution may be nominated for this prize. The prize carries a cash award of \$250.

Department chairs should mail one paper copy of the dissertation with a cover letter from the department chair to the EUSA Administrative Office (address below). Dissertations may not be submitted by e-mail, facsimile, disk, or delivered to the office in person. Deadline for *receipt* of nominations for the next EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation is *September 17, 2004*.

Send Best Conference Paper and Best Dissertation Prize nominations to:

European Union Studies Association
415 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

Please contact us with questions via e-mail at eusa@pitt.edu or by telephone at 412.648.7635.

EUSA Book Prize

The 2003-05 Executive Committee of the European Union Studies Association is pleased to announce the launch of the **EUSA Book Prize**, to be awarded at each biennial EUSA conference, for a book in English on any aspect of EU studies and published in the two years prior to the EUSA Conference. This prize carries a cash award of \$US 300 to the author(s). For the 2005 EUSA Book Prize, to be awarded in Austin, Texas, books published in 2003 and 2004 will be eligible. Authors or publishers should submit one (hard) copy of the nominated book with a letter of transmittal to EUSA Book Prize, European Union Studies Association, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA. (Nominated books may not be submitted by e-mail, as galleys or proofs, or in any form other than hard-copy published book.). Deadline for receipt of nominated books in the EUSA office is **January 15, 2005**.

EUSA List Serve

EUSA members sent the following replies to member Victor Gavin's January 24 list serve query seeking resources addressing the economic progress of Ireland and the relation of that progress to Ireland's European Union membership.

(1) See Rory O'Donnell, Ireland's Economic Transformation: Industrial Policy, European Integration and Social Partnership, European Union Center, University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, Working Paper #2, December 1998.
-Desmond Dinan, George Mason University

(2) Nigel Boyle at Pitzer College wrote a paper on this topic in 2002 called "Employment Programs in Ireland 1987-1999: national, sub-national and supranational governance in a globalized political economy." Also, the National Action Plans of each EU country can be found at: http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_strategy/national_en.htm.
-Stephanie L. Mudge, University of California Berkeley

(3) A book published by the Irish think-tank TASC has recently been published on the economic progress of Ireland since EU membership: Fintan O'Toole, *After the Ball*, Dublin, New Island, 2003.
-Dr. Huri Tursan, Universite Catholique de Louvain

(4) The National Economic and Social Council published reports on this in 1989 and 1995. Also our most recent three yearly review of the Irish economy and society offers and interpretation of Irish development, in which EU membership figures strongly (see NESC report NO. 110 and 111). Ireland's Institute of European Affairs published a book reviewing 25 years of membership. Rory O'Donnell (ed.) *Europe-the Irish Experience*, published in 2000.

-Dr Rory O'Donnell, National Economic and Social Council

EUSA News and Notes

Planning for EUSA's **Ninth Biennial International Conference** (March 31-April 2, 2005) is well under way. The Program Committee has been convened; our Call for Proposals appears in this issue on p.13 and is posted on our Web site. Please circulate the call widely. Key deadlines to note: for receipt of conference proposals at the EUSA office, **Friday, October 15, 2004**; to get the early registration rate and to appear in the final printed program, **Monday, February 7, 2005**.

Please plan to attend our Austin, Texas gathering. Our conference hotel is the Hyatt Regency Austin on Town Lake. Austin is the Texas state capital, and the state legislature will be in session—and open to the public for observation—during the dates of our conference. Free guided tours are available of the stunning capitol building, built in 1888 of pink granite. Across the street is the Texas Governor's Mansion (free guided tours also available), home to Texas' "first family" since 1856. Austin's oldest building is the French Legation, constructed in 1841 for the French *charge d'affaires* to the Republic of Texas, and now a small museum on lovely grounds. Austin has many historical linkages to Europe, especially to Germany, as the German Free School and the Scholz Garten (Texas' oldest *biergarten* and Austin's oldest restaurant) attest.

Austin's population is approximately 1.25 million people, and Austin is 235 miles from the Mexican border. The city is home to the University of Texas main campus, one of the largest state universities in the United States—thus Austin's reputation as a young city. Nicknamed "live music capitol of the world," Austin has over 100 live music venues and is home to the well-known "Austin City Limits" concert studio. More details about our Conference and about Austin as a destination are posted on our Web site at www.eustudies.org.

Don't forget to list the **European Union Studies Association** and our Web address on your course syllabi as an important EU resource for your students. For those of you whose syllabi are posted on your institution's Web sites, please include a hyperlink to us. The full URL is <http://www.eustudies.org>. Please feel free to download our logo image from our home page as well.

Did you know that **your home institution** may cover some of the cost of your membership in the European Union Studies Association? Some academic departments, law firms, think tanks and other organizations have budgets for **professional memberships** for their employees. Please contact the EUSA Office in Pittsburgh if you need to know our federal ID number for this purpose.

Are you moving? We know that many EUSA members move frequently. Please drop an e-mail to the EUSA office at eusa@pitt.edu in advance, to let us know your new address. Six weeks' advance notice is ideal.

From the Chair

(*continued from p. 2*) importance of recruiting new members, particularly among young scholars and practitioners working on European integration, including from the new member countries. May we enlist our existing members in helping us find interested colleagues and students? If you provide names and addresses, we will send letters. Just drop a note to EUSA, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA, or e-mail eusa@pitt.edu.

In Summer 2003 the executive board launched EUSA's new Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies. Contributions have been more than generous to this point, and we would like to encourage members, especially those influenced by Professor Haas' work and/or teaching, to contribute to this legacy of his work. The Haas fund will support doctoral research on European integration, an essential task for developing a community of scholars and enhancing the field. Please see p. 10 in this issue for the details.

Finally, we are delighted to announce the appointment of Joseph A. Figliulo, JD, as our new Executive Director. Joe comes to us from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law where he served as Director of Career Services and Public Interest Initiatives. He previously practiced in the field of labor and employment law with several Pittsburgh law firms and clerked for the Honorable Kate Ford-Elliott of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania. As a law student he was Executive Editor of the University of Pittsburgh Law Review. Joe also holds the Master of Library Science degree from the University of Pittsburgh School of Library and Information Science, where his coursework focused on information technology, and is an accomplished and erudite musician. Please join the EUSA Executive Committee in welcoming Joe to his new position.

GEORGE ROSS
Brandeis University

The *EUSA Review* follows an annual calendar of announcements and listings organized in four topic areas: Winter: [EU-Related Academic Programs](#) (degree or certificate-granting, worldwide); Spring: [EU-Related Web Sites](#); Summer: [EU-Related Organizations](#) (academic and professional associations or independent research centers with significant EU aspects in their missions); and Fall: [EUSA Members' Research Notes](#) (EUSA members' current EU-related research projects, with particular attention to funded projects). We list EU-related conferences and calls, fellowships and scholarships and publications (books, journals, working papers) in every issue of the *Review*. Send brief announcements by e-mail to eusa@pitt.edu or by mail to EUSA, 415 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA.

EUSA Lifetime Membership

What is it?

Simply put, it is a one-time dues payment to EUSA of US\$ 1500.

What does it include?

The Lifetime Membership includes all regular membership benefits for life. Among those benefits currently are subscription to the quarterly *EUSA Review*, receipt of occasional EUSA monographs, discounted registration rates at the EUSA International Conference, subscription to our e-mail List Serve, and the opportunity to join EUSA interest sections.

Are there any other benefits?

By making a one-time membership payment, you not only avoid the task of renewing each year, but gain the twin advantages of securing lifetime membership at today's dollar values and avoiding future dues increases.

Who should do this?

Any person wishing to support the endeavors of the European Union Studies Association—the fostering of scholarship and inquiry on the European integration project. For U.S. taxpayers, an additional benefit is a receipt for a one-time \$500 charitable contribution to EUSA, tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law (reducing your tax liability for the year in which you become a Lifetime Member).

How do I become a Lifetime Member?

Simply mail your check, in US\$ and made payable to “EUSA,” to the European Union Studies Association, address given at right. (We can not accept lifetime membership payments by credit card.) We will send you a receipt and letter of acknowledgment.

Will my Lifetime Membership be publicly recognized?

Yes, EUSA Lifetime Members will be listed in the *EUSA Review* and in our printed, biennial Member Directory.

EUROPEAN UNION STUDIES ASSOCIATION

New Individual Membership Form Only (*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):

Individual _____ \$85 two-year membership

Student* _____ \$55 two-year membership

Lifetime Membership _____ \$1500 (+ credit for \$500 tax deduction)

* *Students must provide copy of current semester's registration form.*

EU Law Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Political Economy Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

Teaching the EU Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Latin America Caribbean Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Economics Interest Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU Public Opinion and Participation Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EU as Global Actor Section _____ \$10 (2 yrs.)

EUSA members may wish to make a contribution to support the work of EUSA in any amount over membership dues:

EUSA Grants and Scholarships Fund \$ _____

EUSA Endowment Fund \$ _____

Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies \$ _____

Total amount of dues and gifts enclosed \$ _____

We prefer payment by check (payable to “EUSA”) when possible. Checks must be in US\$ and drawn on a USA bank. We also accept international money orders and MasterCard or Visa credit cards. Your cancelled check or credit card statement will be your receipt.

MasterCard # _____/_____/_____/_____

Visa # _____/_____/_____/_____

Expiry ___/___ Last 3 digits from back side of card ___/___/___

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



Inside the Spring 2004 *EUSA Review*:

EUSA Review Forum: Transatlantic Relations: A Year Later	
“Transatlantic Trade Issues”	Sophie Meunier 1
“Transatlantic Relations and European Security and Defense”	John T. S. Keeler 4
“Transatlantic Cooperation in the Area of Border Control”	Virginie Guiraudon 5
Call for Proposals: EUSA’s 9th Biennial Conference	8
Teaching the EU	
“Transatlantic Tensions: Opportunities for Learning”	Judith Kelley 9
Book Reviews	12
EU-Related Web Sites	18
Conferences; Publications	20
EUSA Prizes, EUSA Listserv	21
EUSA News and Notes	22

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.

How to Support the European Union Studies Association



Lifetime Membership

\$1500 for all our materials, for life, and credit for a one-time tax-deductible contribution of \$500

EUSA Grants and Scholarships Fund

to support EU-related scholarship, the EUSA prizes, and travel to the biennial EUSA Conference

EUSA Endowment Fund

to ensure the long-term viability and independence of our non-profit organization

Ernst Haas Memorial Fund for EU Studies

to honor the seminal work of Ernst B. Haas and support dissertation research in EU studies

Your gifts are tax-deductible to the extent allowable by U.S. tax law. Donors of \$25 or more receive a receipt for income tax purposes and will be listed in the *EUSA Review*. 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