



EUROPEAN UNION STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Vol. 19, No.2 ISSN 1535-7031
Spring 2006 www.eustudies.org

EUSA REVIEW

EUSA Review Forum

The Danish Cartoon Controversy: A Defense of Liberal Freedom

Randall Hansen

THE DANISH CARTOON CONTROVERSY,¹ which erupted following the publication by a conservative Danish daily of caricatures of the prophet Muhammed, provoked popular passions and intellectual debate that recalled the 1980 Rushdie affair. In this piece, I review the Danish cartoon controversy and offer a robust defense of the right to free expression that, importantly, rejects the notion that Islam and the West are split by any immutable differences of principle. The ‘clash of civilizations’ thesis is another rendition of the argument made dozens of times in the settler societies – against Germans, Jews, Italians, Asians, and East Europeans – that this current batch of immigrants is for reason *x* harder to integrate than previous waves of immigration. Against this argument stands the weight of history: all of these groups have integrated into Canada, the US, and Australia. The precedent suggests the same will be true of Muslim migrants; indeed, in most cases, it is already true. The corollary of rejecting the thesis of Muslim exceptionalism, however, is the rejection of any claim to religious, in this case, Muslim preference: like all other actors living within the liberal state, observant Muslims’ beliefs are to be respected, but they are to be accommodated within the norms and principles that underpin the liberal constitutional state. They cannot be demanded through a revision of those norms and principles.

Events, dear boy, events: the development of the Danish cartoon crisis

On 17 September 2005, the Danish newspaper *Politiken* published an article entitled ‘A Profound Fear of Criticizing Islam,’ which discussed the difficulties encountered by a Danish writer, Kare Bluitgen, in finding an illustrator for a children’s book. The paper attributed its difficulties to self-censorship. Two weeks later *Jyllands-Posten* published twelve caricatures of the prophet Muhammed. *Jyllands-Posten* is a conservative newspaper with a circulation of 175,000, the largest in Denmark. It has close ties to the Prime Minister of Denmark, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, whose coalition includes

the far-right Danish People’s party. Its core demographic is made up of farmers and the provincial middle class. It had never published anything that would offend their religious sensibilities.

The cartoons themselves, depending on one’s tastes, varied from the anodyne and perhaps even amusing to the offensive. One was a subtle attack on the paper itself: in it, Muhammad is not the prophet but rather a young boy, a second-generation migrant. He points to a chalkboard script: ‘The editorial team of *Jyllands-Posten* is a bunch of reactionary provocateurs.’ The most offensive portrays Muhammed with a bomb, replete with a lit fuse, in his turban. It was penned by a member of *Jyllands-Posten*’s staff.

Following the publication of the cartoons, Muslim groups in Denmark launched a series of protests. All of these fell well within what we would regard as regular interest group activity. The Islamic Society of Denmark demanded an apology and the withdrawal of the cartoons on 9 October, and 5000 people held a peaceful protest at the Copenhagen offices of *Jyllands-Posten* on 14 October. At this moment, the crisis became international. On 19 October, ambassadors from eleven Islamic countries requested a meeting with the Danish Prime Minister, Rasmussen, to discuss the cartoons. He refused, citing free speech and his government’s unwillingness to influence editorial opinion. A week later, Muslim organizations in Denmark filed a complaint against the paper, claiming the publication constituted blasphemy under a rarely invoked section of the Danish criminal code. At the end of the month, there were the first signs of what was to come. Muslim youth, possibly taking inspiration from the French suburbs, rioted in a suburb of Aarhus, citing in part the cartoons as justification.

Until this point, the story was a Danish one. Then, with the court case undecided, a delegation of imams headed off to the Middle East with a 43-page document entitled ‘Dossier about championing the prophet Muhammed peace be upon him.’ The dossier contained the 12 caricatures, pictures from another Danish newspaper, anti-Muslim hate mail, a televised interview with Dutch Member of Parliament Ms Ayaan Hirsi Ali, who received the Freedom Prize from the Danish Liberal Party, and three additional images. The last included a picture of a man with a pig’s face. The dossier claimed that this was an insulting representation of the prophet

(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.

© 2006 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

Amy Verdun (University of Victoria)

Book Reviews Editor

Andrew Smith (Sciences po Bordeaux)

Assistant Editors

Irina Andriamanana

Kim Rajdev

2005-2007 EUSA Executive Committee

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

LIESBET HOOGHE, Vice-Chair (UNC Chapel Hill)

SOPHIE MEUNIER, Secretary
(Princeton University)

AMY VERDUN, Treasurer
(University of Victoria)

GRAINNE DE BURCA (European University
Institute; New York University)

VIRGINIE GUIRAUDON
(European University Institute)

FRANK SCHIMMELFENNIG
(University of Mannheim)

ALBERTA SBRAGIA (University of Pittsburgh)
Ex Officio

Immediate Past Chair (2003-2005)

GEORGE ROSS (Brandeis University)

European Union Studies Association ®

415 Bellefield Hall

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA 15260 USA

Web www.eustudies.org ®

E-mail eusa@pitt.edu

Telephone 412.648.7635

From the Chair

John T.S. Keeler

WE ARE PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE the Program Committee and Call for Proposals (details in this issue on p.7) for our Tenth EUSA Biennial International Conference to be held May 17-19, 2007, in Montreal, Canada. The 2007 Program Committee Chair is Wade Jacoby, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Europe at the Brigham Young University. Wade will lead an excellent and diverse Program Committee whose membership is listed in the Call and on our Web site. The deadline for proposals will be Friday, September 22, 2006. 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. Contingent upon receiving a grant from the European Commission, we will again offer modest conference travel grants to encourage student and young scholar 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 2007 we will recognize the best dissertation in EU studies at a U.S. institution and the best paper presented at our 2005 Conference in Austin. As noted in the last issue of the *EUSA Review*, we will also present our 5th Lifetime Contribution Award to Professor Fritz Scarpf. In addition, the 2003-05 Executive Committee instituted 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. 15 and will be 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 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,

(continued on p.22)

(continued from p.1) Muhammed, but it was in fact the winner of a French pig-squealing contest that had nothing to do with Islam. The delegation's spokesperson was Ahmed Akkari. Akkari was secretly filmed by a French TV crew suggesting, to the delegation's head, Sheikh Raed Hlayhel, that Naser Khader – a moderate, integrationist Muslim and member of the Danish parliament – be bombed. When confronted, Akkari rediscovered his sense of humor (though he remained irony-blind): he was only joking. It was a form of expression presumably covered by free speech principles.

In early 2006, things began to get ugly. A Swedish newspaper published two of the cartoons, followed by a Swedish paper and the *Brussels Journal*, which published all twelve. On 24 January, Saudi Arabia publicly condemned the cartoons, followed by Yemen, and Syria. Libya closed its embassy in Denmark. The Danish flag was burned in Nablus and Hebron, on the West Bank. *Jyllands-Posten*, clearly taken aback by the events it unleashed, issued two apologies for hurting Muslim feelings, though not for publishing the cartoons. They had no effect. On 30 January, armed gunmen in the Gaza strip stormed the European Union (EU) office in Gaza, threatening to kidnap the workers unless the EU issued an official apology. Hamas's leader demands that Denmark punish the cartoonists and *Jylland-Posten*.

By February, one French, four German, one Italian, one Spanish, one American, and three Dutch publications had decided to publish (some or all of the) the cartoons. Publishers in Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Honduras, India, Ireland, New Zealand, and South Korea followed suit. Demonstrations were organized outside the Danish embassy in London, during which radical Islamists brandish placards stating "Slay [also butcher/massacre/behead/exterminate] those who insult Islam," "Free speech go to hell," "Europe is the cancer and Islam is the cure," and "Europe will pay, your 9/11 is on its way." In the Middle East, Syria and Lebanon decide to instrumentalize the crisis. In Damascus, demonstrations (with direct or indirect government assistance) were organized outside the Swedish and Danish embassies, and the building housing both is set on fire by a mob. The Norwegian embassy was next, and it too burned. In Beirut, protesters set the Danish embassy ablaze. In Gaza, the same happened to a German cultural centre. Demonstrations became ever more violent, and in Somalia, India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan people were killed. When the protests finally burn themselves out, some 139 people were dead.

Reactions in the EU and the West

As the accusations of western hypocrisy and Islamphobia became ever louder, reactions in the west became ever more accommodating. The European Union protested the burning of the embassies, but balked at the prospect of collectively withdrawing its ambassadors. In the face of the unofficially encouraged boycott of Danish products, the EU threatened vague retaliation, but did nothing. As Danish flags burned –

the protestors demanding respect for religious symbols that matter to them but showing none for the national symbols of others – the EU remained silent. The EU's reaction was nothing short of feeble.

The United Nations (UN) entered the fracas in the autumn. Under pressure from Muslim countries, some of whose records on tolerance are hardly without blemish, requested observations from the Permanent Danish Mission to the UN and launched an investigation into the cartoons' "racism." Next came the Council of Europe, which attacked the Danish government's invocation of free speech as a defense of the cartoons. The cartoons were "insulting" and a "seam of intolerance" characterized the Danish media.

Finally, major politicians – active and retired – offered their pronouncements. Tony Blair and George Bush, according to *Guardian* commentator Jonathan Steele, showed their "good sense...by siding with leftwing and liberal critics of the offensive drawings' publication." But it was Bill Clinton who went furthest in attacking the cartoons, describing them as "totally outrageous" and comparing European Islamophobia today with prewar Anti-semitism.

Whither freedom of speech?

In the midst of the furor, those who defended the cartoons in the name of free speech – the Millian principle that we may hate what people say but will defend to the death their right to say it – found themselves isolated and their motivations impugned. They were at best hypocritical, and worst racist. As a Research Fellow at the University of Manchester put it,

A chorus of European commentators have invoked the freedom to speak as a smokescreen for the crudest form of racist vilification. In addition to Israel, this racist vilification spans at least thirteen European states. The constellation of responses spanning media coverage cannot have escaped anyone's attention. Reminiscent of the liberal inquisition pursued by western commentators during the Rushdie affair in 1980, we are yet again witnessing attempts to denigrate legitimate Muslim political expression. Back then Muslims merely questioned the conventional criteria of free speech. Now, however, they recognize free speech as *the* red herring in an Islamophobic onslaught...These cartoons cannot be located in the tradition of European satire, but they can be located within the tradition of racist representation, currently directed at Europe's powerless minorities (Nabi 2006).

If there was a "chorus," it was barely audible; the majority of liberal newspaper commentators and scholars did everything they could to judge the motives of the cartoon's publishers – they were racist, wanted to provoke, in partnership with the rightwing government, and so on – and to relativize that of the violent protestors – they were frustrated with poverty, social exclusion, discrimination, the war in Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine. When an earlier version of this article was sent to the misnamed website "Open Democracy," they re-

jected it on the grounds that their coverage had “moved on.” This week, the headline story sings from what has become the standard scholarly song sheet: “the Muslim protest...challenges the conceits of liberal democracy.”

The equation of the cartoons with racism has become so common (a google search of ‘Danish cartoons’ and ‘racist’ produces 232,000 hits) that it is rarely, if ever, questioned. It should be. Three possibilities present themselves. The first is that the cartoonists and editors are themselves racist. They might well be, but the cartoons themselves do not provide a doorway into their heads. The second is that Denmark is a particularly anti-Islamic society, and that the publication of the cartoons reflects that hostility. Again, this might be the case, but it might not. Comparative public opinion polls, content analysis of editorials, and studies of day-to-day discrimination faced by Muslims would shed light on this question. The cartoons themselves tell us nothing. The third is that the cartoons equate Muslims with terrorists.

Did they? The question is open to interpretation, but none of the cartoons portrayed stereotypical looking Muslims; they were not, as many claimed, the equivalent of *der Stürmer’s* hooked nose, bearded Jew reaching into a pot of gold. The most offensive cartoons – and they are offensive – portray Muhammad with an unsheathed sword and with a lit bomb in his turban. They seem to equate Islam with terrorism, to argue that Islam is an essentially violent and deadly religion. This is of course nonsense, but is it racism? It is not. It is hatred of a religion. And in a liberal society, there is and must be a distinction between racism and religious hatred, for the simple reason that while there can be no acceptable reason to object to ‘blackness’ there are many good reasons to object to religion, whether Christianity, Judaism, or Islam. Many people believe, not without historical evidence, that religion encourages intolerance and violence (how many throats have been slashed in religion’s name?) and oppresses women and minorities (think of all three religion’s attitude toward gays). In a liberal democratic society, religion is, like it or not, a fair target for criticism, satire and, fortunately or unfortunately, mockery and ridicule.

This point relates to the question of whether the cartoons were hate speech, the only conceivable grounds for censoring them. Most of them were not. The sword/bomb cartoons came closest, but again only if they are read as equating Muslims with terrorists, or if it can be shown that they provoked attacks on Muslims. As far as we know, they only provoked attacks by Muslims.

Some might reject the hatred of religion/hatred of race distinction as untenable on the grounds that putative hostility to religion masks a deep-seated hostility to Muslim people. Tariq Modood (2005) argues this case, pointing to two pieces of evidence: “First, the suggestion that Muslims are not the subject of racism because they are a religious group is nonsense when one considers that the victimisation of another religious group, the Jews, is paradigmatic of many peoples’

understanding of racism, especially on the continent.” Second, there is an “idea – prevalent among anti-racists, the progressive intelligentsia, and beyond, that religions people are not worthy of protection; more than that, they should be subject not just to intellectual criticism but mockery and ridicule (Modood 2006).”

The first matter oversimplifies the matter. A religious group may be transformed by racists into an ethno-racial group, which is exactly what happened to the Jews. There are, of course, clear-cut instances when Muslims are attacked because they are Muslim: women wearing the hijab are spat on, men with beards or who otherwise appear Muslim are denied jobs. Such and similar incidents are depressingly common. Islamophobia does exist, but this does not mean that every injustice suffered by Muslims – social exclusion, poverty, physical and verbal attacks – can be related back to a hatred of religion. In many if not most cases, those committing the injustice could not distinguish a Muslim from a Hindu and are motivated by nothing other than base racism. Many of those who invoke 9/11 as an excuse for attacking Muslims would have attacked them pre-9/11 as Asians, Pakistanis, or Indians. Some readers may view the hatred of religion/hatred of race distinction as one without a difference, but there are broader issues at stake. Some of those who are quickest to claim Islamophobia – and I cite the Muslim Council of Britain here – have an interest in essentializing Muslims, placing their religious identity above their nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, or any other sort of attachment they might have. Rather than being Pakistanis, Indians, Saudi Arabians, Britons, Germans, Londoners, Berliners, Europeans, cosmopolitans, gays, atheists, workers, or anything else, the foundation of their identity can only be Islam (Adamson 2006). And their spokespeople head an organization that denounces homosexuality as a sin, does not include Muslim gays and lesbians, and refuses to recognize Holocaust Memorial Day.

Modood’s second argument can be easily dismissed. Defenders of free speech do not hold that religion *should* be subject to mockery; they hold that it *can* be subject to mockery. In a liberal democratic society, religion is, like it or not, a fair target for criticism, satire and, fortunately or unfortunately, mockery and ridicule.

Hypocrisy and free speech: the case of Holocaust denial

Defenders of free speech are frequently accused of hypocrisy because of the West’s treatment of the holocaust: it criminalizes holocaust denial while allowing Muslims to be mocked, ridiculed, and vilified. While this argument seems superficially appealing, it too is unsustainable for three reasons. First, banning holocaust denial while allowing the ridicule of religion is not inherently hypocritical. Liberal thinkers have long admitted exceptions of freedom of speech, and it might be argued that criminalizing holocaust denial is an acceptable limit while limits on free speech are not. Denying a

historical fact is not the same thing as mocking a religion. The accusation of hypocrisy would only make sense if it were the case that *any* limit on freedom of speech were evidence of hypocrisy; clearly this is not so. Second, holocaust denial is hardly illegal across all of Europe, though that is the most common position; it is perfectly legal in the UK and in Denmark. Third, and most importantly, there are many liberals – including Ronald Dworkin and Deborah Lipstadt (and the author) who believe that such laws should be overturned in the name of freedom of speech and who oppose the recent imprisonment of historian David Irving under Austria’s holocaust denial laws.

Who’s the hypocrite now?

The real hypocrisy and inconsistency would be if Western countries protected some religions but failed to protect others. They do not. When Christian fundamentalists burn abortion clinics, demand the teaching of education and prayer in school, and attempt to have homosexuals fired, they are told that their religious beliefs are inconsistent with liberal constitutional values. If any religion has been treated with leniency and indulgence, it is Islam. As noted, in the weeks since the protests erupted, major politicians – George Bush, Tony Blair, Jack Straw, and Bill Clinton – and liberal intellectuals (see the contributions to <http://www.guardian.co.uk/cartoonprotests/0,,1703418,00.html>) have lined up to denounce the cartoons; they have urged self-censorship; and they have expressed sympathy with offended Muslims. I doubt that Christian fundamentalists would receive such an empathetic response under comparable circumstances. If, following the screening of the ‘Last Temptation of Christ,’ Christian fundamentalists had burned theatres, and held placards in Times Square saying ‘Death to you and your Freedoms,’ the response from the liberal intelligentsia and politicians would have been total condemnation. I find it unlikely that either would justify their actions with reference to the difficulty of living in a world that does not respect one’s deepest beliefs, or explain that years of seeing babies murdered (which is what abortion is for Christian fundamentalists), deviant lifestyles flaunted, and insulting representations of Christians (think of the Church Lady on Saturday Night Live) led to a level frustration that boiled over because of the film.

One ironic element in the whole crisis was that the real hypocrites were not identified. They were not observant, non-violent Muslims: it is entirely right of them to let their offense be known, and to protest, as Catholics and Jews do, a failure to respect their religion. They only have to accept that they may not convince everyone that it or any religion is worth respecting. Nor, for that matter, were the violent Muslims hypocritical: the position of those few who shouted “massacre those who insult Islam” was all too clear and consistent.

Neither were Danes hypocritical: Denmark has some of the most robust free expression laws in the world. It is the

home, against German protests, of many publishers of neo-Nazi propaganda, and it hosted, against Russian accusations of support for terrorism, a Chechen congress. Danish courts rejected police demands that a journalist reveal his sources for a story on Islamic extremists in Denmark. Danish artists have with impunity painted murals of Jesus with an erect penis and made films portraying him as a sexually active terrorist. The country consistently ranks near the top of ‘Reporters without borders’ worldwide index of press freedom. Since the crisis erupted, there has been much talk of the importance of context – particularly broader Muslim frustration and deeply held prejudice in Denmark – but little has been said about this libertarian Danish context. In failing to placate Muslim demands for censorship and/or apology, the Danes were on one level treating them as citizens rather than foreigners.

The real hypocrites in the debate were liberal intellectuals, too many to name, who spent years denouncing Christian fundamentalist demands for prayer and the teaching of evolution, in schools, the censorship of books and films, and limits on abortion, only to cave to fundamentalist Muslim demands for the introduction of Sharia law, for separate swimming classes for boys and girls, and – in the Danish case – for the respect for religious rules not only by members of the religious group but by the society at large. Portraying the prophet may be prohibited for Muslims, but it is not and cannot be for anyone else. Muslims may ask that others respect their religious precepts, but they cannot demand it any more than observant Jews can demand that their fellow citizens not shop on Saturdays or Christians can demand that non-believers respect their sexual mores. That liberal intellectuals could be so absolutist in their dismissal of the demands made by Christian fundamentalists but so apologist and relativist in their indulgence of those made by Muslim fundamentalist beggars belief.

Muslim exceptionalism?

One argument for a Muslim ‘opt-out’ of the liberal free speech requirement might be that Muslims take their religion more seriously than Jews or Christians. I know many Jews and Christians who would disagree, but let’s admit the possibility. If we do, then there is a problem. Academics, including myself, have for years rejected as bigoted the argument that Muslims are particularly difficult, relative to earlier generations of migrants, to integrate. Many of those angered by the cartoons would also reject the claim, but they cannot have it both ways. They cannot argue that Muslim integration does not present particular challenges *and* that religion is so important to Muslim identity that our conception of laws on freedom of speech have to be changed. Because if the latter were the case, then Muslim integration would raise particular challenges and present particular difficulties.

For my part, I am convinced that it does not. I’m sure it is

the case that many Muslims are deeply and genuinely offended by the Danish cartoons, and I sympathize with them. But this offence is the price of living in a liberal society, one that has been paid by many groups before. Soldiers in Canada or Britain who were disgusted by the thought of serving in the army with homosexuals have been told they must; Christians and feminists who object to pornography have been told that others have a right to view such material; Bavarian Catholics who demanded a crucifix in every school were told that respect for other religions in Germany meant that they couldn't. Elderly Jews, including holocaust survivors, have been told that they could not stop neo-Nazis from marching past their front windows. Going back further, racists have been told that their deepest convictions were unacceptable. In these as in many other cases, people have been told that their firmly held beliefs and attitudes were inconsistent with liberal democracy and that, however important those beliefs and however offensive a failure to respect them was, they simply had to accept it. So it is with those Muslims who think that their religion is above satire and mockery. It is not; no religion is.

At the end of the piece cited earlier, Tariq Modood presents Europe with a choice: it has to decide which is more important, the right to ridicule Muslims or the integration of them. This gets it entirely wrong. It is not Europe that has to choose; it is rather those who wish to restrict free speech, whether they be Muslim or non-Muslim, citizens or non-citizens, recent immigrants or longstanding permanent residents. They have to decide whether they wish to live in a liberal democratic society. If they do, they have to accept that they will hear and see things that offend them, sometimes deeply. They are free to protest them peacefully, but not to demand their criminal sanction. They will hopefully do this in the knowledge that that same liberal democracy sustains many values and practices from which they benefit and that they cherish. In the end, the same liberal democratic values that protect a right to practice one's religion, to maintain one's distinctive cultural practices, to be reunited with one's family through family reunification, protect the right of free speech. It is part of the liberal democratic framework, not a negotiable addition to it.

Randall Hansen is Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair in Immigration & Governance in the the University of Toronto Department of Political Science

Notes

¹ I have discussed the issues raised in this essay with many people, and I am grateful for their comments: Emmanuel Adler, Fiona Adamson, Erik Bleich, Joseph Carens, Matthew Gibney, Todd Lawson, Rahsaan Maxwell, Shourideh Molaei, Shahreen Reza, Phil Triadafilopolous, Gokce Yurdakul, Melissa Williams.

Works Cited

Fiona Adamson, "“Muslim” as a Politicized Identity Category: Changing Discourses of “Immigrant” Mobilization and Political Incorporation in Western Europe,' Paper presented at the Council of European Studies conference, Chicago, 29 March-1 April 2006.

Tariq Modood (2005). "The Liberal Dilemma: Integration or Vilification?" at http://www.opendemocracy.net/faith-terrorism/liberal_dilemma_3249.jsp (consulted 15/05/06).

Shaida Nabi (2006). "Honing European Traditions" at http://www.opendemocracy.net/faith-europe_islam/muslim_cartoons_3244.jsp#seven (consulted 1/03/06)

EUSA Interest Sections

The European Union Studies Association now has eight 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; EU Public Policy 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 Montreal (May 17-19, 2007). For more information, please visit <www.eustudies.org/EUSAsections.html>.

place rev2007call here

EUSA Public Policy Interest Section Essay

Whatever Happened to Public Policy?

John McCormick

AS WE KNOW, research and publishing on the European Union has undergone a boom in the last 10-15 years. Whether in the form of textbooks, monographs, trade books, or journal articles, the isolated trickles of the 1980s and early 1990s have turned into the torrent of today, reflecting a combination of the increase in the number of scholars and analysts who have turned their attention to this fascinating and yet sometimes exasperating topic, the growing interest in matters European among students and the informed public, and the degree to which the EU has now simply come to matter.

Twenty years ago, comparative studies of European states were more prominent than studies of the European Community/Union, and it is difficult today to read much of that literature without noting the absence of discussion about integration, or – where it exists – detecting prominent seams of bemusement and even occasionally bafflement about its implications. Back then, integration was something that impinged only on the margins of studies of the individual states of Europe, and it was not always well understood; today, no study of Europe or those individual states is complete without consideration of the impact of integration, the features and the outlines of which have achieved greater clarity, and the debates over which have intensified. The result: It is hard to keep up with the production of new research on the EU, which examines the mechanics and implications of integration from multiple and occasionally surprising perspectives.

And yet the level of coverage remains strangely irregular. While there has been much new notice paid to institutions, for example, the Council of Ministers and the European Council have attracted notably less attention than the Commission and Parliament. This is odd given the importance of the former institutions to decision-making; apparently we are more interested in the servants of the decision-making process than in the people who actually make the decisions. And the bulk of research on the European Court of Justice has come from legal scholars, who are generally more interested in the intricacies of European law than in the political, economic and social impact of the Court.

Nowhere have the irregularities been more visible than in the field of EU policy studies. If we were to gauge results on the ground by the volume of the literature, we would be left with some gross misconceptions about the policy priorities of the EU. A quick scan of library bookshelves and the contents pages of journals would give the impression that foreign policy was at the top of EU agenda; perhaps no single area of EU policy has been the subject of so much study and

so much debate. The same scan would probably give us the impression that security policy was also high up the agenda, in spite of the fact that interest in the EU as a military actor has been a relatively recent phenomenon. On environmental policy, the picture would be more accurate; there has been an impressive body of research, keeping up with the EU's productive record as a policy entrepreneur, and reflecting the obvious transfer of policy responsibilities from the member states to the EU.

At the other end of the scale, the scan would leave us with the impression that agricultural policy – by far the biggest of all European policy areas when measured by the amount of EU spending and by the length and the temperature of the political debate – was only marginal to European policy interests. There are perhaps less than a dozen book-length studies, but most are more than twenty years old, leaving Wyn Grant's *The Common Agricultural Policy* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1997) and Alan Greer's *Agricultural Policy in Europe* (Manchester, 2005) among the few whose pages have not yet turned yellow with age. Meanwhile, the next biggest items on the EU budget (regional policy, and employment and social affairs) have been given even shorter shrift, and most other policy interests of the EU (including competition, technology, transport, energy, or justice and home affairs) return even more indistinct shadows on the radar of the literature. And one of the most successful of all EU policy ventures – its common positions on international trade – barely even registers on that radar.

Thus we are left with the curious situation where the most attention has been paid by scholars to those areas of policy that have been among the more modest in their achievements (foreign and security policy), while much less attention has been paid to those areas of policy that have absorbed the most time and money (such as agricultural and structural policy), or that have brought the greatest changes (such as trade and competition policy). More generally, there has been surprisingly little attention paid to the European policy process. Consider the following indicators:

- In their otherwise excellent survey of the “state of the art” of European studies – *European Union Studies* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006) – Michelle Cini and Angela Bourne chose not to include a chapter on public policy, and only one of their authors makes much reference to policy studies, but then only in passing.

- There are few general surveys on public policy in the EU: they include Laura Cram's *Policymaking in the EU* (Routledge, 1997), Jeremy Richardson's edited collection *European Union: Power and Policy-Making* (Routledge, 2001), and the Wallace, Wallace and Pollack edited collection *Policy-Making in the European Union*, now in its fifth edition (Oxford, 2005). The latter is of course important, but it has 15 chapters dealing with case studies and only four

offering broader analytical assessments. (A fourth survey will be available when Buananno and Nugent's new book *Policies and Policy Processes of the European Union* (Palgrave Macmillan) is published in 2007-2008.)

· Over the years, the *Journal of European Public Policy* (first published in 1994) has been a valuable and creative forum for studies of and discussions about public policy in the EU, but it has been functioning in near isolation. Most of the other key journals in EU studies, international relations and comparative politics have made their contributions, but they tend to be less interested in policy than in institutions.

· While research and publishing on distinct areas of policy has grown, it is more often concerned with the content of policy than with the ways in which policy is made or with the pressures and influences that come to bear on the policy process. Thus we often see analyses of the history of policy, the record on developing common policies, the role of institutions, and the results of policy, but we see much less about agenda-setting and policy development.

The state of EU policy studies stands in stark contrast to the state of US policy studies, where there is an extensive body of research and literature on the policy process dating back decades. Public policy in the US has been assessed from every conceivable angle and through every stage in the policy cycle, from agenda-setting to implementation. There is an extensive literature on the forces and pressures that come to bear on policy-making, a host of theories and models have been developed to help us better understand that process (institutional, process, pluralist, elitist, rational, incremental, public choice, and systems – the list goes on), and numerous scholars have built careers and reputations by giving us insight into how policy is developed and implemented in the United States. Contemporary monographs on US public policy can be numbered in the high dozens, while recent journal articles can be numbered in the hundreds.

But the story is quite different with the EU. There is no question that considerable effort has been invested in better trying to understand the way that European institutions function, and in clarifying the relationship between those institutions and the governments of the member states, but how much do we ultimately know about the difference that Europe has made? The literature on European policy analysis is meager, minimal attention has been paid to the manner in which the European policy agenda is formed, or to the pressures and principles that drive policy formulation, and far less attention has been paid in Europe than in the United States to questions of policy legitimation, implementation, or evaluation. Even the literature on Europeanization is not always convincing on the changes to national policies that have arisen out of the pressure of integration and those that have come from other sources.

Why is the field of European policy studies so underdeveloped? Much of the explanation probably lies in the dominance of international relations (IR) over comparative politics in studies of the EU. As we struggle to pin down the personality and character of the EU, wondering where it sits on the continuum between an international organization and a state, the bias tends to remain with the internationalists. But as a discipline, IR deals little with public policy (except foreign and security policy, which helps explain why the literature in EU foreign and security policy is so substantial). Perhaps if we were to focus more on the qualities of the EU as a proto-state, we might be more inclined to focus on trying to understand how it makes, implements, and evaluates policy. In order for the field of European policy studies to grow, then, we need to see more attention paid to the methods and interests of the comparativists.

Second, attention to policy has been compromised by the Europeanist addiction to theory. And here again IR has much to answer for. Thanks to the strong theoretical bias of IR studies, far more scholarly effort has been employed in trying to understand the character of the EU, and in trying to understand how and why European integration has evolved, than in trying to better understand how policy decisions are made. The resulting literature has been valuable, to be sure, and much of it can give us insight into the character of policy-making. But policy has not been its major focus or concern, and EU studies have focused on explaining principles to the detriment of explaining process. In other words, attempts to explain how integration has happened have swamped attempts to explain what difference it makes.

Finally, the modesty of the EU policy literature is a reflection of how quickly the EU has grown up and expanded its reach. For much of its 50-plus years it has been an exercise in economic integration, and it has only been in the last 15 years or so that scholars of the EU have come to better appreciate the role of the EU as a policy entrepreneur, and to see that "competence" has come to mean something much broader and multi-faceted than it once did. But the focus is still on individual, isolated policy areas, rather than on trying to draw universal conclusions from the lessons of the case studies. In short, policy specialists have not been able to migrate in any great numbers out of their more narrow interests into broader studies of the character and personality of European-level policy-making and implementation. Why should we care? Because the picture painted by our accumulated efforts is incomplete, and because we cannot really understand the EU without looking in more depth at its broader policy achievements.

It was concerns such as these that recently prompted the creation of a new EUSA public policy interest section. There were already sections dealing with political economy, economics, and the EU as a global actor, but it seemed logical to establish a new section that would look at the EU policy process more broadly defined. The new section sets out to

focus on the pressures, principles, and ideas that drive EU policy broadly-defined, as well as promoting a new focus on under-studied policy areas, and encouraging the development of better theories of EU policy. Hopefully it will act as a gathering point and clearing house for EUSA members with interests in policy, will promote the submission of panel proposals to EUSA conferences, will maintain a page on the EUSA web site, and perhaps - in due course - will develop a syllabus bank, issue a regular newsletter, maintain a list of research interests of members, and organize workshops. Agreement has also been reached to organize annual essays for the *EUSA Review*. In the end, we hope that the work of the section will help elevate EU policy studies to the position on the scholarly agenda that they deserve.

John McCormick is Professor and Chair of Political Science at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

The *EUSA Review* follows an annual calendar of announcements and listings organized in four topic areas: Winter (December 15): [EU-Related Academic Programs](#) (degree or certificate-granting, worldwide); Spring (March 15): [EU-Related Web Sites](#) (especially primary sources such as databases, on-line publications, and bibliographies); Summer (June 15): [EU-Related Organizations](#) (academic and professional associations or independent research centers (such as think tanks) with significant EU aspects in their missions); and Fall (September 15): [EUSA Members' Research Notes](#) (current, EU-related, funded research projects). Send brief announcements by e-mail to eusa@pitt.edu.

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

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM, University of Pittsburgh, Archive of European Integration (AEI), is a major online repository for non-commercial, non-governmental full text publications (short monographs, working or policy papers, conference papers, etc.) dealing with some aspect of European integration, whether they are already on the Web or not. The AEI co-sponsors are the European Union Studies Association and the Center for West European Studies/European Union Center, University of Pittsburgh.

As discussed above, the AEI is partnering with the European Research Papers Archive (ERPA) and the European Integration online Papers (EIoP), and seeks to acquire other appropriate papers which do not reside on the ERPA. It will be possible to access and search simultaneously the AEI, the ERPA, and the EIoP. Together, the ERPA and the AEI will constitute the most comprehensive, accessible single interface to materials on European integration either already available on the Internet or in another format that can be converted to be deposited on the AEI.

Anyone can access and download materials on the AEI. The search engine allows searching by author, title, keyword, year, etc. Not only are titles free to all for reading and downloading for personal use, the AEI is an archive for the permanent retention of articles submitted (authors can have titles removed upon request).

If either individuals or institutions know of additional materials – either in electronic or paper format, and no matter how old – which would be appropriate for the AEI, please feel free to contact Phil Wilkin at pwilkin@pitt.edu. The AEI editors invite all with appropriate papers to submit them to the AEI. The AEI editors will be happy to help any individual or organization seeking assistance with the process of contributing materials to the AEI. If you wish to deposit papers in a series, you *must* contact the AEI editor before beginning deposit of papers. With questions about the AEI, e-mail aei@library.pitt.edu.

place elgar ad here

Book Reviews

Berthold Rittberger. *Building Europe's Parliament: Democratic Representation beyond the Nation-State*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005, 234pp.

RECENT YEARS HAVE WITNESSED the publication of several important works on the establishment and empowerment of supranational institutions. Much of this research has been based on the principal-agent framework, with scholars specifying the incentives for and conditions under which member states delegate significant policy-making and control functions to institutions such as the Commission and the European Court of Justice. Interestingly, the creation and subsequent strengthening of the European Parliament (EP) had until now escaped similar detailed, theory-driven analysis.

Hence the book by Berthold Rittberger, *Building Europe's Parliament*, comes at the right time, filling this gap in the literature. The objective of Rittberger is seemingly simple: to explain the creation of the Parliament (initially called the Consultative Assembly) in the early 1950s, and the subsequent empowerment of the EP in 1970, when it was assigned budgetary powers, and in 1987, when the Single European Act introduced the co-operation procedure which paved the way for the later introduction of the co-decision procedure. Rittberger also covers more superficially the recent developments from the Maastricht Treaty onwards, focusing here also on the role of national parliaments as an alternative channel for legitimizing EU decision-making. Rittberger bases his analysis on a wide range of data, consisting primarily of various government documents, parliamentary debates and personal recollections of the key participants in the negotiations.

The key word of the book is legitimacy. According to Rittberger the legitimacy of the EU is based both on outputs – or what he calls ‘consequentialist legitimacy’ – and on inputs – ‘procedural legitimacy’. Rittberger argues that the transfer of powers to the supranational level produces a legitimacy deficit unless member states simultaneously establish supranational democratic institutions. As a result, when bargaining in Intergovernmental Conferences (IGC), national governments will ‘feel compelled’ (p. 51) to think about democracy and institutional design at the European level. And, when making choices on how to inject (at least some degree of) democracy to EU decision-making, the national leaders will be guided by alternative ‘legitimizing beliefs’, with the main division being between those that support the establishment of a federal state versus those who favour intergovernmental cooperation.

Rittberger puts forward three rival explanations for understanding the creation and empowerment of the EP. According to the ‘rationalist’ hypothesis, ‘decision-making is

characterized by bargaining about the powers of the EP and the outcome reflects the constellation of preferences and relative bargaining power of member state governments’ (p. 58). The ‘communicative action’ hypothesis in turn claims that ‘decision-making is characterized by a truth-seeking discourse on the appropriate role of the EP in the Community polity as a result of which member state governments reach a reasoned consensus’ (p. 59). Finally, the ‘rhetorical action’ hypothesis argues that ‘decision-making is characterized by the strategic use of arguments through which member state governments seek to justify and realize their own preferences regarding the powers of the EP. Proponents of the *federal state* ‘legitimizing belief’ – appealing to community values – exercise social pressure on recalcitrant states with the aim to shame them into acquiescing to the EP’s empowerment. Recalcitrant member states will downplay the outcomes, question their relevance or reinterpret them to their advantage in the light of domestic opposition’ (p. 64).

The strategy of using such hypotheses works only partially. While Rittberger certainly deserves credit for critically discussing the background factors that impacted on behaviour of individual governments, the validity of the rival hypotheses is in the end very difficult to prove. The wording of the hypotheses illustrates the problem well – it is practically impossible to draw clear lines between the rival explanations. Rittberger acknowledges this, and shows how all three types of action played a role in the IGCs. Another problem has to do with the way in which the various member states are grouped into different categories of ‘legitimizing beliefs’. Rittberger manages by and large to convince the reader that he knows the preferences (and underlying motives) of the national governments, but occasionally one gets the feeling that the differences between the countries are emphasized too much – especially as it is very difficult to assess the intensity of the preferences. The addition of Tables to the empirical sections, with data on countries’ positions on institutional questions in the IGCs, would have enabled the reader to get a better grasp of what the national governments wanted.

This minor criticism aside, the empirical sections are sound, with Rittberger making impressive use of his data. However, the chapter that covers developments from the Maastricht Treaty to the Constitutional Treaty is much weaker than the preceding chapters. From the point of view of his research design, it makes sense to explore the role of national parliaments as an alternative way of democratising the EU, but unfortunately the discussion is quite superficial in comparison with the other empirical chapters. Perhaps the main problem here is that of not comparing like with like. As the two Tables on pages 188-189 effectively show, the further empowerment of the EP is far more significant than the mere mentioning – mainly in non-binding declarations attached to the Treaties – of national legislatures in the EU’s

'constitution'. Rittberger acknowledges this himself in the text, and hence it might have been better to either focus on the EP alone or then to provide a more nuanced analysis of the limited role accorded to national parliaments. Having said that, I certainly agree with Rittberger's assessment in the chapter. National parliaments have normally been seen as the main losers in European integration, and giving them better access to EU documents, or even giving them a role in monitoring compliance with the subsidiarity principle, will not change the big picture. These new rights are mainly ways to alleviate the concerns of national MPs and more recalcitrant member states, and it is very probable that their impact will remain marginal.

In conclusion, Rittberger has written a convincing and fascinating account of the birth and empowerment of the world's only supranational legislature. This book deserves to be read by both students of the EP and of European integration, not least because it teaches us a lot about government behaviour in IGCs.

Tapio Raunio
University of Turku

Gregory C. Shaffer. Defending Interests. Public-Private Partnerships in WTO Litigation. Washington DC: Brookings Institution, 2003, 227 pp.

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION has enjoyed considerable attention among students of international politics in recent years. The increased legalization of international politics, most conspicuously in the world trading system, has given rise to a range of studies and publications on the development, functioning and consequences of international dispute resolution mechanisms. This literature has benefited from the cross-fertilization between law and political science, and scholars from both disciplines have contributed to it.

Gregory Shaffer's *Defending Interests* provides a distinct contribution to this literature. Shaffer's book studies the role of public-private networks in bringing complaints before the WTO's dispute settlement system. Although, formally speaking, WTO complaints can only be brought by governments, private industries play important roles both in identifying practices that violate WTO law and in preparing the reports and claims that governments subsequently present before the WTO. As a result, WTO litigation can be thought of as a hybrid between public and private litigation. The way these public-private networks operate in practice, the reasons why they work that way, as well as the implications this has for governance in the world trading system, are the topics Shaffer addresses.

In doing so, he compares practices in the US and the EU. Both have established legal procedures under which private firms can inform their governments of foreign trade

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

Dr. Andrew Smith
CERVL
Sciences po Bordeaux
Domaine Universitaire
11 Allée Ausone,
Pessac 33607, France
E-mail a.smith@sciencespobordeaux.fr
Fax 56 84 43 29

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

barriers and urge them to take action. Shaffer shows that these legal procedures are nested in broader public-private networks that are formed to deal with foreign trade barriers. At the same time, there are also marked differences in the way these networks operate on either side of the Atlantic. Shaffer details these differences and offers an account both of why they exist and of why the EU system has tended to develop more toward US-style lobbying and litigation. In the concluding chapter, Shaffer discusses the implications of these public-private networks for domestic politics, Transatlantic relations, and the operation and equity of the world trading system.

Shaffer's book is a well-written, well-informed and thoughtful account of this important yet understudied phenomenon. It has two particular strengths. To begin with, the book is a very good example of how insights from law and political science can be combined to produce better analysis. From law, Shaffer borrows a thorough understanding of law and legal reasoning, as well as a precise and well-documented style. From political science and sociolegal studies, he borrows a keen interest in how law works in practice and what are the political and policy implications of legal procedures. By bringing these two perspectives together, Shaffer is able to understand both the different legal instruments used in the US and the EU and the actual practices that take place 'within' or 'under the umbrella of' those legal constructs.

Second, Shaffer gives a detailed and well-informed analysis of the way public-private networks operate in WTO litigation. Based on documentary sources, existing literature, and a wide range of interviews, the book presents an empirically rich analysis that reveals an intimate knowledge of the field and the players. Despite this empirical richness, the book is clearly structured, well written and to the point, with a pleasant touch of anecdote and subtle irony.

All in all, the book's strongest points, and probably its main ambitions, lie in the thorough presentation of empirical material and the nuanced analysis of policy practices. It is less ambitious in terms of theoretical analysis and it avoids sweeping generalizations. Theoretically, Shaffer places his

book within the literature on public-private policy networks, and his analysis of the differences and similarities between the US and the EU is an important contribution to that literature. The analysis relies mainly on inductive reasoning, combining empirical insights and existing literature, and the book's conclusions are carefully crafted not to extend beyond the reach of the empirical basis. As a result, Shaffer devotes less attention to systematic theory and broader theoretical generalizations, although the book does hint at the wider relevance of the type of networks studied.

Shaffer's book is recommended reading for at least three groups of scholars. Most obviously, the book will be of interest to students of international trade policies or, more specifically, transatlantic trade relations. Shaffer gives a detailed and in-depth account of the way WTO litigation works in practice, as well as an analysis of the implications this has for transatlantic ties and the world trading system. Moreover, Shaffer's extensive tables and appendices provide useful reference materials. In addition, the book should be read by scholars working on international adjudication and dispute resolution. Although Shaffer focuses on WTO litigation, his analysis has implications for a wider range of international dispute resolution mechanisms, and provides excellent input for a comparative study of those mechanisms. Finally, the book is relevant to those interested in lobbying and interest representation in the US and the EU. With the rise of interest in group activity in the EU, this topic has gained greater interest among students of EU politics. In recent years, some of this work includes comparisons between the EU and US systems of interest representation. Shaffer's book provides an excellent comparison in one specific area and may serve as both an empirical and a theoretical source of inspiration.

Given the specificity of the book's topic, it is less well-suited as reading material in undergraduate courses. It may, however, form useful complementary reading in graduate or advanced undergraduate courses on trade politics, trade law or international dispute settlement.

Sebastiaan Princen
University of Utrecht

Stefano Bartolini. Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building, and Political Structuring between the Nation State and the European Union. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 415.

OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS, Stefano Bartolini has brought his vast knowledge of state formation to bear on studies of the European Union (EU). In this book, he combines Hirschman's theory of exit, voice and loyalty with Rokkan's study of the formation of territorial units, as a process of boundary building and removing, in order to understand European integration in

terms of the centralisation of authority, the development of collective identity and rights and the structuring of political representation (or, more precisely, as occasionally failed or half-hearted attempts to pursue these objectives). To do so, Bartolini takes a long term perspective. He sees European integration as the last of a series of subsequent and concurrent trends: state building, the development of capitalism, nation formation, democratization and the formation of welfare systems. State and nation formation led to the centralization of power under defined, territorial and hierarchical units and to the creation of cultural boundaries. They provided the wrapping within which capitalism developed. Democratization and the creation of welfare systems provided the mechanisms for national identification and the legitimation of power. European integration is thus seen as a phase that is gradually dismantling the previous processes of centralization of authority and definition of boundaries, leading to legal, economic and cultural de-differentiation. In four empirical chapters, Bartolini then goes on to study the formation of a centre of political authority in the EU, its policy output, the patterns of interest representation and the European party system.

This book is both fascinating and frustrating. It is fascinating because Bartolini shares with us his broad and extensive knowledge of European history and politics. The parts where he cuts through disciplinary boundaries and decades, if not centuries, of history and politics are a pleasure to read. One cannot but admire scholars that have the gift of both perusing and condensing such a broad field of knowledge.

However, the book is also frustrating in essentially two ways. Methodologically, Bartolini has a tendency to over-conceptualize and under-operationalize. This could be the result of the newness of Bartolini's enterprise, but I still think that there are far too many terms and concepts that are introduced but not sufficiently developed and clearly defined. There are also too many causal linkages that remain unclear, at least to this reviewer. In particular, the analysis does not take advantage of the latest developments in qualitative methodology, especially with regard to the identification of spatial and temporal variation across and within units of analysis and clear the elucidation of casual mechanisms through process-tracing, pattern-matching and use of counterfactual reasoning. Indeed, the book would have benefited from a much longer discussion on method in each empirical chapter.

The book is also frustrating for specialists of the EU. Bartolini reveals his impressive knowledge of the field. Chapter three covers the establishment and development of supranational bureaucratic and judicial institutions, the processes of Treaty adoption and enlargement, the distribution of policy competencies, the 'constitutionalization' of and problems of legitimacy in the EU. Chapter four covers the entire EU policy output and its implication for the establishment

and removal of boundaries. Chapter five deals with the structure of political representation of territorial units and interest groups, while chapter six concludes with an analysis of national parties' attitudes towards the EU and the European party system. Thanks to his outstanding historical knowledge, Bartolini provides extensive, illuminating and interesting historical parallels. This said, the specialized reader will probably remain dissatisfied because he or she will find it difficult to discern the detailed, cumulative, added value of each chapter as regards such an extensive literature.

Ultimately, this book is essentially an exercise in typologies as a means of understanding the nature of the (EU) beast. Each empirical chapter concludes observing that the EU shares features with and presents dissimilarities from European states and their formative experiences. Although the author claims to link micro-motivations with macro-outcomes, in my view, he fails in this endeavour. The reason is that because the current EU literature has advanced so considerably in terms of micro-level analysis, and in so doing generated specialized knowledge across the various fields of the EU political system, it has become almost impossible to write a book that contributes significantly to all of its sub-fields.

Fabio Franchino
University College London

EUSA Prizes

THE EUSA 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 2007 to an outstanding paper presented at the 2005 Biennial Conference in Austin. All those who presented an original paper at 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 2005 EUSA

Conference to the EUSA Administrative Office (address below). Papers may not be submitted by facsimile, disk, or delivered to the office in person. Deadline for **receipt** of nominated papers for the EUSA Prize for Best 2005 Conference Paper is **October 31, 2006**.

EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation

The EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation in EU studies will be awarded in 2007 to a dissertation on any aspect of European integration submitted in completion of the Ph.D. at a U.S. university between September 1, 2004 and August 31, 2006. 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 \$200.

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), and an electronic version should be submitted by email or disk as well. Dissertations may not be submitted by facsimile, or delivered to the office in person. Deadline for **receipt** of nominations for the next EUSA Prize for Best Dissertation is **October 31, 2006**.

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 established the **EUSA Book Prize**, to be awarded at each biennial EUSA conference, to 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 2007 EUSA Book Prize, to be awarded in Montreal, Canada, books published in 2005 and 2006 will be eligible. Authors or publishers should submit 3 copies 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, 2007**.

EU-Related Web Sites

The following URLs and annotations have been updated as of May 2006.

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, EU Enlargement, 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.

http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/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.

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

The European Union: A Bibliography by Osvaldo Croci, Department of Political Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland

aei.pitt.edu

The Archive of European Integration (AEI) is an online 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.

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 frame-work 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 Europe.

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.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.

http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/canadaeuropa/menu-en.asp

A Web site dedicated to the exploration of Canada's relations with the countries of Europa.

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.

On-line archives and publications

aei.pitt.edu

The Archive of European Integration is an electronic repository for research materials on the topic of European integration and unification. It now contains many of the papers from past EUSA Conferences. 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.

EU skeptics sources

www.democracy-movement.org.uk/

Democracy Movement's vision is "of a Europe of self-governing democracies that trade together, enjoy cultural exchange with each other, and co-operate voluntarily where it makes sense to do so."

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.”

www.eurosceptic.com

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

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, English, Spanish, and German.

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.

www.fornet.info

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

www.europeanresearchforum.com

The European Research Forum at London Metropolitan University promotes analysis and debate of the politics and economics of the European Union, its member countries, Britain’s relationship to them and its place in the world.

www.jeanmonnetprogram.org

Among the Jean Monnet Program website’s features are the links to our Jean Monnet Working Paper Series, published online throughout the year and in hard-copy form annually, and links to two book review sites under the direction of Professor Joseph Weiler, the European Law Books and Global Law Books sites.

www.unizar.es/euroconstitucion/Home.htm

This website is aimed at researchers, journalists and citizens interested in learning about the 50-year process culminating in the elaboration of a Constitution for the European Union. It brings together facts, official documents, bibliographies, links and other resources relevant to the main treaties that have led to this historic moment.

www.streitcouncil.org

This website offers continuously updated information on the history and current trends of transatlantic relations. It focuses on EU-US relations as they evolve into a more structured partnership.

ieuss.org/sunyme.html

This website contains information about the State University of New York's Model European Union. Visitors can find information about the Model EU annual program, the SUNY Model EU Manual, and a Model EU training film produced by the Institute for European Union Studies at SUNY.

commonagpolicy.blogspot.com/

Regularly updated review of developments in the CAP and international agricultural trade negotiations.

www.ulb.ac.be/assoc/odysseus/

Website of the *Odysseus Academic Network for Legal Studies on Immigration and Asylum in Europe* where information can be found on European Community Law on Immigration and Asylum as well as on national legislations of the Member States in that field.

www.ul.ie/~ceuros

The Centre for European Studies at the University of Limerick provides a focal point for teaching, research, and training programs in European integration.

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/europeanInstitute/>

This site is a portal to European studies at the LSE in which about 100 LSE staff members have research interests. Web pages include information on Study, Staff, Research Centres and Projects, LSE/Bilgi Fellowship, EUI/LSE Erasmus Exchange, News and Announcements and Events.

www.umich.edu/~iinet/euc/

This site provides information to U-M students, faculty and public in the region, on research, programs and events related to European Union and European integration.

www.ips.uiuc.edu/eu/

The website is currently made up of thirteen areas consisting of the Home Page, Faculty, Funding, Academic Resources, Diplomatic Room, Events, EU News, Issues and Debates, Economic Data, the Program in Good Governance, and the Vienna Diplomatic Program. Our site also has links to the European Union Library Resource Center, the Network of EU Centers, the International Programs and Studies web site and to the main University of Illinois web site. The web site is user friendly and provides information for every type of user: students, faculty, K-12 educators, general community, and dignitaries.

www.eucenter.scrippscollege.edu

The European Union Center of California website provides information about the Center's events and programs for students, academics, and the public. The website also includes links to the Center's publications, which include working papers and research briefs.

www.europe.canterbury.ac.nz

Established in 2000 at the University of Canterbury, the NCRE remains the only EU-dedicated tertiary level research centre in New Zealand. It is a multi-disciplinary centre that brings together graduates, post-doctoral fellows and academics from a wide range of disciplines to research and study the European Union and Europe-related issues and topics. Raising a critical awareness of the EU, informing government, the media and public opinion, all play an equally important part in the NCRE's core function.

www.eusanz.org.nz

The European Union Studies Association of New Zealand was formed in 1992. The Association is open to academics and other interested individuals concerned with the study of European integration. The Association is multi-disciplinary in approach and independent in its academic pursuits.

www.jmcoe-australasia.org

In 2004, the National Centre for Research on Europe (NCRE) at the University of Canterbury, Lincoln University, the University of Auckland, and the Contemporary European Research Centre (CERC) at the University of Melbourne, were designated the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence Australasia. This trans-Tasman network is designed to facilitate joint research activities at both the graduate and staff level through sponsoring academic exchanges and mobility.

asef.on2web.com/subSite/ESiA/default.asp

ESiA was initiated by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) to stimulate European studies in Asia by creating synergies between European study centres in the two regions and strengthening interaction between existing networks in Asia. It is an inter-disciplinary and open network that embraces any institution in Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) countries offering European studies research and networking.

www.unc.edu/euce

This site profiles the Network of the European Union Centers of Excellence in the United States. It contains access to research and teaching materials developed in the centers as well as a database of doctoral students writing on EU and transatlantic topics to which students may submit their names.

Spotlight on Poland

Important Websites

<http://www.poland.gov.pl/> - website of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

www.chamberofcommerce.pl/warsawtradecenter/ - Poland Business and Warsaw Trade Center

<http://en.yellowpages.pl/> - Polish Yellow Pages

www.politicalresources.net/poland.htm - Poland Political Resources

www.polandtour.org – Tourist information on Poland

www.experiencepoland.com - Poland Travel and Hotels Guide

Travel in Poland

Polish National Tourist Office

5 Marine View Plaza

Hoboken, NJ 07030.

Tel: 201-420-9910

Fax: 201-584-9153

E-Mail: pntonyc@polandtour.org

Missions

Embassy of the Republic of Poland

2640 16th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20009

tel. (202) 234-3800

fax (202) 328-6271

www.polandembassy.org

e-mail information@ioip.com

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the United Nations

9 East 66th Street

New York, New York 10021

tel. (212) 744-2506

fax (212) 517-6771

www.un.int/poland

Office of the Trade Commissioner of Poland

675 Third Avenue, 19th Floor

New York, New York 10017

tel. (212) 370-5300

fax (212) 818-9623

www.brhusa.com

e-mail brhusa@brhusa.com

Polish Cultural Institute

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4621

New York, New York 10118

tel. (212) 239-7300

fax (212) 230-7577

www.polishculture-NYC.org

e-mail mail@polishculture-nyc.org

Consular Offices

Consulate General of the Republic of Poland in New York

233 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10016

tel. (646) 237-2100

fax (646) 237-2105

www.polandconsulateny.com

e-mail kgrpny@aol.com

Consulate General of the Republic of Poland in Chicago

1520 North Lake Shore Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60610

tel. (312) 337-8166

fax (312) 337-7841

www.polishconsulatechicago.org

e-mail promotion@polishconsulatechicago.org

Consulate of the Republic of Poland in San Francisco

Honorary Consul Christopher Kerosky

Humboldt Bank Building

785 Market Street, 15th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

tel. (415) 777-4445

fax (415) 778-8123

www.youradwokat.com

e-mail consul@youradwokat.com

Consulate General of the Republic of Poland in LA

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 555,

Los Angeles, CA 90025

tel. (310) 442-8500

fax (310) 442-8515

web site www.polishconsulatela.com

e-mail consulplla@consulplla.org

Media

News from Poland - <http://www.poland.pl/>

<http://www.einnews.com/poland/>

Recent Publications

- Bache, Ian and Stephen, George (2006) *Politics in the European Union, 2nd edition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Benacchio, Gian Antonio (2006) *A Common Law for Europe*. Budapest, Hungary: Central European University Press.
- Bochniarz, Zbigniew and Cohen, Gary eds. (2006) *The Environment and Sustainable Development in the New Central Europe*. Oxford, UK: Bergahn Books.
- Cook, Trevor (2006) *EU Intellectual Property Law*. Richmond, UK: Richmond Law and Tax.
- Dardanelli, Paolo (2005) *Between Two Unions: Europeanization and Scottish Devolution*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Fishman, Robert and Messina, Anthony eds. (2006) *The Year of the Euro: The Cultural, Social, and Political Import of Europe's Common Currency*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Handoll, John (2006) *Capital, Payments and Money Laundering in the European Union*. Richmond, UK: Richmond Law and Tax.
- Lister, Marjorie and Carbone, Maurizio eds. (2006) *New Pathways in International Development: Gender And Civil Society in Eu Policy*. Abingdon, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Messina, Anthony and Lahav, Gallya eds. (2006) *The Migration Reader: Exploring Politics and Policies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Michalski, Krzysztof ed. (2006) *What Holds Europe Together?* New York, NY: Central European University Press.
- Michalski, Krzysztof ed. (2006) *The Role of Religion in the New Europe*. New York, NY: Central European University Press.
- Oswald, Franz (2006) *Europe and the United States: the Emerging Security Partnership*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Puetter, Uwe (2006) *The Eurogroup: How a Secret Circle of Finance Ministers Shape European Economic Governance*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Sadeh, Tal (2006) *Sustaining European Monetary Union: Confronting the Cost of Diversity*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Svasek, Maruska ed. (2006) *Postsocialism: Politics and Emotions in Central and Eastern Europe*. Oxford, UK: Bergahn Books.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, Andras, Carmen and Marsovszky, Magdalena eds. (2006) *The New Central and East European Culture*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Turner, Jonathan (2006) *Intellectual Property and EU Competition Law*. Richmond, UK: Richmond Law and Tax.
- Vaughan, David, Lee, Sarah, Kennelly, Brian and Riches, Philip (2006) *EU Competition Law: General Principles*. Richmond, UK: Richmond Law and Tax.
- Wagner, Peter (2006) *Languages of Civil Society*. Oxford, UK: Bergahn Books.
- Watson, Philippa (2006) *EU Social and Employment Law*. Richmond, UK: Richmond Law and Tax.
- Whyman, Philip, Baimbridge, Mark and Burkitt, Brian eds. (2006) *Implications of the Euro: a Critical Perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Youngs, Richard (2006) *Europe and the Middle East: In the Shadow of September 11*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Zeff, Eleanor and Pirro, Ellen eds. (2006) *The European Union and the Member States, 2nd edition*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

EUSA News and Notes

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE in your planner that the dates of our **2007 10th Biennial International Conference** in Montreal, Canada, are **May 17-19, 2007**. We will be at the Le Centre Sheraton in Montreal and will circulate the Call for Proposals in Spring 2006.

Some information about Montreal. Throughout its history, Montréal has been in turn a French settlement, a British stronghold and a bilingual city. Today it is officially bilingual and proud of its status as the largest French-speaking city in North America and second-largest French-speaking city in the world.

Today as you tour the Old Port and Old Montreal, you'll find that much of what Montreal's ancestors built has been lovingly preserved: graceful stone buildings, stately churches, cobblestone streets. Elsewhere, historic neighbourhoods are being restored so more people can live downtown, but it is being done very carefully so as to preserve the special character of each area.

ON THE SUBJECT OF CONFERENCES, the Executive Committee is also pleased to announce that the EUSA conference in the spring of 2009 will take place in Los Angeles, California. This will be only the second EUSA conference ever held on the West coast; the first was located in Seattle in 1997.

THE STATE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, VOLUME 7 NOW AVAILABLE!

Now available from Oxford University Press is the seventh volume in the EUSA series *The State of the European Union*. This volume provides major new insights on both the recent evolution of the EU and its future developmental trajectory, and maps European trends against American policies and institutions. Edited by Nicolas Jabko and Craig Parsons. Available by calling 1-800-451-7556 or online at www.oup.com.

From the Chair

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.

John T.S. Keeler
University of Washington, Seattle

We are grateful for all the members of EUSA, and we especially appreciate those who:

- have EUSA and its Website (www.eustudies.org) listed as a resource on their EU-related course syllabi.
- recommend EUSA membership to their students/colleagues as the key source for the latest ideas and scholarship on European integration, EU affairs, and transatlantic relations.
- contact the EUSA office for EUSA membership brochures to take to EU-related events they attend.
- list EUSA's biennial international conference on calendars of upcoming events and help circulate EUSA's call for proposals.
- encourage their students to submit paper/poster proposals for the EUSA conference.
- vote in (and run for) our biennial executive committee election (the next election takes place in Spring 2007).

Thanks, EUSA members, for your support!

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 _____ \$90 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 Public Policy Interest 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 Operating 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 2006 EUSA Review:

EUSA Review Forum

The Danish Cartoon Controversy: A Defense of Liberal Freedom

Randall Hansen

1

EUSA Public Policy Interest Section Essay

Whatever Happened to Public Policy?

John McCormick

8

Book Reviews

12

A Selective List of EU-Related Web Sites

16

Recent Publications

21

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.