The Contrasting Fortunes of European Studies and EU Studies: Grounds for Reconciliation?

Francis McGowan,
Sussex European Institute

f.mc-gowan@sussex.ac.uk

Ordering Details

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between the fields of EU Studies and European Studies, locating each in a wider framework (Regional Integration Studies and Area Studies). It contrasts the revival of interest in EU/Regional Integration Studies with the difficulties faced by European/Area Studies, arguing that this contrast reflects a more fundamental shift in terms of both research and teaching. Such a shift risks narrowing the basis on which we understand Europe as a region. The paper offers one way of reconciling the fields of EU and European Studies by developing a broader and more historical concept of the region. Drawing on the insights of a number of scholars of comparative regionalism it seeks to understand the historical development of Europe as a region. Such a historical approach means moving beyond the study of the EU per se and drawing upon the insights of a range of disciplines. At the same time however if offers an opportunity for dialogue with both the empirical and conceptual concerns of EU studies.

The Contrasting Fortunes of European Studies and EU Studies: Grounds for Reconciliation?

Francis McGowan, University of Sussex[1]

f.mc-gowan@sussex.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Over the last few years the range of academic activities embraced by European Studies has undergone something of a crisis at the same time as the "subfield" of European Union (EU) studies has flourished. In the US and the UK (and perhaps more broadly), European Studies - by which we mean the tradition of teaching and research rooted in broadly based understandings of Europe in its cultural, economic, political and social senses - has experienced some of the more general challenges which have faced interdisciplinary area studies (notably, globalisation and the "disciplining" of academic endeavour). By contrast EU Studies has apparently gone from strength to strength, effectively identifying itself as a subfield in political science (and possibly the wider social sciences). To some extent the factors which have undermined the broader field have helped to consolidate the more focused activities of EU studies, raising the question whether the two fields' fortunes are somehow in a zero sum relationship with one another.

The two fields are clearly intertwined. The study of the EU/EC has been an element in most European Studies teaching and research agendas for most of the last fifty years. Indeed, over that period, the heightened profile of the EU has been matched by increased interest in its contribution to Europe's economic and political development. As the EU has grown from 6 to 27, with other memberships either on track or at least in prospect, the spatial fit between "Europe" and the EU has become closer. The widening of the EU has been accompanied by an extension of its competences to embrace a greater range of activities (Pollack 2000) and a consolidation of its institutional base (Hix 2005). In as much as these two developments have transformed the profile of the EU, attempts to make sense of the "nature of the beast" have proliferated (see Pollack 2006 and Cini and Bourne 2006 for reviews of the state of the art). It is not, therefore, surprising that an EU of 27 member states with a presence in almost every area of public policy and an ability to provoke political controversy, should increasingly figure in contemporary studies of Europe (or studies of contemporary Europe). Yet, just as the "EU" and "Europe" are very far from being equivalent, so the preoccupations of EU studies and European studies might be considered to have distinctive if overlapping agendas. Even a narrowly drawn

---

European Studies curriculum or research agenda would tackle a range of historical and cultural issues where the EU contribution was modest or non existent and there are aspects of EU Studies which would be of at most limited interest to many European Studies students and scholars. Indeed there might be more broadly based European Studies programmes which would pay only limited attention to the EU and its works while much EU studies teaching and research would make little reference to broader questions of Europe's historical and cultural development. Nonetheless, overall there has been some (often considerable) common ground between the two fields.

In recent years, however, the nature of the relationship between European and EU Studies seems to have changed. There appears to have been a certain intellectual sleight of hand which involves an equating of the two or, in some cases, a displacement of the one by the other. Part of the problem, as we will see, is the rather arbitrary way in which the terms are applied in the literature (paralleling the way in which politicians and officials in the EU happily invoke "Europe" when they are discussing the Union's affairs). But underlying this casual equivalence is perhaps a more fundamental shift in our terms of reference, one which privileges certain aspects of - and approaches to - contemporary Europe at the expense of other broader understandings.

Moreover, for the most part, the emergence of EU studies has coincided with an intensification of particular approaches to making sense of the EU (or any other political institution). As various studies have noted, EU studies is largely based on political science methods and approaches and it has been affected by the tendency within political science to be defined by particular "disciplinary" approaches, notably rational choice (Rosamond 2007). While this remains only one part of the picture of EU Studies (Jupille 2007), its growing significance – and the more general turn towards "disciplinarity" in the field - may be leading to a marginalisation of the sort of interdisciplinarity or multidisciplinarity which has informed European Studies (as well as some studies of the EU).

Is there a risk that the increased profile of a more "focused" EU studies has been at the expense of the breadth of analysis? Does the current trend mean that students will be given an unduly narrow perspective on "Europe" while researchers will plough ever narrower subfields? Are we in danger of losing broader perspectives on the nature of Europe as a region, perspectives which depend upon a more interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach?

This trend has been welcomed as a positive development by those inside the tent of EU studies (particularly where they share the core discipline of political science). However if one takes the view that there is more to Europe than the EU and that a bigger toolkit is required to understand Europe, the turn gives cause for concern. While there are undoubtedly insights to be drawn from more focused analyses of the EU as a political system, it is only one part of the picture (arguably in EU studies and certainly in European studies). What is needed, therefore, is a research and teaching agenda which brings EU studies and European studies back into dialogue with one another.

This paper examines how the fields of European Studies and European Union Studies can be reconciled. It does so by drawing on the insights of "comparative regionalism" (or Regional Integration Studies). Recent work in this area has been based upon a broader understanding of the idea of region and with that a recognition of the need for a more interdisciplinary approach. We focus particularly on the work of Andrew Hurrell (1995 and 2007), Bjorn Hettne (1994) and William Wallace (1990 and 1994) as scholars trying to make sense of the "new regionalism", the revival since the 1990s in projects of regional cooperation. While borrowing their attempts to develop a broader notion of "region", it does so not to contextualise and compare different regional experiences but to understand how Europe as a region has changed over time. Such a historical approach means moving beyond the study of the EU per se and drawing upon the insights of a range of disciplines to understand the development of Europe as a region. At the same time however it offers an opportunity for dialogue with both the empirical focus of current EU studies and many of the concepts it adopts.

The paper aims to bring together not only the fields of European and EU studies but also to highlight the linkages of each to the more generic fields of area studies and regional integration. Area Studies and Regional Integration Studies are approaches to studying the region albeit in different forms: the broad interdisciplinary sweep of Area Studies covers a variety of aspects of what defines a region while Regional Integration Studies has tended to focus on the institutional frameworks and/or economic linkages which have developed to manage political and economic cooperation. We aim to outline a historically informed synthesis of these different approaches which will give us a better sense of the "regionness" of Europe over the longer run on the one hand, and, on the other, of the contribution of more or less institutionalised forms of cooperation (of which the EU is the most recent example) to that regionness. In the process, the piece aims to contribute to the broader debate on "new regionalism" which aims to incorporate the insights of Area Studies into the study of these regional arrangements (a linkage which has been successfully explored in recent work by Breslin and Higgott (2000) and Katzenstein (2005)).

We begin by outlining a framework for locating European Studies and EU studies according to the vectors of "scale" and "scope" - or territoriality and disciplinarity. We then focus in on the respective fortunes of our two fields: on the one hand noting European studies as a particular case of the more general problems facing area studies in US and British academia ; on the other EU studies as a particular example of the academic study of regional integration. We explore some of the ways of thinking about "region" and "regionness" in the field of comparative regionalism, drawing upon the broader debate on the nature of region as well as the work of Hurrell, Hettne, Wallace and other attempts to put Europe (and European integration) into a historical context. We address some of the possible pitfalls and criticisms such an approach might encounter, recognising that such an approach might be considered as teleological (that European unity has been in some sense inevitable) or Eurocentric (that Europe constitutes a superior or dominant pathway of development or civilisation). We would argue however that our intention is to make sense of how the region of Europe has developed - with the EU as an important instance of cooperation rather than as the best of all possible Europes and Europe as a space which has over time been characterised by intensive interactions rather than a superior civilisation. In the course of sketching how such research might be pursued we hope to reconcile

European and EU Studies, identifying a possible agenda for research and teaching which draws on the insights of both disciplines: placing the different ideals and practices of integration into a broader context and applying concepts and approaches drawn from current thinking about European integration to inform our understanding of the region in the past.

2. Mapping the Fields of European and EU Studies

If we are to come to terms with the challenges facing European studies and to sort out its relationship with EU studies we need to have a grasp of what each field seeks to address. That task is not made easy by the looseness with which these and other terms are applied. In one account of the study of "Contemporary Europe" the analysis shifts from a rather general account of the way in which "Europe" has been researched in the past to a more detailed review of research on the institutions and policies of the EU in more recent times (Wallace 2000). Others are more explicit in recognising the problems presented by discussing distinctive but closely related fields (Rosamond 2007; Cini 2006).[2]

The nature of the relationship between EU Studies and European Studies is not as obvious as might be thought. As some accounts would have it, EU Studies has historically and institutionally evolved out of European Studies (Warleigh 2006; Cini 2006; Wallace 2000; Calhoun 2003) and it is certainly true that, in terms of training, academic locations and research outlets, there may well have been many students and scholars who encountered the EU in this way. However such accounts do not convey the whole story. It is clear, for example, that much of the North American study of the European Community (arguably the original source of EU Studies) originated in mainstream political science (and other "disciplinary") departments. Closer to home, while many of yesterday and today's EU specialists may have originally taught and been taught in European Studies departments, others were located in departments of politics, economics and law where their "EU" competence was often seen as part of a broader specialism within those disciplines - international organisation in the case of politics and international relations, international law in the case of law and trade policy in the case of economics. These specialisms reflected the extent to which in the early decades of its existence, the EC may have been considered *sui generis* but it also more or less fitted into the existing categories which were used by those interested in the international more than the domestic aspects of their subjects.

There is therefore a relationship between European Studies and EU Studies, both in the sense of a "history" as well as in the sense of an "intersect" or "overlap" between the two fields, but the fields constitute rather different academic ventures in terms of

---

[2] One example of the confusion is to look at how the respective fields are (or are not) addressed by learned associations. Rosamond (2007) has examined how far particular disciplines dominate the respective national associations. There is an interesting contrast in nomenclatures between the two principal associations. On the one hand, the UK has the University Association for Contemporary European Studies, an organisation which has primarily supported research on the EU to the exclusion of most other aspects of European studies (though it has retained a concern about the wider discipline in tracking the teaching of "European Studies" - see Smith 2003). By contrast in the US, the academic community which researches and teaches the EU is organised around the European Union Studies Association while the Council for European Studies (formerly the Council of Europeanists) retains a broader (though not too broad) concern with Europe.

teaching and research. The following matrix (Figure One) attempts to provide a schematic view of these different ventures, and presents a stylised characterisation of them according to the dimensions of "scale" and "scope".

Figure One: Scale and Scope In European/EU Studies

		Scale of Territorial Coverage	
		Narrow	Broad
Disciplinary Scope	Focused	European Union/Integration Studies	The "Wider Europe" in a Social Science Context
	'Holistic'	"Traditional" European Studies	The "Wider Europe" in a Broader Interdisciplinary Context

By scale we refer to the territorial space addressed by each discipline. This is perhaps more of historical than current importance, being a more important source of differentiation when the European Community comprised six or even 15 states rather than 27. There is a better "fit" between the EU and Europe in 2008 than there was in 1958. Yet there remain important parts of Europe which remain outside the EU. Moreover there is a sense in which the historical contrast between the EU and Europe defined the original focus of EU Studies in terms of politics and policies and those characteristics endure in the current "discipline" (for example in analyses of the relationship between the EU institutions and member states). This is apparent when we contrast EU Studies with the accounts of Europe in which a more comprehensive approach is adopted or in which a wider range of common themes is explored.

This takes us to our second dimension – "scope", by which we mean the breadth and depth of the disciplines and perspectives which inform each approach. As we have noted (and will explore more fully later in the paper), EU studies has tended to be dominated by political scientists (IR specialists initially but increasingly comparativists and policy analysts as well) with established contributions from economics, law and history. European studies by contrast lays claim to (at least) the spectrum of the humanities and social sciences as its intellectual basis. A relatively early account of European Studies as a teaching programme (by the founder of the first "School" of European Studies in the UK, Martin Wight) gives some sense of the ambition of the field: "the various disciplines, literary, historical, philosophical and social, are so far as possible combined and the connections between them are emphasised" (Wight 1964 p.105).

Looking at our categories it becomes possible to offer a rather stylised view of both European Studies and EU Studies. We can thus contrast the relatively narrow and focused approach of conventional EU Studies (quite focused in terms of territorial and disciplinary scope) with other approaches, most notably its diagonal opposite. (The other two categories entail a more interdisciplinary approach to the EU and a relatively focused view of the wider Europe.) Of course these categories are in a sense extremes and do not take account of the nuances within both disciplines. Few would lay claim to the ambition of the holistic broad approach in a single text. There are perhaps some historians of particular eras of Europe who have approximated this

ambition but it is debateable whether they would identify themselves primarily as "of" European Studies (Mazower 1998; Judt 2005; Davies 1996). At the other end of the spectrum our matrix may not give enough recognition of those who claim to be in the field of EU studies but who come from or draw upon a wider range of disciplinary backgrounds (for example sociologists like Crouch 2001 and Favell 2007 and anthropologists such as Shore 2000 and Belier 1997). Nonetheless the matrix does offer one way of characterising some of the key differences between EU Studies and European Studies in terms of their respective focal points and approaches.

3. European Studies and the Crisis of Area Studies

Having laid out the characteristics of EU and European Studies, how have they fared? As we have indicated, some accounts of the development of EU studies appear to welcome the increased differentiation between the two fields. In a discussion of approaches to the EU, Cini notes how earlier Area Studies approaches to the study of EU had suffered "a loss of credibility", being "empirically detailed but theoretical(ly) underspecified" (Cini 2006: 44). Wallace refers to traditional European Studies as being "something of a backwater in terms of scholarship, caught between the social sciences and the humanities and mainly concerned with delivering degree programmes that had a bit of everything and not much depth" (Wallace 2000, p.96) and notes approvingly the fact that the study of the EU has been "mainstreamed" (98-9). Such criticisms, moreover, explicitly refer to the problems of European studies as part of the wider problems facing "area studies" in the last few decades.

Of course it could be questioned whether European Studies "fits" the classic Area Studies template. The emergence of European Studies was not facilitated by the factors that fostered the study of other areas, or at least not in the same way. Whereas the development of "non European" Area Studies was a function of initially colonialism and subsequently the cold war (see Worcester and Tarrow 1994; Rafael 1994; and Katzenstein 2001 on the "diplomatic" roots of area studies), it could be argued that European Studies was only possible in the wake of colonialism and the region's changed position as the object rather than the subject of great power politics. Many years ago, Martin Wight argued that European Studies emerged as a result of Europe's fall from dominance: after World War Two, Europe "now deposed from world primacy by her American and Russian descendants, could become academically self-aware as one among the several civilizations of the world. University curricula reflect their historical circumstances. The end of European hegemony made the concept of "European Studies" possible". (Wight, 1964, p.100) He also argued that European Studies was never as "vocational" as other area studies and that - at least for European based scholars - it could not be examined with the same "detached curiosity" (103) as other regions. Of course, "European Studies" has moved on from Wight's depiction yet its distinctiveness seems to persist. Writing rather more recently, Calhoun also sees European Studies as having a rather ambivalent status vis a vis Area Studies as a whole. While arguing that it provided the basic model for Area Studies, he also recognises that it has been an odd fit (pp5-6) and has followed a rather different trajectory from Area Studies as a whole (p.14-16).

However it is clear that, notwithstanding its allegedly distinctive character vis a vis other Area Studies (a claim which would most likely by made by specialists in every area for their own domain), European Studies has been susceptible to some of the

challenges and critiques which have faced the broader field of Area Studies. Following on from our earlier discussion of "scale and scope" the questions of territoriality and disciplinarity have been at the heart of those more general critiques of Area Studies. These challenges, it should be noted, were not just intellectual and had an impact on the pursuit of "area based knowledge" in the way that financial resources were provided for teaching and research.

The challenge of "globalisation" (as a concept) took a variety of forms. In its earliest form, accounts of globalisation challenged the actual importance (and conceptual relevance) of nation states as well as certain understandings of "the region" (for example, in terms of specificities which were shared by nation states and societies within particular area). The cultural, economic, political and social effects of globalisation diluted or overwhelmed the particularities of nation states while undermining their sovereignty and governing capacity. Academically this rendered the study of particular societies, and the regions in which they were located, less relevant (Strange 1996 and 1997; Horsmann and Marshall 1994). While such claims might have seemed interesting grounds for debate, their impact was rather more immediate as research foundations and government agencies appeared to take such claims for the impact of globalisation at its word and began to shift funding priorities to the detriment of teaching and research in area studies. Stung perhaps by the practical implications of this particular interpretation of the phenomenon (in the shape of the redeployment of teaching and research funds away from area studies), Hall and Tarrow (1998) provided a robust defence of area studies against simplistic notions of globalisation.

Since then the "vulgar globalisation" has been repudiated in the work of Hirst and Thompson (1994) (who offered an early counter critique of globalisation which emphasised the continued importance of the nation state and of the region) and, to some extent, Garrett (1998 and 2000). There is now a recognition that globalisation has not meant the end of nations or regions and that there is still a need to understand the characteristics of these in the light of globalisation (see Held et al 1999 and Hay and Marsh 2000 for reviews of the debate). Katzenstein's (2005) account of "porous regions" offers just such a balanced sense of the relationship between these phenomena.

Intellectually, therefore, Area Studies has been able to benefit from more nuanced understandings of the relationship between globalisation and the region. However it has faced arguably a more formidable challenge from the "disciplinary turn" in the social sciences. For nearly two decades, there has been a growing critique of Area Studies in terms of its credentials as a discipline. Tessler notes that there has been a conflict between area studies specialists concerned with the particular features of regions on the one hand and social scientists with a disciplinary focus on the other. At the heart of this conflict is "an important disagreement about social science epistemology, about what constitutes, or should constitute, the paradigm by which scholars construct knowledge about politics, economics and international relations in major world regions" (Tessler, vii). For such social scientists, area studies has been too "mushy" and lacking scientific rigour (viii) compared with more "theoretically grounded" approaches such as rational choice and formal modelling (see Bates 1997 on the overall critique of area studies and Cini 2006 and Rosamond 2007 on its implications for European - and EU - studies).

While rational choice has informed the orthodox critique of area/European studies, the field has also been subject to a countercritique from the other emerging strand in social sciences - Tessler argues that the postmodern/reflexive critique of area studies has been as much of a challenge (in some ways rooting its critique in the "orientalist" and/or "cold war" origins of area studies (Tessler, ix-x). Arguably European studies (and possibly Area Studies more generally) has responded better to this critique than it has the "scientific" critique, by recognising the problematic nature of "Europe" and incorporating the insights of critical and social theory (Katzenstein 2005, xi).

4. The Emergence of EU Studies and its Relationship to Regional Integration Studies

Like Area Studies more generally, therefore, European Studies has had its share of critiques and challenges since the 1990s. By contrast, the same period has seen the field of EU Studies appear to go from strength to strength (Keeler 2005). As we have seen, some have seen the consolidation of the study of the EU and its development as a distincive "sub-discipline" as something of a "moving on" from what they perceived to be the limitations and vaguenesses of European Studies. Indeed the development of EU Studies could be seen as going with the grain of academic debate in rejecting the preoccupations of the broader area studies approach by focusing on the EU as a "system" and attempting to make the study of the EU more theoretically informed than as the case with the "thick description" of the past. However, there remains much dispute within EU Studies about which direction if should take (even though most would regard these debates as symptomatic of the vitality of the sector rather than of a challenge to its survival). Over the last 20 years there has been a proliferation of approaches which seek to make sense of European integration, in effect a response to both the evolution of the EU itself and the "sterile debates" which informed earlier debates on the dynamics of its development (Schmidt 1997; Hix 1994; Pollack 2006; Rosamond 2000 and Joergensen et al 2007). The diversity of approaches has raised questions of disciplinarity, intradisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity.[3]

The disciplinary focus is probably best exemplified by the orthodox (or as Rosamond calls it "Mainstream") political science approach. Arguing that the EU's own institutional development has rendered it more of a system in its own right, proponents of this view consider that it should be analysed by those models which are used to examine political systems. This line of argument is in some ways rather similar to the "solution" put forward by the disciplinary critics of area studies and entails making the study of the EU more systematic and conforming with social scientific principles. The injection of such "rigour" into the study of the EU can be seen primarily at the level of the research community (Rosamond 2007 provides a critical summary of this debate) but also in other respects such as the undergraduate curriculum (Umbach and Scholl 2003 though their views have been criticised by Rumford and Murray 2003a as fostering a narrowly defined approach to the study of the EU which would be "both distorting and limiting").

---

[3] The contrast between these different approaches has been at the heart of recent work by Alex Warleigh-Lack (2004; 2006).

In contrast to this "mainstreaming" model are those who want to adopt a more "pluralist" (in Rosamond's term) approach to understanding the EU, one which is still rooted in political science but which draws upon a wider range of perspectives from across the discipline. This so-called intradisciplinarity (Warleigh 2006) in turn shades into yet broader approaches (whether interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary or post disciplinary - see Cini (2006) for more details). On the one hand, the intradisciplinary approach draws on the insights of other disciplines as pre-digested into political science (for example rational choice or constructivism) while, on the other hand, other disciplines have begun to focus on the study of the EU from their own vantage points (for example the previously noted increased interest in spheres such as anthropology and sociology).

At the same time as researchers and teachers of EU studies have engaged with other disciplines, the study of the EU itself also being considered in the context of the study of regional integration beyond the European region. This marks in some senses a return to an older preoccupation with "regionalism" - indeed, historically, the study of what was then the European Community was at the heart of the "old regionalism" which examined regional cooperation in the developed and developing world in the 1950s and 1960s. In more recent years there has been a revival of interest in comparing developments in the EU with those in North America, Latin America, Asia etc. However, just as European Studies has been considered as semi-detached from other parts of the Area Studies canon, so EU studies has enjoyed - and enjoys - a rather complex relationship with the study of Regional Integration in other settings. Partly this is to do with the nature of European integration, built upon a particular set of institutions and apparently more "successful" than other regional projects, therefore offering more grist to the research mill. Partly it is due to the past experience of Regional Integration where models originally developed to make sense of European integration in the 1950s and 60s were applied to other regions but to little effect: whatever the insights generated by regional integration theory on the early European Community it was of little relevance to regional projects elsewhere.[4] In more recent periods some analysts of the "new regionalism" have tended to focus on Regional Integration outside of Europe (Grugel and Hout 1998). There were, however, others who made a link between the revival of the EU and the re-emergence of regionalism (See Payne 2000; Gamble and Payne 1996 and Mansfield and Milner 1997), arguing that they were the result of similar forces such as the rise of neoliberalism and globalisation (McGowan 1999). Indeed it is worth contrasting our earlier discussion of the early challenge to Area Studies from a globalisation perspective with the way in which regional integration has been seen by students of globalisation - economists as well as political scientists - as a part of the process, whether as a catalyst for it or as a way of mitigating or containing its effects. (Lawrence 1996; McGowan 1999)

---

[4] Some of the early students of regional integration sought to generalise the models which they applied to Europe to other regions. However, fairly quickly, even the most enthusiastic had to recognise that such models were not applicable (shortly before they had to recognise the limited applicability to the European Community itself). See Nye (1969) and Haas (1975).

5.Towards a Reconciliation: "Region" and "Regionness" in the Study of Europe

So far we have considered the respective fates of European Studies and EU Studies and have done so with reference to more general developments in the fields of Area Studies and Regional Integration Studies. At the risk of oversimplifying, the "European/EU" cases follow the general trend: Area Studies has been subject to a mix of material and intellectual challenges whereas Regional Integration studies has enjoyed something of a revival. If there is a contrast from the general trend it is probably the apparent strength of EU Studies: arguably it has been at the vanguard of the regeneration of regional integration studies, as a result of the growing role of - and interest in - the EU. In a tightening academic market (both financially and intellectually) it could be argued that the success of EU studies has been at the expense of the wider European Studies agenda. Of more concern is the tendency for the EU studies research and teaching project to redefine European Studies in a way where it comes to be considered as the primary component of European Studies.

While some protagonists - and maybe some officials - would welcome the equating of EU and Europe in academic endeavour, many others would be uneasy. There is of course no doubt that the EU is a very significant part of the European economy and polity (and to a lesser extent European society and culture – see Shore 2000 and Medrano 2003). Any attempt to make sense of contemporary Europe, therefore, cannot ignore the EU. Yet an understanding of Europe which was primarily informed by the development and workings of the EU would be very limited - privileging the activities of actors and institutions over other political (as well as social and cultural) players and spaces and focusing too much on the current developments without a sense of context. Too narrow a definition of EU studies - as proponents of a disciplinary approach might favour - would be even more restrictive. There are of course many active in EU studies who would recognise these dangers and who would argue that their own embrace of interdisciplinarity within EU studies offers a way of avoiding such risks. More valuable still, however, might be to pursue an understanding of the EU which is informed by an understanding of the development of Europe. It is in this context that we argue for the importance of unpicking the elements of European studies and EU studies and considering more closely the issues of region and regionness.

One starting point in reconciling European and EU studies would be to build on the renewed interest in comparing the fortunes of different regional integration projects, including the EU. Warleigh (2004; 2006) has sought to bring together the insights of EU Studies and "New Regionalism" and there has been a more general revival of interest in "comparative regionalism". As noted, the return to regional cooperation has, like its predecessor, attracted a good deal of academic attention though the research agenda is much more diverse and has given rise to a more pluralistic approach to comparison. As noted, "old regionalism" sought to apply models originally applied in an European context, generally unsuccessfully and with the result that the academic interest in regionalism - whether comparative or otherwise - diminished. Current analyses of regionalism are able to draw not only upon a more eclectic range of ideas (drawn not only from the study of the EU but from other disciplines as well), and take into account the rather different circumstances in which integration has taken place as well as a better understanding of the importance of the "idea of region" (Breslin and Higgot, 2000: 335).

The notion of region has often been taken for granted. As Smouts notes (in a piece which is as much about the subnational aspect of regional as the supranational aspect) "it is characteristic of the region to have neither a definition nor an outline. The empirical criteria which allow the socio-economic entity to be recognised as sufficiently homogenous and distinct are vague and mixed. The "region" category regroups disparate aggregates and the same term serves to denote subnational formations..., intermediaries between the local and the national levels within the state.., various cooperation zones including states indeed entire subcontinents...and transborder areas between several subnational regions belonging to different states" (Smouts 1998: 30-31)

Indeed the region's importance as a focus for research seem to go beyond the specifics of the "new regionalism". Emmanuel Adler (1997) talks of the community or cognitive region as increasingly manifest in people's notions of identity. He notes how what is understood as "home" has grown from the nation state and while this is likely to remain as the "basic reality of international life" he argues that there are other venues. Adapting Karl Deutsch's concept of pluralistic security communities he argues that there is an increasing focus on "cognitive regions" as integration consolidates. In this context he argues, drawing on Ruggie (1993), that "territoriality" which had traditionally privileged the nation state becomes unbundled and the relative significance of the region increases.[5]

Wallace, Hettne and Hurrell's approaches to regionalism take on board this broader perspective. While William Wallace focuses upon the contrast between the formal and informal aspects of regions (Wallace 1990, 1994), the others seek to identify a more multifaceted notion of the region. Hettne outlined his concept of "regionness" as analogous to ideas of stateness and nation-ness, suggesting five levels or degrees of regionness:
- the region as "a geographical and ecological unit delimited by natural barriers" (136);
- the region as a social system implying a mix of "translocal relations of a social, political, cultural and economic nature" which form a "security complex";
- the region as "organized cooperation";
- the region as regional civil society emerging when frameworks promote "social communication and convergence of values", within which culture and a "shared civilizational tradition" are important";
- the region as a historical formation with a distinct identity and actor capability, as well as a certain level of legitimacy". (137)

Hurrell admits that, while some geographical definition is inevitable, there are "no 'natural' regions". Instead he argues that "it is how political actors perceive and interpret the idea of a region and notions of 'regionness' that is critical: all regions are socially constructed and hence politically contested" (38-39). He offers five contrasting (but overlapping and potentially cumulative) notions of region:

---

[5] A more critical view of regionalism and the region argues that most accounts "inevitabilise" the region as a "particular interpretation of international space" and fail to grasp the changing nature of regions - see Larner and Walters (2002).

- *Regionalisation*: Referring to "societal" and undirected processes of social and economic interaction (39) (broadly equivalent to what others consider as informal integration or soft regionalism), Hurrell tends to stress this as referring to a condition of economic relations (including issues of migration). Such regionalism he argues is not necessarily the result of conscious policy (40)
- *Regional awareness and identity:* Considering this as "fuzzy" but "impossible to ignore" (41), Hurrell explicitly links this notion of the region to Adler s cognitive regions - relying on language, a discourse of regionalism and shared understandings and meanings, which offer various bases for regional awareness including "the other" (41) . He sees this aspect as a feature of the new regionalism (41) "they are framed by historically deep-rooted arguments about the definition of the region and the values and purposes that it represents - although...as with regionalism, there is a good deal of historical rediscovery, myth making and invented traditions" (41)
- *Regional interstate cooperation*: By this Hurrell means, "the negotiation and construction of interstate or intergovernmental agreements or regimes" (42). Such cooperation could be formal or informal (treaties or looser arrangements).
- *State promoted regional integration*: He considers this as a process of internal integration along the lines of the European Union "model" in its economic aspects (43).
- *Regional cohesion*. Hurrell considers this as a possible "combination of these first four processes" which "(m)ight lead to the emergence of a cohesive and consolidated regional unit" (44). Such cohesion might be seen when the region shapes relations between the states of that region and the rest of the world and/or when the region becomes the focal point for policy making on a range of issues (44). This, arguably, could be read as referring to the EU in terms of its broader competences.

Such approaches have generally been deployed to contrast the relative development of regionalism in different parts of the world and in some cases (such as Fawcett and Hurrell 1995) comparing the EU with other regional projects. However, for our purposes, such approaches could be used for examining the current evolution of integration in the context of the longer term evolution of "Europe". Such a historical comparison would not simply focus on the various attempts (through cooperation or conquest) to "unite" Europe but would look at how "the regional" and "integration" have characterised Europe in the past.

Historical perspectives on European integration are not new, ranging from William Henderson's (1959) account of the Zollverein and subsequent work on other forms of cooperation in Europe (1962) to William Wallace's (1990) account of European integration in earlier periods, Walter Mattli's (1999) account of the factors shaping regionalism across time and space and Pagden's (2002) more wide ranging collection which brings together accounts of the idea of Europe with contemporary understandings of integration. Of particular importance was Deutsch's (1957) attempts to understand processes of integration at the national and regional level. However, as another author of a historically-informed approach to integration argued, in seeking to identify generalisations about the necessary conditions for integration, Deutsch "avoided the questions of whether integration is qualitatively different in

different socio-economic formations, why it emerges at some historical periods and ...gave no indication of the dynamic that connects or disconnects past and present cases of unification" (Cocks 1980, p.2).

A better approach might be to adapt recent work on defining the region in a comparative context and apply that over time rather than across space. Taking Hurrell and Hettne's characteristics of regions, therefore, we can identify a set of criteria for assessing region-ness in Europe over time:
- the extent of actual integration – how linked together are the societies by trade, migration, etc
- the extent of values, institutions, cultures, languages, beliefs, etc held in common - how far are there similar structures, predicaments, etc
- the extent of any shared identity
- the extent of any "sense of mission" - how far is the region "idealised" - are there grand designs, projects for unity
- the extent of any formal cooperation or even consolidation - what frameworks for integration (whether by consent or force)

Addressing the regionness of Europe in these ways cannot really be achieved on the basis of a narrowly defined "EU Studies" agenda (though the latter may still offer important insights - see Mattli 1999 as well as Dinan's (2006) review of how historians have explored the EU). Instead there has to be an engagement with a much wider range of insights and perspectives of the sort which "European Studies" could provide. The range of factors highlighted here - and the readiness to contextualise historically and culturally - brings into the frame a wider range of understandings of Europe than a narrow account of integration and institutions. At the same time, retaining the concern with integration provides some focus for pooling those insights. As Breslin and Higgot (2000) have suggested - with reference to the comparative analysis of regionalism - what is needed "is a marriage between the disciplinary approaches of the theorist of regionalism and that rich empirical work which recognises the importance of specific historical and political contexts" (341). Arguably what they argue as valuable about the comparative approach - "a key mechanism for bringing area studies and disciplinary studies together and enhancing both." (341) - would also be relevant for a comparison across time as well as between places.

6. The Perils of Eurotopias and Eurocentrism

What is proposed is a way of bringing together aspects of studying Europe as a region (whether institutionalised or not) rather than a discipline in its own right (Rumford and Murray 2003b). Such an approach would entail a fruitful synthesis of the insights of European Studies to the study of European Integration while also offering the possibility of using concepts and debates derived from the study of the EU to make sense of Europe as a region before 1951 (for example the importance of non state actors in framing economic cooperation in earlier eras or the possibilities of deploying the insights of the Europeanisation debate).

However it must be recognised that such an approach brings its own problems. The perennial question of the boundaries of Europe as a region is one such problem, though we are inclined to agree with William Wallace who argues that while "Europe

as a region has never had clear boundaries... it has had identifiable core areas, shifting slowly over time in response to internal and external developments" (Wallace 1990: 13). Two more fundamental criticisms need to be considered in more detail, however. At one level, the sort of endeavour envisaged in the last few pages could fall into the trap of prescriptiveness and of teleology: that there has been an "essence" of Europe over time and that where we are now offers an fulfilment of that essence. At another related level, there is a risk that such a project privileges the development of Europe as a distinctive region, and prompting the charge of "Eurocentrism".

The relationship between studying Europe and the EU on the one hand and idealising them on the other is never far from the surface of the academic debate. Calhoun notes the impact of the EU on European studies as "both part of an analytic project as researchers sought to understand what was happening in Europe and of an ideological-pedagogical project as some European leaders sought to teach students a European self understanding of the EU" (13). Drawing attention to the wave of European histories which explicitly invoke recent steps towards integration, Mitterauer argues that there is "an obvious synchronicity between a wave of intensive publishing activities and the institutionalisation of European history on one hand and the foundation of ...(European institutions)...on the other" (Mitterauer 2006, 269), asking whether "European historiography serve(s) as an ideology to legitimate current European policies" (270) and drawing parallels with past political movements where nationalism and national historiography have been closely connected (270). Heffernan (1996) also touches on the "prescriptive" tendency in much writing about Europe: "The history of the European idea is ...read "backwards" from the present into the past so that recent moves towards European unification appears as an inevitable historical evolution" (3).

Certainly there is a danger that such an approach falls into the trap of seeing European history, as Delanty notes, "in quasi teleological terms as a movement towards unity". (Delanty 2007 p.21) Past accounts of the "emergence of Europe" have been more or less explicit in celebrating European cooperation in the post war period (in contrast to earlier eras), with de Rougemont's (1969) work a particular example of this. Such tendencies were the target of Delanty's 1995 critique of the "idea of Europe" where he seeks to deconstruct the "Platonic-like vision of an immutable European ideal" (2) and take issue with the large uncritical nature of what he considered the limited existing literature. Others had the opportunity to reconsider their enthusiasm. Hay (1980) repudiates his earlier (1957) writing on Europe as uncritical, claiming that "We were not only assuming a kind of historical inevitability in the notion but trying positively to encourage the process" (3) and appearing to recognise the need to keep some distance between historical analysis and current affairs.

Yet, as Delanty and others admit, the status quo of nation state centric history is not unproblematic either. Blockmans, himself the author of a European Commission funded history of Europe over the last 1000 years (1997), echoes Le Goff's view that it is impossible to write a truly European history as such nation state centric literature dominates the field and "the national boundaries of modern Europe seem to be indelibly etched into the consciousness of historians" (Blockmans 2006, p241).

Cutting across the federalist and statist perspectives (in Delanty's terms) might be possible - and the risks of teleology and prescription minimised - by a more detached

and critical approach to the EU and Europe, one based on a recognition that the EU does not constitute the end-result of past ideals and national conflicts. Instead it marks a particular venture in integration which has its resonances in the ideals and the experience of previous eras. Moreover such a historically informed perspective does not imply that integration be considered as either a default or a desideratum for it to be interest and relevance.

It is also important to avoid another - sometimes related - tendency in previous accounts of Europe's development - Eurocentrism: the slip from explaining what factors might define Europe's "regionness" - and in the process highlighting certain specificities and shared experiences - to asserting an intrinsic superiority about the European path (as expressed by Roberts (1985) and Landes (1998), though Blaut (2000) identifies a much wider range of economic historians and historical sociologists which he considers adopt such a perspective). Moreover the debate on Eurocentrism does raise important questions about how we should consider the development of Europe as a region in a world context over the longer run. However, it is important to recognise, as one critic of the tendency to Eurocentrism appears to, that centring on Europe per se is not the same as advocating that Europe has a privileged place in economic and political development (Blaut 2000).

7. Conclusion

This paper has sought to explore how European Studies and EU Studies - and their respective understandings of the region - have developed and interacted over recent years. It has highlighted the ways in which interest in the two fields has evolved and particularly the apparent shift from the more area studies based approach of European Studies to the narrower integration agenda of EU Studies. The paper has discussed some of the reasons for this shift, placing them in the context of more general debates. While the paper recognises that some of these reasons relate to the shortcomings of European Studies, it also argues that to marginalise that approach in favour of the more focused research programme of EU studies would bring its own problems.

It goes without saying that the EU and Europe are not equivalent and nor are European and EU Studies. Of course, it is not possible to understand Europe over the last fifty plus years without taking into account the European Union or its precursors. As one considers the more recent past, moreover, the significance of the EU increases as its shadow casts across a wider territorial space and ever more policy competences. Moreover the EU impacts upon the other parts of Europe that membership has not yet (or might ever) reach. However while arguably necessary part of anyone's understanding of Europe, the EU is very far from being a sufficient basis for such an understanding.

Moreover, whatever the relationship between "Europe" and the "EU" in the public discourse and the political realm, it would be wrong to subsume the agendas of different academic agendas within a particular approach. It would be even more wrong to marginalise some issues because they did not fit within the research agenda of a particular approach. Instead a better approach is to recognise that there are important questions that each field has to address. Where the two fields overlap, moreover, the research and teaching challenge is not for one approach to displace the other but to bring about an effective synthesis of the two in addressing the nature of

Europe as a region. Such an approach has been apparent in some recent scholarship (Katzenstein 2005) and the paper has sought to identify how the two approaches could be used to inform each other and to understand the ways in which Europe as a region have evolved.

References

- Adler, E (1997) "Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations" <u>Millennium</u> 26 (2) 249-277

- Bates, Robert H. 1997. "Area Studies and the Discipline: A Useful Controversy?" <u>PS: Political Science and Politics</u> 30 (2) 166-69.

- Bellier, I "The Commission as an Actor: An Anthropologist's View" in Wallace, H and Young, A (eds) <u>Participation and Policy Making in the European Union</u>, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Blaut, J M (2000) <u>Eight Eurocentric Historians</u>. New York: The Guilford Press,

- Blockmans, W (1997) <u>A history of power in Europe : peoples, markets, states,</u> Antwerp : Fonds Mercator Paribas, 1997

- Blockmans, W (2006) "Europe's history of integration and diversity" <u>European Review</u> 14 (2) 241-256

- Breslin, S and Higgott, R (2000) "Studying Regions: Learning from the Old, Constructing the New" <u>New Political Economy</u> 5 (3) 333-353

- Calhoun, C (2003) "European Studies: Always Already There and Still in Formation" <u>Comparative European Politics</u> 1 (1) 5-20

- Cini, M (2006) "The State of the Art in EU Studies: From Politics to Interdisciplinarity (and Back Again?) <u>Politics</u> 26 (1) 38-46

- Cini, M and Bourne, A (eds) (2006) <u>Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies</u>, Palgrave

- Cocks, Peter (1980) "Towards a Marxist Theory of European Integration," <u>International Organization</u> 34 (1) 1-40.

- Crouch, C (2001) "Breaking Open Black Boxes – the Implications for Sociological Theory of European Integration" in Menon and Wright (eds) <u>From the Nation State to Europe</u> Oxford University Press

- Davis, N (1996) <u>Europe – A History</u> Oxford University Press

- de Rougemont, D (1966) <u>The Idea of Europe</u>, Macmillan

- Delanty (2008) "The European Heritage: History, Memory and Time" in Rumford, C (ed) <u>The Sage Handbook of European Studies</u>, Sage.

- Delanty, G (1995) <u>Inventing Europe</u>, Palgrave

- Deutsch, K (1957) <u>Political Community and the North Atlantic Area,</u> Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Dinan, D (2006) "Interpreting European Integration" in Dinan, D (ed) <u>Origins and Evolution of the European Union</u>, OUP

- Favell, A (2007) "The Sociology of EU Politics" in Jorgensen, K Pollack, M and Rosamond, B eds <u>Handbook of European Politics</u> Sage.

- Fawcett, L and Hurrell, A (eds) (2005) <u>Regionalism in world politics : regional organization and international order</u>, Oxford University Press

- Gamble, A and Payne, A (eds) (1996) <u>Regionalism and World Order</u>, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

- Garrett, G (1998) "Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle?", <u>International Organization</u> 52(4) 149-176

- Garrett, G (2000) "The Causes of Globalization" <u>Comparative Political Studies</u>, 33 (6-7), 941-991

- Grugel, J and Hout, W (eds) (1998) <u>Regionalism Across the North South Divide</u> Routledge

- Haas, Ernst B. (1975) <u>The Obsolescence of Regional Integration Theory</u> Berkeley: University of California.

- Hall, Peter A., and Sidney Tarrow. (1998) "Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Broad Too Narrow?" <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u> 44:114-115.

- Hay, C and Marsh, D (eds) (2000) <u>Demistifying Globalization</u>, Palgrave

- Hay, D (1957) <u>Europe – the Emergence of an Idea</u> Edinburgh University Press

- Hay, D (1980) 'Europe Revisited: 1979' <u>History of European ideas</u> 1 (2),11-21.

- Heffernan, M (1998) <u>The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics</u>. Arnold

- Held et al (1999) <u>Global transformations: politics, economics and culture</u>, Polity Press

- Henderson, W (1959) <u>The Zollverein</u>, Cass

- Henderson, W (1962) <u>Genesis of the Common Market</u>, London: Cass.

- Hettne, B (1994) "The regional factor in the formation of a new world order" in Sakamoto, Y (ed) <u>Global Transformation: Challenges to the State System</u>, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

- Hirst, P and Thompson, G (1996) <u>Globalisation in Question</u>, Cambridge: Polity

- Hix, S (1994) "'The Study of the European Community: The Challenge to Comparative. Politics', <u>West European Politics</u> 17(1) 1-30

- Hix, S (2005) <u>The Political System of the European Union</u>, Palgrave.

- Horsman. M and Marshall, A (1994). <u>After the nation-state : citizens, tribalism and the new world disorder</u> Harper Collins

- Hurrell, A (1995) "Explaining the Resurgence of Regionalism in World Politics" <u>Review of International Studies</u> Vol 21 pp 331-358

- Hurrell, A (2007) "One World? Many Worlds? The Place of Regions in the Study of International Society" <u>International Affairs</u> 83 (1) 127-46

- Judt, T (2005) <u>Post War - a History of Europe since 1945</u>, Penguin.

- Jupille, J (2006) "Knowing Europe: Metatheory and Methodology in European Union Studies" in Cini, M and Bourne, A (eds) (2006) <u>Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies</u>, Palgrave

- Katzenstein, P (2001) "Area and Regional Studies in the United States" <u>PS: Political Science and Politics</u> 34 (4) 789-91

- Katzenstein, P (2005) <u>A World of Regions</u>, Cornell

- Keeler, J (2005) "Mapping EU Studies: the Evolution from Boutique to Boom Field 1960-2001" <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u> 43 (3) 551-82

- Landes, D <u>The Wealth and Poverty of Nations</u>, Little, Brown and Company, 1998,

- Larner, W and Walters, W (2002) "The Political Rationality of "new regionalism" Towards a genealogy of the region" <u>Theory and Society</u>, 31 (3) 391-432

- Lawrence, R (1996) <u>Regionalism, Multilateralism and Deeper Integration</u>, Washington: Brookings.

- Mansfield, E and Milner, H (eds) (1997) <u>The Political Economy of Regionalism</u> New York: Columbia University Press.

- Mattli, W (1999) <u>The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond</u> Cambridge University Press

- Mazower, M (1998) <u>Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century</u>, Allen Lane.

- McGowan , F(1999) "Globalisation, Regional Integration and the State" in Shaw, M <u>Politics and Globalisation</u>, Routledge

- Medrano, J (2003) <u>Framing Europe: Attitudes to European Integration in Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom</u>, Princeton UP

- Mitterauer, M (2006) "Exceptionalism? European history in a global context" <u>European Review</u> 14 (2) 269-80.

- Nye, J (ed) (1969) <u>International Regionalism</u>, Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

- Pagden, A (ed.) (2002) <u>The Idea of Europe. From Antiquity to the European Union</u>, Cambridge University Press

- Payne, A (2000)"Globalization and Modes of Regionalist Governance" in Pierre, J (ed) <u>Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy</u>, Oxford UP

- Pollack, M.A. (2000) 'The End of Creeping Competence? EU Policy-Making Since Maastricht', <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u> 38 (3), 519-538

- Pollack, M.A. (2005) "Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance?". <u>Annual Review of Political Science</u>, 8, 357-398.

- Rafael, V (1994) "The Cultures of Area Studies in the United States" <u>Social Text</u> 41 91-111

- Roberts, J (1985) <u>The Triumph of the West</u>, BBC.

- Rosamond, B (2000) <u>Theories Of European Integration</u>, Palgrave.

- Rosamond, B (2007) "European integration and the social science of EU studies: the disciplinary politics of a subfield" <u>International Affairs</u> 83(2) 231-252.

- Rosamond, B (2007) "The Political Sciences of European Integration: Disciplinary History and EU Studies" in Jorgensen, K Pollack, M and Rosamond, B (eds) <u>Handbook of European Politics</u> Sage.

- Ruggie, J G (1993) "Territoriality and Beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations" <u>International Organization</u> 47 (1) 139-174

- Rumford, C and Murray, P (2003a) "Do we need a core curriculum in european studies?" <u>European Political Science</u> 3 (1).

- Rumford, C and Murray, P (2003b) "Globalization and the Limitations of European Integration Studies: Interdisciplinary Considerations" <u>Journal of Contemporary European Studies</u> 11 (1).

- Schmidt, S (1996), "Sterile Debates and Dubious Generalisations: European integration theory tested by telecommunications and electricity', <u>Journal of Public Policy</u>, 16 (3) , 233-71

- Shore, C. (2000), <u>Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration</u>, London, Routledge.

- Smith,M (2003) <u>The State of European Studies, Report Commissioned by the Standing Conference of Heads of European Studies</u>, London: SCHES

- Smouts, M.C. (1998) "The region as the new imagined community" in Le Gales, P and Lequesne, C (eds) <u>Regions in Europe</u>, London: Routledge.

- Strange, S (1996) <u>The Retreat of the State</u>, Cambridge University Press.

- Strange,S (1997),"The Future of Global Capitalism; or Will Divergence Persist Forever?" in Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck (eds), <u>Political Economy of Modern Capitalism</u>, Sage.

- Tessler, Mark (1999) `Introduction: The Area Studies Controversy', in Mark Tessler (ed.) <u>Area Studies and Social Sciences - Strategies for Understanding Middle East Politics</u>, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Umbach, G. and B. Scholl (2003), 'Towards a Core Curriculum in EU studies', <u>European Political Science</u> 2:2, 71-80.

- Wallace, H (2000) "Studying Contemporary Europe" <u>British Journal of Politics and International Relations</u> Vol 2 No 1 pp 95-113.

- Wallace, W (1990) <u>The Transformation of Western Europe,</u> RIIA

- Wallace, W (1994) <u>Regional Integration: the West European Experience</u> Brookings

- Warleigh-Lack, A (2004) "In Defence of Intra-disciplinarity: 'European Studies', the 'New Regionalism' and The Issue of Democratisation". <u>Cambridge Review of International Affairs</u>, 17(2), pp. 301-18.

- Warleigh-Lack, A (2006) "Learning from Europe? EU Studies and the Re-thinking of International Relations", <u>European Journal of International Relations,</u> 12(1), 31-51.

- Wight, M (1964) "European Studies", in Daiches, D (ed) <u>The Idea of a University</u>, Andre Deutsch

- Worcester, K and Tarrow, S (1994) "New Challenges Facing European Studies", <u>PS: Political Science and Politics</u>, (1) 53-55.

Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies

1.	Vesna Bojicic and David Dyker *Sanctions on Serbia: Sledgehammer or Scalpel*	June 1993
2.	Gunther Burghardt *The Future for a European Foreign and Security Policy*	August 1993
3.	Xiudian Dai, Alan Cawson, Peter Holmes *Competition, Collaboration & Public Policy: A Case Study of the* *European HDTV Strategy*	February 1994
4.	Colin Crouch *The Future of Unemployment in Western Europe? Reconciling Demands* *for Flexibility, Quality and Security*	February 1994
5.	John Edmonds *Industrial Relations - Will the European Community Change Everything?*	February 1994
6.	Olli Rehn *The European Community and the Challenge of a Wider Europe*	July 1994
7.	Ulrich Sedelmeier *The EU's Association Policy towards Central Eastern Europe: Political* *and Economic Rationales in Conflict*	October 1994
8.	Mary Kaldor *Rethinking British Defence Policy and Its Economic Implications*	February 1995
9.	Alasdair Young *Ideas, Interests and Institutions: The Politics of Liberalisation in the* *EC's Road Haulage Industry*	December 1994
10.	Keith Richardson *Competitiveness in Europe: Cooperation or Conflict?*	December 1994
11.	Mike Hobday *The Technological Competence of European Semiconductor Producers*	June 1995
12.	Graham Avery *The Commission's Perspective on the Enlargement Negotiations*	July 1995
13.	Gerda Falkner *The Maastricht Protocol on Social Policy: Theory and Practice*	September 1995
14.	Vesna Bojicic, Mary Kaldor, Ivan Vejvoda *Post-War Reconstruction in the Balkans*	November 1995
15.	Alasdair Smith, Peter Holmes, Ulrich Sedelmeier, Edward Smith, Helen Wallace, Alasdair Young *The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Pre-Accession* *Strategies*	March 1996
16.	Helen Wallace *From an Island off the North-West Coast of Europe*	March 1996
17.	Indira Konjhodzic *Democratic Consolidation of the Political System in Finland, 1945-1970:* *Potential Model for the New States of Central and Eastern Europe?*	June 1996

33.	Alan Mayhew *Financial and Budgetary Implications of the Accession of Central* *and East European Countries to the European Union.*	March 2000
34.	Aleks Szczerbiak *Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement - Explaining Declining* *Support for EU Membership in Poland*	May 2000
35.	Keith Richardson *Big Business and the European Agenda*	September 2000
36.	Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart *Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro* *and Europeanisation* OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 1	October 2000
37.	Alasdair Young, Peter Holmes and Jim Rollo *The European Trade Agenda After Seattle*	November 2000
38.	Sławomir Tokarski and Alan Mayhew *Impact Assessment and European Integration Policy*	December 2000
39.	Alan Mayhew *Enlargement of the European Union: an Analysis of the Negotiations* *with the Central and Eastern European Candidate Countries*	December 2000
40.	Pierre Jacquet and Jean Pisani-Ferry *Economic Policy Co-ordination in the Eurozone: What has been achieved?* *What should be done?*	January 2001
41.	Joseph F. Francois and Machiel Rombout *Trade Effects From The Integration Of The Central And East European* *Countries Into The European Union*	February 2001
42.	Peter Holmes and Alasdair Young *Emerging Regulatory Challenges to the EU's External Economic Relations*	February 2001
43.	Michael Johnson *EU Enlargement and Commercial Policy: Enlargement and the Making* *of Commercial Policy*	March 2001
44.	Witold Orłowski and Alan Mayhew *The Impact of EU Accession on Enterprise, Adaptation and Institutional* *Development in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*	May 2001
45.	Adam Lazowski *Adaptation of the Polish legal system to European Union law: Selected aspects*	May 2001
46.	Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak *Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate* *States of Central and Eastern Europe* OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 2	May 2001
47.	Paul Webb and Justin Fisher *Professionalizing the Millbank Tendency: the Political Sociology of New* *Labour's Employees*	May 2001
48.	Aleks Szczerbiak *Europe as a Re-aligning Issue in Polish Politics?: Evidence from* *the October 2000 Presidential Election*	June 2001

OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 3

49.   Agnes Batory   September 2001
        Hungarian Party Identities and the Question of European Integration
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 4

50.   Karen Henderson   September 2001
        Euroscepticism or Europhobia: Opposition attitudes to the EU in the
        Slovak Republic
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 5

51.   Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak   April 2002
        The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in EU Member and Candidate States
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 6.

52.   Alan Mayhew   April 2002
        The Negotiating Position of the European Union on Agriculture, the
        Structural Funds and the EU Budget.

53.   Aleks Szczerbiak   May 2002
        After the Election, Nearing The Endgame: The Polish Euro-Debate in
        the Run Up To The 2003 EU Accession Referendum
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 7.

54.   Charlie Lees   June 2002
        'Dark Matter': institutional constraints and the failure of party-based
        Euroscepticism in Germany
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 8

55.   Pinar Tanlak   October 2002
        Turkey EU Relations in the Post Helsinki phase and the EU
        harmonisation laws adopted by the Turkish Grand National Assembly
        in August 2002

56.   Nick Sitter   October 2002
        Opposing Europe: Euro-Scepticism, Opposition and Party Competition
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 9

57.   Hans G. Nilsson   November 2002
        Decision Making in EU Justice and Home Affairs: Current Shortcomings
        and Reform Possibilities

58.   Adriano Giovannelli   November 2002
        Semipresidentialism: an emerging pan-European model

59.   Daniel Naurin   December 2002
        Taking Transparency Seriously

60.   Lucia Quaglia   March 2003
        Euroscepticism in Italy and centre Right and Right wing political parties
        OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 10

61.   Francesca Vassallo   March 2003
        Another Europeanisation Case: British Political Activism

62.   Kieran Williams, Aleks Szczerbiak, Brigid Fowler   March 2003
        Explaining Lustration in Eastern Europe: a Post-Communist Politics
        Approach