World Leaders in Florence to Participate in a Conference Promoted by the EUI and NYU

The European University Institute promoted, together with New York University, a Conference on ‘Progressive Governance for the 21st Century’ which was held in Florence on Saturday 20 and Sunday 21 November and was organized in collaboration with some of the major Italian research institutes and thanks to the hospitality offered by the Florence Municipality.

The conference was attended by President BILL CLINTON, Premiers MASSIMO D’ALEMA, TONY BLAIR and LIONEL JOSPIN and Chancellor GERHARD SCHRODER, as well as by the President of the EU Commission ROMANO PRODI, the new Secretary-General of the EU Council, JAVIER SOLANA, Brazil-
ian President FERNANDO HENRIQUE CARDOSO, Portuguese Prime Minister ANTONIO MANUEL DE OLIVEIRA GUTERREZ and the Director General of the International Labour Organization JUAN SOMAVIA.

The focus of the conference was similar to the one organized in 1997 in New York and the discussions which took place among the Heads of State and of Government of European and transatlantic countries in Florence was centred on the major global themes concerning equitable, effective and democratic governance in the coming years.

The European University Institute was involved in the initiative, together with New York University, because of its academic independence and high level of
research, notably on such themes as the Welfare State, globalization, human rights and developments facing the Fifteen with advancing integration and Europeanization processes in the societies of European Union Member States.

Long before the event took place, the Institute engaged on a process of reflection which lead to the publication of a series of studies on the focal points addressed throughout the conference.

The research work done by a number of Institute teachers was then posted on the Institute’s website. The papers are as follows: *The ‘Not-a-cat’ Syndrome: Re-thinking Human Rights Law to Meet the Needs of the Twenty-first Century* by Prof. PHILIP ALSTON; *Building a Sustainable Welfare State and Reconciling Social Justice and Growth in the Advanced Economies* by Prof. MAURIZIO FERRERA and Prof. MARTIN RHODES; *Five (Hypo)theses on Democracy and its Future* by Prof. YVES MÉNY; *Democratic Global Governance in the 21st Century* by Prof. THOMAS RISSE.

The seminar on Sunday was held in the Salone dei Cinquecento in Palazzo Vecchio. The first session—which was dedicated to the topic: “The new economy: equality and opportunity” and was moderated by MASSIMO D’ALEMA, began with a welcoming speech by the Mayor of Florence, Dr MASTERSOHN and JAY OLIVA, President of New York University gave opening speeches. The heads of State and of government then discussed the problem of combining policies promoting growth with policies promoting social justice against the backdrop of the limits and opportunities offered by globalization.

The seminar resumed in the afternoon. The first session was dedicated to “Democracies in the 21st century: values, rights and responsibilities” and was chaired by MASSIMO D’ALEMA. The opening speakers were Professor YVES MÉNY (European University Institute) and Professor NORMAN DORSEN (New York University), after which questions were taken from the audience, comprising intellectuals, academics and journalists of the participating countries.

The Florence seminar was an opportunity for an in-depth discussion amongst the leaders of major European countries and the American President on the fundamental challenges which will dominate the next century and how to meet those challenges in a reform-minded and progressive fashion.

The proceedings of the conference will be published in the near future.
Samedi 20 novembre aux environs de 18 heures s’est ajoutée une nouvelle signature, prestigieuse va sans dire, au Livre d’or de l’Institut: celle de LIONEL JOSPIN. La France préside actuellement le Conseil supérieur de l’établissement et la présence de son Premier ministre - et ancien ministre de l’Education nationale- sous les voûtes de l’antique ‘refettorio’, offrant en toile de fond une splendide fresque, a constitué une marque de reconnaissance appréciable des activités académiques menées à la Badia. Mais la cérémonie qui s’est déroulée en présence des autorités de l’Institut et de sa communauté française - professeurs, étudiants, personnel - a été empreinte d’une émotion particulière. En effet, c’est aussi pour avoir donné une impulsion décisive au projet de séminaire sur “Le réformisme au XXIe siècle”, que les gouvernants sociaux-démocrates européens et américains s’apprêtaient dès le soir-même à inaugurer à Florence, que l’Institut a reçu le Premier ministre français et son hommage explicite au rôle joué par ladite maison dans cet événement.

Descendu de la tribune, LIONEL JOSPIN est allé à la rencontre des étudiants pour se faire une idée concrète des travaux, s’enquérant des sujets de thèse: “Liberté d’expression et Internet”, “Face à face politiques à la télévision” (le Premier ministre a malicieusement feint de n’en point connaître l’existence), “L’incidence du droit européen sur le concept d’Etat de droit”, “Les causes des crises financières dans les pays émergents”… Le ministre a écouté, complimenté, invité le cas échéant à prendre contact avec ses conseillers… Mais bientôt, trop tôt, il a dû se retirer pour rencontrer le président du Brésil, FERNANDO HENRIQUE CARDOSO, qui venait de franchir le seuil d’une des salles de séminaire.

Visits

In October the President went on mission to Helsinki and Stockholm to visit two of the younger members of the European University Institute in order to better inform the Finnish and Swedish academic world about the Institute.

On his first day in Helsinki Dr. Masterson had extensive discussions with the Finnish members of High Council, representatives from the Finnish Ministry of Education, Members of the Academy of Finland and the Rector of the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

During the afternoon at an information seminar in the Academy of Finland Dr. Masterson presented general information about the EUI including research cooperation and researcher training.

The next day included visits to the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, the University of Helsinki, the Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies and the Institute for International Economic Law.

On to Stockholm for discussion with Swedish members of High Council and where the Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR) hosted a preliminary meeting and lunch. In the afternoon the Stockholm Center for Organization Research (SCORE) hosted a seminar with researchers and students at Stockholm University.

The following day Dr. Masterson met with the Under-Secretary of State, Dr. Agneta Bladh of the Ministry of Education after which he went to Uppsala University. During the afternoon Dr. Masterson conducted a seminar on the future of the European University Institute at the Department of Government of the University of Uppsala.

This visit was an excellent chance to better acquaint the Finnish and Swedish academic world with the opportunities offered by the Institute and it is to be hoped that increased awareness will also increase the number of Scandinavians applying to come to Florence. And it also provided Dr. Masterson with an insight into the postgraduate and research programmes of these countries which, in turn, will be very interesting for EUI researchers.

Informal Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Trade of the European Union at the European University Institute

On Friday 1 October the European University Institute hosted the informal meeting of Foreign Trade Ministers of the European Union. Devoted to defining the European position with an eye to the Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization to be held in Seattle in December, the meeting was attended by the 15 Ministers of Foreign Trade of the EU and by the new European Commissioner for Trade, Pascal Lamy.

The idea of a new round of negotiations on liberalization of world trade (the Millennium Round or Fiesole Round) was initially launched at the Badia Fiesolana by Sir Leon Brittan, then European Commission Vice-President, on the occasion of an informal meeting held at the European University Institute in November 1997.

On the evening of the previous day, the Ministers had been welcomed at Palazzo Vecchio by the Mayor of Florence and a dinner was offered in the Pitti Palace.

At the end of the meeting the Finnish Minister for Foreign Trade, Mr. Kimmo Sasi – Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU - the Italian Foreign Trade Minister, On. Piero Fassino and Commissioner Lamy met EUI researchers for a very lively ‘questions and answer’ session.

Dr Masterson’s Mission to Finland and Sweden

In October the President went on mission to Helsinki and Stockholm to visit two of the younger members of the European University Institute in order to better inform the Finnish and Swedish academic world about the Institute.

Dr. Masterson, Minister Fassino, Mayor Dominici and Minister Sasi
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In this age of so-called globalization, there are only two areas in the world which are truly integrated economically as far as trade, investments, and capital flows are concerned. These are the European Union itself and the transatlantic region. At the same time, the EU and the U.S. including their partnership are major movers and shakers in the global economy and in world politics in general. However, both their internal relationship, particularly regarding transatlantic economic affairs and the international role which the U.S. and Europe can play together are still poorly understood.

It is, therefore, more than appropriate that the European University Institute has recently announced the establishment at the Robert Schuman Centre of the BP Chair in Transatlantic Relations. It did so on the occasion of its promotion of an international conference in Florence involving participation of European and American Presidents and Heads of Government (see also p. 1).

The Chair, appropriately endowed by a Euro-American company, will develop a program of highly relevant policy-oriented as well as basic research by leading scholars from both sides of the Atlantic on key issues of common European-American interest. In particular, the program will initially concentrate on the following questions:

1. Governance of the transatlantic relationship, especially in the areas of trade and investment. This includes analyzing the institutional structures for decision-making on both sides of the Atlantic.

2. The external role of Europe and the U.S. in global governance. This includes investigating the contributions by the EU and the U.S. to stabilize relations with Russia and other successor states of the former Soviet Union. It also involves analyzing the role which Europe and the U.S. can play together in the reform of international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the Worldbank, and the UN Security Council.

This research will be made public through international seminar, conferences, and publications. Several research fellowships will be given to junior scholars working on aspects of the transatlantic relationship. A key feature will be the annual BP lecture, delivered by a major European or American figure. The program will also establish a prize for the best essay on transatlantic relations for young researchers.

Announcing the endowment, Sir John Brown, BP Amoco’s Chief Executive Officer said, “We are delighted to be making this investment. The partnership of Europe and America has made the world a safer and more properous place over the last fifty years. I hope the work to be done at the European University Institute will help to renew that link as we go into a new century.”
Transatlantic Fellowships

The European University Institute has just announced the establishment at the Robert Schuman Centre of the

**BP-AMOCO Chair in Transatlantic Relations.**

The Chair, appropriately endowed by a Euro-American company, will develop a programme of highly relevant policy-oriented as well as basic research by leading scholars from both sides of the Atlantic on key issues of common European-American interest.

In this context, the BP-AMOCO Chair in Transatlantic Relations at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies invites applications for five Post Doctoral fellowships in transatlantic relations.

Applicants’ research area should be concentrated on transatlantic relations with a particular focus on one of the following themes:

- Governance of the transatlantic relationship, especially in the areas of trade and investment. This includes analyzing the institutional structures for decision-making on both sides of the Atlantic.

- The international role of Europe, the U.S., and the transatlantic relationship in global governance.

**The deadline for application for the Academic Year 2000-2001 is 1 February 2000**

For more information on application procedure consult http://www.iue.it/JMF/Welcome.html
1. Monsieur le Ministre, l’Institut universitaire européen vient de passer le cap de ses vingt ans et occupe aujourd’hui une place d’excellence dans le domaine de l’enseignement et de la recherche au niveau doctoral et post-doctoral en Europe et dans le monde. Quels sont, à votre avis, les raisons d’être et les objectifs qui se doivent d’animer une telle institution à l’aube du XXIème siècle?


La diversité et l’exigence du recrutement, la grande qualité du corps professoral et la valeur des programmes de recherche, font aujourd’hui de l’Institut universitaire européen une grande institution doctorale en sciences sociales. C’est donc sur cette lancée que l’Institut doit poursuivre son action.

2. Organisation internationale interétatique cogérée par les quinze pays membres de l’Union européenne, l’Institut universitaire européen accueille des chercheurs et des professeurs venus d’horizons fort divers, brassant ainsi les langues, les cultures et les traditions scientifiques. Le Général de Gaulle, en son temps, voyait la création d’une université européenne d’un oeil sceptique. Le regard de la France a-t-il changé ? Dans le cadre de la présidence française qui vient de s’ouvrir, quelles sont les ambitions du Ministère des Affaires étrangères pour l’Institut universitaire européen ? De quelle façon la France peut-elle contribuer à son rayonnement ?

La France a toujours promu les échanges culturels en Europe et soutient, chaque année et pour deux ans, une douzaine de candidats. Ceux-ci bénéficient d’une bourse Lavoisier accordée par le Ministère des Affaires étrangères, afin de poursuivre des études à Florence, et de mener leur recherche de doctorat dans un environnement européen et international enrichissant et formateur. Ils peuvent ainsi tisser un réseau de relations avec leurs collègues européens. La France, à l’occasion de la présidence, est tout d’abord résolue à maintenir le niveau d’excellence qui fait la réputation de l’Institut.

Plus largement, elle considère que la connaissance, la culture et la mobilité constituent des enjeux fondamentaux pour les jeunes Européens. Le développement de la coopération universitaire doit représenter un axe privilégié de l’action de l’Union dans ce domaine, et la France souhaite que l’Institut y prenne toute sa place.

Enfin, la France souhaite l’encourager à ouvrir son champ d’activités aux pays d’Europe centrale et orientale et, au-delà, aux autres continents.

Je suis convaincu que l’interdisciplinarité des cursus universitaires est une bonne chose. Certes, des réticences subsistent, mais le cloisonnement des disciplines - longtemps de mise dans notre pays, il est vrai - tend à s’estomper. Il faut persévérer.

La complexité du monde et la compréhension de notre environnement, tant national qu’international, exigent des compétences et des connaissances de plus en plus vastes et diversifiées. Le temps où juristes et économistes pouvaient s’ignorer est révolu. Désormais, les experts de tous horizons se doivent de conjuger leurs forces et leur savoir. Le rôle de l’université est de sensibiliser les chercheurs et les décideurs de demain à cette réalité nouvelle en leur donnant les outils et les méthodes nécessaires.

3. La France est un pays où les cloisonnements disciplinaires et les corporatismes sont pesants. L’Institut universitaire européen, et tout particulièrement le centre Robert Schuman, prônent au contraire la pluridisciplinarité dans les sciences sociales, droit, économie et histoire - qui y sont représentés. Cette perméabilité des frontières académiques est-elle un premier pas vers l’université de demain ?

Il est indéniable que la langue anglaise progresse universellement, notamment en raison de l’influence économique et donc culturelle...
qu’exercent les États-Unis. Cependant, cette prépondérance de l’anglais ne doit pas se faire au détriment des autres langues, qu’il s’agisse, entre autres, du français, de l’allemand, de l’espagnol ou de l’italien. Le but de notre action est de préserver cette richesse que sont les diversités culturelles et linguistiques. La francophonie est aujourd’hui une réalité démographique, culturelle et politique. La langue française est un élément important du dialogue et du partenariat de l’Union européenne avec les pays du Sud. Il en va de même pour l’allemand à l’Est, pour l’italien en Méditerranée ou pour l’espagnol en Amérique latine.

5. L’Institut universitaire européen a pour credo de promouvoir la formation par la recherche pour la recherche et au-delà. Que signifie, pour le décideur que vous êtes, le travail d’analyse et de réflexion mené en ces lieux? Le savant et le politique, pour reprendre Weber, sont-ils complémentaires, voire indispensables l’un à l’autre, pour une meilleure compréhension du monde d’aujourd’hui?

La complexité des relations internationales contemporaines exige des capacités d’analyses multiples et souvent très pointues.

Sollicité de tous côtés et au sujet de questions très diverses, généralement dans l’urgence, le décideur d’aujourd’hui a besoin de collaborateurs qui soient parfaitement au fait de la situation dans tous les domaines. Sans pour autant influer directement sur le processus de décision, les experts exercent une activité de conseil indispensable. Par ailleurs, l’expérience et la méthode d’une formation par la recherche peuvent s’avérer précieuses dans l’appréhension d’une crise ou dans la compréhension rapide et synthétique d’un dossier.

6. La construction européenne progresse dans de multiples domaines, tant politique qu’économique, culturel ou social. Pourtant, des barrières subsistent. Malgré la reconnaissance officielle des diplômes, le doctorat de l’Institut universitaire européen est souvent mal accueilli, voire tous simplement ignoré, en France. L’insertion professionnelle des jeunes docteurs est plus aisée - et plus ouverte - (pour les nationaux comme pour les expatriés) chez nos voisins britanniques, néerlandais ou allemands, qu’il s’agisse des carrières dans l’université ou dans le secteur privé. La France ne laisse-t-elle pas là un échapper une manne précieuse de ‘forces vives’? Comment y remédier?


L’accueil parfois mitigé réservé au diplôme de l’IUE est bien davantage le résultat d’un manque d’information que l’expression manifeste d’une mauvaise volonté.

Notre objectif est de sensibiliser davantage les autorités universitaires nationales aux avantages que présente ce type de formation et de mieux faire connaître l’IUE, notamment auprès des entreprises privées.

7. Au cours de ces dernières années, l’Institut universitaire européen, sans pour autant renier son objectif initial, a quelque peu diversifié le champ de ses recherches en s’ouvrant, par la création (effective ou à venir) de chaires et de programmes de recherche, à ses voisins - euro-péens, sud-méditerranéens, mais aussi aux continents nord et sud américains. L’Europe doit-elle effectivement se concevoir comme un ensemble intégré dans un monde global?

L’Union européenne entretient d’intenses relations avec ses voisins et partenaires: processus d’élargissement et partenariat économique avec les pays d’Europe de l’Est, partenariat méditerranéen depuis la conférence de Barcelone, accords avec les pays du Mercosur, relations multiples avec les États-Unis.

Il est donc parfaitement logique et souhaitable que le champ d’investigation de l’IUE s’étende à ces nouvelles aires géographiques.

8. On parle beaucoup, à l’heure actuelle, d’une identité européenne - pour le moins difficile à saisir, à observer, à rationaliser, voire à susciter, notamment au regard des balbutiements de la PESC et de l’Identité européenne de Défense. L’identité européenne, qu’elle soit politique, militaire, intellectuelle ou citoyenne, est-elle, selon vous, un concept creux ou au contraire une réalité viable et pleine d’avenir?

Les Européens ont adopté une politique convergente pendant la crise puis la guerre du Kosovo; “M. PESC” a pris ses fonctions, l’UP-PAR va voir le jour; le Conseil européen de Cologne a reconnu que, dans la gestion des crises, l’Union européenne devait disposer “d’une capacité d’action autonome soutenue par des forces militaires crédibles”.

Ceci n’est qu’un exemple. Il montre en même temps, sur un sujet traditionnellement conflictuel entre les États membres, comment les mentalités, les perceptions, peuvent évoluer dans le contexte européen vers une identité européenne.

9. Dans le cadre de la Présidence française (1999-2000), le Ministère des Affaires étrangères, assisté par...
SEMED ’99
Convegno internazionale su ‘Nuove frontiere della comunicazione e sviluppo delle regioni mediterranee’

Anche quest’anno l’Istituto Universitario Europeo ha preso parte ai lavori del Convegno Internazionale SEMED ’99 – organizzato a Palermo il 26 e 27 Novembre dal Banco di Sicilia – cui offre la propria collaborazione scientifica nel quadro delle attività della Cattedra Mediterranea.

SEMED ’99 è la seconda edizione di un ciclo di seminari internazionali annuali che hanno lo scopo di favorire l’internazionalizzazione delle aziende e la promozione delle piccole e medie imprese nello spazio euro-mediterraneo. Quest’anno l’attenzione si è focalizzata sulle ‘Nuove frontiere della comunicazione e sviluppo delle regioni mediterranee’. Al centro dell’analisi dei partecipanti sono state le possibili linee di sviluppo economico alla luce delle nuove tecnologie che hanno consentito di potenziare le trasmissioni di dati e informazioni accrescendo e migliorando lo scambio di persone e merci.

Il tema della riduzione delle distanze politiche ed economiche tra le diverse regioni del Mediterraneo è stato sviluppato attraverso cinque workshop di approfondimento:

‘La comunicazione nell’era multimediale’ ha trattato le tematiche dell’informazione, delle relazioni fra i popoli, della comunicazione multimediale e del finanziamento degli investimenti collegati alla comunicazione;
‘Ricerca, formazione e innovazione: una ricetta per le economie del Sud’ ha consentito di approfondire i temi della ricerca applicata, della formazione e del ruolo che le università possono svolgere nell’area mediterranea a vantaggio delle imprese e degli investimenti;
‘Turismo e giacimenti culturali: un bene comune per i Paesi del Mediterraneo’ ha analizzato le potenzialità del turismo come risorsa economica;
‘Energia, reti e infrastrutture’ ha affrontato la discussione sulla possibile realizzazione di un sistema integrato di trasporti in grado di sviluppare il trasferimento di persone e merci;
‘Sistemi di piccole imprese e immigrazione: un nuovo binomio per lo sviluppo del Mediterraneo’ ha, infine, approfondito i temi della crescita economica e sociale con riferimento ai flussi migratori tra le due sponde.

Il convegno è stato aperto dal Presidente del Banco di Sicilia Alfio Noto, dal Presidente dell’Istituto Patrick Masterson. Il Professor Yves Ménÿ ha poi tracciato le linee principali dei lavori nella sua relazione introduttiva incentrata sul tema della mobilità di idee e modelli di sviluppo.

Tra le presenze istituzionali i ministri del Commercio con l’Estero Piero Fassino, del lavoro Tiziano Treu, eil Vice Presidente del Consiglio Sergio Mattarella, oltre che del Presidente della Regione Siciliana Angelo Capodicasa e del Presidente di Mediocredito Centrale Giafranco Imperatori.

Particolarmente nutrita è stata poi la presenza di esperti dei Paesi del Mediterraneo con rappresentanti di Israele, Egitto, Spagna, Tunisia, Marocco e Libia che hanno contribuito ad animare i cinque workshop pomeridiani.

Il convegno internazionale SEMED ’99 – organizzato a Palermo il 26 e 27 Novembre dal Banco di Sicilia – cui offre la propria collaborazione scientifica nel quadro delle attività della Cattedra Mediterranea.
This is a short summary of the paper on “Advertising Restrictions in Professional Services” presented by Chiara Fumagalli (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona and Università Bocconi, Milano) and Massimo Motta (EUI) at the Conference on “Anticompetitive Impact of Regulation”, Florence, 10 and 11 September 1999 (see also conference report on p. 31).

In many countries, professionals may not advertise their services. In Italy, for instance, lawyers are currently forbidden by law to make personal publicity, considered as contrary to the dignity and honour of the profession. The code of conduct established by the order of lawyers also prohibits any type of advertising, with the exception of the indication of one’s specialization on a letterhead or in the lists of lawyers prepared by the order. Complete or partial restrictions on advertising activities by lawyers are to be found in some fifteen OECD countries. A very similar picture applies to the current state of affairs in other professions, such as doctors, dentists, architects, and so on. Many countries are now rethinking the role of regulation in the markets for professional services, and eliminating many of the regulatory barriers, including advertising restrictions, that set an obstacle to competition in such sectors. In such circumstances, it is interesting to ask whether economic analysis supports the idea that such regulations on advertising should be removed or not.

The rationale for advertising restrictions

Markets for professional services are characterized by considerable asymmetric information between the professional, who usually knows the quality of the service she can provide her clients with, and her clients, who are unable to judge the quality of such a service, not only before but also, in general, even long after having “consumed” the service. For instance, one might go to see a doctor because of a pain in the left shoulder, and whether this is due to heart problems or to something else is something one cannot know. One might leave the doctor’s surgery very happy about having such a nice and reassuring doctor, who said there is nothing to worry about, and discover only some time (and a heart attack) later that the diagnosis was plainly wrong. The same is true for the other professional services. The care, knowledge and ability of lawyers, engineers, architects, accountants and professionals is in general very difficult to verify for somebody who has not been trained in the same profession.

These informational asymmetries give an advantage to professionals, who might abuse them to their own benefit. Some regulations are therefore needed in all markets characterized by strong informational asymmetries of this type, to make sure that consumers are protected. One such regulatory tool is the establishment of a minimum quality standard, such as a qualification requirement. For instance, only somebody who has taken a degree in medicine and subsequently passed all the exams in the particular specialization of cardiology can practise as a cardiologist. Obviously, this does not guarantee that the cardiologist is a good one who does not make obvious mistakes, but it is reasonable to expect that on average she would make many fewer mistakes than a charlatan who had never followed a course in a medical school!

If some regulations, like the one just described, are clearly needed to ensure that consumers do not bear the consequences of their lack of information, it is less clear that all regulatory instruments currently used in most countries are really needed in order to increase efficiency. In particular, the existence of minimum fees for some services is not for the benefit of consumers, but rather of professionals themselves. Likewise, the rationale for advertising restrictions is far from being clear, as we shall discuss in what follows.

It is not easy to find sensible and well-founded arguments which justify the existence of such strict restrictions. After all, in markets characterized by informational asymmetries, it is far from obvious that there should exist laws which prevent professionals from even disclosing their area of specialization. If anything, one would like to increase the amount and quality of information available to possible consumers, not to limit it. Making public information about the studies carried out by professionals, the diplomas obtained, their rate of success or the jobs previously held, their location and possibly the prices they charge should all go towards diminishing the ignorance of consumers, and therefore tend to balance the informational asymmetries they have with respect to the professionals themselves.

Even at first sight, therefore, it is not straightforward that advertising restrictions should exist in markets characterized by information asymmetries. In what follows, we critically discuss the main reasons which are usually invoked to justify restrictions in such sectors. The first reason is that advertising is unethical for professionals, who should not try to attract consumers in ways which are not proper for the dignity of the profession. However, even if deontological preoccupations were genuine and in good faith, they would have little
to do with the welfare of the population at large. It is all very well for a category to want to adopt some code of conduct, but this should be accepted by society only insofar as this does not have a negative impact on other groups. In this specific case, instead, rules imposed by professional orders to keep their “prestige” intact, such as not allowing professionals to compete on prices or to advertise, should be deemed illegal whenever they are against the public interest.

Furthermore, it is not clear why disclosing to the public the specialization obtained, and more generally the educational and professional record, should be considered as against the prestige of the profession. Of course, deceptive advertising and non-substantiated claims would be unethical, but nobody maintains that advertising of such a nature should be permitted, and in any case, laws already exist that protect consumers from false statements made in advertising messages.

Perhaps paradoxically, publicity might even have the side-effect of protecting consumers from charlatans. In Italy newspapers and magazines have recently emphasized that hundreds of people without the required qualifications have practised as doctors or dentists undetected and undeterred for years. Perhaps if they had had to make their claims in a more public way, this would have contributed to the diffusion of information and it would have been easier to check whether such claims were truthful. In short, it does not seem that advertising restrictions would protect the public against incompetents, as some professionals claim, and the reverse might even be argued.

A second argument which has been made to justify advertising restrictions is that the quality of the services on offer might decrease. However, economic theory does not support the view that advertising decreases the quality on offer in the market, nor has significant evidence been found to support the claim that advertising lowers the quality of professional services. In fact, there is some evidence revealing that advertising might help professionals to signal the quality of their services.

Furthermore, the existence of licensing regulations (minimum quality standards) would already ensure that practising doctors are providing services of acceptable quality. In other words, even the bad doctors would be doctors who have been at medical school and who have had the basic training necessary to practise the profession at an acceptable standard.

A third line of argument which has been invoked to justify advertising restrictions is that advertising might increase concentration, thereby reducing consumer welfare. Suppose, this argument goes, that some professionals have better financial resources than others. Then the better-endowed professionals can afford more advertising, which in turn attracts consumers and gives them an even stronger financial position. Non-advertising professionals would lose market share, while advertisers would increase theirs. Market power and prices would rise and consumer welfare would decrease.

Escalations of advertising expenditure are a typical phenomenon in consumer-goods industries, and indeed mechanisms of the type just described are not uncommon in many manufacturing industries. However, it is unlikely that similar processes would occur in markets for professional services. When one thinks of escalation of advertising, one has in mind advertising of the persuasive type, which aims at shifting the tastes of consumers and making them more willing to pay for a certain brand, which conveys a certain image. This is not the type of advertising that one would expect from professionals. (Perhaps we do not have much imagination, but we cannot think of doctors and lawyers advertising their services – “Go to doctor so-and-so if you want to look cool” – with the same kind of messages as well-known consumer products). Also, in a world in which information on education, specialization, and past professional record is allowed to circulate without restriction, whereas unverifiable claims may not be made, consumers are likely to base their choices on such simple facts, rather than on some expensive advertising campaign. And given that to make such facts public is relatively simple and inexpensive, it is unlikely that advertising would be accessible only to a few well-endowed individuals. Means to advertise specializations and past record might include a web page, an announcement in local newspapers, an entry in telephone directories and yellow pages and so on. Professionals who have foregone an income for all the years of their education are likely to find a source of financing to face such minor expenses.

In fact, advertising would help entry and reduce concentration. Currently, markets for professional services are characterized by enormous difficulties of access, due not only to various licensing and entry regulations but also to the impossibility for entrants to make themselves known. In markets where clients can only rely on friends, relatives or hearsay to obtain some information about providers of services, a new entrant cannot easily get a clientele. The spread of information brought about by advertising would instead favour entry and, other things being equal, would increase competition. Indeed, the impact of advertising on entry to the professional market has been investigated empirically. These studies indicate that less-experienced professionals are more likely to advertise and hence that advertising promotes entry by allowing entrants to make themselves be known by consumers.

**Theory and empirical evidence**

To sum up, the arguments invoked to support legal restrictions on advertising in professional services do not seem well founded. Economic theory suggests instead that advertising can have beneficial effects on welfare.
When advertising informs about prices, it helps consumers to find the professional who charges the lowest price, reduces the time and energies they have to spend in costly search activity, and helps effective competition to work.

Even when it does not convey information on prices, advertising can provide information about the existence of professionals and their relevant characteristics. This not only helps consumers to find professional services which are closest to their need, but it also exerts competitive pressures in the market. The intuition is as follows. Imagine that somebody has some skin problem but is aware of the existence of only one doctor in his home town. He may be willing to go to this doctor and pay a high price even if this doctor is not a dermatologist. If, instead, more information were available, he might learn that a dermatologist exists in the same town. In this case, information will have a twofold effect. First, it will allow for a better matching of the patient’s needs. Second, it will also help contain the prices asked by doctors: a doctor would be more cautious about asking for high fees if she knew that the patients in town were aware of the existence of other doctors.

Indeed, the empirical literature shows that the less restrictive the professional rules governing advertising, the lower will be the professional fee for any given service. In other words, if consumers are aware of the existence of the different types of professionals on the market, they will be more reactive to changes in prices. This limits the ability of professionals to exert market power. Moreover, richer information about existing goods and services benefits consumers by allowing them to identify the specification of the product (in terms of variety or quality) best suited to them.

Conclusions

Our conclusion is that there is no economic reason why truthful informative advertising should be prohibited in the market for professional services. The effort exerted by professional orders to maintain such legal restrictions appears to be motivated by the intention to weaken competition rather than to benefit consumers.

Of course, this does not mean that professionals should be free to make whatever claims they want to. However, there is no need for particular legislation in order for this not happen, since deceptive and unsubstantiated claims are already punished by existing Consumer Protection Laws.

As for the role of professional orders, they should be prevented from imposing advertising restrictions which distort competition in the market, and they should limit themselves to establishing rules of a deontological nature, such as those which guarantee the impartiality, competence, integrity and responsibility of professionals.

FINANCE AND CONSUMPTION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

A major conference on Family Portfolio Choices will be held at the Institute on 17-18 December

It is being organized by Professors Luigi Guiso (Università di Sassari and Ente Einaudi, Roma), Michael Haliiassos (University of Cyprus), and Tullio Jappelli (Università di Salerno and CSEF).

The conference will consolidate the first of the Chair’s two research directions by providing a comprehensive account of the status of theoretical knowledge and methodological achievements in the analysis of family portfolios. Methodological papers will focus on how use of household-level data may offer deep insights into issues of particular interest for policy design. Empirical papers will offer an original comparative analysis of the structure of household portfolios in a set of countries which are representative of a wide spectrum of financial development, with particular attention to consumer-credit issues.

The project will provide a stimulus for the development of new papers that will follow a common set of guidelines provided by the coordinators but will also allow considerable scope for author originality and discretion. Contributors and discussants include many of the leading researchers on the economics of consumption choices.

For more information consult: http://www.iue.it/FinConsEU/activities.htm
On 23–26 September a conference on “Expectations, Economic Theory and Economic Policy” sponsored by the EUI, the Bank of Italy and the Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) took place in Perugia at the Bank of Italy’s SADIBA Conference Centre. The conference was organized by PAOLO ANGELINI (Bank of Italy), ROGER FARMER (EUI, UCLA and CEPR), JORDI GALÌ (NYU, UPF, NBER and CEPR) and RAMON MARIMON (EUI, UPF, NBER and CEPR). Local organizers were MARCIA GASTALDO, ELENA GENNARI and PETER OMTZIGT for the European University Institute and MARIATERESA PUGLIESE for the Bank of Italy.

The conference was preceded by a Macro Summer School held at the European University Institute on 20–23 September, with the participation of EUI and non-EUI students. The Summer School included lectures by JESS B ENHABIB (New York University), THOMAS S ARGENT (Stanford University), JAMES B ULLARD (Federal Reserve Bank Saint Louis) and MARTIN EICHENBAUM (Northwestern University). THOMAS SARGENT presented a paper (joint with IN-KOO CHO, University of Illinois), on Escaping Nash Inflation, which was discussed by MARK SALMON (City University Business School–London). Their paper explored the idea that agents may not be fully rational in the usual sense that economists use this term. Instead, in SARGENT and IN-KOO CHO’s work, individuals entertain the possibility that their model of the world may be wrong. This leads to a framework in which the agents in the model are endowed with no more (or less) rationality than policy makers. This is in marked contrast to the standard approach in which the rationality assumption leaves us in the uncomfortable position of building models that ascribe considerably more rationality to the actors in our models than we ourselves possess as social scientists.

In the second paper of the morning session, JAMES B ULLARD talked about Learning about Monetary Policy Rules, a joint work with KAUSHIK MITRA (University of Helsinki). His paper, which was discussed by GRAZIELLA BERTOCCHI (University of Modena), focused on the indeterminacy of the equilibrium associated with certain monetary policy rules and the possible use of a criterion called “learnability” to evaluate them. MARTIN EICHENBAUM concluded the session with Hedging and Financial Fragility in Fixed Exchange Rate Regimes, a paper written in collaboration with CRAIG BURNSIDE (World Bank) and SERGIO REBELO (Northwestern University), and discussed by GIORGIA GIOVANNETTI (University of Florence). This highly topical piece presented an explanation of the facts surrounding currency and banking crises. In line with the theme of the conference, their explanation hinged on the possibility of multiple self-enforcing equilibria.

The Friday afternoon session was opened by FRANCK PORTIER (GREMAQ-IDEI, Toulouse) who presented his work, Anatomy of a Recession: France 1993 and the Maastricht Hypothesis. The paper, discussed by KENNETH WALLIS (University of Warwick), gives an interpretation of the end-of-1992 French recession as triggered by the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty with its implicit announcement of future public deficit reduction. FRANCESCO LIPPI (Bank of Italy) ended the session with his paper on Strategic Monetary Policy with Non-Atomistic Wage Setters: A
Case for Non-Neutrality. His paper, discussed by Hubert Kempf (University of Paris-Parthenon-Sorbonne), showed that in the presence of non-atomistic wage setters, the degree of inflation aversion of the policy maker can have an influence on employment even under rational expectations and incomplete information.

The third session, on Saturday morning, contained papers by Bill Dupor (Wharton School—University of Pennsylvania), Alessandra Pelloni (University of Manchester) and Willi Semmler (University of Bielefeld). Bill Dupor presented his paper on Keynesian Conundrum: Multiplicity and Time Consistent Stabilization. His work, which was discussed by Mark Weder (Humboldt University Berlin), addressed the problem of dynamic inconsistency of stabilization policy in models with increasing returns. Dupor showed that, because these models can give rise to multiple equilibria, an optimal policy (one that picks an equilibrium with the highest time zero consumer welfare) may not be time consistent. In other words, a benevolent policy maker might announce a policy that it would be in his own interest to renege on at a later date (much as a smoker might announce his interest to renege on at a later date).

Don’t allow a tax on capital income that is used by central banks to control inflation. It is widely believed that Central Banks should actively intervene by raising interest rates more proportionately than inflation in order to stabilize prices. Benhabib showed that this policy is “globally indeterminate”. The Benhabib paper gives cause for concern since it implies that a widely advocated class of monetary rules may not have the intended consequence.

The conference provided an opportunity for EUI students and researchers from the Bank of Italy to interact with world class academics from Europe and the United States. These interactions were all the more pleasant given the beautiful green Umbrian surroundings, the SADIBA swimming pool and the delicious food of Bank of Italy’s SADIBA Conference Centre. We also enjoyed a gala dinner in the old centre of Perugia and, needless to say, wonderful weather.

Elena Gennari
New Appointment
Professor Arfon Rees

Professor ARFON REES has recently joined the Institute as Professor for Eastern European History. For the past ten years he has been based at the Centre for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Birmingham, England. Prof. REES comes originally from Wales, and is a native Welsh speaker. His wife Tatiana is a Russian from Kiev, Ukraine. Their two children have been brought up bilingual in English and Russian.

Over the past two decades Prof. REES has been engaged in research on the development of the Soviet State in the 1920s and 1930s, examining institutional structures, methods of operation, policy-making and policy implementation with specific reference to economic policy. This has combined the use of new empirical data, made available by the opening of the former party and State archives, and the adoption of western models relating to decision-making and bureaucratic behaviour as well as broad theories about the nature of the Soviet State itself. The work has been organized on the basis of three interlocking research projects, developed at Birmingham.

The results of the first project, involving the study of the work of the main Soviet economic commissariats in the 1930s, were published in 1997. The results of a second project examining centre-local relations in the USSR, focusing on a number of republican and local authorities during the 1930s, are being prepared for publication. Professor REES is responsible for the theoretical part of the work, a chapter on Ukraine, and two chapters which analyse the role of republican and regional lobbies at the XVIIth (1934) and XVIIIth (1939) party congresses. The third project, studying decision-making over a more extended period of time (1928-53) and concentrating on the central party and State institutions, including the Politburo and Stalin’s private secretariat, is still in progress.

Once these projects are completed Prof. REES plans to write a more theoretical work, dealing with alternative conceptualizations of the Stalinist State (totalitarian, institutional pluralist, corporatist), which will bring the finding of the three main projects noted above to the attention of a wider audience. It will also relate these findings to broader comparative studies on the nature of the State in the twentieth century. It will address in particular the ambiguous nature of the Stalinist State as an agency of modernization, the question of State-societal relations, and the nature of social ‘resistance’.

Prof. Rees is also writing a political biography of LAZAR KAGANOVICH, one of Stalin’s leading lieutenants. Through a study of the career profile of a leading Soviet politician, it is intended to shed light on the influence of individual leaders on policy, the nature of factional struggles, and the relationship between STALIN and his deputies. As part of this project he is engaged in co-editing, for publication by Yale University Press, the STALIN - KAGANOVICH correspondence from the 1930s. He is currently also collaborating with a Ukrainian colleague in writing a study of KAGANOVICH’s role in the government of Ukraine during the Soviet period. The biography is made possible by access to new archival materials, the publication of KAGANOVICH’s own memoirs (Pamyatnye zapiski, Moscow, 1996), and the appearance of a number of studies in Italian and French on KAGANOVICH’s career.

Prof. REES is also engaged in a writing a study on the influence of political ideas on the development of the Soviet State, with particular reference to the ‘realist’ tradition of political thought. A monograph exploring the impact of MACHIAVELLI’s political ideas in Russia in the 19th and 20th centuries is at an advanced stage. This will involve also a study of STALIN’s own reading of MACHIAVELLI, if access can be gained to his personal, annotated copy of The Prince. This is intended as part of a wider study exploring the relationship between politics and ethics in Russian thought which Prof. REES plans to develop as his main research topic from 2000 onwards. The study will be based initially on the examination of the attitude of leading Marxist thinkers to the question of ethics (there are important contributions by KAUTSKY, PLEKHANOV, LENIN and PREOBRAZHENSKII). It will explore the complex issue of ‘means’ and ‘ends’ in the construction of socialism; and it will examine how the regime perceived itself and its own subjects, and how it rationalized its own behaviour. This is intended to provide a better understanding of the intellectual and moral parameters (or absence of moral parameters) within which the Soviet State under STALIN developed.
The ‘Age of Extremes’ revisited

Eric Hobsbawm’s visit to the History Department within the framework of the ‘Writing the History of Europe’ lectures

Monday, 11th of October, 5 p.m. – both entrances to Sala Europa in Villa Schifanoia are blocked by an impressive number of people desperately seeking to get in. The event had not been announced long before, nor was there much publicity by the department - just a few lines on the departmental website. But the rumours that immediately spread were enough to gather researchers and professors from all four departments and to transform Villa Schifanoia’s largest seminar room into a nightmare for anybody who suffered from claustrophobia. The reason was an 82-year-old living legend: ERIK J. HOBBSBAWM. “Do dates change interpretation? ‘The Age of Extremes’ five years later” was the title of his lecture, which continued a series of departmental seminars on problems with “Writing the History of Europe” organized by Professors LUISA PASSERINI and RAFFAELE ROMANELLI.

It was ROMANELLI who accepted the tricky task of opening the seminar and welcoming Professor HOBBSBAWM. Indeed, what could possibly be said to introduce an academic celebrity whose works are nowadays considered educational classics almost all over the globe and have, for the last few decades, become obligatory reading for any historian? Consequently, Prof. ROMANELLI decided NOT to introduce ERIK J. HOBBSBAWM, but instead to make some rhapsodic observations which could be headed ‘Do historians change history?’ . HOBBSBAWM, for example, had and continues to have such an immense impact on European historiography that to study his contributions may easily be used as a red thread in studying the evolution of historiography in Europe. Would we know as much as we do now about the social conditions of workers and the labour movement in Europe, if HOBBSBAWM had not inaugurated a new type of approach in socio-political studies which was then picked up everywhere in Europe (starting with his Labouring men, London 1964)? Would there have been such a flood of studies in the construction of cultural imageries as early as in the eighties, if HOBBSBAWM had not coined the suggestive shortcut-term of ‘invented tradition’ which soon became the label for a whole range of new and important studies (cf. The invention of tradition, together with T. Ranger, London 1983)? And what would be the state of today’s international theoretical discussion on Nations and Nationalism without one of its most important points of orientation and reference, namely the homonymous book by Hobsbawm from 1990? We might even add the somewhat heretical question whether the tremendous and world-wide success of HOBBSBAWM’s most popular trilogy on the 19th century (The Age of Revolution 1789-1848, London 1962; The Age of Capital 1848-1875, London 1975; The Age of Empire 1875-1914, London 1987), which shaped the historical thinking of a whole generation, does not itself constitute a powerful, though unintended, ‘Invention of Tradition’.

Conceived as the continuation of what nevertheless in many respects still remains a trilogy, The Age of Extremes 1914-1991 was written in 1994 and is an extensive, masterly historical reflection on the ‘short 20th century’ – another very influential expression which gained prominence thanks to HOBBSBAWM. It can be considered the first major attempt to frame and to analyse the 20th century as a whole published by an historian. This being the case, the title of his lecture raised vivid interest and expectations, in two equally exciting, but opposite directions: What were the dates that formed and shaped the interpretation of the 20th century developed in The Age of Extremes? And: did recent events or newly acquired dates challenge or change this interpretation?

Hobsbawm decided in favour of the first question and started his lecture with some general remarks on the centrality of dates not only for history as such, but also for historical concepts as interpretative tools. This, he argued, is especially the case with contemporary history, and is most obvious for territorial concepts like ‘Austria’ or ‘Germany’ which throughout the 20th century have been subject to a number of profound transformations and were connected to the most varied types of State and society. But it is also true for general frameworks, which deeply depend on external dates - in terms both of the surrounding ongoing debates and of the ‘point of view in time’. What would a world history of the 20th century in 1960 have looked like?, asked HOBBSBAWM and left it to his audience to imagine how historians would have framed phenomena like the North-South conflict, decolonization, the revival of nationalism or economic globalization, when these problems had hardly started to become recognizable and some of them had not even a name yet.

With this in mind he then sketched a personal history of the making of the Age of Extremes book, on which he started to work in the late eighties. By that time - and this can be considered the most surprising revelation of his talk - his interpretation of the 20th century still came down to a diptych, a two-stage perspective, in which a period of catastrophic conflict and crisis was followed by a period of increasing welfare – politically, economically and in terms of international rapprochement. It was only with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent period of international destabilization which led
to the breakdown of the Soviet Union that Hobsbawm changed his mind and started to reframe his view on our century: the years from 1989 to 1991 now became the peak point of a crisis which, in this new perspective, started in 1973 with the oil crisis and the ensuing depression. Thus, Hobsbawm’s age of extremes since then consists of a triptych, with an initial age of catastrophe determined by the two World Wars and their aftermath, a ‘Golden Age’ of recovering economies and societies, and the big ‘landslide’ after 1973 culminating on the one hand in the breakdown of the USSR and the Communist world, and on the other with the breakthrough of capitalism on a world-wide scale.

This periodization may not convince everybody born during the Hobsbawmian ‘Golden Age’ and it apparently excludes the Cold War from the phenomena which shaped the epoch. It is nevertheless a periodization of almost stubborn, or at least courageous, consistency, firmly anchored within a materialistic view of the development of societies. “It is not men’s ideas that determine their social and economic abilities, but the other way around,” as Hobsbawm summarized his Marxist approach, which led him to what he called the ‘historical sandwich’ (a period of welfare between two periods of crisis) of the 20th century.

In a way this is what links the Age of Extremes to the earlier trilogy, which according to its author is about the successive “globalization of capitalism”, the dominant theme in The Age of Extremes. Such a perspective implicitly presumes what Hobsbawm explicitly confirmed at the EUI, when he returned to consider the problems of ‘writing the history of Europe’: the world-history of the 19th and 20th centuries is the history of fading eurocentrism. While European development during the 19th century still set the agenda and had a universal impact on world history, this has changed in the 20th century. In a globalized world, Asian stock-market crashes are at least as important as European ones.

Hobsbawm’s ‘short century’ starts with World War I and ends with 1991. Of the three post-war crises, for Hobsbawm the most dramatic and profound has been the one following the Cold War which led to the breakdown of the USSR. This is by now a widely accepted date, and subsequent events and dates have not yet been able to change the historical interpretation of the year 1991 as the end of the 20th century. But this might not have been completely obvious in 1994, when the Age of Extremes appeared, and, as Hobsbawm revealed, there was also an old historians’ rule, that made him adopt this periodization: “never write a history that goes up to the present moment!” that was the principle he was following while writing his book, and he now handed over this advice to the young historians at the EUI History Department.

Hobsbawm’s firm materialist statement was certainly no surprise, but still it inspired most of the questions during the discussion. Referring to a remark by Hobsbawm, who with respect to his historical thinking defined the historian’s task as “to go beyond and behind the language of the present,” Professor Bo Stråth put into question the feasibility of such a task in the light of the “linguistic turn” – whereby the historian like everybody else is bound to the usage of language – and therefore stressed the relevance of cultural approaches. Hobsbawm replied without a moment of hesitation that language describes social realities and its variants rise or die out with them. Since the concept of class seems to be fading away, so does its language. Prof. Luisa Passerini observed that in his revisitation of The Age of Extremes Hobsbawm had insisted on the need of rewriting certain parts of political history but had not included any mention of cultural and artistic changes, and suggested that this was a result of considering language as a “description of social reality”: if changes in the discourse are subordinate to a social reality which goes on by itself, there is no priority of reformulating the history of the cultural. Another important question was raised by Professor Arfon Rees, who did not totally agree with Hobsbawm’s reading of the 20th century as a confrontation between Capitalism and Communism, the one being essentially an economic movement, the other a socio-political theory. This was taken up in another statement from a researcher, who even questioned the very concept of a ‘short 20th century’ by introducing the alternative of a ‘long 20th century’ of struggles caused by the rise of mass society and the search for the right balance between individual rights and social (collective) justice. Again Hobsbawm did not seem to be at all challenged and conceded that alternative models on alternative grounds might well be found and be discussed, but would not alter nor threaten his own firm beliefs.

But this already points towards future historical debate which might arise in the light of new events, further evidence and fresh dates. As Hobsbawm, with unconcealed irony towards Fukuyama, stated: “The only thing we historians can really be sure about is that history will continue.”

Johannes A. Müller
Researcher in the History Department

Raffaele Romanelli, Eric J. Hobsbawm and Luisa Passerini
Workshop, 5 October

Multiple Modernities: Between Nation-Building and Muslim Traditions

Dr Armando Salvatore and Prof. Bo Stråth organized a workshop with the title Multiple Modernities: Between Nation-Building and Muslim Traditions, which took place in the History Department on 5 October.

This workshop continued the discussion on the broader topic of Modernity and Religion in Europe and the Middle East: Selfimage and Image of the Other, which was the title of a workshop that had taken place in April 1998. The outcome of this first workshop was a first draft of a book that tried to draw the lines between the various contributions. After one year of constant work on this book, the second workshop should then offer the opportunity to present four new contributions for the book and at the same time to discuss the whole framework.

After Armando Salvatore had outlined the general framework of the workshop, the four contributions addressed the topic of Muslim practices and the public sphere. Michael Gaspar gave a paper on Citi-fying and Civilising: Islamic Modernism, the Egyptian Press and the Peasants Question in the late 19th Century. Andreas Christmann presented his research on the social function of Ramadan in Damascus. Nadia Hashmi then examined the question of Muslim immigrants in Europe and focused especially on the individual strategies through which second-generation immigrants bridge the gap between their parents’ culture and their environment. Finally, Burcu Akan dealt with the topic of memory and tradition-making in the Balkans, where some everyday practices testify to the influence of the former Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic.

The final discussion in the afternoon got as hot as the Sala Belvedere, where the sun presided over disputes on concepts, approaches, and methods. The problems resulting from the very broad framework of both workshops became evident once more. There was common agreement among all participants that studies of modernities in the Western and Middle Eastern sphere have to be deconstructivist if they do not want to reproduce former essentialistic assumptions of “Islam” and “the West.” However, the discussion showed that a deconstructivist approach becomes the more difficult the larger the framework is.

In the use of the concept of identity, a similar analytical trap was brought to light. In both cases, a careful and accurate use of concepts that is constantly aware of different contexts and shifting borderlines might overcome these problems. The editors of the book decided in consequence to pigeonhole the concept of transcultural dynamics, which had until this workshop been the common basis of the earlier contributions. Accordingly, the workshop was very helpful not only in embedding the new contributions in the formerly established framework of the book, but also in revising and refining the framework itself.

Almut Hofert
Images of Europe

Professor Luisa Passerini organized a workshop entitled “Images of Europe”, which took place in the Department of History and Civilization on 26 and 27 November.

The aim of this workshop was to pose the question of the various ways in which Europe can be conceptualized, imagined and constructed as a continent among other continents and starting from different perspectives. The first session, chaired by Luisa Passerini, presented two interpretations of a longue durée process of construction of an image of Europe in historical and philosophical perspective: one from outside, the other from inside the European world.

Anthony Pagden (Johns Hopkins University) gave a paper entitled ‘Techne, travel and empire: the non-European world in the construction of an image of Europe’. Starting from the different conceptualizations of the dichotomies between European and non-European worlds he identified the development of technology and travel (real and imaginary) connected to European expansion as important means by which this separation has been challenged, from the ancient Greeks to the present. From this rich and somehow vertiginous historical travel, it emerged that the question of the distinction between Europeans and the others is not as clear-cut as it has been traditionally described.

Richard Waswo (University of Geneva) traced the transformation of the image of Europe from ancient Crete to the Euro as shifting from a “dark continent” – as seems to be suggested by the etymological evidence that shaped the conceptualization of the continent proposed by Herodotus – to the “state of mind” required by the imminent unification of European currency. In Waswo’s understanding of this process, the Euro can produce omnipresent, geographical unity more than ancient mythology could in the past.

In the second session, chaired by Peter Becker, the talk by Ioanna Laliotou (Columbia University) focused on images of the Balkans as existing, imaginary or futuristic symbols or anti-symbols of Europe and Europeanness. Analysing the notions of plurality and diversity and the different ways in which they have been used in order to describe both the cultural heritage of Europe and the dangerous diversity of Balkan cultures and identities, the paper presented some views of the Balkans constructed in the nineteen-thirties from a Western perspective: the writings of women travelling in that region for cultural or political reasons and the intellectual debates on nativism and multiculturalism in the USA, in which the Balkans became the model for the elaboration of an alternative Europe.

A different perspective, based on a sociological background, was opened by Jan Nederveen Pieterse (Institute of Social Studies, The Hague) who proposed to get rid of the weight of the cultural heritage of Europe, to be able to “travel light” in the transition towards globalization. The key to this process is to find a conceptualization and recognition of otherness in a European, but also world, political, social and cultural context.

The third session, chaired by Hans Erich Bodeker, dealt mostly with visual images. The art historian Sabine Poeschel (Stuttgart University) presented a rich selection of prints, paintings, frescoes and sculptures from the Middle Ages to the 18th century, situating them in the iconographical tradition of the allegories of the continents. In particular, she analysed the fresco cycle by Tiepolo in Würzburg in the light of this tradition.

Luisa Passerini presented a choice of visual interpretations of the myth of Europa and the bull, underlining the political interpretation given to it in the nineteen-thirties by some European artists who understood the Bull as representing the obscure forces of evil and violence which were menacing Europe in that period.

The general discussion was very lively and raised many themes and topics, showing the fruitfulness of the exchange among the different perspectives to which the workshop has given voice.
On 10 November a group of almost 30 Italian dance historians and dance ethnologists met for the day at Villa Schifanoia, hosted by the Department of History and Civilization.

Among those present were Eugenia Casini Ropa (Università di Bologna), Vito Di Bernardi (Università di Siena), Giorgio Di Lecce (Università di Lecce), Francesca Falcone (Accademia di Danza di Roma) Pino Gala (Rivista "Choreola"), Concetta Lo Iacono (Università di Roma III), Fabio Mollica (Società di danza, Bologna), Barbara Sparti (Roma), Stefano Tomassini (Università di Venezia), Patrizia Veroli (Roma), Alessandro Pontremoli (Università di Torino).

The meeting was organized in an attempt to answer a pressing need for more communication among those who are researching in this field in Italy.

After some short talks on specific themes such as the importance of recently discovered sources for the study of dance, the relationship of music and dance in the reconstruction of spectacular events of the past, and the history of Italian dance ethnology, many of the participants presented ongoing research projects, specifying their difficulties and frustrations and the needs for methodological reflection and for reference instruments.

The general discussion dealt with a number of very important questions, like the variety of historiographical approaches to dance studies, the didactic programmes in the seven universities in which the discipline is recognized and taught, the isolation that researchers feel in this (for Italy) new academic field, publishing strategies, the need for methodological analysis, connections to foreign institutions, the listing of Italian resources (libraries, archives, dissertations, etc.).

It was agreed to meet again next spring, and the project of creating a web-site and a discussion list was discussed.

This meeting constituted a very important starting point for the development of this quite new discipline, thanks to the support given to this initiative by the Department of History and Civilization.

Marina Nordera
The second PhD Summer School of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) on ‘The Welfare State’ took place at the Institute from July 5-16 under the local direction of Professors Richard Breen and Martin Rhodes.

The new Summer School is an initial element of the ECPR’s programme of research training for postgraduates in Political Science. The School was attended by 20 PhD researchers from Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Spain, the UK, Russia, and the USA. Aiming to provide a valuable multinational forum for the provision of access to a wider range of academic approaches and expertise than is normally available to research students, the teaching staff comprised some of the leading international scholars in the comparative study of the Welfare State.

The academic programme consisted of an intensive schedule of lectures, seminars, and researchers’ papers outlining individual research projects. The overall academic aim of the Summer School was to examine the most critical issues concerning employment and social welfare currently facing advanced industrial economies. This included both domestically generated challenges and those coming from beyond the borders of the nation State.

Professor Paul Pierson (Harvard University) introduced those socio-economic trends which are increasingly putting acute pressures on the mature Welfare State. Professor Ann Shola Orloff (Northwestern University) discussed cross-national and historical variations in the ways Western States organize the provision of income and care in relation to families, markets, and voluntary organizations, highlighting the effects on gender relations. Prof. Giuseppe Bertola (EUI) outlined how labour-market and other social protection institutions interact with the changing character of EU economies. Professor Agneta Kruse (University of Lund) addressed the challenges to European pension systems by looking at the effects of economic and demographic changes as well as the design issues involved in the pension reform. Professor Bill Jordan (Exeter University) analysed the features of social exclusion that are related to globalization, and the strengths and weaknesses of this particular attempt to reformulate the postwar social contract in this new context. Professor Gosta Esping Andersen (University of Trento/EUI) considered the employment problems facing various types of Welfare States and the extent to which these may be related to their institutional structures and traditional policy responses to the problems of the labour market. Professor K.-U. Mayer (Max Planck Institut f. Bildungsforschung, Berlin) dealt with the problem of whether observed differences and changes in work and family lives in advanced industrial societies have an impact on the variations in the Welfare State.

Professor Tony Atkinson (Nuffield College) examined issues concerning the distribution of income inequality in Europe. Professor Martin Rhodes (EUI) introduced the implications of new nationally-negotiated social pacts (involving political parties and organized interests) on Welfare States. Professor Bob Deacon (Sheffield University) reviewed the consequences of the present phase of globalization for the making of social policy in developed and middle income countries.

In sum, the Summer School gave participants an excellent opportunity to listen to, and discuss some of the principal debates and theoretical perspectives within the comparative study of Welfare States. Furthermore, students obtained feedback from both peers and established academics on their PhD research projects.

On behalf of the ECPR Executive Committee, I would like to thank Richard Breen and Martin Rhodes for having provided an excellent, wide-ranging academic programme and for having taken a lot of time and energy to run the Summer School in a professional way. I was also asked by the participating students to especially thank Martin Rhodes for all the efforts he has put into directing the seminar discussions, as well as for supervising individual PhD research projects.

According to the participants’ evaluation sheets, the second ECPR Summer School was a great success.

Ferdinand Müller-Rommel
Vice-chairman of the ECPR and director of the ECPR PhD Summer Schools
I came to the EUI in October 1994 as a Jean Monnet Fellow in the Robert Schuman Centre, originally intending to stay for just one academic year. The opportunity of spending ten months or so away from rainy Manchester (where I then worked) was irresistible. But that was five years ago. So why am I still here? Apart from a long-standing and rather sentimental relationship with Florence and the Institute (I worked here as an attaché de recherche in 1993 and 1994 – some people are convinced I never left), I was attracted by the possibility of working for the Robert Schuman Centre. So I took further leave from my job at the University of Manchester to do just that.

The Centre was then in its early days. The large organization that it has now become, with a gaggle of joint professors, countless research fellows and two villas to its name on the other side of San Domenico, consisted then of just Yves Meny (its director), two secretaries (Monique Cavallari and Annette Merlan) and a couple of research assistants huddled together in the Archivium at the Badia (pochi ma buoni!). Yves was kind enough to ask me to stay on and help build up the Centre’s research activities in the area of the welfare state, to which Asia-Europe relations were later added.

At the same time, the Centre began its rapid expansion, we moved to the Convento and, under Yves’ inspiring leadership, it quickly became an exciting place to work – so much so that I decided to resign from Manchester University and take a longer-term contract. It turned out to be a good decision. Not only did I have the privilege of working with Yves in building up what has become in a very short time one of the most dynamic research organizations of its kind in Europe, with a strong international reputation, but it allowed me to put in place my own research programme which led to the European forum on ‘Recasting the Welfare State’ in 1998-99. Running that programme with my colleague Maurizio Ferrera (from the University of Pavia) was exhausting (apart from weekly seminars we ran 8 workshops and conferences) but also highly rewarding – both for us and the twenty or so fellows in residence we attracted from Europe and the United States. Without Yves and the backing of the Schuman team (especially Monique, Katinka Espana, Catherine Divry and Felipa de Sousa) it would not have been possible to run such a large-scale project. It is a tribute to all of them that it was such a success.

My plans now are to continue with and consolidate research already begun at the Schuman Centre on comparative and European social and labour market policy and corporate governance. All of my recent and current work has been shaped either by policy oriented research conducted with the support of the European Commission (globalization and social and employment policy) or by my involvement in three different projects: on internationalization and the adjustment of welfare states (led by Fritz Scharpf and Vivienne Schmidt); the new politics of welfare (led by Paul Pierson); and the institutionalization of European space (led by Neil Fligstein, Alec Stone Sweet and Wayne Sandholtz). My contributions to these focus on, respectively, the adjustment of the British Welfare State, welfare reform and new social pacts in Europe and the evolution of a new ‘corporate’ space in the EU. Over the next couple of years I will be concentrating on producing a number of books on the same theme.
This is the book I have been working on since I arrived the Institute in 1995, and although I had signed a contract to write it even before I knew I would ever get a job here, I do not think I would ever have completed it unless I had come to Florence. This is not so much because the book has involved writing about the whole of western Europe - I had done that before - but because of the range of subjects I needed to include. For 25 years before I started work on this project I had written almost solely about industrial relations and similar themes. Now, trying to produce something about virtually all aspects of social structure, I needed competence in several new areas: gender, family, religion, ethnicity, social class....

Colleagues and researchers at the EUI proved invaluable to this, especially those working in the areas of gender and family, which I knew had to be very prominent themes in the study but which I had completely neglected over the years.

Whether I have made good use of what I have learned from them all I now have to wait for the reviewers’ verdicts to learn. I am anxious, because I know that this is a book in which I have tried to do too many things at once. I want students at many levels to be able to use it, but I don’t want it to be just a text book; I have been trying to say Something New. I also run two parallel themes throughout the book: one is the attempt to pin down the unity and diversity of western European societies; the other is to develop a more general theory of social change in advanced industrial societies over the past four decades. I fear that some chapters groan under the strain of that double burden, and in the end I had to have two separate concluding chapters, one on each theme. Subtle integration of two subjects, or two-headed monster?

Anyway, whatever they say, I enjoyed doing it. I was very well behaved, and took the advice that I always give to my researchers: once you have made your general plan, just work at it bit by bit. While you are writing one chapter, forget there will ever need to be any other chapters. While you are writing one section of a chapter, forget there will ever need to be any other sections. On a really difficult day, while you are writing one paragraph, forget there will ever need to be any other paragraphs. If you keep looking up and thinking of how much has to be done before the whole project is finished, you will get a nasty attack of la nausée.

This in more detail is what I have tried to do: I have compared west European countries across a wide range of social institutions: work and occupations, the structure of the economy, the family, education, religion, nationality and ethnicity, and the mechanisms of citizenship in the welfare state. I try to get some perspective on any shared west European specificities by including basic details on Japan and the United States throughout, though detailed discussions are restricted to the European cases.

Then there is the theory of change in contemporary societies. Starting from a model of a mid-century social compromise - based on certain balances between industrialism, capitalism, traditional community institutions, and community - I see the subsequent destabilization of this, initially through a rise in the role of what I call citizenship institutions, but more recently and powerfully through the resurgence of capitalism in shaping a new social order. I also try to evaluate various other attempts at defining current change - such as post-modernist and post-Fordist ones. I certainly find these useful, but inadequate in that they are rarely based on as wide a diversity of cases as I have studied here.
Summer at the European University Institute has in recent years come to be associated with the Academy of European Law’s summer courses. Just as researchers are heading off to their home countries, a new wave of students appears to add life and vitality to the Villa Schifanoia. Indeed, the Academy held its Tenth Anniversary Session from 21 June to 2 July (Session on Human Rights Law) and 5 July to 16 July (Session on the Law of the European Union).

With more than 160 participants from over 40 countries, attending lectures and workshops delivered by leading scholars and practitioners in the respective fields, the Session proved to be a very successful one.

Each of the courses focused on a particular theme: the international law framework of human rights and the European Court of Justice, respectively. The detailed programme of the session included the following lectures:

**Session on Human Rights Law**

*Distinguished Lecture*

Is the Human Rights Regime Special in International Law? **Pieter van Dijk**, Member of the Council of State, The Netherlands

*General Course*

A Comprehensive Human Rights System. **David J. Harris**, Professor of Public International Law, University of Nottingham

Rethinking International Human Rights: What Have We Learned, Where Are We Going? **Richard B. Bilder**, Foley & Lardner Emeritus Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School

**Session on the Law of the European Union**

*Distinguished Lecture*

La Constitution européenne de la Communauté à l’Union. **Jean-Victor Louis**, Professor of Law, Université Libre de Bruxelles and EUI; Honorary Legal Adviser, Banque Nationale de Belgique

*General Course*

Rethinking the Foundations of European Law. **J. H. H. Weiler**, Manley Hudson Professor of Law and Jean Monnet Chair, Harvard Law School; Co-director, Academy of European Law

Private International Law and International Human Rights Law: Conflicts and Convergence. **Andrew Byrnes**, Associate Professor of Law, University of Hong Kong

Les rapports entre les droits de l’homme et la paix et la sécurité internationales en droit international. **Olivier Corten**, Research Fellow, Université Libre de Bruxelles

Judicial Activism versus Judicial Restraint in the Interpretation of Human Rights Norms. **Craig Scott**, Associate Professor of Law, University of Toronto

Erosion of the Private-Public Divide and the Growth of the Human Rights Movement. **Henry Steiner**, Professor of Law and Director of Law School Human Rights Program, Harvard University

Droits de l’homme et souveraineté de l’Etat: les frontières ont-elles été substantiellement redéfinies? **Hélène Ruiz Fabri**, Professor of Law, Université de Paris I

Erosion of the Private-Public Divide and the Growth of the Human Rights Movement. **Henry Steiner**, Professor of Law and Director of Law School Human Rights Program, Harvard University

Droits de l’homme et souveraineté de l’Etat: les frontières ont-elles été substantiellement redéfinies? **Hélène Ruiz Fabri**, Professor of Law, Université de Paris I

Les rapports entre les droits de l’homme et la paix et la sécurité internationales en droit international. **Olivier Corten**, Research Fellow, Université Libre de Bruxelles

Judicial Activism versus Judicial Restraint in the Interpretation of Human Rights Norms. **Craig Scott**, Associate Professor of Law, University of Toronto

Erosion of the Private-Public Divide and the Growth of the Human Rights Movement. **Henry Steiner**, Professor of Law and Director of Law School Human Rights Program, Harvard University

Droits de l’homme et souveraineté de l’Etat: les frontières ont-elles été substantiellement redéfinies? **Hélène Ruiz Fabri**, Professor of Law, Université de Paris I

**Tenth Anniversary Session**

The Academy of European Law
The Jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice Reconsidered. PAUL P. CRAIG, Professor of Law, Worcester College, Oxford University

Adjudicating European Integration and its Limits: Examining the Role of National Courts and the EC. MATTIAS KUMM, Adjunct Assistant Prof. of Law, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Interpretation, Integrity and Integration in the Jurisprudence of the ECJ. NEIL MACCORMICK, Regius Professor of Public Law, University of Edinburgh; JOXERRAMON BENGÖETXEA, Professor of Law, Universidad del País Vasco; and LEONOR MORAL, Marie Curie Research Fellow, Centre for Law and Society, University of Edinburgh

The Community of Judges: The Court of Justice in Socio-legal Perspective. HARM SCHEP, Marie Curie Research Fellow, Université Libre de Bruxelles and ERHARD BLANKENBURG, Professor of Legal Sociology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Gendering the Court of Justice. JO SHAW, Professor of European Law, Centre for the Study of Law in Europe, Department of Law, University of Leeds

These lectures, revised and substantially developed for publication, will appear in book form as the Collected Courses of the Academy of European Law. This new series of four annual volumes, published by Oxford University Press, was launched this year with the lectures arising from the 1998 courses. The first set of volumes features the following titles:

People’s Rights, edited by PHILIP ALSTON, with contributions by PHILIP ALSTON, JAMES CRAWFORD, BENEDICT KINGSBURY, PETER LEUPRECHT, ANNE ORFORD and DINAH SHELTON (available May 2000)

Towards a Common Law of International Trade? The EU, the WTO and the NAFTA, edited by JOSEPH H. H. WEILER, with contributions by JOSEPH WEILER, MARISA CREMONA, ROBERT HOWSE, JACQUES BOURGEOS, JOANNE SCOTT and FREDERICK ABBOTT (available February 2000)

Ethnicity, Democracy and Human Rights, by YASH GHAI (available March 2000)

The Constitutional Law of Europe, by FRANCES NYDER (available February 2001)

WOJCIECH SADURSKI grew up and was educated in Poland, studying law at the University of Warsaw, where he obtained his LL.M and Ph.D. He also completed a year of postgraduate studies at the Institut Européen des Hautes Études Internationales in Nice, France. Returning to Poland, he taught the history of political and legal ideas, and legal theory, at the University of Warsaw. In 1991 he took up a position at the University of Sydney, and worked in Australia until accepting the position of Professor of Legal Theory and Philosophy of Law at the EUI, Department of Law, from September this year.

In Australia, after two years at the University of Sydney, a fellowship at the Australian National University in Canberra and two years at the University of Melbourne, he returned to Sydney, and in 1994 was appointed to a Personal Chair in Legal Philosophy. He also became a member of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia. He received a fellowship from the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS), and was twice a visiting professor at Cornell Law School in Ithaca, USA. He served as President of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy and was also a member of the Executive Committee of the International Association of Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy (I.V.R.)

His main books include: a monograph on political theory of neo-liberalism (in Polish) and three books published in Kluwer’s “Law and Philosophy Library”: Giving Desert Its Due: Social Justice and Legal Theory (1985), Moral Pluralism and Legal Neutrality (1990) and Freedom of Speech and Its Limits (1999). He has also edited or co-edited various books in the area of jurisprudence and legal theory, and published over fifty articles in academic journals. As the titles of his
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three English-language books suggest, his main areas of intellectual interest have been: theories of justice (including theories of discrimination and affirmative action), theories of the liberal State and its functions, and philosophical inquiries into various aspects of freedom of expression. He is a commentator on social and legal issues for a leading Polish newspaper, and is also a member of the council of the Centre for Monitoring Freedom of the Press in Poland.

The main project that he intends to pursue during his term at the EUI concerns the role of judicial and quasi-judicial bodies in representative democracy, an important issue in the field of constitutional theory. This project lies at the intersection of political philosophy and comparative constitutionalism and has been triggered by the growing importance of constitutional tribunals in the most advanced post-communist democracies of Central Europe. The dilemmas of judicial power versus parliamentary representation are, however, more universal: whenever non-representative bodies acquire the authority to displace the choices made by parliaments, difficult issues of legitimacy emerge. They are particularly evident in Central Europe, where societies face the unique opportunity - and challenge - of crafting new constitutional mechanisms against the contrasting background of their recent undemocratic pasts.

In addition to this long-term project, he intends to set up a European Legal Theory Network, a relatively informal scheme which would help bring to Florence some of the best, most interesting and most innovative legal theorists from various European countries.
Rarement un agenda politique aura été aussi chargé que celui qui attend R. Prodi et sa nouvelle équipe. La Commission mise en place bénéficiante d’une lune de miel temporaire, bref répit entre la crise de mars, la pétition participation électorale de juin et l’examen de passage devant le Parlement en septembre.

Cette pause est bienvenue car si l’Union Européenne présente bien des défauts, il est injuste d’en faire porter tout le fardeau sur la Commission. Mais cette injustice signifie aussi que c’est encore la Commission qui est au centre des choses, qui présente le maximum de visibilité et par voie de conséquence prend en charge le maximum de responsabilité, la sienne bien sûr, mais accessoirement celle qui pourrait être plus légitimement attribuée au Conseil des Ministres, au Conseil Européen, voire au Parlement. Le processus de décision communautaire est si complexe qu’il est bien difficile d’identifier qui est responsable de quoi.

Les attentes à l’égard de la Commission sont donc considérables : élargissement à l’Est, réforme institutionnelle, gestion des Balkans, coopération avec la rive Sud de la Méditerranée, relations commerciales avec les États-Unis, politique commune de défense et de sécurité ne sont que quelques exemples des questions pressantes qui attendent la nouvelle Commission sans compter l’ordinaire, c’est à dire toutes les politiques communautaires, de l’agriculture au marché intérieur en passant par l’environnement.

Les hommes et femmes choisis par Prodi sont compétents, expérimentés et surtout judicieusement placés. Il n’y a donc pas trop de soucis à se faire pour les pilotes. En revanche, l’état de la machine, c’est à dire la Commission est préoccupante. La svelte machine de course conçue originellement pour aller de plus en plus à ces avions de guerre allemands qui à force d’ajouts de toutes sortes se sont écrasés au sol par dizaines. Sans réforme majeure, la Commission ne sera ni à même de bien gérer les dossiers qui lui sont confiés ni à même de convaincre l’opinion publique de leur bien-fondé.

Il serait nécessaire d’agir sur plusieurs fronts : symbolique, politique procédural, managérial.

Les symboles sont l’accessoire, l’écrêve des choses, mais en politique ils sont souvent essentiels. Saluons l’initiative de Prodi de demander aux Commissaires de s’installer près de leurs services, d’europeaniser leur cabinet. Souhaitons que les règles d’éthique soient renforcées même si les problèmes sont en fait assez mineurs. Mais ce n’est pas suffisant. Des changements de méthode, des modes de faire et d’agir doivent rapidement être mis en place et rendus publics. Mais que l’on nous fasse grâce de la transparence, cette tarte à la crème qui sous prétexte de mettre le pouvoir à nu transfère les mécanismes de décision réels dans des coulisses plus profondes.

La politique peut rejoindre le symbole quand les mesures prises parlement au public : les programmes pour étudiants Erasmus et Socrates concilient de ce point de vue un impact extraordinaire sur les jeunes avec un coût très bas.

C’est le bon modèle d’association de la société civile – même s’il peut être amélioré dans son fonctionnement – et les domaines où il pourrait être étendu sont innombrables. Après tout pourquoi seuls les étudiants seraient-ils incités à cette mobilité européenne ? Dans d’autres secteurs, le symbole, l’efficacité et la politique pourraient également être réconciliés, par exemple en développant les droits liés à la citoyenneté européenne ou encore par la création d’une police commune des frontières.

Plus prosaïque mais pas moins difficile est la réforme des procédures de la Commission. L’administration communautaire a été influencée à son origine par les modèles français et allemands, par les traditions du service public classique c’est à dire un style relativement juridique et formel. Avec le temps et la multiplication/diversification des compétences, avec les élargissements successifs, la Commission est devenue une « usine à gaz ». Les règles de la soi-disant transparence conjuguée avec la méfiance inspirée par quelques affaires de mauvaise gestion ou népotisme ont suscité la plus naturelle mais aussi la plus stupide des réactions : la multiplication des contrôles formels, administratifs et financiers sur un corps qui manquait déjà de ressort. Non seulement la Commission au bord de la paralysie administrative, mais, plus grave, le tâtillon respect des formes perdait là-sous une capacité et la politique pourraient également être réconciliés.

Enfin, la Commission devrait s’attaquer de front à la réforme managériale. Il est heureux que le dossier ait été confié à Neil Kinnock, un britannique. Venant avec des idées différentes sur le management,
The European University Institute continued its tradition of academic and policy dialogue with Japan by hosting on 27-29 October the 10th annual Symposium of the EU-Japan Club.

Broadly titled “What is the Future of Global Society”, it brought together prominent academics and policy makers to discuss in a polite, but very frank, way some of the most pressing globalization issues regarding the recent globalization phase, and the role of both Europe and Japan in shaping it.

The symposium was organized by Martin Rhodes, Professor in the Social and Political Sciences Department, and Ms. Daniela Di Corrado, from the Commission’s DGI and long-time co-ordinator of the Club, who keeps securing the support of the Japan Foundation, and the Keizai Koho Center, a public relations institute affiliated with the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations.

The EU-Japan Club was created at the end of a period of relations marked by confrontations in trade matters and little substantial political co-operation and dialogue. During the 1990s, the Club’s monthly gatherings in Brussels and its annual symposia may have exerted real influence in the improvement of bilateral relations, now filled with joint sectoral co-operation activities and a regular overall political dialogue. While misperceptions and difficulties in learning from each other are still present, the feeling among the participants in this year’s symposium was of increasing understanding paired with a predisposition to greater joint promotion of various bilateral and multilateral issues.

The opening session took place in Palazzo Vecchio, setting the tone for the remainder of the symposium. In the welcome address, the President of the Institute, Dr Patrick Masterson, stressed the need to develop new thinking in the social sciences so as to maintain their characteristic openness and thus help address the pressing problems of a globalizing world dominated by the rationality of science and technology. Dr Horst Krenzler, former Director-General of the European Commission for External Relations and Honorary Governor of the Board of the EU-Japan Club, then remarked about the difficulty of fully distinguishing between the positive and negative aspects of globalization.

The first lecture was given by Mr Yves-Thibault de Silguy, former European Commissioner in charge of monetary affairs, who spoke highly of the Euro and its implications. The most remarkable event since the creation of the Bretton Woods system, in less than a year since its launch the Euro has already proved to be a success story that brings stability and growth to Europe while helping to reduce volatility in an increasingly multipolar financial world. Yet, as Mr de Silguy recalled, it is just a first step and many challenges remain ahead, chiefly the need for the members of the European (Monetary) Union to speak and act united.

Less upbeat, but equally intriguing and more original, was the subsequent lecture by Prof. Hayao Kawai, a Governor of the Board of the EU-Japan Club and Director-General at the International Research Centre for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) in Kyoto. Using metaphors from national identity creation myths of a Native American people, he indirectly upheld the necessity of pluralism and calmness in adapting to new situations, not least in the current moment of changes.

After both lectures, H. E. Takayuki Kimura, Japanese Ambassador to the EU, delivered rather calmly an official address in which he contrasted the largely limited and contentious bilateral relations of the 1980s with the much smoother current ones, filled with co-operation projects. Yet, there is much room for enhanced co-operation at the multilateral level and in bilateral political, business and cultural relations.

Following the lectures, interesting panel discussions ensued in each session of the symposium. The first one, chaired by Dr Krenzler, raised a number of ideas worth monitoring or exploring, including the march of diverse development models in Europe and industrial Asia, the Americanization of the world, the trend towards regionalization of currencies, the possibility of currency collaboration between Europe and Japan, and the role of education. An interesting comment was that of Corrado Molteni, Professor of Japanese Economy in Milan, who concluded that Europe should listen more to understand other regions of the world, but that the background of the EU should facilitate this.

The final word for the day was given to Prof. Yves Mény, director of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, who first spoke on the need of creating a more rule-based global paradigm that goes beyond the current ones of laissez-faire and the Bismarckian Welfare State, and then added that the European project has so far been successful for three main reasons: the promotion of its myth, the application of the principle of pluralist participation despite wealth or size, and the instrumentality of institutions, especially the European Court of Justice. Yet, Prof. Mény believes, the rule of law could still be much improved in both Europe.
and internationally, and legal developments in Europe may drive the process of globalization both as an example and as a key building block.

The second session, titled “Reregulation: International Rule Making” was opened with the views of Mr Koji KAKIZAWA (former Japanese foreign minister) on the need to balance the overall positive process of globalization with the preservation of local diversity. He went on to present the term ‘glocalizing’, using the successful example of Sony in achieving such a balance. He then described the idea of a multilevel world harmoniously based on the individual, arguing for the need to strengthen the family, local governments, as well as global and regional multilateral institutions, and civil societies, especially in Asia.

Afterwards, Prof. GIULIANO AMATO, promoter of a ‘Constitution for Europe’ while at the Institute and now Italian Minister of the Treasury, concentrated on the historical progress of both hard and soft legal ways with the long-term goal of finding commonalities among conflicting domestic-market regulations addressing the risks of supranational private cartels. The evolution of legal doctrine in this field has moved from the unilateral behaviour of powerful states with extraterritoriality effects, to newer, more collaborative doctrines, by which countries would try to take into consideration, and even investigate upon request, the direct negative implications of their actions for the affected country. Yet only the EU has gone far enough to have near-direct legal domestic applicability of many of its supranational decisions. Prof. AMATO concluded that although the European example is probably very difficult to replicate in other parts of the world or international organizations like the WTO, one should welcome a more global exercise to bring diverse parties closer together hoping they find ways to converge, since the possible failures of regulations may be less costly than the possible failures of systemic market risk. Prof. AMATO’s lecture led to a very lively panel session in which differences could only partially be bridged. Specially interesting was the idea of reaching similar progress between Europe and Japan in competition law as the recent transatlantic agreement has achieved.

In the third session, chaired by Prof. MÉNY, three interesting papers were given on the issue of “Democratic Accountability”. Dr NICOLAS RENGER (St. Andrews, Scotland) started by suggesting organizing a global opposition through the co-ordination of knowledge-intensive, international non-governmental organizations, maybe around the World Bank. Afterwards, Prof. TAKENORI INOKI (Osaka University) pondered on the risks of short-term thinking, and on the related issue of accounting for policies with long-term consequences, as such as those of the European Central Bank, an institution lacking proper accountability.

Finally, Prof. DAICHI ITO (National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Tokyo) recounted the recent arduous process of reforming the central administration in Japan, eventually successful despite being largely driven by a new generation of elite bureaucrats, who were hoping at the same time to create a framework that exacts stronger leadership and accountability from
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appartenant à une tradition qui ne confond pas la réforme avec le discours sur la réforme, on peut espérer que des changements importants verront le jour. La clef de l’affaire est dans la question suivante : comment débarasser la Commission de tous les bagages inutiles qu’elle a accumulés au fil des ans sans pour autant renationaliser les politiques. La solution n’est ni dans l’augmentation du personnel, ni dans celui du budget, facilités qui ne remédient en rien au problème. Elle est sans doute dans la restructuration des taches (abandonner les programmes fractionnés à l’excès pour satisfaire telle ou telle clientèle) et surtout dans la constitution d’agences autonomes sur le modèle de l’agence du médicament à Londres ou des marques et brevets à Alicante. La piste est prometteuse mais à condition de respecter quelques règles de bon sens : ne pas multiplier à tort et à travers le recours au modèle de l’agence, y compris pour des questions qui ne le justifient pas ; ne pas répéter au niveau des agences les erreurs commises à Bruxelles, c’est à dire enfanter des monstres bureaucratiques où les objectifs ne seront plus que celui de respecter les oukases du contrôleur financier ou les éventuelles fantasies d’un rapporteur de la Commission compétente du Parlement Européen. Bref, au niveau européen (comme d’ailleurs au niveau national) il y a matière à réflexion pour une nouvelle organisation de l’action publique et la mise en œuvre d’une véritable responsabilité.
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the largely entrenched and ineffective Japanese politicians.

The ensuing panel discussion raised various issues, including the difficulties of attacking the gatopardesque nature of administrative reforms, the example of the European Parliament as a supranational institution with some accountability, the evolution of the United Nations System, the lack of definitions for democracy and civil society, and the role of Japanese universities. The day was concluded with Prof. Ménÿ’s reminder of the power of ideas.

The fourth Session, chaired by Prof. Tomihide Kashoaka (Kyoto Women’s University), was devoted to the theme “Society and Identity under Globalization: Education, Adaptability of Elites”. First to speak was Mr Roberto Gucci, (President of the Florence House) who gave his thoughts about the meaning of identity and globalization from the point of view of fashion and warned about excessive homogenization, largely Americanization, which could stifle creative innovation in Japan. To this, Prof. Vandae Walle (Catholic University of Louvain) added that such homogenization is to some extent also happening in European art.

The second lecture, ‘Globalization, Harmonization and Moral Obligations’, was delivered by Prof. Kotaro Suzumura, Economist at the Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University, and President of the Japanese Economists’ Association. It centred about the problems of bilateralism and unilateralism as being against general desires for economic efficiency and democratic accountability, and argued in favour of a multilateral approach to international harmonization and conflict resolution. Prof. Suzumura then went on to the issue of global warming, to uphold the moral obligation on developed countries not to transfer to future generations the costs of solving now their present and past pollution misdeeds.

Afterwards, Dr Wolfgang Pape, from the Commission’s Forward Studies Unit, commented on the problem of bringing both China and Japan together into regional institutions, and individually into multi-lateral ones, and agreed with the idea of many other participants that the best way to converge internationally is through the use of mutual recognition mechanisms.

The final lecture of the symposium was delivered by Prof. Richard Higgott (Director of the Centre for Globalization and Regionalization, University of Warwick) and entitled “Emerging Elite Networks and Global Public Policy: Where do we Stand?”. He described the recent trends by emerging global networks voicing the concerns of large groups of people opposed to the inequalities globalization brings, and trying to shape the agenda of a Post-Washington Consensus, where economic efficiency would have to accommodate social values.

The final afternoon session was chaired by Prof. Pompidou, Member of the French Economic and Social Committee, Professor of Medical Sciences, and for ten years a member of the European Parliament Japan group, five of which he chaired. Currently chair of the evaluation panel of Research and Development projects related to the Information Society under the European Commission’s DGXIII, Prof. Pompidou spoke on how information communications multimedia allow for new forms of globalization in various science fields, but did not fail to exhort against the perils of excessive uniformization.

The final word was given to Lady Diana Brittan (President of Charity Funds, UK Lottery) who summarized the symposium in an original way. Often using metaphors, she described the main dichotomies one has to keep pondering on to find ways to bridge, a task that the younger members of the EU-Japan Club would have to undertake.

In both Japan and Italy, real progress also often happens in a friendly and relaxed manner after the formal work is done. In this respect, the Symposium met everybody’s expectations. After a rushed visit to the Palazzo Vecchio, la Galeria degli Uffizi and the Corridoio Vasariano on the first evening, the cultural and social evening programme included a dinner on the second evening in the mist of the Tuscan hills offered by Mr Gucci, and a visit on the last day to Museo Stibbert, which is currently exhibiting many of the most important masterpieces in its ample Japanese collection, including the largest assortment of Japanese armoury outside Nippon.

César de Prado Yepes


For more information on the Club’s activities, including this Symposium, please visit www.jmission-eu.be/club/index.htm.
Many public regulations currently in force in Europe are designed in such a way that they have a harmful effect on competition in the market in which they apply, with no corresponding social benefit. For instance, regulations applicable to the provision of professional services typically define conditions for entry into the profession through licensing requirements, the scope of permissible activity of the professionals, and the duties of the professionals to their clients and to other professionals. Such regulations are often written in terms that severely restrict competition, ostensibly to protect the consumer who suffers from a lack of sufficient information to judge the competence of the professional. In fact, many of these restrictions are designed and administered by groups made up of incumbent professionals, with an aim to restrict competition and keep prices high.

The cost to society of anticompetitive regulation initially became a concern to EUI Professor GIULIANO AMATO during his tenure as head of the Italian Competition Authority in 1993. His interest and research into the historical legal background of Europe revealed that anticompetitive regulation can be traced back to the post-medieval period, when a national army and bureaucracy were being constructed as the backbone of the newly formed nation States. Any regulatory instrument aimed at protecting the ‘polis’ - the security of the Crown, the financial needs of the State, etc. – were deemed in the public interest. Concerns about efficiency and competition did not exist.

In the decades following the formation of the European Union, protection of competition has become a paramount concern. Numerous regulations in Europe, at both national and Community levels, conflict with the overall goal of protecting competition. One reason that anticompetitive regulations continue in effect is that strong interests, such as incumbent professionals or an incumbent monopolist in a public-service sector, benefit greatly from such regulations and therefore oppose reform. Yet the European Commission and the Court of Justice have narrowly defined their powers to review anticompetitive State measures. They have held that anticompetitive State measures fall within their jurisdiction only when such a measure delegates to a private undertaking power that should be independently exercised by a private authority, or when the State measure provides for a State aid. Accordingly, the need has arisen to reconsider the regulatory framework that we have inherited from our post-medieval forebears, and to devise an innovative institutional framework with sufficient power to accomplish this task, but without offending the positions of the Commission or the Court.

In an effort to employ the teachings of current economic and legal theory to tackle the problem of reforming anticompetitive regulations, Prof. AMATO, in collaboration with Dr. LARAINE L. LAUDATI (Ph.D., Law Department, 1998) organized a conference entitled The Anticompetitive Impact of Regulation. Financial support for the conference was provided by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei of Milan. Approximately 25 economists and lawyers from a number of EU countries (Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, the UK), as well as Australia and the US, gathered on 10 and 11 of September to address these issues.

The goal of the conference was to derive a set of draft guidelines based on economic theory that could be used as a first step towards promoting reform of laws and regulations, both national and European, to eliminate their anticompetitive effects. The conference was divided into four panels: Panel 1 considered regulations affecting the professions and private businesses; Panel 2 focused on regulations affecting the provision of public services; Panel 3 was concerned with the institutional aspects of reform and the role of competition authorities;
and Panel 4 was a tour de table, the purpose of which was to gather the ideas of each of the participants, so as to derive a first draft of the guidelines.

The participants were among the most qualified in the world to address these issues. For instance, Prof. Allan Fels, Chairman of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, was present. Australia is the only country that has undertaken a comprehensive review of all of its regulations with the goal of identifying and eliminating or revising those with an anticompetitive effect. The Australian review began in 1995, and is scheduled to be completed in 2000. Prof. Fels reported on the considerable political problems that Australian reformers have confronted in their efforts, leaving the ultimate success of the project still open to question. Moreover, he noted that many other countries have undertaken regulatory review projects focused more generally on improving regulatory efficiency, which produced requirements for regulatory impact analysis of new legislation that ultimately faded away to insignificance. Thus, he emphasized that the greatest challenge is to create and maintain political momentum for a reform process to be undertaken and successfully implemented.

Prof. Frédéric Jenny, Vice-Chair of the French Conseil de la Concurrence, reported on the work his agency has done in examining the consequences of anticompetitive regulation of the professions. The examination has revealed that professional services are unique in that the consumers of such services often do not know what their needs are, and that such services are frequently customized rather than standardized. The result of this information asymmetry is that consumers may pay higher prices for professional services than they would if they benefited from perfect information, and too much or too little of the service may be provided. To address this vulnerability of consumers of some professional services in France, independent auditors are being used to assess the “real” needs of the consumer. Prof. Jenny concluded that such auditing may not be a perfect solution, but is at least a necessary complement to elimination of the most blatantly anticompetitive provisions of regulations affecting the professions.

Following the presentation by all participants of their papers and the panel discussions, Prof. Amato suggested an outline for the draft economic guidelines. His proposal was as follows:

First, the regulators should be required to indicate the objective of the regulation, and to specify whether they are aware of restrictions that might result from it.

Second, the type of competitive restriction that is a side effect of the regulation should be identified. Obvious examples are limiting entry, fixing prices, and sharing markets; less obvious examples are consequences for innovation, the range of products available to consumers, or the system of distribution.

Third, the guidelines should specify through a series of footnotes providing examples from various sectors, how the context in which a given regulation applies may alter the analysis of whether it has an anticompetitive effect.

Fourth, the guidelines should provide an economic mechanism for assessing the gravity of the regulation anticompetitive effect.

Fifth, the guidelines should specify how to search for less restrictive alternatives. They should provide examples of less restrictive alternatives for various types of regulations.

Sixth, the guidelines should specify an institutional architecture, appropriate to Europe, for an institution responsible for screening both Community and national regulations for their anticompetitive effects. One possibility would be an independent European competition council, composed of a group of influential, knowledgeable and prestigious individuals, who would work with the expert support of DG 4 and possibly with that of national authorities as well. A screening procedure could also be specified.

Reacting to Prof. Amato’s proposal, the participants made a number of further suggestions. For instance, John Hilke, a senior economist with the US Federal Trade Commission, suggested that the guidelines should include an initial provision for “zero-based regulation.” This would establish a presumption that regulation is not necessary unless proven otherwise. Analysis of need for a regulation should include benchmarking with other countries that do not have a regulation in place to address the perceived market failure. With respect to new regulation, he suggested that a “competition impact statement” should be required to accompany any new regulatory proposal, which would increase transparency. With respect to existing regulation, he observed that some of the most anticompetitive provisions are there because they were there historically. He suggested the use of a “sunset provision” mechanism, by which regulations would have to be re-justified on a regular schedule, such as once every five years.

Dr. Kirti Mehta, a Director in the European Commission’s Competition Directorate, stated that he favoured a proposal made by Prof. Amato at an earlier time for a “competition scoreboard.” Following international benchmarking, this would involve scoring national legislation in each Member State for its degree of compliance with competition principles. He believes that if this were done with
a high degree of credibility, it would have an important effect, as Member States would not want to appear at the bottom of the list.

Domenico Siniscalco, Economics Professor at the University of Turin, added that international benchmarking should be used in conjunction with a sunset provision. This would involve multilateral meetings at which each government would explain what it does, and all would discuss the merits of the various approaches. Prof. Jenny also argued in favour of international benchmarking among the EU Member States. He argued that such benchmarking would have the advantage of avoiding the difficulty that, in his view, no European institution would be likely to decide that it has the power to review purely national regulation with no effect on trade between Member States. However, Carlo Scarpa, Professor of Economics at the University of Bologna, questioned whether national markets still exist in Europe.

EUI Economics Professor Massimo Motta discussed the importance of educating the public as to how anticompetitive regulations hurt their interest. He urged transparency in the review process, which would help this process of education, and help build the constituency that would be necessary to create a consensus in support of reform. Absent such a consensus, powerful groups representing affected interests could place pressure on politicians to prevent reform.

Alberto Heimler, Director of the Italian Antitrust Authority’s Research Department, suggested that a different guideline would be needed for each sector. However, Prof. Jenny disagreed with this suggestion, on the ground that it would not be politically feasible to achieve reform if guidelines were written on a sectoral basis, as interest groups would easily mobilize against them. He believes that general guidelines would be far less likely to meet such focused resistance. Dr. Ginevra Bruzzone, Senior Economist with the Research Department of the Italian Competition Authority, suggested a compromise: to draft general guidelines but keep a distinction between structurally competitive services and public utilities. Dr. Mehta agreed with this suggestion, noting that the extensive experience thus far accrued in the public-utility sectors could be used to developed more focused guidelines for these sectors.

Prof. Jenny took issue with the first of Prof. Amato’s criteria, that the regulators be required to state the objectives of the regulation. Based on six years’ experience as a member of a commission charged with evaluating legislation, he argued that it is extremely difficult to define objectives, which can be both explicit and implicit.

Dr. Laudati urged the method followed by the US Supreme Court, to consider whether the legislation in question directly advances a substantial State interest. The process of making this assessment will often reveal anticompetitive effects of the legislation, and will help identify any less restrictive alternatives.

The work of crafting the guidelines will continue. Further work will be done by Prof. Amato and Dr. Laudati to derive the draft guidelines based on the papers and discussion at the Round Table, and on further comments by the participants. Thereafter, the draft guidelines, papers and discussions will be published in a book during the year 2000. The book will be presented to the European Commission, and will hopefully generate a sufficient level of interest to support carrying forth this important work.

Laraine Laudati, Research Fellow, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

---
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Whereas the overall compliance of the Member States with EU environmental law is rather low, the Southern Member States (Italy, Greece, Spain, and Portugal) have the reputation of being particular laggards. The poor implementation record of these countries is usually attributed to systemic deficiencies of their political and administrative institutions. Lacking administrative capacity, a civic culture inclined to individualism, clientelism, and corruption, and the fragmented, reactive and party-dominated legislative processes are believed to undermine the public willingness and ability to comply with EU environmental law. The difficulties of Southern European countries in protecting their environment have been also referred to as the ‘Mediterranean Syndrome’.

To be sure, the Mediterranean Member States do face considerable problems in the implementation of EU environmental policies. Yet, blaming the ‘Southern problem’ on certain ‘Mediterranean’ characteristics of these countries does not only neglect the considerable differences among them. This view reproduces specific Northern European images of Southern European politics and ignores the general causes of implementation failure and non-compliance faced by Northern leaders and Southern laggards alike.

First, there is significant variation in compliance with EU environmental laws across the European Member States, which does not easily fit into a simple North-South dichotomy. For example, the performance of Spain and Portugal in transposing European policies into national law compares well against Northern European countries, such as UK, Germany, and France, and is only topped by the Netherlands and Denmark. Greece and Italy, on the contrary, find themselves at the very bottom of the list. Italy, together with Belgium, has been called before the European Court of Justice (ECJ) more often than any other Member State for violating European environmental law. At the same time, Greece and Spain have faced fewer ECJ trials than Germany and the Netherlands. And Portugal accounts for the lowest number of references to the European Court of Justice, together with Denmark.

There is simply no consistent outcome with respect to the compliance of the four Southern European countries with EU environmental law. Greece and Italy appear to be the environmental laggards of the EU, whereas Portugal puts up with the Northern leader countries. Spain finally, seems to oscillate between the laggards and the leaders. There is too much cross-national variation in order to talk about a ‘North-South divide’ in the implementation of EU environmental law.

Second, compliance with European environmental law does not only differ between countries. It also varies across different policies within one country. In other words, the environmentally more advanced Northern countries often encounter significant problems in effectively implementing EU environmental policies, too. It took Germany more than 10 years and a ruling of the European Court of Justice to correctly transpose the Drinking Water Directive of 1980 into German law. Spain, on the contrary, had legally implemented the Directive four years before it even joined the European Community in 1986. In the implementation of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and the Access to Information Directive, Germany has been facing as many European infringement proceedings as Spain. And while German policy-makers are still debating on how to implement the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive, some Spanish regions already enacted the necessary legislation.

How can we explain such variations in the implementation of EU environmental policies, which cuts across the North-South divide? Why do Member States successfully implement some policies while leaving others insufficiently transposed, applied and enforced? First of all, compliance problems should only be expected if a European policy imposes considerable costs in its implementation, which the public administrations of the Member States are little inclined to bear. This is usually the case if a European enviroment
mental regulation does not fit the corresponding legal and administrative regulations in the Member States. As a result, the Member States may have to change their laws, introduce new administrative procedures, invest into new measurement technologies, acquire additional expertise, and employ more manpower to monitor and enforce the new regulations. Moreover, the enforcement of new environmental regulations is likely to provoke the opposition of those domestic actors who ultimately have to bear the costs of compliance, such as industry and agriculture, which may have to upgrade their production technologies in order to meet the stringent European environmental standards. For example, the prompt compliance with the Drinking Water Directive of 1980 would have required the immediate closure of 20% of German wells and a serious change in the fertilizing practice of German farmers. Likewise, the strict enforcement of European air pollution regulations in Spain would require investments in new technology which are prohibitive for many companies and hence could put at risk a considerable number of jobs. Or, the effective implementation of the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive (IPPC) of 1996 commands the integration of the permits for the different environmental media (water, air, soil etc.) required in the authorization of an industrial plant into one single procedure. This integrated authorization procedure would signify a revolutionary change in the highly fragmented structure of German environmental law, where authorization competencies are dispersed across different public authorities at one level (industry, environment, public health) as well as across different levels of government (national, regional, local). No wonder that the IPPC Directive is not even legally transposed into German law yet.

But the incompatibility of European and national regulations does not necessarily lead to implementation failure and non-compliance. The mobilization of domestic actors who pressure public authorities to effectively implement and enforce EU environmental law may significantly improve the level of compliance. First, political parties can raise concerns about the proper implementation of policies vis-à-vis the government. Second, environmental organizations can act as a ‘watchdog’ drawing the attention of both public authorities (national and European) and the public opinion on incidents of non-compliance with EU environmental legislation. Media coverage can play a crucial role here. And third, powerful interest groups (business and industry) can mobilize in favour of compliance with a policy, as they did in case of the Eco-Audit Regulation.

Domestic mobilization is most effective in bringing about compliance if it is able to link-up with the European Commission, which may withdraw European funding from, or open infringement proceeding against recalcitrant Member State authorities. Thus, the Catalan socialists complained to the Commission about the authorization of a motorway cutting through a nature reserve which the Catalan (conservative) government had issued without demanding an environmental impact assessment. As a result, the Commission decided to freeze the loan which the European Bank for Investment and Reconstruction had granted for the construction of the motorway and asked for the elaboration of an environmental impact assessment including corrective measures.

Another example of the combined pressure from below (domestic actors) and above (Commission) is the implementation of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (EIA) of 1985 in Germany. As Germany delayed legal transposition for two years, several environmental organizations filed complaints with the Commission claiming direct effect of the EIA, which was confirmed by the European Court of Justice. When Germany finally enacted a law in 1990, transposition was still vastly deficient and complaints of German environmental groups continued resulting in new infringement proceedings of the Commission against Germany. In light of several rulings of the European Court of Justice and the revision of the EIA Directive in 1997, Germany is currently revising its EIA legislation to bring it in formal compliance with EU regulations.

In sum, environmental leaders can face as serious problems in implementing European environmental law as environmental laggards, particularly if European regulations do not fit the corresponding national
Coming to Terms with the ‘Mediterranean Syndrome’.
The Implementation of European Environmental Policies in Southern States

Environmental Studies Workshop
organized by
the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
at the European University Institute Florence, Italy
18-19 May 2000

CALL FOR PAPERS

Whereas the overall compliance of the Member States with EU environmental law is rather low, the southern countries have the reputation of being particular laggards. The poor implementation record of these countries is usually attributed to systemic deficiencies of their political and administrative institutions. Lacking administrative capacity, a civic culture inclined to individualism, clientelism, and corruption, and the fragmented, reactive and party-dominated legislative processes are believed to undermine the political willingness and organizational capacity to comply with EU environmental law. The difficulties of southern European countries in protecting their environment, have been also referred to as the ‘Mediterranean Syndrome’.

The Mediterranean countries, which are Members of the EU (Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece) do face considerable problems in the implementation of EU environmental policies. And those countries that prepare for membership (Malta, Cyprus, Turkey) have to adapt to an ever growing environmental acquis which tends to be oriented towards the problems and the level of environmental protection of the Northern member states.

How do the Mediterranean countries, which have a lower level of environmental protection than the Northern environmental leaders of the EU, cope with the challenges of implementing European environmental law? Do certain ‘Mediterranean’ characteristics impair their willingness and capacity to effectively implement European policies? Does their compliance with European environmental law vary, and on what factors does their level of compliance depend? How do Mediterranean Countries implement European policies? Do European regulations give rise to significant changes in policy and institutions?

The workshop will address the question to what extent the implementation gap in European environmental policy is a particular ‘Southern’ problem. The Robert-Schuman-Centre especially welcomes papers which take a comparative approach both cross-country (between Mediterranean countries but also across the ‘North/South’ divide) and cross-policy.

Applications should be sent to:
Dr. Tanja A. Börzel
Coordinator for Environmental Studies
European University Institute
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy
e-mail: boerzel@datacomm.iue.it

The deadline for applications is January 31, 2000. Prospective Participants will be notified by February 15, 2000. Contributions to travel expenses and accommodation are available.
regulations. This is not to deny that the overall compliance with EU environmental legislation in Northern European countries is still higher than in the four Southern Member States. However, the lower level of compliance is not the result of a general incapacity of Spain, Italy, Portugal, and Greece to effectively implement EU policies.

First, the politically and economically more powerful Northern European Member States, like Germany or the UK, often succeed in ‘uploading’ their more stringent regulations to the European level. As a result, the Southern countries with lower environmental standards and less bargaining power have to adapt their legal and administrative structures in order to implement European policies which are often oriented towards the economic interests and ecological problems of the Northern Member states. The ‘uploading’ of national environmental regulations to the European level also explains why environmental leaders, such as Germany, face increasing problems in complying with EU environmental law. The Northern leaders may share a high level environmental protection but they still differ significantly in their regulatory approaches. If European environmental policies reflect the British or Dutch rather than the German approach to environmental regulation, like in case of the Environmental Impact Assessment or the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive, Germany faces similar difficulties as the Southern Member States in the implementation process.

Second, the level of domestic mobilization is lower in Southern European countries, where environmental organizations and citizen groups have still limited resources and environmental awareness is only emerg-
Seven months after the start of the “War for Kosovo”, what lessons are to be drawn for the future of European defence and security policy? What is European security and defence policy?

While defence and security are not new issues in the European debate, they have been given a new sense of urgency by the Kosovo crisis. Defence and security policy is currently a much discussed subject, particularly with the imminent opening of a new Intergovernmental Conference on institutional reform in the European Union, and with the challenge of enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe. Moreover, the probability of long-term European involvement in the Balkan Region means that the topic of European defence and security policy will remain on the agenda for some time to come.

With these issues in mind, on 29 October the Robert Schuman Centre brought together a group of experts on this subject for a Round Table on the Security and Defence Policy of the European Union after the Kosovo War. The intended star guest, HUBERT VÉDRINE, French Foreign Minister, was unfortunately unable to attend, but the Round Table went ahead in his absence, with three external participants (CHRISTOPHER HILL, London School of Economics, ADAM ROTFIELD, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and CHRISTOPH BERTRAM, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik) and two of the Institute’s own professors (THOMAS RISSE and JAN ZIELONKA). Mr Védrine’s absence in fact enabled the discussion to proceed on a more informal basis, and the audience of interested people, both researchers and others, helped contribute towards a very lively discussion.

The Round Table aimed to address some of the specific issues raised by the Kosovo war for European defence and security policy, and evaluate some of the current trends, but also to speculate about possibilities and opportunities for future developments in this area. The first aim proved to elicit rather more agreement from the panellists than the second. This perhaps reflected the difficulties faced in trying to hit a moving target – the situation is continually and rapidly developing beyond each political agreement, under the pressure of events.

There was general agreement that the Kosovo war revealed more starkly a fact which had already been known – that Europe, more specifically the European members of NATO, lacks the military capacity to project significant force overseas, being thus totally dependent on US military assets for an operation of this kind. From this initial point of agreement, the discussants diverged in their assessments of how far such a capability was either necessary or possible. Any attempt to develop such a capacity would require massive increases in defence spending, which was simply politically completely unacceptable [CHRISTOPHER HILL], although it was suggested that increased cooperation in procurement and defence planning could enable existing resources to be better deployed. On the other hand, it was emphasised that both US and European forces were already severely stretched by existing commitments, and that any further crisis could find European States dangerously lacking the ability to respond [CHRISTOPH BERTRAM].

The relationship between the EU and the USA emerged as a strong theme. The Europeans, particularly France (and here Mr Védrine’s contribution was missed) display a deep ambivalence towards the role of the USA in Europe [CHRISTOPHER HILL]. While there was still a reliance on US military capacity and a desire to maintain an American commitment to European security, many European leaders were unhappy at such dependence on American leadership. Conversely, US ambivalence towards developments in European security and defence was also highlighted, with the US eager to share the financial burden, but less likely to welcome having to share political leadership. The development of a genuine European defence capacity would have both costs and gains, and may well lead to increased conflict, rather than harmony, with the US [JAN ZIELONKA].

Jan Zielonka argued that a European Union military capacity would be costly, divisive, and ultimately pointless, stressing that there were other ways to use strength. The EU has often been described, with both approbation and disapproval, as a ‘civilian power’, and the Kosovo war can be considered to have confirmed this view of the EU as an international actor for the immediate future, with a continued reliance on the United States for “the dirty, heavy stuff” [CHRISTOPHER HILL]. The ‘civilian model’ was clearly demonstrated to have serious weaknesses by the Kosovo war, most particularly the necessary dependence on US leadership, but it was argued that the potential costs of changing this may prove too high [JAN ZIELONKA]. JAN ZIELONKA stressed the extent to which much of the EU’s international credibility depends on its civilian status, whilst others placed more emphasis on the damage inflicted on European credibility by its military incapacity [CHRISTOPH BERTRAM].
An extremely useful distinction was drawn between what was called Kosovo 1 and Kosovo 2 [CHRISTOPH BERTRAM]. Kosovo 1 refers to the air war, in which 85% of the assets were provided by the US, and which lasted 78 days. By contrast, Kosovo 2 refers to the stabilization task. In this, 85% of the assets are European, and involvement can be expected to last for decades. Where as in Kosovo 1 the goal was to win militarily, in Kosovo 2 there must be success in the political, economic and social fields. Most of the discussion within NATO and more widely has concentrated on the lessons of Kosovo 1 – on the inadequacy of European military assets and on how to bridge the gap in military capabilities. BERTRAM emphasises that Kosovo 2 will prove the more demanding role, where Europe is not only left holding the baby but also with the responsibility for bringing it up too. Adopting the same terminology, this role for the EU in Kosovo 2 reinforces the EU’s role as a ‘civilian power’ [CHRISTOPHER HILL].

Bertram argued that what Europe can do and is doing in the Balkans should be redefined as security policy. ADAM ROTFELD also argued that in discussing European security and defence policy we must ask how far traditional concepts and understandings can be useful in this entirely new situation. Policies must be developed which begin to answer how to deal with internal sovereignty pitted against considerations of human rights; of legitimacy versus the legality of intervention. Unfortunately, as CHRISTOPHER HILL pointed out, all aspects of the concept “European Defence Co-operation” are contested. ‘European’ – does this refer only to the EU or to Europe more broadly defined? ‘Defence’ – does this mean the Petersberg tasks (peacekeeping, peace-making, humanitarian assistance) or the capacity to undertake a Kosovo 1? and Co-operation – how? Kosovo has certainly thrown some of these contested concepts into sharper focus, and if anything, the lessons of both Kosovo 1 and 2 are that the EU must be imaginative in developing both military and economic/political capabilities, and that the debate is not only about military hardware or foreign-policy institution building, but also more broadly related to discussions on the future nature and shape of the European Union.

Far more questions were raised than could possibly have been dealt with adequately in the limited time available. Whatever the future shape and nature of a European entity on the international scene, one thing which clearly emerged from the discussions was the extent to which the Kosovo experience, and dealing with the aftermath, would be a crucial test of the EU’s credibility, and a defining issue for the EU as an international actor. The institutions and policies created to deal with this situation will define the EU’s capacities and international identity for many years to come. Mrs THATCHER used to complain that her diplomats always brought her problems, but never answers. This Round Table certainly showed that there are still more questions than answers, and indicates the extent of the scope for future discussion.

ALISON WESTON  
Researcher in the Department of Political and Social Science

---

**Forthcoming Events in the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 – 15 January</td>
<td>Conference organized by YVES MÉNY and YVES SUREL on Populism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8 February</td>
<td>Conference organized by MARTIN RHODES on The Local Dimension of European Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4 March</td>
<td>Conference organized by DANIEL VERDIER on The Origins of Universal Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Workshop organized by BO STRATH on Intermediality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 26 March</td>
<td>Mediterranean Programme Conference organized by IMCO BROUWER on Perceived Ethnic Cleavages, Democratic Consolidation and Democratic Governance in Mediterranean Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March – 1 April</td>
<td>Workshop organized by ALEC STONE/WAYNE SANDHOLZ (Oxford University/University of California) on The Institutionalization of European Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mediterranean Programme
Reports

Summer School on Trans-Mediterranean Flows

Starting with the Academic Year 1999-2000, the Mediterranean Programme has entered its second year of activity. At the end of the previous Academic Year it organized its first Summer School on ‘Trans-Mediterranean Flows’, between 5 and 15 July. The Director of the Summer School, Prof. GHASSAN SALAMÉ (Institut d’études politiques de Paris & CNRS) selected 24 participants coming from the Mediterranean and from Europe. The Summer School was structured along two main types of activities: on the one hand morning seminars given by a number of scholars – including Prof. PHILIPPE FARGUES, HEBA HANDOUSSA, STEVEN HEYDEMANN, YVES MÉNY, PHILIPPE C. SCHMITTER, and JAN ZEJONKA – and on the other hand three working groups working separately and also in collective sessions.

The first one, entitled “Migrations and Demographic Flows”, was directed by Prof. AYSE CAGLAR (FU Berlin) and Prof. ANDREW GEDDES (University of Liverpool). The second, ‘The Partnership: Economy and Institution Building’, was directed by Prof. SAMIR MAKDISI (Institute of Money and Banking, Beirut) and MARTIN KOHLER (Adviser to the Green Group at the European Parliament/Research Fellow of the Centro Investigación para la Paz, Madrid). The third working group dealing with “Security and Policy”, was directed by Prof. DIDIER BIGO (Institut d’études politiques de Paris) and Prof. ABD EL-MONEIM SAID ALI (Centre for Political and Strategic Research al-Ahram, Cairo). A second Summer School is planned for July 2000.

Post-doctoral Fellowships

This Academic Year, the Mediterranean Programme has five post-doctoral fellows, three more than last year. These Jean Monnet Fellows spend between six and ten months at the Robert Schuman Centre. AYSE BUGRA is Professor of Economics at Bogazici University in Istanbul. Her recent research interests include theory and history of entrepreneurship, state-business relations, and political economy of consumption. She is currently working on a book on the political economy of Islam in Turkey. UMIT CIZRE SAKALLIOGLU is currently an associate Professor of politics at Bilkent University in Ankara. She focuses on comparative research problematizing the political course and discourse of the Turkish military in the 1990s against the backdrop of changing security concerns, roles, identities and missions of the European armies. MARILYN EORDEGIAN is a historian, appointed as Research Fellow since 1992 at the Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She especially worked on the status of Jerusalem and the maintenance of the status quo in the holy places of Christendom. During her stay in Florence, she is concentrating her research on Church-State relations in Israel. BRAD GLASSER studies the comparative politics of developing countries and the political and economic liberalization of Middle Eastern States. He received his Ph.D. in political science from Colombia University in 1996. At the Mediterranean Programme he focuses on “Political Ethnography of Leading Arab Business Groups”. AMR SABET is a Political Scientist, specializing in Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Middle East and Islamic Politics. He is affiliated with the Department of Political Science, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada, from which he received his doctorate (1990). He has written on issues related to Islamic politics, leadership and State, Islamic-Western relations, the Peace process and strategic issues pertaining to the Middle East region. Currently he is working on a project entitled “Near-East–Western Relations: The Islamic International Theory Revisited”.

Research Students

For the first time, this Academic Year the EUI enrolled three students through the Mediterranean Programme into the doctoral program. Two of them are in the Social and Political Sciences Department: BABAK RABHINI (Iran) and FATMA SAYYED (Egypt) and one in the History and Civilization Department, CHAHNAD KHERIFI (Algeria). While nationals of EU member countries apply for a grant from their country of citizenship, they benefit from a grant from the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs made available to nationals of the Middle East and North Africa.

Applications for the Academic Year 2000-1 are due by 31 January 2000. The call will be published in early December of 1999 on the Mediterranean Programme’s WWW page, or can be obtained by contacting the Mediterranean Programme secretary.

International Relations Seminar

The Mediterranean Programme has appointed Prof. GHASSAN SALAMÉ to teach an International Relations seminar on “War games and peace processes: conflict and conflict-resolution around the Mediterranean”. This is the first time that the Programme is organizing a regular seminar in one of the four departments of the Institute. It will consist of 10 courses, given in five sessions of two courses (Friday-Monday). The course will focus on the end of the Cold War era and its effects on civil/regional conflicts. It will pay particular attention to sanctions and interventions in the Middle East. Case studies include the Arab-Israeli conflict, Iraq, the Greek-Turkish dispute and the Balkans.
The First Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting

The Programme is, thanks to a generous contribution from the Tuscan Region, organizing the First Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, to be held from 22-26 March 2000. The Meeting wishes to bring together scholars, especially from the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, European countries, and elsewhere, who can present high-standard original research papers. The Mediterranean Programme encourages the publication of the papers in the form of edited volumes, thematic issues of journals, or working papers of the Mediterranean Programme. The meeting programme includes a keynote lecture and a few round-table discussions. The core structure of the Meeting, however, is ten workshops in which about 12 scholars discuss their original research:

Workshops

I. Middle Eastern and North African Cinemas: Culture and Politics in a Transregional World, directed by WALTER ARMBRUST (Georgetown University) and VIOLA SHAFIK (American University in Cairo)

II. The New Generations South of the Mediterranean. Changes, Challenges and Opportunities, directed by PHILIPPE FARGUES (Institut national d'études démographiques), and CARLA MAKHLOUF-OBERMEYER (Harvard School of Public Health, Harvard University)

III. Changing Economies and Changing Societies in the Middle East: Winners and Losers in the Process of Economic Reform, directed by RAGUI ASSAAD (University of Minnesota), and STEVEN HEYDEMANN (Columbia University)

IV. Euro-Mediterranean and (Arab) Free Trade, directed by SAMIHA FAWZY (ECES, Cairo) and RAED SAFADI (OECD, Paris)

V. Changing Labour and Restructuring Unionism, directed by ASEF BAYAT (American University in Cairo), and ELISABETH LONGUENESSE (GREMMO, Lyon)

VI. Legal Education and Legal Knowledge in Mediterranean Societies, directed by BAUDOUIN DUPRET (CNRS, Cairo) and NATHALIE BERNARD-MAUGIRON (CEDEJ, Cairo)

VII. Migration in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, directed by FATIMA DAZI-HENI (Paris) and NADER FERGANY (al-Mishkat, Cairo)

VIII. Perceived Ethnic Cleavages, Democratic Consolidation and Democratic Governance in Mediterranean Countries, directed by UMIT CIZRE SAKALLIOGLU (Bilkent University and EUI) and MUSTAFA KAMIL ALSAYYID (Cairo University and American University in Cairo)

IX. The Articulation of International and National Tourism in Southern Mediterranean Countries, directed by KAMRAN ALI (Rochester University) and MOHAMED BERRIANE (Université Mohammed V, Rabat)

X. Urban Politics, directed by GEMA MARTIN MUÑOZ and MOHAMED TOZY (Rabat)

Workshop participants can be at any stage of their career (i.e. students advanced in their Ph.D. writing, young professionals, well-established scholars), but should currently be doing research on the topic of the workshop and should present an original paper at the Meeting.

Application Procedure

Those interested should apply for participation by sending a one-paragraph (max 250 words) abstract of their paper and a current CV, to be received not later than 3 December 1999. Participants will be informed whether they are selected by 20 December 1999. They are obliged to send a draft paper by 28 February 2000. The Mediterranean Programme provides financial incentives for participants who are national of and resident in Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. They will receive up to 500 Euros for their travel expenses. In addition, their hotel rooms will be paid for a maximum of four nights.

For more information on the Meeting, please visit: www.iue.it/RSC/ResearchRSC-3a1.htm#meeting.

For more information on the Mediterranean Programme, please visit: www.iue.it/RSC/ResearchRSC-3a1.htm

Or contact:
Secretary of the Mediterranean Programme
Ann-Charlotte Svantesson, e-mail: svantess@iue.it
Tel.: +39 055 4685 785; fax: +39 055 4685 770

Mediterranean Programme
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini, 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

VALÉRIE AMIRAUX & IMCO BROUWER
Mediterranean Programme Co-Ordinators
Quelle charte constitutionnelle pour l’Union européenne? — Suites…

Le rapport du Comité des Sages recommande l’Institut Universitaire Européen pour procéder à une réorganisation des traités fondant l’Union européenne

En vue de la prochaine Conférence intergouvernementale qui devrait démarrer au début de l’an 2000, la Commission européenne a invité un groupe des Sages à faire part de ses vues, en toute indépendance, sur les réformes institutionnelles que rend nécessaire la perspective de l’élargissement de l’Union européenne1. Une partie du rapport qu’ils ont présenté le 18 octobre dernier est consacrée à la ‘réorganisation’ des textes des traités sur lesquels repose l’Union européenne2. Afin de rendre la nature et le fonctionnement de celle-ci plus intelligibles et accessibles aux citoyens de l’Union et à ceux des États associés en voie d’y adhérer, le groupe des Sages suggère de réaménager dans un ‘traité fondamental’ les dispositions de droit primaire concernant le cadre institutionnel unique de l’Union, ses principes, ses objectifs et orientations générales, ainsi que les droits de ses citoyens.

En outre, les Sages proposent que les autres textes des traités, notamment ceux qui ont trait aux diverses politiques de l’Union, ne soient plus soumis à la procédure internationale classique de révision des traités. Déjà jugée par d’aucuns extrêmement lourde et peu appropriée à l’heure actuelle, elle risque de s’avérer paralysante dans une Europe comprenant vingt, vingt-cinq, voire trente États membres, une Europe qui pourtant devra continuer de se réformer. Dans la nouvelle procédure envisagée, une décision du Conseil, prise dans certains cas à une majorité superqualifiée, se substituerait au processus de la Conférence intergouvernementale. Quant à la procédure de ratification des amendements en question, laquelle passe aujourd’hui par l’assentiment des parlements ou référenda nationaux, d’un représentant de chaque État membre, et d’un représentant du président de la Commission. Le groupe des Sages suggère que la Déclaration du Millénaire prévue à l’occasion du Conseil européen d’Helsinki introduise, en guise de préambule, ce que d’autres nomment déjà le traité de Paris. Le 1er décembre, le Président Prodi a annoncé devant le Parlement Européen qu’une étude de faisabilité serait confiée à l’Institut universitaire européen.

Hervé Bribosia

1 Le groupe des Sages était présidé par l’ancien Premier Ministre belge Jean-Luc Dehaene, et également composé de l’ancien président de la République fédérale d’Allemagne Richard von Weizsäcker ainsi que de Lord David Simon, ancien ministre britannique.


3 Le groupe était composé de Stefano Bartolini, Renaud Dehousse, Bruno De Witte, Luis Diez-Picazo, Claus-Dieter Ehlermann, Yves Mény, Christoph Schmid, Armin von Bogdandy, et Joseph Weiler. Le rapporteur était Hervé Bribosia.

Activities in 1999-2000

During the academic year 1999-2000 Stefano Bartolini, Thomas Risse and Bo Stråth will direct the Forum of the Robert Schuman Centre. The overall theme of this year’s programme is ‘Between Europe and the Nation-State: The Reshaping of Collective Interests, Identities and Political Representation’. Within this encompassing perspective, the Forum will discuss several dimensions of the domestic consequences of ‘Europeanization’ through a series of conferences, workshops and seminars.

Seminars
The forum will hold a regular weekly seminar on Thursdays at 9.00 a.m. in which fellows, visiting guests, and EUI researchers will be invited to present their work in progress. The goal of the weekly seminar is twofold. First, to give an opportunity to fellows and guests to present their research in progress; second, to link these individual research endeavours within a broader framework that specifies the relationship between the domestic changes in interest definition and articulation, those in identity formation and those in the forms of their political representation.

Workshops and Working Groups
The second component of the programme is the organization of a series of internal workshops and working groups with the participation of fellows, EUI staff and researchers on a number of more specific sub-topics relating to the domestic consequences of Europeanization. Two such internal workshops are at the moment being organised. The first, in co-operation with the Department of Economics and Prof. Giuseppe Bertola and Ramon Marimon, will be dealing with the ‘Domestic Socio-economic Consequences of EMU’. The second, in co-operation with the Law Department and Professors Jacques Ziller and Grainne de Burca, will be focusing on ‘The Impact of Europeanization on Domestic Legal Structures and Practices’. It is hoped that these internal workshops and working groups help to define new relevant thematic axes for future years’ Forum programmes.

Conferences
The third part of the Forum’s activities is represented by conferences and workshops held at the EUI or in other academic institutions and bringing EUI members together with those of other academic institutions to discuss in depth parts and aspects of the overall thematics.

The first of these conferences, with the title ‘From the Werner Plan to EMU’ and directed by Bo Stråth, will take place on 26-27 November. The workshop is organized within the framework of a joint project with the...
National Working-Life Institute in Stockholm con-
nected to the Forum programme. The aim of the work-
shop — and the project — is to investigate the con-
nections between ideas for a European economic and
monetary union since the 1970s and interest and iden-
tity formulations. Questions of economic politics and
of the preconditions for a political economy in Europe
are central. The focus is on the linkage between eco-
nomic politics and political economy on the one hand
and labour-market and social politics on the other. The
insight that labour markets have changed fundamen-
tally since the 1970s, when the Werner Plan was
debated, and that social questions have as a conse-
quence taken on new meaning, belongs to the prereq-
uisites for attempting to establish a new connection
between the monetary issue and political economy.
During the autumn a working group will be estab-
lished to study these questions beyond the workshop.

A second conference will be held on 16-18 December
on the topic of ‘Multi-level Party Systems: Europe-
eanization and the Reshaping of National Political
Representation’ directed by STEFANO BARTOLINI. The
conference is devoted to discussing whether and to
what extent the equilibrium that had been reached
between the forms of corporate, territorial and politi-
cal representation within the closed-boundary Nation
State, is altered by the long-term impact of the unifi-
cation process. The main issues to be addressed con-
cern the following aspects of European party systems
insofar as they are transformed and/or affected by the
integration process: - electoral alignments and realign-
ments; internal party tensions, conflicts and reorgani-
zation; changes in inter-party competition patterns;
linkage and co-ordination problems between Euro-
pean and national parties (and parliamentary groups);
effects, prospects and problems of a ‘multi-level’
party system.

Two conferences will be devoted to the theme of
‘Multiple Identities and Europeanization’. The first, to
be held on 3-4 December at Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio, USA and directed by THOMAS RISSE,
will discuss the theoretical, methodological, and
empirical problems in studying multiple identities,
with an eye to Europeanization. It will bring together
philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, and politi-
cal scientists from the US and from Europe. The sec-
ond, to be held in spring 2000 at the EUI, will contin-
ue the discussions from the meeting in Columbus, and
participants will present and discuss draft chapters for
an edited volume.

IDNET
Special mention should be made of the connection
between this year’s Forum and the Thematic Network
‘Europeanization, Collective Identities, and Public
Discourses’ (IDNET) funded by the European Com-
misson’s Fifth Framework Programme. This network
brings together five research institutions in conjunc-
tion with the 1999-2001 European Forum activities.
Network partners are the Robert Schuman Centre for
Advanced Studies (THOMAS RISSE, co-ordinator); the
Institute for Psychology of the National Research
Council, Rome, Italy; ARENA, University of Oslo,
Norway; the University of Konstanz, Germany; and
Humboldt University Berlin, Germany. The interdisci-
plinary network IDNET includes political scientists,
sociologists and social psychologists investigating the
processes by which Europeanization impacts upon
and transforms collective identities relating to the
Nation State. In particular, IDNET investigates four
sets of questions:
1. The impact of Europeanization and the emergence
of a European polity on the collective identities of
social groups in various countries, including the gen-
der dimension;
2. The micro-mechanisms by which collective identi-
ties change;
3. The role the media and public discourses play in
these processes of identity formation and identity
change;
4. The influence of the Eastern enlargement of the
European Union on European, national, and social
identities, inter-European perceptions and discourses
as well as the political cultures and the legitimacy
bases of the European integration project.

IDNET will organize several conferences and work-
shops to be held at the partner institutions, including
the EUI, as well as extended research visits of schol-
ars to foster academic co-operation. Special attention
will be given to including young researchers, particu-
larly from Central and Eastern Europe.

STEFANO BARTOLINI
Recasting the Welfare State

The European Forum on ‘Recasting the Welfare State’ in 1998-9, directed by MAURIZIO FERRERA (Universities of Pavia and Bocconi, Milan) and MARTIN RHODES (EUI), was one of the largest Forums to date and generated a record number of conferences and workshops, leaving at least this co-director completely exhausted. Although now concluded, the subject of the Forum – the Welfare State – remains important for the RSC’s activities. Moreover, the activities of the Forum have given an extra stimulus to the RSC’s welfare programme, which this year will see both publication of work carried out in the Forum and various follow ups to Forum initiatives.

The Forum produced an impressive number of high-quality papers, many of which are available from the Robert Schuman Centre (RSC) and/or are in the process of being published as Forum working papers or articles in books and journals. Some will be part of monographs produced by fellows while in residence.

Among forthcoming publications, in 2000 a series of articles stemming from the Forum will be published in a special issue of the journal West European Politics, entitled ‘Recasting European Welfare States’, edited by the Welfare Forum co-directors. The aim of this volume is to present leading-edge research on the recasting of European Welfare States resulting from the European Forum on Welfare at the European University Institute in Florence, 1998-9. The chapters will take the form of both comparative analyses of topical issues (i.e. reforms of the major social programmes: pensions, health, social security and the changing political cleavages in welfare politics), and in-depth studies of changes in the major European countries. The objective will be to analyse the impact of retrenchment and reform and add to the ongoing debates about policy convergence, the origins of pressures for reform (domestic and external), the shifting balance of power between modernizers and vested interests, the nature of the trade-offs involved in social policy innovation and the outcomes in terms of cost saving, resource redeployment and equity.

All of the authors were associated with the 1998-9 Forum as full-time or part-time fellows or visitors. FIONA ROSS is writing on the ‘New Politics of Welfare’, JOAKIM PALME on ‘Pension Reform in Europe’, MICK MORAN and RICHARD FREEMAN on ‘Health Care Reform’, VALERIA FARGION on ‘Social Assistance Regimes’, Jochen Claesen on ‘Unemployment Policy Reform’, BRUNO PALIER on ‘France’, PHILIP MANOW on ‘Germany’, MARTIN RHODES on ‘the United Kingdom’, Maurizio Ferrera on ‘Italy’, STEIN KUHNLE on ‘Scandinavia’ and ANTON HEMERIJK and JELLE VISSE on ‘the Netherlands and Belgium’.

One of the objectives of the Forum was to consolidate and extend the linkages between the Robert Schuman Centre and its activities and the world of policy making. This was successfully achieved during the Forum in the form of six conferences run with the sponsorship and collaboration of external organizations, notably the European Commission – Directorates-General V (Employment and Social Affairs) and XII (Research). This collaboration will continue into this academic year with a number of policy-oriented workshops planned to take place in collaboration with DG V.

In addition, MARTIN RHODES, MAURIZIO FERRERA and ANTON HEMERIJK (University of Rotterdam) have been commissioned by the Portuguese government to write a major report on social protection and employment for the Portuguese presidency of the EU in January-June 2000.

A final objective of the Forum was to establish an informal pan-European research network on the Welfare State and we believe that we also were successful in this ambition. Many of the fellows in the Forum were previously in contact with one another and aware of each other’s work, but for many others it was an opportunity to forge new intellectual relationships.

We hope that all of those who spent all or part of the year with us in Florence will use the experience to generate further collaborative pan-European research initiatives.

MARTIN RHODES
Ten years have passed since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dramatic changes associated with that event. To mark the occasion, a group of EUI researchers organized a one-day conference, held on 22 October in the Theatre of the Badia. The event was supported and generously sponsored by the Departments of History and Political Science and the Robert Schuman Centre. The main aim of the conference was to bring together German and non-German experts to assess the current state of the unification process and the new role of Germany in Europe. While the morning session tackled domestic politics and changes in German society, the second part in the afternoon was devoted to Germany’s foreign policy and its perception in other European countries. In this connection Ludger Volmer, Minister of State in the German Foreign Ministry, gave a speech on international military interventions and the lessons to be learned from the Kosovo conflict. On the domestic panel, participants widely agreed that internal unification is still an unfinished project. The perspectives on Germany from outside revealed a mixture of trust in the continuity of German foreign policy and scepticism about Germany’s willingness to refrain from unilateral strategies and power politics. In terms of participation by Institute members the conference can be called an unqualified success: between 50 and 80 spectators followed the debates in the Teatro.

I. Unification, Identity, and the ‘Berlin Republic’

Central to the current debate on Germany is the assertion of discontinuity and the concomitant view on it as a country on its way to an unclear and uncertain future. One very tangible expression of this changed and changing Germany is the move of the federal government from Bonn to Berlin. The small quiet town on the banks of the river Rhine symbolized West Germany’s integration into EU and NATO after World War II, as well as standing for reliable, rational policies towards its partners. Berlin, however, at the same time symbolizes Prussian traditions, the failed democratization of the Weimar Republic and the terror of the Third Reich. In addition, it was the focus of ideological confrontation during the Cold War, and the Berlin wall epitomized, as no other political symbol has done before, more than 40 years of not only German, but global, division. Last not least, Berlin was also the capital of the GDR – a fact at times neglected in Western debates on Germany. For more than 16 million Germans in the East, Berlin represented the centre of their political and cultural life for over four decades. The decision to move the government from the Rhineland to Berlin thus entails a new confrontation between German politics and its past. In recent years the term ‘Berlin Republic’ has been coined, to express the alleged new qualities and dimensions of German politics after unification. Debates on the first panel, chaired by Jackie O’Reilly from the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, revolved around this highly contested term.

Willfried Spohn, professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, compared the first German unification in 1870/71 to the events after 1989 to demonstrate the entirely different political, social, and international conditions under which the second unification has taken place. In contrast to the situation in the 19th century, the territorial shape of Germany today is marked by a sharp congruence of State borders and national boundaries. In addition, the second unification did not lead to a German ‘Sonderweg’ but is deeply embedded in a European framework: this unification was not directed against Germany’s neighbours, but was achieved with their consent. Europeanized Germany remains an important vehicle in the process of European integration and both supports and promotes the enlargement towards Eastern Europe of the Union.
Here Spohn underlined the continuity with the Western-oriented, integrationist policy of the Bonn Republic. Berlin as Germany’s new political centre may serve as a mediating link between the Western and Eastern part of the country and foster the formation of a common national identity.

Gian-Enrico Rusconi, professor of political science at Turin, remarked that experts have tended to reconstruct German unification retrospectively as a logical, governable process. Arguing against this view, Rusconi stressed the contingency of the situation after the fall of the Wall, and the total failure of political scientists to predict these events. In November 1989, reunification was clearly not on the agenda. Politicians like Helmut Kohl, who presented themselves later as the architects of German unity, were initially hesitant and were only pushed towards unification by facts such as the continuing exodus of people from the GDR to the West. This was supported by the call ‘we are one people’ on the streets of East Germany, though it should be interpreted less as an expression of nationalism than as a desire for Westernization. According to Rusconi, real German unity will be reached only when people in both the East and the West stop being surprised that they are one people.

Assessing the current state of inner unification, East German journalist Christoph Dieckmann highlighted the enduring ‘non-simultaneity’ of life in the Eastern and Western parts of the country. Before 1989, people from both countries were oriented towards the West, with East Germans looking to the Federal Republic and West Germans to the US. Denying that any unity has been achieved so far, Dieckmann stated that ‘the German unification was not a marriage of equals, but instead an adoption. A morally and economically bankrupt German State was adopted by another, intact and complete.’ In economic terms, Western domination is expressed by the fact that 95% of East German public property has passed into West German hands through the ‘Treuhandanstalt’. Dieckmann identified as an even more severe problem that the media, and thus a large part of cultural life, are controlled completely by West German companies, with the result that the representation of an East German reality is neglected. Governing Germany from Berlin opens up a certain possibility of achieving inner unification in the long term, however. Dieckmann also made clear that East Germans accepted the West German model under certain conditions, namely those of democracy and a social market economy. The conditions under which consensus was found are now risking being replaced by a neo-liberal dogma. This risk has united East and West Germans for the first time.

Christoph Dieckmann’s provocative statements elicited a particularly lively discussion with the other panelists and the audience, centring on his specific ally East German perception of the inner unification process. Other contributions tackled the evolution of German identity and ‘normality’, the differences between East and West Germans, and the role of the post-Communist Party, the PDS.

II. Participation in Military Interventions – New German Normality?

On the occasion of the German Sentiments conference, the EUI had the honour to welcome Ludger Volmer, Minister of State in the German foreign ministry. Ludger Volmer was one of the founding members of the Green Party, which supported anti-militarism and had its roots inter alia, in the Peace Movement. When Joschka Fischer was appointed Foreign Minister in 1998 after 16 years of conservative rule, dramatic changes in the aims and means of German foreign policy were expected. Whilst the decision to participate in the recent air raids against Yugoslavia was received with relief among Germany’s allies, it caused protest and open turmoil in the ‘fundamentalist’ faction of the Green party. In his speech, Ludger Volmer addressed the new guidelines of German foreign policy with respect to military involvement abroad. In this connection we would like to thank Benita Blessing for her
work as interpreter of the speech. Ludger Volmer left little doubt about the fact that German participation in international military interventions is a painful issue for a politician from the Green Party with a commitment to pacifism and peaceful conflict resolution.

In Volmer’s view, the military action against Yugoslavia and the sending of troops to Kosovo was ‘an absolute exception made in a case of humanitarian emergency’. It should thus not be viewed as proof of a new German political strategy. According to Volmer, the German government does not feel obliged to intervene in other regional conflicts in a similar way. Moreover, NATO should not be viewed as a global policeman with the right or the obligation to intervene in every conflict situation. Instead of relying on military alliances such as NATO, the United Nations should be strengthened as the only legitimate actor in international conflict resolution. ‘The only alternative to the UN is a better UN’, Volmer said. This necessitates a reform of the decision-making procedures in the UN Security Council as well as an improvement in the financial and institutional capacities of the UN to interfere actively in international conflicts. In the European context, a similar role could be envisaged for the OSCE.

Volmer identified the classic notion of international law as one of the main reasons for the awkward struggle over coming to terms with humanitarian interventions. He pointed out that international law was designed to tackle international wars rather than domestic conflicts, which nowadays represent the main cause of violence. In Volmer’s view, large-scale violation of human rights limits State sovereignty and may justify international intervention. Military action should, however, remain a means of last resort in German foreign policy. Asked for alternatives, Volmer underlined the importance of preventive measures to avoid the outbreak of open violence. In addition, the fostering of an international and intercultural dialogue was presented as one of the main concerns of German foreign policy.

III. Perspectives on Germany from Outside
After Volmer’s presentation and a debate with researchers, the floor was opened to the second panel of experts, chaired by Thomas Risse, professor of international relations at the EUI. Brigitte Sauzay, Gerhard Schröder’s adviser on Franco-German relations, stressed the continuities in German policies towards France. In her view, Germany has changed significantly over the last few years. This process has been rather independent of unification, and has been due to the constraints of globalizing markets which have challenged the social security system and the specific German model of the ‘soziale Marktwirtschaft’. These ruptures – which were almost invisible in the Kohl era – came to the fore after the Schröder government took over. In France it is strongly felt that with Gerhard Schröder’s cabinet a new generation of German politicians has come to power, who experienced their intellectual socialization in the turmoil of the 1968 period. From a French perspective, this means a common experience and another step in the process of Germany’s Westernization, rather than the threat of a new German isolationism.

The Russian journalist Konstantin Eggert, former commentator for Isvestija and currently working for the BBC in Moscow, reported a prevalent pro-German attitude in Russia. Despite the sufferings in World War II, Germany is now perceived as one of Russia’s most important partners and a reliable supporter of Russian concerns in international politics. German aid for the reconstruction of the Russian economy and civil society, which enormously exceeded contributions from other European countries, is also widely appreciated by the Russian public. Eggert rejected ideas from nationalist circles about a German-Russian alliance to set up a counter-balance to the global hegemony of the United States. Instead of dreaming of past glory as a superpower, Russian politicians should now be guided by realism and pragmatism in their foreign policies, Eggert said. Given reasonably favourable economic conditions, Russian-German relations could reach a new quality of cooperation among equals within ten or fifteen years.

With some observations from a British perspective, Oxford historian Peter Pulzer completed the round of external views on Germany. Reviewing the unification process, Pulzer pointed to the irony of the British attitude, stressing liberalism and national self-determination for the Soviet bloc on the one hand, but initially opposing German wishes for unification on the other. Compared to the close Franco-German co-operation in the EC, Anglo-German links remained underdeveloped in the post-war years and constrained the bargaining power of the Thatcher administration in the negotiation of German unity. Alternating with France as the main target of public antipathy in the yellow press, Germany is today viewed by British politicians as a sincere but slightly unpredictable partner in Europe.
Le 30 octobre s’est tenu à l’Institut la seconde journée du colloque *Les Organes consultatifs des Communautés européennes à travers l’expérience du Comité économique et social*. Organisée conjointement par l’Institut (Archives historiques des CE) et par l’Université d’Etat de Florence (Pôle européen) sous l’égide du Comité économique et social de l’Union européenne, cette manifestation, placée sous la Présidence d’honneur du secrétaire général du CES, M. Patrick Venturini, a réuni des chercheurs, professeurs d’Université, témoins et acteurs en vue de retracer l’histoire de cet organe consultatif et d’examiner son rôle spécifique dans le processus de construction européenne depuis sa création en 1958 à nos jours.


La seconde journée, tenue à l’Institut fut marquée par une approche plus politico-juridique. Ont été abordés: le rôle des organisations syndicales internationales (Groupe II au sein du CES) et les opérateurs économiques (Groupe I); les relations du CES avec le Parlement européen ou avec les Conseils économique et social des Etats membres ainsi que l’évolution comparée du CES et du Comité des Régions créé par le Traité de Maastricht.

La table ronde qui clôture les débats permit aux acteurs (M. Jacques Genton, 1er secrétaire général du CES, Mme Fabrizia Baduel Glorioso, ex-présidente, Mme Giacomina Cassina, membre actuel du CES) de présenter leur expérience au sein de cet organe consultatif. Enfin M. Patrick Venturini fit plus que tirer les conclusions de quatre sessions du colloque en présentant le rôle et la légitimité, les perspectives de renouvellement et de synergies que le Comité économique et social entend faire valoir ou mettre en place pour s’adapter aux réalités d’une société européenne en rapide évolution à l’aube du troisième millénaire.

**Austriaca: Geschenk der Regierung**


Nach Erhalt der Bundesratsdokumente wird die EHI-Bibliothek die vollständigste Sammlung von österreichischen Parlamentsprotokollen in ganz Italien besitzen.

**Alexander C.T. Geppert**
Selon la volonté d’Emile Noël, ses papiers ont été déposés aux Archives historiques des Communautés européennes au printemps 1997. Il s’agit pour l’essentiel des dossiers qu’il a eu à suivre dans ses fonctions de secrétaire général de la Commission des Communautés européennes (1958-1987). Ainsi l’on découvre des milliers de notes écrites et reçues par le ‘grand commis’ placé au cœur des institutions comme des affaires européennes, notes qui permettent donc de repartir quelques unes des étapes fondamentales du processus communautaire: l’affermissement, d’abord serein, des positions de la Commission sous la houlette intransigeante du président Walter Hallstein; la fusion des exécutifs opérée sous l’égide de l’ancien titulaire de l’Auswärtiges Amt à des fins de simplification mais aussi d’affirmation administrative qui conduisent finalement leur promoteur à être disgracié par le pouvoir gaulliste; la ‘chimère’ de l’union politique qui cède le pas à une Europe des nations convoitée par la France; l’arrivée à sa rescousse de la Grande-Bretagne et du Danemark qui s’engouffrent dans les brisures d’une Europe dévouée dont valent uniquement, à leurs yeux, les dépouilles; les tâtonnements des partisans d’une construction politique qui tentent de reprendre les rênes, du sommet de La Haye au Conseil européen de Paris; le naufrage du rapport Tindemans qui laisse seules s’égrenner les échéances précieuses mais sèchement mécaniques de l’union économique et douanière... En chaque circonstance Emile Noël sait, Emile Noël suit, Emile Noël suggère et dénoue. L’évidence unanimement reconnue se consolide à la lumière des documents qui éclairent plus qu’ils ne prouvent.

L’engagement européen d’Emile Noël ne s’éteint pas avec son départ de Bruxelles. Les dizaines de discours tenus avec persévérance par ‘l’apôtre laïque’ devant des publics variés et dorénavant contenus dans les dossiers-, l’atteste. Sa poursuite infatigable d’une Europe de l’Homme mais aussi d’un Homme européen, enten- du non pas au sens totalitaire mais comme l’op- portunité d’une dimen- sion individuelle nouvel- le (encouragée bientôt par le traité d’Union européenne), trouve un terrain d’élection à l’Insti- tut universitaire euro- péen dont il exerce la présidence entre 1987 et 1994. Emile Noël y renoue avec ses anciennes amours, une jeunesse réceptive et avide d’espace géogra- phique et mental qu’il a, lui-même à ses débuts, côtoyée dans ses premiers engagements déjà européens, encore pré-communau- taires; jeunesse avec laquelle il n’a jamais perdu le contact par le biais de l’enseignement notamment. Depuis ce lieu d’excellence, instigateur de fermente- tion intellectuelle et observatoire privilégié, Emile Noël ne perd pas de vue le cours européen et fait entendre sa voix aujourd’hui consignée, à cet égard encore, dans des papiers qui illustrent sa volonté d’une Europe démocratisée et politisée, c’est à dire responsabilisée sur la scène internationale où l’histoi- re précipitée l’ invoque. Avec l’imposition de l’autre Europe, une nouvelle architecture s’impose et la Com- munauté se trouve de toutes parts appelée à l’ériger. Les progrès enregistrés à Maastricht ne suffisent point. Si la monnaie unique semble proche à forger les
Le fonds Emile Noël


Le fonds mesure 54 mètres linéaires et se compose de 2800 dossiers.

Le traitement des dossiers est désormais achevé et le fonds a été ouvert au public dans les conditions stipulées par le légataire, lesquelles se réfèrent à la règle d’ouverture à l’échéance trentenaire en vigueur auprès des Archives de l’Union européenne. Les dossiers sont donc consultables 30 ans après leur création. Afin de pouvoir mettre l’information à disposition des chercheurs dans les meilleurs délais, les dossiers ont été classés par années. Dès à présent environ 650 dossiers couvrant les années 1949 à 1970 (inclus) sont disponibles, les autres seront ouverts par tranches annuelles chaque année en janvier.

Les dossiers actuellement consultables se réfèrent principalement aux thèmes suivants: Conseil de l’Europe et discours de Guy Mollet, travaux de la Communauté économique européenne et fusion des exécutifs (incluant l’échange de notes internes avec les présidents Walter Hallstein et Jean Rey et leurs cabinets, de commissaires et leurs cabinets), premières négociations d’adhésion et premier sommet européen (La Haye), association de la Turquie, réunions de la Commission (notes prises par Emile Noël au cours des réunions sur les ‘cahiers’), correspondance avec personnalités européistes, voyages d’Emile Noël seul et avec les présidents, conférences, discours, articles de journaux d’Emile Noël (ce dernier groupe de dossiers est consultable sans condition de date).

L’inventaire présente une description détaillée des documents. Il a été réalisé sur la base de donnée ‘Eurhistar’ et il est consultable sur internet au site des Archives historiques (http://wwwarc.ieu.it/).

RUTH MEYER-BELARDINI
The Thursday evening concerts
Strike Back

It only started last year and has already become a major pillar of the Institute’s cultural life:

“Soddisfare una sete insoddisfatta di musica” (satisfying an unsatisfied thirst for music), had been the original intention of the initiators, LOUISE DE VALOIS and DIETRICH VON BIBER, of the Thursday evening concerts at the Badia, the ‘Concerti del giovedì sera alla Badia’ as the proper title goes. Unaware of the intensity of the EUI community’s thirst they were surprised by the success of the first season. This confirmed the need for music, but it also proved again that the real music lover is never satisfied: hence, there is still a thirsty community waiting for new barrels of music.

And remedy is at hand: supported by GIOVANNI MUGNAIO, who joined the directorial board for this second season, LOUISE and DIETRICH put together another fine programme of almost a dozen extraordinary concerts, ranging from early Renaissance vocal polyphony to unleashed hot-jazz contemporary music for saxophone and piano. The following outline is just to give you a clue to what is coming up - we are still engaged in negotiations with musicians from both sides of the French-English Channel.

This year’s concert series starts with a homage to one of the fathers of modern European music, JOHANNES OCKEGEM, whose vocal compositions deeply influenced composers for centuries to come. His spectacular choir settings from the late 15th century will be performed by the renowned Florentine ‘Ockegem Consort’ under the direction of SILVIO SEGANTINI, and they will be illustrated by readings of extracts from a contemporary text by FRANCESCO FLORIO, who gives an account of his personal acquaintance with JOHANNES OCKEGEM. If you are looking forward to an encounter with the 15th century, come to the Badia on Thursday 25 November 1999, at 9 p.m.

The last concert of the century will be given by the Institute’s hidden musical talents, above all by our very own Coro dell’Istituto Universitario Europeo, a formation which is increasingly gaining international fame - if only for the fact that its components come from all over Europe and change every year. Who will miss them singing ‘Jesu meine Freude’ by JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH or hear them risk ZOLTAN KODALY’s motet ‘Veni Emanuel’? As well as the CIUE, some of the EUI’s finest musicians will exhibit their capacities.

If you want to know which of your fellow researchers are suffering from multiple personalities, be there on December 9th, at 9 p.m. in the Badia.

After the ‘end of the millennium break’ the Thursday evening concerts will continue in spring 2000. A highlight will be the programme on 9 March at 9 p.m., featuring two outstanding German musicians: CHRISTINE RALL, a saxophonist trained by the famous Raschér-Saxophon-Quartet, and STEFAN THOMAS, a prize-winning composer-pianist, will give us a broad insight into the music of what will by then be the ‘previous century’, starting with the Hot-Sonata from 1930 by jazzy expressionist ERWIN SCHULHOFF and ending with recent compositions by STEFAN THOMAS himself. An evening which every sceptic should attend: if you still need to be persuaded that contemporary music can also be fun and funny, then let these musicians have a try at you.

Two weeks later, 23 March, will be the turn of JESSICA KUHN, prize-winning violoncellist, and her piano partner, Russian-born DMITRI Vinnen. Their programme will consist of three of the most important and profound contributions to the Cello-Piano repertoire ever written, including Duos by LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN, BENJAMIN BRITTEN and DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH.

If March 2000 is already offering a superb prospect, the May programme is no less promising: on the 4th of May, a Thursday of course, the ensemble ‘In Due contro un Basso’ will show up at the Badia to play quite an extraordinary set of pieces, featuring quite an extraordinary set of instruments: this Trio of Violin, Viola and Double Bass (MATHIAS HOCHWEBER, JAKOB
LUSTIG and FELIX VON TIPPELSKIRCH will zap around more than 300 years of music history, performing about a dozen pieces by very different composers such as HENRY PURCELL, GEORG FRIEDRICH HANDEL, JOSEPH HAYDN, WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART, HANS WERNER HENZE, ISANG YUN and ERIHAN SANRI. Don’t miss this one!

But also come to KRISTINA LANDSHAMER’S Liederabend. This splendid young soprano will be accompanied by STELLARIO FAGONE, a pianist performing regularly for the Italian radio-television network RAI. Let yourself become enchanted by the dreamy melodies of turn-of-the-century-composers such as HUGO WOLF, RICHARD STRAUSS, ALBAN BERG and ARNOLD SCHOENBERG. All this and more on Thursday (surprise!) 11 May 2000, at 9 p.m. in the Badia.

The stress of the EUI’s-Maggio-musicale continues already a week later with another fine chamber ensemble: IGOR SEMENOV, violin; GEERT DE BIEVRE, violoncello; STEPHANE GINSBURGH, piano are forming a Piano Trio, and have promised us a wonderful programme, which will make the Amici della Musica green with envy! ROBERT SCHUMANN’S Trio op.63 and the same composer’s Five Pieces ‘im Volkston’ op. 102 will be separated by one of the major contributions to the piano-trio repertoire of the 20th century, BERND ALOIS ZIMMERMANN’S imagined Ballet without dancers ‘Presence’ from 1961. This is such a courageous programme that it should be rewarded by a large audience. Excuses based on June papers or similar trifles will not be accepted!

Oh, didn’t we tell you before? It costs almost nothing: researchers only pay 5,000 Lit. and will have free drinks. All others – and we explicitly invite all others, hoping for an increasing interest also from our Florentine hosts outside the Institute - will get free drinks during the break as well, but will have to pay 10,000 Lit. per ticket. All this would not have been possible without the joint efforts of all entities of the Institute. The most consistent support came from the Institute’s Secretary General, Dr. ANTONIO ZANARDI-LANDI, who provided us with all kinds of help and financial backing. But an important contribution came also from the departments, who have made it possible for our visiting artists.

Above and beyond financial support, we have to thank all those institutional services and entities whose work guarantees the running of the concerts: operational service, porters and especially the publication office. It is thanks to them that we can enjoy these concerts. So please take advantage of other people’s hard work, and reward their efforts by having a nice evening.

Starting on 25 November!

GIOVANNI MUGNAIO for the ‘Concerti del giovedì sera’
1-3 October
The Alumni Association Meets in Berlin

9-10 October
Our Third Embassy to Rome
Where are they now?
Reporting from Amman

JEAN-PIERRE CASSARINO earned his Ph.D. in Political and Social Sciences at the European University Institute in December 1998. He worked at the EUI on a topic related to business development and return migration in contemporary Tunisia, under the supervision of Professors CHRISTIAN JOPPKE and Colin Crouch. His doctoral research will be published in February 2000.

In September 1999, JEAN-PIERRE took up the position of research manager at the Amman-based Centre d’Etudes et de Recherches sur le Moyen-Orient Contemporain (CERMOC, Centre For Study and Research on the Contemporary Middle East). Since then, JEAN-PIERRE’s job has consisted not only in developing research activities in the fields of history, social and political sciences, and economics, but also in organizing seminars in collaboration with Jordanian research institutions as well as publishing scientific work, mainly in Arabic and English.

The Amman-based CERMOC is a French research institution which has contributed since 1988 to promoting the participation of scholars and students from European and Middle Eastern research centres and institutions in the development of collective research programmes related to the societies and States in the contemporary Middle East.

In this respect, a three-year research project has been organized under the title “Configurations and Actors of the New Regionalism in the Mashreq”. This research programme, which is coordinated by JEAN-PIERRE, gathers together European and Arab research institutions. The main purpose of his research programme lies in analysing the ways in which corporatist organizations and voluntary business associations in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine have been responsive to the gradual convergence of economic policies in the Mashreq (or Middle East) region. The aim is to analyse the mechanisms through which the identified actors may be able to build an exchange system that reflects the characteristics of a bottom-up process of economic cooperation, at the level of the region, despite the resilience of institutional, political, and security obstacles.

JEAN-PIERRE can be reached at the following address:

CERMOC - P.O. Box: 830 413 Zahran - 11183 Amman – Jordan.
Tel: +962 6 4 611 171
Fax: +962 6 4 611 170
Email: cermoc@nets.com.jo

---

A Reception for Alumni in Bruxelles

The EUI Alumni Association has the pleasure of inviting its members to a reception to be held on Friday 21 January 2000 in Bruxelles.

It has now become a tradition to start the New Year – and for once the New Millennium – with an informal get-together over drinks and a few snacks in an Irish pub near the Commission headquarters. We are therefore asking all former (and present) EUI members in and around Bruxelles to highlight Friday, 21 January 2000 from 6 p.m. onwards in their agendas for our party.

(Invitations will go out in December to all those resident in the Benelux. Should others happen to be in Bruxelles at the time, please let us know so that we can send you an invitation. See you in the Year 2000 then.)

---

55
Vincent Wright left us at the beginning of July, exactly one year after he had been found to have cancer. Faced with the illness, he displayed the virtues we knew in him, but as it were carried to the extreme: he wanted to know everything, absolutely everything, about his disease, the chances of cure, how much time he had left; he took every action to meet the obligations he had taken on, complete manuscripts in hand, offer his books to libraries; and he faced his forecast destiny with devastating humour. Right up to the end, Vincent Wright energetically deployed the qualities that made him unique: a tireless worker able to give the illusion of being a dilettante, with a passion for facts able to bring in the details without losing the overall picture; a rigorous analyst, a sort of British Cartesian, yet never forgetting the nuance, the exception, the counterpoint; a professional whose academic seriousness was tempered by distance and irony; a man of sometimes pitiless frankness, softened by a humanity and a kindly attention to which all who worked under him can testify.

British (or French?!) in Britain, French (or English?) in France, Vincent was the most perfect example of a man at ease in either country, in both cultures. He was perfectly bilingual, but claimed – and it was true – to be incapable of doing a translation. In fact he was not from one side of the Channel or the other. He was a citizen of the world, or rather, a European, as the course of his academic career illustrates.

Vincent Wright had a twofold education, at the London School of Economics and the Paris IEP, following which he spent the years from 1960 to 1965 as an assistant in France. It was in France too that he published his first research on the Conseil d’État, and then on the prefects under the second Empire. This career as a historian was rapidly to move towards political science, though he never lost his taste for the patient hunt for information in archives. He is undoubtedly the only Briton, and probably one of very few researchers at all, to have systematically exploited all the departmental archives of France, for a work on Gambetta’s prefects to which he put the final touch a few weeks before his death. In 1978 his manual The Government and Politics of France came out, and rapidly became a success in Europe and the United States, initiating thousands of students into a nuanced, Tocquevillian view of our country.

After the 80s his academic path shifted direction again. He multiplied his collaborations with foreign colleagues (Jacques Lagroye, Sabino Cassese, Wolfgang Müller) in a comparative perspective, while pursuing very close co-operation with his colleagues or former pupils in Britain. Howard Machin, Rod Rhodes, Jack Hayward and Martin Rhodes frequently collaborated with him in exploring public action, from the aspects of both policy and politics.

In 1977, along with Gordon Smith, he founded the quarterly West European Politics, which was to play a major part in structuring and disseminating comparative studies in Europe. Another dimension of this interest in comparative analysis was the initiation, together with Henri Mendras and Arnaldo Bagnasco, of a series of colloquia and talks on social change in Europe.

Vincent Wright was not a professor, since his position as fellow of Nuffield College, Oxford, left him with the freedom to be able to devote himself fully (meaning twelve hours a day!) to his research. But he was much more than that. He was a formidable educator, who taught all over Europe and the US, training an impressive cohort of young experts on France or on European questions, and encouraging a large number of vocations for research. He was also a member of several editorial committees, a director of collections, and associate professor at several universities. Faithful to Nuffield where he had had the bulk of his career, Vincent nonetheless had privileged relations with many universities, in particular the European University Institute. After teaching there for two years, from 1980 to 1982, he remained associated with it through many activities, in particular since 1995 as a member of its Research Council.

Vincent Wright’s research activity was fecund and very diverse. He had a certain mistrust of theories, often constructed for the university market rather than for their capacity to explain and interpret reality. Without being untheoretical, he gave priority to identifying and checking facts. This major concern runs through his whole work, unifying it in its diversity.

Personally, over and above the immense professional and intellectual merits of Vincent Wright, I recall the richness of an incomparable personality. Excellent academics abound; such striking characters less so, especially if not accompanied by a swollen ego. Vincent was the absolute opposite of a mandarin or a baron. Because he worked seriously, he did not take himself seriously. His work, his capacity for collaboration, his acute mind, were as it were downplayed through his humour and his communicative laugh. Dying at the age of 62, Vincent Wright leaves a great intellectual and human vacuum, the memory of a unique person whose caustic humour would not, if it were possible, fail to be brought to bear on those recalling him post mortem.

The creation of two Fellowships in his name at the RSC (in History and Comparative Politics) is a modest tribute to his memory and to the contribution he gave to Academia, in particular at the EUI. It will be an additional opportunity for post-doc students and at the same time an encouragement to emulate his creative and stimulating spirit.

YVES MéNY
Vincent Wright Fellowships
2000-2001

The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies offers:

one **Vincent Wright Fellowship in History**
for proposals related to the area of research on State Formation and the Development of Administration since the XIXth Century in Europe

one **Vincent Wright Fellowship in Comparative Politics**

Applications are invited for post-doctoral research fellowships tenable at the EUI from September 2000-June 2001 for post-doctoral students and junior academics

**Deadline for applications:**
1 February 2000

Application and information pack:
web site: www.iue.it/JMF/Welcome.html
e-mail: applyjmf@datacomm.iue.it

EUI web site: www.iue.it
RSCAS web site: www.iue.it/JMF/Welcome.html

European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini, 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) Italy
Une édition posthume des textes de Michel Rey, chercheur dans le Département d’Histoire et Civilisation entre 1988 et 1991 et destinés à constituer sa thèse de doctorat d’histoire a été établie sous la direction de Anne-Sophie Perriaux et a vu le jour en juin de cette année. Cette publication de l’IUE doit tout à la ténacité et à l’énorme travail d’édition effectué par Anne-Sophie entre 1997 et 1998 à partir de ce qui avait été conservé dans l’ordinateur de Michel.

En outre, c’est grâce à la sensibilité des membres du Département d’Histoire et Civilisation de l’IUE qui ont dès le début soutenu notre idée de rendre un hommage posthume à Michel et à l’aide précieuse, la compréhension et le soutien immédiat de Birgitte Schwab aussi bien comme responsable des publications de l’IUE que de l’association des Alunni de notre institution que le manuscrit établi par Anne-Sophie a aujourd’hui vu le jour.

Anne-Sophie Perriaux a écrit quelques mots en guise de préface à cette édition en septembre 1998 qui nous permettent d’en savoir plus sur l’origine des notes de travail et des écrits de Michel Rey.


Aujourd’hui cette publication est là, sur ma table et sur la table de tous les amis de Michel dont Anne-Sophie et moi connaissons l’adresse et cette thèse in fieri nous relie tous un peu et nous permet de rendre ainsi un hommage à notre ami commun.

Du travail de Michel en soi je n’entends pas parler ici laissant à chacun le plaisir de découvrir un parcourt intellectuel curieux, quelque fois seulement ébauché, quelque fois soutenu d’une fine analyse et de notes de lectures et quelque fois déjà mûr et prêt à la confrontation avec les travaux d’autrui sur un thème aussi immédiat dans notre vécu quotidien mais aussi plein de sous-entendus comme l’amitié, l’amitié à la Renaissance, l’époque choisie par Michel pour faire de ce sentiment un “objet de connaissance” historique. Anne Sophie a reconstruit des éléments d’une biographie de Michel (pp.7-8) et souligne le fait que “le parcourt intellectuel et professionnel de Michel Rey… est révélateur de l’importance qu’il attachait au lien social. Il entrelace deux trajectoires, l’une consacrée à l’éducation spécialisée, -Michel s’est occupé d’enseigner aux adultes handicapés comme éducateur spécialisé- l’autre attachée à la recherche d’une histoire de l’homosexualité”, une direction, cette dernière, qui a mené Michel à Florence et à conduire son doctorat sur l’amitié à l’IUE, là où j’ai eu le bonheur de faire sa connaissance et de nouer avec lui jusqu’à sa mort prématurée en mai 1993, de profonds liens d’amitié.

Et en effet, si le lecteur ne m’en veut pas, c’est de cette relation là, de ce Michel connu durant cinq années que je voudrais parler quelque peu ici, en évoquant l’amitié qu’il a été au travers de quelques souvenirs bien personnels. Michel était malade. Il avait contracté le SIDA et je n’en savais rien, je n’en ai jamais rien su jusqu’au moment où sa mort m’a été annoncée. Je ne savais même pas Michel malade deux mois avant sa mort. Il m’avait téléphoné en mars pour mon anniversaire qui se célébrait quelques jours après le sien et avait voulu parler de ma fille Alice, née en février...
qu’il avait hâte de connaître. Au moment où Michel me parlait je n’avais aucune idée que tous les médicaments qu’il prenait depuis des années ne pouvaient plus rien pour lui et que cette conversation aurait été la dernière avec lui. J’étais tranquille et heureux de l’entendre comme si les recherches qui le tenaient à Paris auraient bientôt été terminées. On aurait dû se revoir avant l’été.

Anne-Sophie m’a dit depuis, que Michel avait établi des rapports différents avec des gens différents et donc des rapports “normaux” avec des gens “normaux” comme moi et ma compagne d’alors pour qui la maladie de Michel n’était nullement présente. Il était ainsi capable de repousser la douleur et la maladie loin de lui, reprenant force et courage en présence de gens qui tout ignoraient. Il tenait énormément à ces rapports comme d’allieux à ceux qui lui permettaient de s’ouvrir et de parler de son mal –ce que j’ai su plus tard dans mes conversations avec Anne-Sophie- et se montrait un ami présent et discret, toujours sensible aux détails, aux petites choses. Il ne voulait pas que la divulgation de sa maladie change les éléments de ce rapport sincère, fort et libre de conditionnements. Michel devait avoir une force d’âme exceptionnelle: il ne pouvait trouver de réconfort métaphysique et vivait loin des prêtres ou du moins, la religion n’était pas un élément de ses pensées et de ses discours. Michel était ainsi capable de faire abstraction du SIDA et de sa conséquence inéluctable. Il vivait des moments intenses avec nous au cours desquels sa quotidienne fragilité physique restait absente, enesselle, dominée, rejetée sans que personne ne puisse soupçonner la présence de ce mal inéluctable.

Sans doute Michel avait raison de maintenir un espace de liberté vitale où la maladie n’avait pas sa part et sa conduite fut certainement un exemple pour ceux qui souffraient et souffrent du SIDA. Et pourtant je lui en ai voulu de ne pas m’avoir parlé du mal qui le terrassait, de ne pas avoir laissé plus de place, au moins à la fin, pour une amitié plus proche de lui, plus précocisée de ce qui se passait et du temps qui s’écoulait inexorablement et allait nous éloigner pour toujours. Michel lui préférait entendre des mots normaux sur la plage, en hiver, près de Campiglia Marit-
tima, dans la Maremme, son sourire, les photos que nous nous faisions l’un l’autre, sa tranquille bonhomie et la sagesse et les conseils “d’homme plus âgé” pensais-je alors, ses mots tendres et ses regards ironiques et rieurs. Michel ne cachait pas son homossexualité mais restait discret sur sa vie amoureuse et nous ne l’interroisions pas, cela aussi faisait partie de son univers et de la retenue avec laquelle nous en parlions.

Michel nous avait accueillis à Paris en 1991 chez lui et nous avions été frappé par les conditions difficiles et précaires de son logement mais là encore je n’avais pas questionné l’évidence. Sans aucun doute j’ai ainsi pêché de superficialité là où j’aurais dû m’interroger sur mon ami au-delà de son apparent dénuement.

Mais, c’est lui Michel qui travaillait sur l’amitié des Princes et des puissants, l’amitié en politique et les amitiés des politiques, qui connaissait la douceur de la maladie et de la sainteté de ceux qui tiennent immensément à toutes les petites choses. Chaque seconde peut devenir notre dernier instant mais cette certitude ne l’empêchait pas, non, nullement de déterminer avec sérénité son comportement quotidien. Seul la quotidienneté pour laquelle on s’offre tout entier mais avec retenue et qualité, rendait compte qu’il était doué d’un patience, d’un optimisme et d’une force de caractère exceptionnels.

Cher Michel tu m’as accompagné pendant quelques années ici à la Badia Fiesolana et ton amitié a été intense et me manque. Grâce à ton livre je pourrai aujourd’hui penser que, comme tant d’autres amis qui sont passés par ici et que les circonstances ont appelé ailleurs et dont les visages s’estompent avec le temps et la distance, tu es quelque part là où la vie nous a séparé et que ton rire que je sens si proche de moi illumine d’autres visages et d’autres instants là-bas où je n’irai pas.

SERGE NOIRET

Introducing New Academic Service
Staff Members

David Crowley
Head of Research Administration
tel. 4685.(2)246
Email: crowley@datacomm.iue.it

Responsible for:
  Management of internally and externally-funded Research Projects
  Advice to advanced researchers on Marie Curie and other types of externally-funded grants
  Co-ordination of the recruitment procedure for Research Assistant appointments in conjunction with the Professors
  Assistance to Researchers and Professors in the costing and budgeting of Research Projects

Dave was born this century in Dublin and educated at Trinity College Dublin and ULB-Brussels.

His previous jobs include information officer in an EU consultancy firm in Brussels, and lately research contract negotiator and administrator at the University of Nottingham.

His extra-curricular interests include football (ABU), cricket, and food - both consuming and preparing it.

---

Eija Heikkinen
Head of Human Resources and Career Services
tel: 4685.(2)377
Email: heikkine@datacomm.iue.it

Responsible for:
  Administration of the recruitment procedures for research students,
  Jean Monnet Fellows and professors
  Follow-up for Jean Monnet Fellows in residence
  Development of a Career service
  Information and advice on careers and job search
  Organisation of Career forums
  Employer contacts
  Career services web sites
  Traineeships/Stages at EU Institutions
  Undergraduate teaching at US universities based in Florence

Eija was born in the northernmost part of Finland, close to the Arctic circle. She was educated in Finland and took a Masters in International Relations from the University of Tampere, whilst also spending time at the University of Kiel reading Political Science.

Her previous working experience includes jobs as project manager in an employment office in Kemi, Finland, organising international voluntary exchanges in Bern, and administrative conference assistant at the University of Heidelberg.

Her hobbies include international voluntary work, badminton and swimming, and she is a keen cinema-goer.
The Institute Welcomes its New Research Students

### Department of Economics

- ARGENTESI Elena, I
- BILLMEIER Andreas, D
- BUSSIERE Matthieu, F
- CASOLARO Luca, I
- GUEORGUIEV Iliian, BG
- JEAVONS Mark David Andrew, UK
- MENEGAKI Angeliki, GR
- MILLIOU Chrysovalantou Vasiliki, GR
- NANNICINI Tommaso, I
- PAESANI Paolo, I
- PEDERSEN Michael, DK
- PEKKARINEN Tuomas Juhana, FIN
- PELLICER GALLARDO Miquel Llorenc, E
- POLANEC Saso, SLV
- RENOU Ludovic Sebastien Patrice, F
- RIVAS RABAGO Manuel, E
- SANTAMARIA GARCIA Juana Maria, E
- TATSIRAMOS Konstantinos, GR
- VANDENBROUCKE Guillaume Arthur Alex., F
- VERLAINE Michel, L
- VOSTROKNOUTOVA Ekaterina, RS
- WEBER Stefan, D
- WIENRICHT Ulrike Ursula, D
- ZOVKO Ilija, HR

### Department of History and Civilization

- ANTONIOU Georgios, GR
- AUGUSTO Isabel Regina, BR
- BERTAUX Sandrine, F
- BOZINIS ANDINACH Maria Efpraxia, E
- BRACKE Maud Anne Rebecca, L
- DONNEAU Olivier Guy Victor, B
- DUREL Aline Juliette, F
- EDMAN Karin Agneta, S
- ELORANTA Jari Antero, FIN
- FINALDI Giuseppe, UK
- FRANCESCHINI Chiara, I
- FRESTA Massimiliano, I
- GRINKRUG Olga, RS
- HUBER Renate, A
- JORGENSEN Kirsten Winther, DK
- KARAHASAN Devrim, D
- KHERFI Chahnaz, ALG
- KIKU Veronica, UKR
- KOHLRAUSCH Martin, D
- LAFFRANCHI Cristina, CH
- LAZAROV Iassen, BG
- LEDERLE Julia Christine, D
- MASS Sandra, D
- MIGGELBRINK Joachim Johannes Marie, NL
MUNOZ SANCHEZ Antonio, E
O’MALLEY Aidan, IRL
ORLUC Katiana Natascha Florence, D
OSTERBERG Per Oscar Martin, S
PEREZ TOSTADO Igor, E
PIERRE Benoist, F
PRAT SABARTES Marc, E
PUTO Artan, AL
SORENSEN Anders Thornvig, DK
TASCA Luisa, I
TROILO Simona, I

Department of Law

ADRIAANSE Paul Christiaan, NL
ALBI Anneli, EST
BARTELS Lorand Alexander, NL
BONAFE Beatrice Ilaria, I
CARPANO Eric Pierre, F
CHIRICO Alessandra, I
COLETTA Gianluigi, I
DE LA SIERRA MORON Susana, E
DE STREEL Alexandre Marie Alfred A., B
DUNLEAVY Nicola Marie, IRL
ENGBLOM Lars Samuel, S
FOURTIOY Frederic Andre Gabriel, F
GHALEIGH Navraj Singh, UK
GUSTAFSSON Tord Magnus, S
HOFFMANN Florian Fabian, D
HOSAKA Mieko, J
JAVAID Fouzia Ranah, UK
KARAMPATSAKIS Konstantinos, GR
KHANNA Devika, UK
LAURSEN Andreas Steen Myllerup, DK
LEMMENS Koen Karl Rosalinde, B
LENZ Miriam Corinna, D
MACIEJEWSKI Mariusz, PL
MARQUIS Mel Jacob, USA
MARZAL YETANO Elia, E
NEMETH Kristin, A
PIERUCCI Alessandra, I
PREINERSTORFER RIEDL Kristina, A
RALLI Tommi Juhani, FIN
RINGELHEIM Julie Catherine, B
ROESSEL Stefan, D
SLINN Ania Maria, UK
TAOUIFIQI Hidia, F
TYNES Dora Sif, IS
VASSILOPOULOS Christos, GR
VERDELHO ALVES Maria Luisa, P
VEYA Geraldine, CH
WURTZBACHER Estelle Evelyne, F
YOUNG Lorna, UK
ZARTL Karin, A
ZUKOVA Galina, LV

Department of Social and Political Science

AMIR MOAZAMI Schirin, D
ATTUCCI Claudia, I
BLOKKER Paulus Albertus, NL
BOERSCH Alexander, D
BOURGAIN Marina Therese Anne, F
DA SILVA TORRES Joaquim Jose Pablo, P
DE FRANTZ Monika, A
FRITZ Verena Maria, D
GRANGE Aline Marie, F
KEUNE Martinus Johannes, NL
KIES Raphael Donald Guido Jean, L
KOYNOVA Maria, BG
MARTENS Kerstin, D
MARTINSEN Dorte Sindbjerg, DK
MC GARRY Katherine, IRL
MENDEZ JORGE Fernando, UK
MOLINA ROMO Oscar, E
NOWENSTEIN PIERY Graciela Irene, E
RAHIM Babak, IR
RAMOS DIAZ Luis Javier, E
SAYED Fatma, EGY
SELO SABIC Sennada, BH
SOLERA Cristina, I
TERRIER Jean Denis Jacques, CH
TRIGA Vassiliki, GR
WENNERSTEN Peter, S
WHEATLEY Jonathan Michael, UK
European University Institute

3-year Post Graduate Grants for September 2000

in

Law
Economics
History
Social and Political Sciences

in one of the largest structured doctoral programmes in the world in these disciplines. Unique in its international, comparative and interdisciplinary character, it brings together academics and research students from different backgrounds and traditions in a 3-year programme leading to a doctorate recognised in the EU Member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Monthly Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria:</td>
<td>EUR 1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium:</td>
<td>EUR 1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark:</td>
<td>EUR 1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland:</td>
<td>EUR 1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France:</td>
<td>EUR 1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany:</td>
<td>EUR 869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece:</td>
<td>EUR 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland:</td>
<td>EUR 898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy:</td>
<td>EUR 878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg:</td>
<td>EUR 1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands:</td>
<td>EUR 932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal:</td>
<td>EUR 1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain:</td>
<td>EUR 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden:</td>
<td>EUR 1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom:</td>
<td>EUR 898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consult our website http://www.iue.it
or send an email to
applyres@datacomm.iue.it

Closing date for applications: 31 January 2000
The European University Institute

is looking for candidates with a distinguished record of scholarly publications and experience in postgraduate teaching and doctoral supervision, to fill

A Chair in *International Law* (LAW10)

and

A Chair in *Comparative Law* (LAW2)

The Department of Law is seeking candidates with expertise in one of the following fields:

- **International Economic Law:**
  - World trade law, legal implications of globalisation;
  - Law of immigration and social exclusion;
  - Legal issues of discrimination including race and gender;

- **Law and Science:**
  - Information technologies, intellectual property,
  - High technology including biotechnology.

Preference would be given to candidates able to relate the various topics to contemporary concerns in Europe. The department will make one appointment at a senior level and one appointment at an intermediate level; it might be willing to consider a part-time appointment in comparative law.

Interested applicants should contact the Head of the Academic Service, Dr Andreas Frijda, in order to receive an application and information pack.

Tel.: +39-055-4685.332
Fax: +39-055-4685.444
Email: applypro@datacomm.iue.it
Internet: www.iue.it

The contracts are for four years, renewable once.

The Institute is an equal opportunity employer.

European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole
Italy

**Deadline for applications: 31 January 2000**

*Please mark the application envelope with the code of the chair as given above*
The European University Institute is looking for candidates with a distinguished record of scholarly publications and experience in postgraduate teaching and doctoral supervision, to fill

A Chair in European Community Law (LAW8)

This chair previously advertised is still vacant. Applications already received will be considered, along with new applications.

Applicants for this post would be expected to teach across a wide range of issues relating to European law and institutions. The appointment will be made at a senior level.

Interested applicants should contact the Head of the Academic Service, Dr. Andreas Frijdal, in order to receive an application and information pack.

Tel.: +39-055-4685.332
Fax: +39-055-4685.444
Email: applypro@datacomm.iue.it
Internet: www.iue.it

The contracts are for four years, renewable once. The Institute is an equal opportunity employer.

European University Institute
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole
Italy

Deadline for applications: 31 January 2000
Please mark the application envelope with the code of the chair as given above
The European University Institute is looking for candidates with a distinguished record of scholarly publications and experience in postgraduate teaching and doctoral supervision, to fill

**A Chair in Economics**  
ECO10

The Department of Economics wishes to make an appointment in the area of **applied microeconomics**

Whilst the Department would prefer to make an appointment at a senior level, suitably qualified individuals at any level of seniority are welcome to apply.

Interested applicants should contact the Head of the Academic Service, Dr. Andreas Frijdal, in order to receive an application and information pack.

Tel.: +39-055-4685.332  
Fax: +39-055-4685.444  
Email: applypro@datacomm.iue.it  
Internet: www.iue.it

The contracts are for four years, renewable once. The Institute is an equal opportunity employer.

European University Institute  
Via dei Roccettini 9  
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole  
Italy

**Deadline for applications: 31 January 2000**

*Please mark the application envelope with the code of the chair as given above*
Position Announcement for Senior Research Fellow

BP Amoco Chair in Transatlantic Relations at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

The European University Institute has just announced the establishment at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies of the BP Amoco Chair in Transatlantic Relations. The Chair, appropriately endowed by a Euro-American company, will develop a programme of highly relevant policy-oriented as well as basic research by leading scholars from both sides of the Atlantic on key issues of common European-American interest.

The programme will initially concentrate on the following themes:

- Governance of the transatlantic relationship, especially in the areas of trade and investment. This includes analysing the institutional structures for decision-making on both sides of the Atlantic.
- The international role of Europe, the U.S. and the transatlantic relationship in global governance.

In this context, the BP Amoco Chair in Transatlantic Relations at the Robert Schuman Centre invites applications for the position of a Senior Research Fellow. The successful candidate should have a proven research record (PhD and a number of publications) in transatlantic relations, preferably concerning transatlantic economic relations, and some experience in managing research projects and activities.

He/She is expected to organise the activities of the transatlantic programme and also to provide intellectual leadership. He/She will co-operate in this task with the programme director, the academic advisor and with the administration of the RSC.

The candidate should be fluent in English, and the knowledge of other European Community languages will constitute an advantage. The appointment will be made for two to four years.

Applications should include a curriculum vitae, list of publications, a statement on planned research activities to be conducted in the framework of the transatlantic programme, and the names of three referees.

The deadline for applications is 1st February 2000

For the attention of Dr A. Frijdal
European University Institute
Academic Service
Via dei Roccettini, 9
50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) - Italy
Email: crowley@iue.it • Tel: 0039.055 4685246 • Fax: 0039.055 4685444
The Chernobyl disaster of April 1986 confronted Europe with an unprecedented - though not unforeseeable - risk. Why did different countries respond in different ways to the event? And what - if anything - was learned from Chernobyl? In The Management of Uncertainty: Learning from Chernobyl, Angela Liberatore explains why different definitions of the accident emerged in different countries, why certain actions were or were not taken, and what was learned about the management of nuclear risk. This comparative analysis includes discussion of short-term responses and long-term consequences of Chernobyl in the three neighboring countries of France, Italy and Germany. The response of the European Union - the supranational organization to which these countries belong - is also examined, in order to provide insight into the particular realities of a regional approach to managing transnational environmental risks.

The policy communication model developed by Liberatore in The Management of Uncertainty illustrates the interaction among scientists, who choose what is "relevant" knowledge; politicians, who decide how much they want to know (and what they let the public know); social movements and interest groups, which push to utilize and disseminate knowledge; and the mass media, which accesses and selects information to be broadcast as "news". Liberatore’s comparative focus upon “uncertainty management” is a compelling account for all who seek to understand and improve the practical management of transboundary environmental risks.

Angela Liberatore

The Management of Uncertainty. Learning from Chernobyl
Gordon and Breach Publishers, Amsterdam, 1999, 300 pp

ANGELA LIBERATORE, a former researcher of the Institute took her Ph.D in Political and Social Sciences in 1992. The above book is the result of her dissertation and is dedicated to Chernobyl’s victims. Royalties are donated to a NGO based in Kiev Chernobyl. She currently works in the Directorate General for Science, Research and Development of the European Commission in Brussels, where she conducts research on societal and policy aspects of global environmental change, with a special focus on Europe.