



# Introduction: The Stuff of European Studies

Chris Rumford

The introduction to book that calls itself a 'Handbook of European Studies' might be concerned with justifying its existence, explaining why European studies is important, and drawing attention to the ways in which the book illuminates the subject in an innovative way, redefines the field of study, or challenge some embedded orthodoxies. This would be a rather defensive and, I think, oversensitive approach to a subject that as Craig Calhoun pointed out a few years ago is 'always already there and still in formation' (Calhoun, 2003). European studies is neither in need of reinvention, nor does its existence need to be justified. What is required, it is argued – and this is the prime task of this handbook – is for it to achieve a greater degree of visibility and ultimately recognition. There is currently a certain 'invisibility' to European studies, assumed by some to be the poor relation of EU integration studies and by others to be constituted at the 'soft' end of multidisciplinary social science by a preference for questions of cultural identity and normative political visions.

The idea that European studies is 'always already there and still in formation' is a

useful summary of the current state of affairs. It does exist in a fully constituted, robust, and purposeful form – but only if you know where to look for it. European studies does not possess the status, visibility, and profile that it deserves and this does limit the contribution that it can make to the study of contemporary Europe. That it is still in formation is fairly clear, given the low profile and lack of recognition that it enjoys. This should be seen as a strength rather than a weakness though because what is needed, I argue, is less a new orthodoxy for studying Europe, such as that represented by EU integration studies (Rumford and Murray, 2003), and more an openness towards studying European transformations and a continual questioning of how best to study Europe.

As a European studies text, the book has three core aims. The first is to explore the transformations that characterise contemporary Europe. The second is to look at how we can best study Europe. The third is to bring under one roof, so to speak, some key resources in European studies in such a way as to provide a launch pad for future studies. This means that it is not another book on EU

integration studies, although that subject is certainly represented within its 500-odd pages. It is a book about contemporary Europe and how we might study it, and the study of EU integration is situated in the context of Europe's transformations. This makes it a rather unusual book in relation to the majority of contemporary publication that take Europe as their theme. European integration is written about extensively and the vast majority of books published on 'Europe' are concerned in some way with charting, explaining or elucidating the progress of the integration processes. The predominance of this area of inquiry has resulted in a conflation between Europe and the European Union and the idea that that there is not much else to study in relation to Europe. It is possible that people will pick up this book assuming that it is another contribution to integration studies. After all, European studies is often used as a catch-all name for the study of EU integration, the institutions and the EU, and the public policy domains with which the EU is closely associated: agriculture, regional policy, the single market and so on, and indeed all things European. In such a situation what purpose is there in pursuing a different version of European studies?

## MAPPING EUROPEAN STUDIES

In response to this question I can offer five good reasons why we need a healthy and robust European studies to sit alongside the more established integration studies (with the aim of enriching both). The first reason is that European studies offers multidisciplinary, whereas integration studies tend to be dominated by political scientists and international relations (IR) scholars. The broadening of the field to include geography, sociology, planning, and cultural studies is desirable for many reasons, not least of which is that research may coalesce around new, multidisciplinary agendas (but at the same time there is no guarantee that sociology, geography

and the rest are inherently more multidisciplinary than political science), and, perhaps most importantly, that many disciplines can engage in dialogue as equal partners. Too often, EU integration studies insists that if other disciplines wish to participate they must do so by following an agenda framed by political scientists. As things stand at present, there is much European studies-type work being carried out in many disciplines but academics in one discipline too rarely relate to work carried out by academics in another discipline. Political scientists do not read the work of geographers. IR scholars are not familiar with the agenda in sociology, and so on. European studies needs to become much more multidisciplinary in order to ensure that it studies Europe in the most effective way.

The second reason is that studying Europe should be seen as important as studying EU integration. What makes European studies distinctive is that it poses a range of questions about Europe which do not get posed in a more narrowly focused EU integration studies. European studies deals primarily with the transformation of Europe, of which EU integration is one part. European studies is centrally concerned with question of cultural identities, of Europe's relation to the rest of the world, of transnational communities, of cross-border mobilities and networks, of colonial legacies, and of the heritage of a multiplicity of European peoples. Jean Monnet is reputed to have said, when reflecting upon the creation of the original European communities, 'If I could start again I would start with culture.' If we could begin European studies again would we want to start with integration? Or should we too opt to start with culture, as Monnet suggested? Broadly the answer to the latter question is 'yes'. When we say that European studies should study Europe we are referring to the constructedness of Europe, and its meaning to different people at different times and in different places. Upon further reflection though this might be anything but straightforward. Which construction Europe should

we study? Institutional Europe (of which there are in any case several constructions)? Cultural Europe (thereby taking Monnet literally)? Geographical Europe? Political Europe? Social Europe? The answer has to be 'all of the above'. The point of studying Europe is to explore its multiple constructions, meanings, histories, and geographies. Europe is constantly changing in its geographical scope, self-identity, cultural heritage, and meaning to others. European studies needs to investigate the meanings attached to various constructions of Europe, how they have changed over time, and what is at stake when someone offers yet another construction of Europe. Europe is not a given and cannot be reduced to an institutional arrangement (the EU). European studies should be studying Europe, in the broadest and most inclusive sense possible; it should never presume to be able to answer the question 'What is Europe?' in definitive, once-and-for-all terms.

The third reason is that there is a wealth of literature which does not conform to the norms and expectations of EU studies but which makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Europe. This literature needs to be given more prominence, disseminated more widely between (and within) disciplines, and brought to a wider public. For this to happen European studies needs to be established on firmer intellectual foundations and the ongoing activity in different fields and different literatures need to become 'joined-up' to form a more cohesive and substantial whole. Many authors and publishers would not, at this time, view their books as something contributing to European studies. This is a shame. Thus, an urgent project for European studies is to achieve the sort of collective identity which will only emerge if colleagues working in the field feel themselves to be part of a 'common pursuit', rather than working in isolation.

The fourth reason is that understanding Europe's changing role in world politics needs to be prioritized. Caricaturing EU studies we can say that it has been rather inward-looking and tends to see Europe as separate from the

rest of the world. It has also not been good at studying the EU in relation to globalization. In contrast, European studies encourages approaches to studying Europe that place it within a global framework. European studies is concerned with exploring the transformations which have shaped and continue to shape Europe, both internally and in the wider world (assuming for the moment that it is meaningful to talk about Europe as separate and distinct from the world). This global framework acknowledges the interconnectedness of Europe with the rest of the world and embraces globalization theory in an attempt to understand the impact of global process on Europe, and vice versa. Such an approach to understanding the relationship between Europe and globalization can be said to be a marker of European studies.

To assert the need for such a global framework in understanding Europe flies in the face of accepted wisdom in EU integration studies. Many accounts of integration make no reference to the impact of globalization on the EU (Wincott, 2000: 178–9). This is due in no small part to the nature of EU studies as an academic discipline: focusing on the internal dynamics of integration rather than the global environment, which is deemed external to the EU (Rosamond, 1999). Nevertheless, the EU cannot be fully understood without taking into account the impact of globalization on the transformation of post-war Europe and the project of European integration, and the role played by the EU in promoting globalization.

There have of course been many attempts to explain the relation between globalization and the EU (mainly from within European studies rather than EU studies). For example, Manuel Castells (2000: 348) writes that 'European integration is, at the same time, a reaction to the process of globalization and its most advanced expression.' This echoes a consensus view that the European Union was originally threatened by globalization, completed the single market and monetary union as a defensive reaction, following which the EU developed the capacities with which to

shape globalization, both in Europe and the wider world.

However, Castells' account is problematic as it does not account for the complexity of the relationship between globalization and the EU. Several reservations can be noted. First, it assumes that globalization is primarily an economic process driven by international trade, capital flows, global markets, and multinational business organizations. This is an economistic interpretation of globalization which can be more productively thought of as multicausal and multidimensional. Second, it assumes that globalization is a relatively recent phenomenon. It does not acknowledge that processes of globalization (plural rather than singular) have a long history and can be traced back over a millennium or more (Robertson, 1992). In short, globalization existed long before the EU was around to shape it. Third, it views globalization as the increasing interconnectedness of nation-states. In doing so it ignores the more generalized interconnectedness which is characteristic of globalization, linking social movements, citizens, non-government organizations (NGOs), communities of interest, enterprises, and a range of other actors.

According to John W. Meyer (2001: 227), 'It is difficult to draw definite boundaries between Europe ... and the wider world society.' However, studies of the EU and globalization tend to see the former as distinct from the rest of the world, more so as globalization is deemed to be leading towards the creation of regional economic trading blocs (NAFTA, MERCOSUR, ASEAN). Moreover, it is a mistake to conflate Europe and the EU (the EU does not comprise all European countries) and they are not necessarily driven by the same global dynamics. Globalization may act upon Europe in ways which bypass the EU, as for example in the case of global cities and regional autonomization (see the chapters by Brenner and Paasi). Alternatively, global forces at work in Europe may increase the web of interconnectedness in which the EU operates. Citizenship would be one example. Citizenship became a formal part of EU affairs

with the Treaty on European Union (1993) and rests, in the main, on the model of citizen as worker and the 'four freedoms' at the heart of the single market (capital, goods, services, and persons). However, the institutionalization of citizenship by the EU accounts for only part of the broader transformation of citizenship for Europeans. In the post-war period, national citizenship rights have been recast as human rights (Soysal, 1994) and global discourses of personhood rights, sponsored by the UN, have become increasingly influential. One consequence of this has been the increased rights granted to non-nationals resident in a particular nation-state (such as access to education, the labour market, welfare benefits, and even the entitlement to vote in local elections). As such, the advent of post-national rights is one effect of globalization, not an initiative of the EU.

The fifth reason, which follows on from the one above, is that European studies is much more concerned to study processes rather than institutions. The big question in EU studies has long been: 'What kind of state does the EU represent?' Much intellectual activity has been devoted to this question, with the underlying assumption that it must be *some* kind of state (see Delanty and Rumford, 2005, especially chapter 8 for an extended discussion). The 'governance turn' in EU studies has not changed the situation fundamentally, although now talk is about the possibility of a multilevel polity or a post-national polity. It can be argued that the processes of transformation which characterize Europe are much more rewarding to study, and European studies has an advantage in its focus on processes such as immigration, citizenship, and social movements.

## HOW SHOULD WE STUDY EUROPE?

One recent book which I think captures the European Studies spirit is not an academic book at all, and I think would be dismissed by many working on EU affairs and the study

of Europe more generally as being too populist, certainly rather journalistic, and too superficial by half. Nevertheless, I do not hesitate to recommend to you *Did David Hasselhoff End the Cold War?* (Hartley, 2006). The author stakes out her approach to European studies in the introduction. As a university student she found 'Europe' a 'bafflingly dull course' full of details 'about bureaucracy and treaties' (Hartley, 2006: ix). She summarizes her experience of studying Europe in the following terms: 'The "Europe" course was a cul-de-sac ... it was baffling, jargon-filled and ultimately pointless' (Hartley, 2006: 31). Elsewhere she confesses that, 'I wanted to understand [Europe], but didn't really feel that I had the tools' (Hartley, 2006: ix). Her account of Europe aims to be all the things that her college course was not. Out go the architecture of European institutions, bureaucratic history, and the founding fathers. In return we are offered accounts of 'Europe's blood feuds, dungeons, piracy, food, gods or monsters' (Hartley, 2006: 30).

If the result is an imperfect stab at European studies it has the great merit of being lively and stimulating, and succeeds at something that most books on Europe do not even attempt. It brings together many different dimensions of Europe and the European experience and places them in a common frame: the desire to offer something 'interesting, amusing or useful about Europe' (Hartley, 2006: 30). Thus we are offered chapters on 'The European Union as empire' (Chapter 2), 'Why the EU makes things seem boring' (Chapter 8), and 'The role of Islam in making Europe' (Chapter 16). Such themes are central to European studies, I would argue, and the many of the topics on which the 50 short chapters are written resonate with concerns in the more mainstream academic European studies literature. Students who enjoy Hartley's account of 'why the EU makes things dull' might just move on to John W. Meyer's penetrating analysis of why the EU is 'massively and deliberately boring ... gray men in gray Mercedes' discussing issues designed to be technical and mindbogglingly

uninteresting' (Meyer, 2001: 239) contained in his discussion of the relationship between the EU and the globalization of culture. Similarly, reading the chapter on the Islamic origins of Europe might lead the student to an engagement with the work of Jack Goody on the mutual histories of Islam and Europe. The chapter on the EU-as-empire could be served as an appetizer followed by a main course consisting of Jan Zielonka's *Europe as Empire* (Zielonka, 2007).<sup>1</sup> Hartley's *Did David Hasselhoff End the Cold War?*<sup>2</sup> serves at least two very useful functions. It juxtaposes different issues (economic, political, cultural, social, legal) in such a way as to make it a genuine European studies text, and it also flags up themes which resonate with core themes of European studies literature. As such, it represents a fine starting point for the European studies student.

I believe that European studies has been well served in recent years by a range of publications which have given expression to the idea that it is more important to study Europe, broadly conceived, than a narrow reading of integration. However, as mentioned above, the authors of such publications do not necessarily see themselves contributing to a common project. This is because they situate themselves primarily in relation to a disciplinary literature, particularly in those subjects for which European studies is a minority pursuit. This is certainly true in sociology, which does not have a strong tradition of contributing to EU integration studies, and where the study of Europe is generally pursued by those working at the social theory end of the sociological spectrum. This realization has caused some consternation amongst sociologists in recent times. For example, Guiraudon and Favell have voiced the concern that 'sociology in Europe is not dominated by empiricists but by social theorists' (Guiraudon and Favell, 2007: 4). They see as 'regretful' the identification of sociology with debates in social theory which, in their view, does not aid the development of an empirical sociology of European integration. The complaint

that they lay at the door of social theory is formulated as follows (Guiraudon and Favell, 2007: 5–6):

It is quite remarkable how little all the grand talk of contemporary social theory – about transnationalism, cosmopolitanism, mobilities, hybridity, identities, public spheres, governmentality, risk societies, modernity, postmodernity, reflexive modernization, or whatever – has to offer to studying contemporary Europe or the EU in empirical terms that have anything in common with how mainstream EU scholars approach the field.

There is more than whiff of panic in this critique. It makes no sense to lump together the ‘grand talk of contemporary social theory’ as if it were a coherent school of thought. Castell’s work on network Europe does not fit seamlessly alongside Meyer’s cultural globalization approach to Europe’s ‘otherness’, or Beck’s work on the cosmopolitanization of Europe. Social theory approaches have given rise to a disparate body of work which shares few common reference points. More importantly, in their desire to fit sociology into the mainstream of EU studies Guiraudon and Favell miss the point that social theory approaches, on the whole, choose to study European transformations rather than EU integration. In other words, whereas Guiraudon and Favell wish to formulate a political sociology of EU integration, social theorists have turned their conceptual lens on a broader set of questions occasioned by European transformations, of which the integration process is but a part. Therefore, it makes perfect sense for social theorists to explore mobilities, hybridity, governmentality, risk society, the public sphere, post-national citizenship, Europeanization, and borderlands because this is the ‘business end’ of European transformation.

There are parallels between the situation sociologists find themselves in and developments within the field of European historical studies, where the EU studies/European studies division is reproduced. There are historians of European integration whose work is dedicated to understanding the origins and development of the EU’s institutions, the

motivations of its founding fathers, and the key turning points which shaped the process of integration (Dinan, 2004; Gillingham, 2003; Milward, 1993). The work of these historians is frequently annexed to the EU integration literature. Commentators on the development of the single market, institution building, and the development of public policy domains will rely upon the histories written by Dinan, Milward, and Gillingham because their field is EU history. At the same time there are many historians of modern Europe, many of them eminent in their field, whose work rarely, if ever, gets referred to by EU studies scholars, even though the work of these historians covers the same historical period and geographical scope, and they even devote chapters to the history of European integration. However, the work of Norman Davis, Tony Judt, and Harold James, to name but three, rarely get mentioned in political science accounts of European integration. See for yourself. Pick up an EU studies textbook and check the index and the bibliography; it is likely that you will find Dinan but not Davis, Milward but not Judt, Gillingham but not James.

When we read modern European history we have a choice. Either we want historical accounts which range across both Eastern and Western Europe, the processes that shaped the politics and society of the continent, and the unresolved tensions that 50 years of ‘integration’ have produced, or we are happy to work with solipsistic accounts of how the EU made itself and/or ‘rescued the nation-state’. The resources for consolidating European studies are rich and abundant but to do so we must make a choice. There are political parallels. At the time of the Dutch and French electorates’ rejection of the constitutional treaty there was a popular slogan, ‘Not too much Europe; not enough social Europe’, which can be read as an expression of concern that the EU had a preference for markets over welfare provisions. The institutional dominance of EU integration studies is our ‘constitutional crisis’ and our

slogan should be, 'Not too much Europe; not enough European studies.'

### DOES A EUROPEAN STUDIES LITERATURE EXIST AT PRESENT?

It will be useful to introduce some books published in the recent past which serve European studies well, and which endow it with both intellectual substance and a research momentum. In this section I will focus on three texts, all of which advance the European studies agenda, albeit in rather different ways. They do this because they are engaged with their chosen themes in a broader way than is dictated by their parent disciplines, and they are able to reflect upon the practice of studying Europe and in doing so acknowledge the need for broader research agenda and multidisciplinary. The books in question are Jan Zielonka's *Europe as Empire* (2007), Walters and Haahr's *Governing Europe* (2005), and Jensen and Richardson's *Making European Space* (2004). The precise reasons for these selections will be detailed below, but they each advance a novel understanding of Europe, conceive Europe broadly, and, importantly, as something that requires explaining in terms other than those associated with integration, and offer new perspectives, disciplinary or methodological, on familiar issues.

Before moving on to consideration of these particular books it is necessary to situate them within the wider field of European studies publications which have emerged of late and which have begun to change the way we study Europe. Of particular note in this regard is the recent book by Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, which offers a rereading of integration, polity-building, Europeanization, enlargement, and Europe's relation to the wider world through the lens of 'cosmopolitan realism', and depicts the EU as an institutional arrangement which has long been inscribed with

cosmopolitan values. Neil Brenner's *New State Spaces* (2004) provides an account of the 'post-national' spaces of European governance, particularly the way nation-states mobilize urban space to develop a competitive advantage in the global capitalist economy. William Outhwaite and Larry Ray's *Social Theory and Postcommunism* (2005) looks at the impact of the collapse of communist regimes on the whole of Europe, East and West. Delanty and Rumford's *Rethinking Europe* (2005) places the transformation of Europe within a global perspective, and offers a fresh approach to questions of the nature of the European state, society, and processes of Europeanization. A number of edited collections are also worthy of mention. Berezin and Schain's *Europe Without Borders* (2003) addresses themes such as the transnational foundations of Europe, the changing role of borders, and cosmopolitanism. In addition, it focuses on the often-neglected societal dimensions of integration: the public sphere, national versus European identity, and trans-border networks. More ambitious still is Gerard Delanty's *Europe and Asia Beyond East and West* (2006) which explores the relationship between Europe and Asia in a cosmopolitan and post-Western frame. Another edited collection, Rumford's *Cosmopolitanism and Europe* (2007) also contributes to the debate on the transformation of Europe.

#### **Europe as Empire**

I have chosen to look in detail at Jan Zielonka's *Europe as Empire* (2007) for several reasons. One is the commitment to recast Europe (as a neo-medieval empire) and thereby move the study of integration away from the familiar statist template. Another is the determination on the part of the author to challenge some assumptions dear to many political scientists who study the EU. A third is Zielonka's novel perspective on Europe which requires him to study the transformation of Europe through the lens of EU enlargement which he believes

'cannot be treated as a footnote to the study of European integration' (2006: 3). The argument is that enlargement renders the rise of a European state impossible (Zielonka, 2007: 9) and as a result EU scholars need to develop new paradigms with which to study integration: state-centric approaches being deemed insufficient.

While the origins of the book are in the traditions of political science, the author is concerned with challenging the accepted way of doing EU studies. 'The book is written as a polemical response to the mainstream literature on European integration' (Zielonka, 2007: 2). The argument advanced by Zielonka is simple. The EU is not becoming like a state but it is taking on the form of an empire. The empire-like qualities of the EU should not be understood in terms of imperial designs but rather in terms of its 'multiple and overlapping jurisdictions, striking cultural and economic heterogeneity, fuzzy borders, and divided sovereignty' (Zielonka, 2007: vii). In other words, its polycentric system of governance means that it can be likened to 'a neo-medieval empire' (Zielonka, 2007: vii).

But why should we be convinced by the idea that the enlarged EU resembles a neo-medieval empire? What, according to Zielonka, are the characteristics of the EU which make it more like an empire than a state? The EU is diverse, more so than ever after the recent enlargement. This diversity can be discerned in terms of economies and democratic institutions, as well as history and culture. National minorities and patterns of immigration also add to the diversity. In short, 'the current plurality of different forms of governance, legal structures, economic zones of transactions, and cultural identities is striking a bears a remarkable resemblance to the situation in medieval Europe' (Zielonka, 2007: 168). A second main reason why the EU is neo-medieval is the system of governance, particularly as it extends beyond the EU's borders ('soft borders in flux'). The EU has promoted EU governance in the near abroad in order to stabilize the region.

'Countries such as Bosnia and Kosovo are practically EU protectorates, and there is a long list of countries from Ukraine to Palestine which are following EU instructions on organizing economic governance' (Zielonka, 2007: 169).

Enlargement has increased the diversity of the EU, seen in terms of economic stability, levels of development, democratic sophistication, and cultural practices. Enlargement has made manifest a gradient of systemic differences between the EU 15 and the newer member states. However, the differences are not so large that the new member states are in a different category altogether: 'They clearly belong to the same broad category of states, economies, and societies' (Zielonka, 2007: 43). Similarly, the gap between the 12 newest members and the rest of postcommunist Europe is not dramatic. The argument is that the external boundaries of the EU are not marked by sharp differences in levels of economic and political development. The EU and non-EU countries form something like a continuum. These features reflect the neo-medieval nature of the EU; overlapping edges of the EU polity, softer distinctions between us and them, increased networking and connectivity, and polycentric governance regimes.

The idea of Europe-as-empire will not be to everyone's taste and it would be easy to take issue with the idea of Europe as neo-medieval, which in any case is in danger of becoming a rather 'tired' metaphor (Anderson, 1996). Nevertheless, the book is well placed to perform a useful service in EU studies, in the sense that it could become the launching pad for a fresh round of thinking on Europe and the EU which is not in thrall to the statist paradigm, which Zielonka is right to identify as a major fetter on EU scholarship. From a European studies perspective it is significant that an EU integration scholar has found the need to work against political science approaches to the EU. Where one leads others may well follow and *Europe as Empire* may provide to be a significant step in bringing integration studies and European studies closer together.

### **Governing Europe**

*Governing Europe* (Walters and Haahr, 2005) is significant not least because it represents the most substantial effort to date to explore European governance and EU integration from the perspective of the governmentality approach inspired by the work of Michel Foucault (see also Barry, 2001; Huysmans, 2006). The book explores the processes which have shaped the way the EU governs in key areas (the common market, Schengenland, coal and steel) and, central to this, the ways in which Europe has been constructed as a domain which is amenable to governance. To do this the authors acknowledge that it is necessary to introduce new concepts into EU studies (e.g. ordoliberalism, governmentalization) (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 13). Interestingly this is another example of an attempt to approach the question of EU-as-state from a new and fresh perspective. Their project is ‘to investigate the “how” of European government’, ‘how it is able to govern extended social and economic spaces without possessing anything like the administrative apparatus or financial capacity of a nation-state’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 14).

Looking back to the origins of the EC/EU, Walters and Haahr explore the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) (dating from 1951), seeing it as an example of the approach to governance characteristic of ‘high modernism’; that is, a statist project of societal modernization with a belief in scientific progress leading to satisfaction of human needs. High modernism is a name given to a certain approach to governance which was particularly prominent in the West by the middle of the twentieth century. Quoting Scott, they define it as a vision of ‘how the benefits of technical and scientific progress might be applied – usually through the state – in every field of human activity (Scott, quoted by Walters and Haahr, 2005: 24). In relation to the early formation of the European Communities, Walters and Haahr identify ‘a liberal version of high modernism because it

seeks to govern not in a totalizing fashion, but by enrolling and co-opting others’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 29). Driven by the ‘high modernist’ vision of Jean Monnet, the ECSC adopted the technique of governing ‘without controlling the decision-making apparatus’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 30–1). The ECSC is an example of the rational planning, elitist decision-making, and social engineering typical of the ‘high authority’ associated with liberal high modernity. This ‘high authority’ is able to command a ‘general view’ of affairs; in the case of the ECSC the Monnet’s European Community decision-makers (the ‘High Authority’, as it was termed) were able to ‘see’ an integrated Europe ‘which member states alone were incapable of visualizing’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 32–3). From this vantage point the High Authority was able to encourage and enlist others through this vision of Europe. The method was not heavy-handed state intervention (how could there be without a European state) but ‘enrolling and co-opting others’. To this end the High Authority worked to constitute ‘the coal and steel industries as a self-regulating domain populated by responsible economic actors’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 34).

This is one example of the ‘governmentalization of Europe’ wherein social, economic and political spaces are constituted as ‘knowable domains’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 137). The attainment of knowledge of these domains by a High Authority which is uniquely placed to do this is the means by which the European Commission ‘governs’ Europe. This leads Walters and Haahr to conclude that rather than talk about the EU as a state it is much more productive to talk about processes of governmentalization and the technologies of power that can be deployed by institutions of the EU. There are three reasons why this book is a major contribution to European studies. One, it reframes the question of the EU-as-state emphasizing that ‘European integration can be reframed in terms of the governmentalization of Europe’ (Walters and Haahr, 2005: 142). Thus, rather

than being fixated on the state we need to look more broadly at questions of governance (in the absence of a state). Two, it emphasises that in order to govern Europe in this way Europe has to first be constituted as a governable entity. Thus, the authors focus on the ways in which a 'High Authority' was created so as to look at issues in a 'European way' and create European solutions to European problems (see also Delanty and Rumford, 2005, especially chapter 8). Third, Walters and Haahr introduce a new political science perspective to bear on issues at the heart of understanding contemporary Europe and in doing so throw fresh light on familiar territory.

### ***Making European Space***

Jensen and Richardson's *Making European Space* (2004) aims to add a much needed spatial dimension to thinking about Europe. At the centre of the book is the idea that central to the project of European integration is the 'making of a single European space', which the authors term a 'monotopia' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: ix). The aim of the book is to 'reveal the discourse of 'Europe as a monotopia' as an organizing set of ideas that looks upon the European Union territory within a single, overarching rationality of making 'one space', made possible by seamless networks enabling frictionless mobility' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: x) (the single market and single currency are also examples of a concerted attempt to create Europe as 'one space'). In other words, the EU is in the business of promoting a particular vision of European space as being unitary and interconnected. Such a space is associated with untrammelled mobility and a high degree of territorial cohesion. Jensen and Richardson are critical of this version of European space for being too simplistic and idealistic on one hand, and wilfully promoted on the other. The term monotopia is thus a critical response to what the authors see as the 'hegemonic vision of EU space' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: x).

The authors deploy their critique of 'monotopic rationality' in order to explore the EU's attempts to advance spatial governance 'within the frame of seamless mobility' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 3).

According to Jensen and Richardson what has emerged in recent years is an 'official' vision of European space which aims to reconcile the drive for greater competitiveness with balanced geographical development, and promote a polycentric form of spatial organization in place of the long-standing centre-periphery imbalances which have characterized European patterns of growth. The key to this monotopic interpretation of European space is the idea of mobility, so central to the EU's self-image.

Mobility has become a defining feature of contemporary Europe. The four freedoms at the heart of the European Treaties are based on movement: of people, goods, capital and services ... the European project seeks to break down the barriers to free movement: the great distances between the core cities and the peripheral dispersed communities, the natural barriers which are not crossed by high speed roads and railways, and the national borders across which transport systems do not mesh. (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 5–6)

On this account, the challenge for Europe is infrastructural networks to enable 'frictionless mobility'. The trans-European networks were one policy solution, casting national borders as a problem that could be rectified by enhanced mobility schemes which could link up separate national rail and road networks. The overall aim of the Trans-European Networks projects is to 'reorganise the dynamics between spaces, cities and regions, and to reframe the possibilities for transnational mobility. The core vision embodies the Europe of flows, relying on integrated networks, the reduction of peripherality, and the related polycentric spatial strategy' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 50). The trans-European transport networks represent an attempt to forge a 'homogenous EU territory linked by a single transport network which seamlessly

crosses the borders and natural barriers between member states' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 17).

Jensen and Richardson's book is significant because it places issues surrounding 'integration' in a very different context: the construction of European space. Their work contributes to the project of recasting the core concerns of EU integration studies, broadening them and developing a multidisciplinary approach. Their 'cultural sociology of space' combines elements of planning studies, human geography, sociology, cultural studies, and politics. The book encourages us to rethink questions of power and territorial identity through the lens of mobility. On Jensen and Richardson's account Europe is being imagined by EU policy-makers as a single, integrated space made possible by an unprecedented degree of connectivity. In this way, 'a Europe of global competitive flows has become hegemonic over the alternative idea of a Europe of places. Greater mobility is seen to be the answer to a range of social and economic problems – exclusion, peripherality, uncompetitiveness – and the key to the EU being a player in the global economy' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 223–4).

I have singled out these three recent books and held them up as exemplars of European studies because each of them performs (at least) three valuable services that deserve acknowledgement. Each offers a fresh perspective on a familiar theme in EU studies and each seeks to broaden the frame of reference in order to understand issues in integration within a wider framework of political and social transformation. With their ability to bring together core integration questions with wider perspectives on change in Europe these books are well placed to bring together disparate readerships. For example, Zielonka's book will be read by scholars of integration and by those who are keen to think the EU beyond the state. In this sense, European studies is multidisciplinary not just because authors choose to combine a range of disciplinary concerns or methodologies but also because it creates a new constituency

of readers for whom the focus is Europe rather than the EU.

The approach to studying Europe embodied in *Europe as Empire*, *Governing Europe*, and *Making European Space* is not representative of the literature on contemporary Europe as a whole, particularly the work which goes under the banner of EU studies. At the same time these books are not isolated examples. A growing proportion of work on Europe aims for multi- or trans-disciplinarity, seeks to broaden the focus beyond 'integration', and seeks to offer new perspectives on familiar problems and issues. The books surveyed above represent some of the best work in European studies, and hopefully will serve as an intellectual core around which more work will coalesce. This handbook aims to make this task somewhat easier, and to this end advances the view that the consolidation of European studies is not to be achieved on the basis of projections of what it might be or could be in a ideal world, but on the basis that European studies already has substance and a sense of purpose, and what it does require is a degree of recognition hitherto not evident.

## WHY A HANDBOOK?

This handbook is designed to showcase the best work representative of European studies. It is also designed as a resource that can assist scholars in producing work which focuses on the transformation of Europe rather than its institutional architecture, and which draws upon a range of perspectives and approaches. To this end the handbook takes seriously the question 'How should we study Europe?', a question to which the majority of chapters attempt to offer an answer. European studies is animated by a constant questioning of what Europe we are studying and how best we might go about it.

The handbook also aims to make the case for why it is important to study Europe broadly, rather than reproduce the more narrow focus on the EU. In outline the case

is straightforward; there are many Europes, both institutionally (e.g. EU, Council of Europe, Schengen) and culturally. A concentration on institutional Europes tends to mark Europe off from the rest of the world, a study of cultural Europes draws attention to the connectivity of Europe with the rest of the world, the impossibility of delimiting Europe, and the global context within which Europe operates. Multidisciplinarity also points to the need to conceive Europe broadly; a combination of history, sociology, geography, and cultural studies will militate against a narrow and exclusive reading of Europe as the product of post-war 'integration'.

As has already been made clear the handbook is also centrally concerned with the need to bridge EU studies and European studies in such a way as to reduce the separation between the two that currently exists. One strategy for engendering this cross-over approach is to include in the handbook chapters by scholars recognized as leading authorities in EU studies side-by-side with chapters by authors whose concerns would not normally place them on the EU studies map. EU scholars may be drawn initially to the chapters by Ben Rosamond and Ian Manners on themes for which these authors are renowned, but will also be happy to make the short journey to Philomena Murray's critique of the concept of integration and Martin Lawn's account of the constitutive role of education in creating a European 'intellectual homeland'. The handbook also advances a distinctive European studies identity through the choice of 'themes and issues' covered in Section 3. These highlight the societal and spatial dimensions to thinking about contemporary Europe, in a way that embodies the multidisciplinarity of European studies. Thus the 18 chapters comprising this section deal with key European issues such as global governance, freedom and security, nationalism and transnationalism, migration, social movements, citizenship and democracy, the public sphere, religion, welfare, education, the information society, urban politics, borders, and regions, and additionally address such 'core' EU studies

concerns as global competitiveness, agricultural policy, and integration.

The bridge between EU studies and European studies is also evident in Section 2 which deals with issues of polity-building, institutionalization, and Europeanization. While the chapters focus on themes central to the EU studies agenda – markets, law and justice, the democratic deficit, enlargement – the treatment of these themes is anything but standard. Each of these chapters works to situate issues of EU governance within a broader European (and global) context, and each chapter in its ways addresses the question, 'How did institutional Europe come to be the way it is?' The chapters in this section also address the changing nature of Europe, viewing current institutional arrangements as 'always in motion' and the EU as an evolving polity, conditioned by wider European transformations at the same time as working to shape them.

The handbook does aim to be original in its approach to European studies, its coverage of core issues, and its choice of contributions. One feature worth drawing attention to is the way several key issues are studied from different perspectives. For example, the question of the place of religion in contemporary Europe is approached both from the possibility that we are living in a postsecular Europe (Chapter 23 by Effie Fokas) and from the challenge to (provincial) European liberalism posed by global Islam (Chapter 34 by Faisal Devji). Similarly, the democratic deficit characteristic of 'institutional Europe' (Chapter 10 by Dimitris Chrysochoou) frames the issue of democracy and Europe in very different terms from those staked out in John Erik Fossum's contribution (Chapter 20) on citizenship, democracy, and the public sphere which looks beyond institutionalized dimensions of democracy. What these examples point to is that for European studies there cannot be one single way of approaching any topic; it is necessary to admit different perspectives on a common theme.

The handbook also points up some interesting and novel directions in European

studies research. These include Craig Parson's contribution on the role of ideas in shaping the project of European union, the chapter by José Magone on Europe's role in global governance, the idea of 'normative power Europe' advanced by Ian Manners, the cosmopolitan reality of Europe as formulated by Ulrich Beck, and the post-emotional interpretation of Europe advanced by Stjepan Mestrovic. The handbook aims to show that novel interpretations of Europe have a natural home in European studies, already demonstrated by the reception given to Zielonka's idea of Europe as a neo-medieval empire.

## FINAL THOUGHTS

Craig Calhoun offers a useful characterization of European studies when he writes that it 'has never been simply the study of a region, but always complexly interwoven with ideas about modernity, the West, Christendom, democracy, and civilization itself' (Calhoun, 2003: 6). I think he is right in saying this and we could perhaps add to his list; European Studies is also interwoven with ideas about multiple modernities, post-Westernization, postsecularism, Empire, and cosmopolitanism. The list could of course be extended still further. But in characterizing European studies in this way are we not in danger of associating it with those things that scholars of integration studies most dislike, and are consequently reluctant to embrace European studies because of? Put another way, building bridges between EU integration studies and European studies may be made more difficult by portraying the latter as being preoccupied with 'modernity and civilization'. There are two possible answers. One is to emphasize the perceived gulf between a focus on institution-building and integration processes and the conceptual innovations associated with post-emotional Europe and multiple modernities and how this might be responsible for promoting a 'never the twain' mentality. Thinking of this kind inspired Guiraudon and Favell's

comments that an empirical sociology of the EU was losing ground to the abstractions of social theory. The other possible answer is to point to Zielonka's embrace of 'empire', the Prodi Commission's desire to talk about 'network Europe', or the widespread interest in the idea of Europeanization as strong indications that the gulf between integration studies and European studies is smaller than we might have been led to believe.

## NOTES

1 With Beck and Grande's chapter 'Cosmopolitan Empire' as a side order (Beck and Grande, 2007).

2 The answer to the titular question is 'no'. He needed help from Frank Zappa.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. (1996) 'The shifting stage of politics: new medieval and postmodern territorialities?', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14 (2): 133–153.
- Barry, A. (2001) *Political Machines: Governing a Technological Society*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Beck, U. and Grande, E. (2007) *Cosmopolitan Europe*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berezin, M. and Schain, M. (eds) (2003) *Europe Without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship and Identity in a Transnational Age*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calhoun, C. (2003) 'European Studies: always already there and still in formation', *Comparative European Politics*, 1 (1): 5–20.
- Castells, M. (2000) *End of Millennium: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. 3* (2nd edn). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Delanty, G. (2006) 'Introduction: the idea of a post-Western Europe', in G. Delanty (ed.) *Europe and Asia Beyond East and West*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–/.

- Delanty, G. and Rumford, C. (2005) *Rethinking Europe: Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*. London: Routledge.
- Dinan, D. (2004) *Europe Recast: A History of European Union*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Gillingham, J. (2003) *European Integration 1950–2003: Superstate or New Market Economy?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guiraudon, V. and Favell, A. (2007) *The Sociology of European Integration*. Paper presented at the EUSA Conference, Montreal.
- Hartley, E. (2006) *Did David Hasselhoff End the Cold War? 50 Facts You Need To Know: Europe*. Cambridge: Icon Books.
- Huysmans, J. (2006) *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge.
- Jensen, O. and Richardson, T. (2004) *Making European Space: Mobility, Power, and Territorial Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Meyer, J.W. (2001) 'The European Union and the globalization of culture,' in S.V. Andersen (ed.) *Institutional Approaches to the European Union*. ARENA Report No 3/2001. Oslo: ARENA.
- Milward, A. (1993) *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Outhwaite, W. and Ray, L. (2005) *Social Theory and Postcommunism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Rosamond, B. (1999) 'Discourses of globalization and the social construction of European identities', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6 (4): 652–668.
- Rumford, C. (2007) *Cosmopolitanism and Europe*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Rumford, C. and Murray, P. (2003) 'Do we need a core curriculum in European Union Studies?', *European Political Science*, 3 (1): 85–92.
- Soysal, Y. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Walters, W. and Haahr, J. (2005) *Governing Europe: Discourse, Governmentality and European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Wincott, D. (2000) 'Globalization and European integration', in C. Hay and D. Marsh (eds) *Demystifying Globalization*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Zielonka, J. (2007) *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.