INTRODUCTION:
APPROACHES TO EUROPEANIZATION

Robert Harmsen and Thomas M. Wilson

In multiple guises and across a range of disciplinary contexts, Europeanization has become a ‘hot’ topic. An increasing number of books, articles, and conferences are being devoted to the theme of Europeanization. Major research programmes have been established to examine the phenomenon. The 1999-2000 European Forum of the Florence-based European University Institute has, for example, taken Europeanization as its principal theme.\(^1\) Outside of the European Union (EU), the Oslo-based ARENA project has been established to examine the ‘Europeanization of the Nation-State’.\(^2\) Numerous other examples might be given. Suffice it to say that Europeanization has become a growth industry. Yet, though there appears to be a lot of it around, no clear and widely accepted sense of the term has emerged across the range of social science disciplines in which its use has become popular. Indeed, as outlined below, at least eight distinct, if partially overlapping senses of the term may be seen in the literature.

‘Europeanization’ in Scholarly Practice

The eight usages of the term Europeanization which we have identified are surveyed below. While such a listing cannot claim to be exhaustive, it

---


\(^2\) Details available at [http://www.sv.uio.no/arena](http://www.sv.uio.no/arena). See also Olsen 1996.
provides an overview of the variety of social science analyses in which the process has been discussed and, to a lesser extent, problematized (a point to which we return below).

1) Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization as the emergence of new forms of European governance. Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization in this sense is very much focused on the European Union. It should not, however, be understood simply as a synonym for European integration. Rather, the emphasis is placed on the ways in which European integration has led to redefinitions of the conceptions, relations and structures of power at both the national and the supranational levels. The previously mentioned EUI project is predicated on a definition of this type. For the purposes of the project, Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization is understood as:

[t]he emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal and social institutions that formalise and routinise interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specialising in the creation of authoritative European rules. (Bartolini, Risse and Strøm 1999: 2)

This usage of the term emphasizes the socialization potential of institutions – highlighting the extent to which participation in permanent institutional structures leads to longer-term redefinitions of actor interests and self-perceptions. Research based on this perspective might query, for example, whether repeated participation in Council of Ministers' bargaining sessions leads national officials to become ‘Europeanized'. More generally, Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization of this type also draws attention to the EU's efforts at ‘polity-building', and the extent to which the EU has been able to move beyond the formulation of joint and common policies to the creation of a genuine ‘public space'. This, in turn, focuses attention on the emergence and development of an EU citizenship.

2) Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization as national adaptation. Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization here refers to the adaptation of national institutional structures and policy-making processes in response to the development of European integration. Ladrech (1994: 70) has provided a widely cited definition of Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization in this vein as ‘an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making'. The most obvious research questions arising from this variant of Europeans\(\text{a}\)nization are those concerned with the con-
vergence of national institutional structures and policy-making processes. Such studies principally address the question of whether the domestic institutions of EU member states are becoming more alike one another, either through processes of transnational borrowing or through the emulation of an emerging European model (see, for example, Börzel 1999; Harmsen 1999).

3) Europeanization as policy isomorphism. This variant of Europeanization is concerned with the degree of convergence in substantive policy areas. Radaelli (1997) has suggested that the Europeanization of policy has two dimensions. On the one hand, there has been a ‘direct’ Europeanization of various areas of public policy to the extent that regulatory competence has passed from the member states to the European Union. On the other hand, there has also been an ‘indirect’ Europeanization of policy. This refers to areas where member states have, to varying degrees, begun to emulate one another as regards particular policy choices or regulatory frameworks. In this vein, some authors have spoken of a possible dynamic of ‘policy isomorphism' (Radaelli 2000; Lodge 2000), drawing on the seminal sociological work of Dimaggio and Powell (1984). The central idea of the original Dimaggio and Powell model is that, over time, particular organizational forms or policy choices come to be perceived as ‘legitimate' by the actors concerned, to the exclusion of other choices. In the present context, it is correspondingly argued that the type of intensive transnational co-operation fostered by European integration may lead to the emergence of such shared senses of legitimate (and illegitimate) choices – though the empirical evidence to date is, at best, inconclusive.

4) Europeanization as problem and opportunity for domestic political management. Europeanization may be understood primarily in terms of the problems which it poses and the opportunities which it creates for domestic political management, insofar as it confronts governments with policy choices that fall outside of established domestic parameters (see Drake and Milner 1999; Cole and Drake 2000). Governments must find the means to reconcile potentially contradictory European and domestic pressures, as regards both substantive policy choices and broader discourses of legitimation. Europeanization may, in some instances, simply appear as an external constraint. Although the logic of the EU decision-making system remains protective of self-defined vital national interests,
particular member states in particular circumstances may be faced with having to implement policy choices that enjoy little domestic support. The European policy-making arena may, however, also change opportunity structures in ways which may be positively utilized by national governments. Governments may find that their crucial strategic position at the juncture between the European and the national arenas allows them to engage in more or less sophisticated versions of ‘two-level games’ (Putnam 1988). Following Putnam’s classic analysis, European bargaining, as most forms of international bargaining, is effectively conducted under a double constraint. National governments must find a policy stance which falls within the range of politically acceptable outcomes in each of the domestic and the international arenas. Yet, this double constraint may also be used as a strategic advantage. Effectively, the European constraint may be used to shift the parameters of domestic political debate in ways amenable to the government’s own agenda, while at the same time domestic opposition may serve as a useful bargaining chip in European negotiations. In this way, Europeanization as a constraint also comes to be understood – and used – as a resource.

5) Europeanization as modernization. Europeanization here is applied in the context of the more geographically peripheral and less economically developed member states of the European Union. It is taken to imply a series of structural transformations intended to bring these countries back into the European mainstream, defined with reference to the economic and political models which prevail in the more prosperous and influential ‘core’ countries. O’Leary (1987) wrote, in this vein, of a Europeanization of Irish politics – pointing to the urbanization and secularization of Irish society in ways which, over the longer term, might create the possibility for a re-alignment of Irish political parties along a more conventional West European (left/right) pattern. Featherstone (1998) has similarly spoken of a Europeanization of the Greek state, interestingly suggesting a definition of the term which draws on a Gramscian notion of hegemony. Essentially, as seen from the periphery, this type of Europeanization becomes a process of assimilation with the European Union core, in which the extent of political choice and discourse is progressively limited.

6) Europeanization as ‘joining Europe’. This definition concerns Europeanization understood in the context of EU enlargement. Most
readily, it applies to the adoption by the Central and East European candidate states of a West European state model. This evidently involves the firm anchoring of democratic institutions and market economies. It also concerns the development of administrative institutions able to bear the weight of participation in the highly complex and demanding European policy-making environment (see Ágh 1999). Ágh (1998: 42-45) has, however, also suggested a somewhat different definition of Europeanization in this context. He puts forward Europeanization as describing a successfully completed process of transition in which some or all of the candidate countries become fully integrated into the entire range of political, economic, and security structures of West European integration and Trans-Atlantic co-operation. This positive scenario of Europeanization is contrasted with three other possible scenarios: ‘Germanization’ (economic integration as a hinterland, but without political and security integration); ‘Turkization’ (security integration, but without political and economic integration); and ‘Yugoslavization’ (a generalized breakdown of order in the region).

7) Europeanization as the reconstruction of identities. This is the broadest usage of the term, which ironically is seldom found beyond the field of anthropology. It refers to the reshaping of identities in contemporary Europe in a manner which relativizes (without necessarily supplanting) national identities. Borneman and Fowler (1997: 487) have put forward an influential definition of Europeanization in this sense, seeing it ‘as a strategy of self-representation and a device of power’, which is ‘fundamentally reorganizing territoriality and peoplehood, the two principles of group identification that have shaped the modern European order’. Europeanization from this perspective must focus on issues of culture and identity, both in terms of culture as a European Union project (Shore 1998), and in terms of the ways in which EU policy has an impact on, and interacts with, local forms of political and cultural identification throughout the member states (Wilson 2000). The studies of this type of Europeanization which have had perhaps the widest impact across disciplinary boundaries have been those dealing with the redefinition and negotiation of identities within EU institutions such as the European Commission and the European Parliament (for a summary of these studies, see Bellier and Wilson 2000).
8) **Europeanization as transnationalism and cultural integration.** In this usage of the term, Europeanization refers to 'spheres of interaction' in everyday life, 'where peoples of Europe engage in face-to-face encounters with each other' (Borneman and Fowler 1997: 497; see also MacDonald 1996). These interactions, which are perceived to be evidence of increased transnational and intercultural relations, are judged to be on the rise in Europe due to the forces of globalization and EU integration. Thus this form of Europeanization is about boundary maintenance and boundary crossing, in both the metaphorical sense of the borderlands of cultural and political identity as well as the more concrete sense of legal, political and administrative borders between and within states. Borneman and Fowler (1997: 498-510) suggest that more critical attention should be paid to 'practices of Europeanization', particularly in the areas of language, money, tourism, sex, and sport.

While these definitions and usages of the term Europeanization may at times seem to be at odds with each other, and in some cases actually seem to be about completely different political and social transformations, they all have one thing in common: they are at least in part attempts to understand the European Union and its role in major change throughout the European continent.

**Europeanization and European Integration**

The preceding discussion thus points to a wide range of usages at work in the social science literature, touching on most aspects of political and societal change in contemporary Europe. As such, the notion of Europeanization lacks a paradigmatic consistency. This is particularly true when the concept is compared with the major schools of European integration theory which have emerged in the political science and international relations literature. These schools of thought, such as neo-functionalism or intergovernmentalism, either were consciously constructed or rapidly assumed the character of paradigms in the Kuhnian sense. They put forward a series of interrelated premises concerning both the dynamic and the end state of the European integration process. Neo-functionalism, for example, posits that integration moves forward by a logic of 'spill-over', whereby transnational co-operation in particular domains gradually leads to both the need and the demand for co-operation in other areas. Intergovernmentalists, on the other hand, argue that
integration is driven forward by the pursuit of national interests and will, in consequence, proceed only insofar as it is in the interests of the participating states to do so. In both cases, one may identify falsifiable hypotheses about the nature of European integration which structure a particular research agenda. Europeanization lacks this quality. One cannot point to core tenets, common to all or most usages of the term, which might serve as the basis for constructing a common, paradigmatically defined research agenda.

Europeanization also lacks an obvious policy attachment. Throughout the history of European integration, there has often been a fairly close relationship between theory and practice. Concepts move easily back and forward between the realms of academic study and the policy-making community. Terms such as spill-over and intergovernmentalism, or more recently subsidiarity and flexibility, form part of a specialist lexicon shared by both the practitioners and the students of European integration. At least thus far, this has not been the case with Europeanization. Although it has blossomed in the academic literature, there would appear to be little – if any – use of the term on the part of policy-makers.

What, then, to make of it? It can be suggested that the growing usage of the term Europeanization in recent years stems from a sense that at least some of the debates surrounding the process of European integration have gone rather stale. Discussions of European integration can succumb to a one dimensional concern with the simple question of whether there has been more or less of it – reflecting an essentially teleological view of the process. Europeanization provides a means of moving beyond this. It evokes a much wider canvas, concerned with the myriad processes of change – both as concerns the EU and beyond it – taking place in contemporary Europe. In particular, the idea of Europeanization, relative to that of European integration, appears to add two significant dimensions. First, Europeanization evokes parallel and interconnected processes of change at both the national and the supranational levels. The idea of European integration, as suggested by its etymology, is primarily concerned with the construction of a European ‘centre’, or perhaps a European ‘whole’. Europeanization, by way of contrast, recognizes that significant changes are taking place at the national and sub-national levels as well – in ways which both complement and contradict what is happening at the supranational level. Europeanization thus recognizes
that integration has created and will continue to foster diversification at various levels of European polities and societies.

Second, the concept of Europeanization also tends to be associated with a much stronger focus on the interrelationship of institutions and identities. European integration has, over the years, tended to assume a rather technocratic character. Integration is frequently understood almost exclusively in terms of what is done in or by ‘Brussels’. Europeanization is suggestive of a wider concern with the manner in which institutional change may reshape identities and, reciprocally, of the ways in which changing identities may create pressures for new institutional forms. This is not to say that a notion of Europeanization can, simply, replace that of European integration. There obviously are processes of economic, legal and political integration presently occurring in Europe which are largely, if not exclusively centred on the European Union. What Europeanization points to, however, is the need for those processes to be understood relative to broader cultural and societal contexts. In disciplinary terms, Europeanization reminds us of the need for sustaining the study of the EU as an integral part of a broader, interdisciplinary European Studies, which is as interested in the issues of culture and identity as it is in economic integration and political union. A European Studies of this type is only spatially and temporally constrained by one’s definition of ‘Europe’ itself.

It is against the background of these concerns and understandings that the present volume was conceived. We have taken this opportunity to invite a range of contributors from different disciplines and countries to reflect with us on the meaning of Europeanization. While we suggested possible definitions of Europeanization to the contributors, no attempt was made to impose a common analytical framework. Indeed, it is our view that Europeanization is not a rigorously specified analytical concept – nor is it desirable that it should become so. Rather, the utility of the term lies in its ability to provide a focal point for genuinely interdisciplinary dialogues concerned with the multidimensional processes of change occurring in contemporary Europe. The range of contributions in the present volume bears ample witness to the multiple and interconnected avenues for research opened by the theme of Europeanization.
Approaches to Europeanization in this Volume

The volume opens with two chapters that examine the reshaping of European governance. Magnus Jerneck looks at Europeanization in terms of the changing notions of both territoriality and time which have accompanied the development of European governance structures. He sees the emergence of a new political space structured by the existence of multiple and cross-cutting networks, in place of more traditional and hierarchically based state structures. Robert Harmsen analyses the manner in which Europeanization understood as national adaptation shapes Europeanization understood as the creation of supranational governance structures. He argues that differential national adaptive patterns must be seen as a constitutive property of the European political order, necessitating the conception and the construction of that order on the basis of an explicitly articulated accommodation of national diversity. Both the Jerneck and the Harmsen pieces, it should be underlined, are concerned with the parallelism or simultaneity of governance processes at the national and the European levels – in ways which exploit the breadth of the notion of Europeanization relative to narrower conceptions of integration.

The following two chapters present detailed case studies of Europeanization as national adaptation, seen from differing disciplinary perspectives. Gordon Anthony looks at the extent to which United Kingdom public law has been Europeanized by its participation in the broader European legal system. He describes a process of ‘cross-fertilization’ in which European law has unquestionably forced British courts to confront issues that might otherwise have lain dormant. Nevertheless, the terms in which they have handled those issues remain largely structured by endogenous jurisprudential models and dynamics of change. Till Geiger, in a rather different vein, looks at the Europeanization of Irish foreign policy from the period of the interwar Briand Plan until the eve of Ireland’s first, unsuccessful bid for membership in the European Economic Community. Geiger argues that Europeanization, in the case of Ireland, was initially a process whereby national political elites began to reconceive of national interests relative to a broader European framework. Europeanization, in other words, emerged as a modernization process spearheaded by national political and bureaucratic elites which, only much later, percolated more generally into Irish society. Both the An-
Anthony and the Geiger pieces, though dealing with very different substantive areas, highlight the extent to which Europeanization as a process must be studied with reference to various forms of national mediation.

Irène Bellier’s chapter shifts the focus of analysis to a concern with the internal functioning of the European institutions, in this case the European Commission. She investigates the extent to which Commission officials have been Europeanized, in the sense of having forged a common culture. A certain process of cultural hybridization – reflected in the use of terms such as ‘Frenglish’ – has emerged. Nevertheless, the Commission has not, more generally, proved to be a cultural melting pot. Rather, it functions by way of ongoing processes of cultural compromise which point to the persisting salience of nationally defined identities. Somewhat ironically, those who are often seen as the builders of a distinctive European political order have, on Bellier’s findings, not been able to create such a unified public space within their own institution.

The next three chapters turn from the construction of identities within European institutions to a concern with the construction of identities by European institutions. Elizabeth Meehan, Edward Moxon-Browne and Yves Déloye look at the development of European Union citizenship from a variety of perspectives. Strikingly, all three authors conclude by stressing the limited nature of both past and likely future developments. Meehan evokes the possibility that a supranational citizenship might emerge which is more democratic than existing national citizenships. Nevertheless, she then goes on to discuss a number of inhibitions – including the state of European civil society and the resistance of national governments – which make it unlikely that this prospect will be realized. Moxon-Browne, in similar terms, expresses sympathy for the idea that a ‘multilevel constitutionalism’ is emerging within the European Union which may enhance citizen rights. He does not, however, see those enhancements as amounting to the creation of a distinctive European citizenship – which, for him, would imply the emergence of a European polity capable of making its own determinations as to who would benefit from such a status. Finally, Déloye argues that European citizenship must be understood with reference to the same socio-historical processes by which national citizenships came into being. Emphasis is consequently placed on conflicts of norms and identities, highlighting the social reconfigurations which European citizenship seeks to impose and the
oppositions which this is likely to engender. Overall, the three contributions thus point to a situation in which Europeanization has clearly prompted a rethinking of identities in ways which give questions of citizenship a particular salience; there does not, however, appear to have been a Europeanization of citizenship in the sense of a strong, substantive development of European Union citizenship.

The chapters by Gerard Delanty and Heidi Grainger and Rachel Cutler move discussion to the plane of Europeanization understood as the broad reconstruction of identities. Delanty argues that many analyses of the emergence of a European culture mistakenly see this as implying the development of a core set of common values. In its stead, he puts forward the thesis that an emergent European culture, linked to new forms of post-national identity, should be conceived in terms of the creation of new sites for conflict – in which the politics of identity may be played out. Grainger and Cutler, in a similar vein, see the European city as providing a site within which new notions of citizenship might be developed. Laying emphasis on the ‘glocal’, they argue that the redefinition of territorial relationships in Europe is creating a new space within which cities may emerge as venues for new, more participatory political and social forms. Both contributions underscore the potential magnitude of the processes of ‘re-identification’ currently taking place in Europe. Both chapters also strike a positive note as regards the possibility of major shifts taking place in culture and identity in Europe. Perhaps tellingly, this stands in marked contrast to the more reserved conclusions of the majority of the other chapters in this volume, which focus more directly on the European Union.

Finally, Ben Rosamond concludes the volume with this issue’s review article, which explores the multiple and complex interrelationships between globalization and Europeanization. Whereas much of the present volume is concerned with the relationship between the European and the national, Rosamond’s chapter reminds us that Europeanization must also be placed in wider global contexts. Europeanization may, within this framework, be seen as an ‘institutionally thick’ form of regionalization within the global economy. This perspective opens up a rich research agenda – in addition to a potential ninth definition of Europeanization. One is led to examine the multiform dynamics by which Europe both shapes broader processes of globalization and is itself shaped by them.
Among many promising areas of enquiry, the discursive use made of globalization by both national governments and the European Commission bears mention. Certainly, in the case of the Commission, a globalization discourse has been used as a significant means of legitimating a Europeanization discourse; global pressures are presented as necessitating the further development of European structures of governance.

Conclusion

The definitions of Europeanization which we have reviewed, and which the authors in this volume employ, contribute to wider scholarly concerns with the historicization and spatialization of both the European Union and ‘Europe’ more broadly defined. While almost all usages of the term imply at least some EU dimension, Europeanization as a process is more explicitly about the transformation of local, regional, national and international structures and relations. Europeanization is about the practices involved in ‘being and becoming more European’, whether it be among farmers, factory workers, homemakers, civil servants or politicians, or more particularly within and between organs of power and decision-making. Europeanization, in part, has been a process of creating the conditions of alterity, in which Europe was the ‘other’ to such entities as Islam, European empires, and most recently the USA and Japan. Yet, it is also about defining the ‘other’ at home, within Europe as a continent and as an idea. To many Eurosceptics and Europhiles alike, the EU is one important alternative to their national projects so long influenced by their nation-states. The EU is their ‘other’, to be embraced or resisted, to be sampled or to be moulded to fit the needs of their nations and states.

In this regard, one cannot help but be struck by the unfortunate consonance of the word ‘Europeanization’ itself. It evokes too many other ‘-ization’ words – not the least both harmonization and standardization. The image too readily springs to mind of the dreary, conformist universe evoked by opponents of the European integration project – a world of uniformly curved cucumbers and linguistic Volapük. Yet, as suggested earlier, if Europeanization is to mean anything relative to more standard definitions of European integration, it is as an approach to the study of developments in contemporary Europe which more fully embraces the continent’s rich and persisting diversity. If the use of the term Europeanization raises awareness of the complex environment which both sustains
Introduction

and limits the narrower project of European integration, then the intro-
duction of yet another neologism into an admittedly already overcrowded
lexicon can perhaps be forgiven.
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