

Informations – Informations – Informationen

*Towards a European Society? Convergence and Divergence in 20th Century Europe
Synthesis of the Summer School organized by RICHIE, the German Historical Institute Paris and the University Sorbonne-Paris IV*

The Summer School “Towards a European Society? Convergence and Divergence in 20th Century Europe (Politics, Economy, Society and Culture)” was organised by the German Historical Institute Paris, RICHIE and the University Sorbonne-Paris IV, and took place from 4th to 10th July 2010 in Moulin d’Andé, France.¹ Open to PhD and advanced Master students in history or related social sciences, the Summer School discussed structural change, convergence and divergence in 20th century Europe. The participants, who were requested to explore the possible benefits of applying social science concepts and European integration theories to historical research, perceived Europeanization as a gradual political, economic, cultural and social process of convergence, leading towards an increasingly similar development of European societies. It was stated that Europeanization can be interpreted as a result of individual conceptions of “Europe” or as a result of external incentives and pressures on the different European countries and societies to cooperate. However, the participants made clear that gradual processes of convergence within Europe, internal conceptions of Europe and external pressures on Europe should not be seen as separate but rather as mutually dependent phenomena. Most of the papers therefore dealt with a relatively broad definition of Europeanization, explicitly going beyond the institutional integration and including top-down as well as bottom-up processes. In contrast to more restrictive definitions of Europeanization provided by political scientists, who focus mainly on the emergence of European institutions and their growing influence on domestic politics, European integration was less referred to as a cause than as a result of Europeanization – which, admittedly, could henceforth be the starting point for a huge variety of successive evolutions.

It was precisely this broad definition of Europeanization which led many participants to put into perspective and to question the importance of 1945 as a historical turning point and as a prelude to European cooperation. They argued that Europeanization had never been a uniform nor linear process starting with post-war European cooperation, but a long-term evolution with various points of departure, breaks, standstills and different dynamics instead. In this respect, the modernisation and globalisation processes of the 19th century, as for instance in the field of communication and transport, certainly paved the way for the subsequent convergence and rapprochement of European societies. The cooperation of medical institutions from various European countries in order to fight epidemics can serve as one example among many for these early forms of Europeanization. However, the first concepts

-
1. Organisers were Matthieu Osmont (RICHIE), Émilie Robin-Hivert (RICHIE), Katja Seidel (GHI Paris), Mark Spoerer (GHI Paris) and Christian Wenkel (GHI Paris/RICHIE). Scientific advisers were Éric Bussière (Université Paris IV) and Reiner Marcowitz (Université de Metz).

for a political integration of Europe that were based on economic interdependences and cooperation, for instance by Aristide Briand, were not developed before the interwar period. Even though the Second World War represented a considerable setback for those who advocated a democratic and peaceful cooperation between European countries, the 1930s and early 1940s should not simply be understood as a time of complete standstill with regard to Europeanization. Instead of referring to the relatively well known postwar planning of resistance movements, several participants pointed to the often neglected but considerable impact of national-socialist occupation policies and economic collaboration under totalitarian auspices on postwar conceptions. On the other hand, there seemed to be no doubt that the memory of destruction and genocide had served as a decisive catalyst for European integration after 1945, which was undeniably conceived and perceived as a solution and as the only alternative to what had happened before. While pointing out the structural continuities and underlying forces of Europeanization, the participants hence emphasised the far-reaching consequences of the Second World War with respect to political and intellectual history.

Even though the notion of space was only rarely referred to in an explicit manner, it played a prominent role in many of the papers. Most of the participants understood Europeanization as a process transgressing traditional barriers and limitations. They stressed a general tendency to move away from national categories, accelerated by an increase of transnational phenomena and challenges such as environmental pollution, epidemics or labour migration. It was underlined that these forms of Europeanization had always reached beyond the member states of the institutional integration process. From the participants' point of view, countries such as for example Austria, Sweden or Spain were subject to multilayered forms of Europeanization long before their entry into the European Union. In many cases, convergence and integration amongst European countries and societies were catalysed by encounters with the non-European world, as in the cases of the international campaigns against the sleeping sickness in African colonies or the European reactions to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Other contributions dealt with competing historical ideas and concepts of Europe, their impact on civil society, and the formation of European memory spaces. The question of space was however not only discussed at the macro-level, but also with regard to the micro-level processes such as the entwinement of German, Belgian and Dutch civil societies in the borderland during and after World War I or the growing economic integration between Rotterdam and its German hinterland since the 1960s. The difficult balancing act of post-communist Eastern European societies between Europeanization and re-nationalisation was repeatedly mentioned and still requires systematic analysis.

While in some cases it still seems justified to distinguish between public and private actors of Europeanization, most of the participants avoided such distinctions. Whereas the influence of political actors such as the European institutions themselves, national governments and diplomats remains crucial, certain other groups like retirement and labour migrants or migrating industrialists can clearly be identified as private actors. The participants detected a growing range of actors who rather occupy

the sphere in between the public-private paradigm. With European integration progressing not only at an institutional level, but also in the social, economic and cultural sphere, more and more actors can be described as „in-betweens“. This conclusion seems particularly striking with regard to the mass media, to transnational social movements, civil society organisations or environmental associations, to elite and expert circles, academics or lobbyists. At the same time, the participants advocated a shift in focus away from those actors being either explicitly in favour of or explicitly opposed to European integration. They suggested focusing as well on actors who are not directly involved in shaping the process of Europeanization in spite of being subject to it. They pointed to those who – depending on their respective interests – might occasionally act in favour of, but sometimes also against Europeanization. And they paid special attention to actors who – like conservative elites and right-wing movements co-operating on a European level for the preservation of national interests – are promoting a sort of “Europeanization against intention”.

The majority of the participants opted for a comprehensive interpretation of Europeanization as an important category of historical analysis and as a long-term process running often together with or in parallel to, but sometimes also in the opposite direction of other evolutions shaping the European countries during the 20th century, such as globalisation, modernisation, liberalisation, democratisation or westernisation. Far from describing Europeanization as a linear and teleological development, they focused especially on the discontinuities and the phases of apparent stagnation repeatedly affecting the rapprochement and the integration of European states, economies and societies. It was underlined that periods of conflict, confrontation or open violence such as World War II or – in a less devastating way – the “standstill” of European integration during the 1970s and early 1980s had often prepared and decisively preconditioned subsequent pushes for Europeanization and integration. In line with these findings, the participants identified different types of external and internal pressures accelerating and catalyzing Europeanization – among them in particular the two World Wars and their aftermaths, the Cold War constellation and its break-up in 1989/90, the economic challenges of an increasingly globalised world trade, migration, environmental pollution and cross-border terrorism.

To sum up, the Summer School offered a good occasion to contemplate and discuss the complexity of Europeanization from an interdisciplinary angle. The cooperation between the German Historical Institute in Paris, the International Research Network of Young Historians of European Integration (RICHIE) and the University Paris IV-Sorbonne provided a constructive working atmosphere, and a stimulating and comprehensive overview of current research on the path “Towards a European Society”.² More studies focusing on Europeanization in Eastern, Central and South-east Europe would complete this multifaceted approach. Particularly inspiring were

2. Papers of the summer school will be published in 2011 by Peter Lang in a volume entitled *Pour une lecture historique de l'europanisation au XXe siècle / Europeanisation in the 20th century: the historical lens*.

approaches envisaging Europeanization as a process comprising not only elites and political institutions, but European societies and cultural practices.

Johannes Grossmann, Universität des Saarlandes
Jacqueline Niesser, Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder
Tobias Schneider, HU Berlin

Participants and their contributions to the Summer School: **Raimund Bauer** (Universität Mannheim), Europe United by Force. Did the National-Socialist economic “New Order” shape Europe during World War II? – **Luc-André Brunet** (London School of Economics), Franco-German Relations 1940-1951: The Foundations of European Integration – **Rémi Devémy** (Université d’Artois), Vers la conclusion de conventions salariales européennes? – **Sarah Ehlers** (HU Berlin), Europeanization from the Periphery? Europeanness in the International Sleeping Sickness Campaigns 1900-1945 – **Florian Greiner** (Universität Gießen), A Lost Vision? Discourses on Europe in German, British and U.S. American Print Media 1914-1945 – **Johannes Großmann** (Universität des Saarlandes), Élités conservatrices, socialisation transnationale et politique extérieure privée en Europe de l’Ouest dès la Seconde Guerre mondiale – **Melanie Hühn** (Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder), Deutsche Ruhestandswanderer als Pioniere der europäischen Gesellschaft? – **Anja Keutel** (Universität Leipzig), Die Europäische Union im Spannungsfeld von Integration und Abstufung – **Bernhard Liemann** (Universität Münster), Civil Society in Public Sphere during the First World War and beyond. German, Belgian and Dutch towns in the borderland compared – **Florian Lindemann** (Universität Münster), Herausforderungen, Ansätze und Probleme der Koordinierung der Nahostpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Frankreichs im Rahmen der Entwicklung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft 1967-1977 – **Fabian Link** (Universität Basel), Burgenforschung im deutsch-französischen Vergleich. Vom „Kampf um den Rhein“ zu einer europäischen Verständigung – **Yohann Morival** (Ecole normale supérieure, Paris), Les intégrations européennes du Conseil national du patronat français. Retour sur la notion d’européanisation d’une organisation 1948-1992 – **Jacqueline Nießer** (Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder), Between Globalization and Europeanization: Dealing with the Past in post-Yugoslavia – **Klára Paardenkooper** (Universiteit Rotterdam), The Box and Rotterdam’s New Hinterland. The Rise of Container Transport and Globalization 1966-2000 – **Stephan Pumberger** (Universität Wien), Le Pool blanc. Le projet de parvenir à une Communauté européenne de la Santé – **Thomas Raineau** (Université Paris IV), Whitehall et l’Europe. Les hauts fonctionnaires et diplomates britanniques face à la construction européenne 1949-1973 – **Laurent Schmit** (Universität Freiburg), «Le Waldsterben»: convergences et divergences franco-allemandes face à un problème écologique – **Tobias Schneider** (HU Berlin), “Their Holocaust is not our Holocaust” – History and identity in Europe – **Katrin Schreiter** (University of Pennsylvania), European Aesthetic Convergence and the Common Market: A Case Study of East and West Germany – **Olga Sparschuh** (FU Berlin), Limits of Borders. The Decrease in Importance of National Origins for Labour Migration within the European Economic

Community 1950s-1970s – **Tobias Temming** (Universität Münster), Widerstand – Geschichte – Film. Mediale Repräsentation des Widerstands im niederländischen und deutschen Spielfilm 1945-2000 – **Tatsiana Vaitulevich** (Universität Göttingen), Coming to Terms with the Past. Forced Labourers, Collective and Individual Memories in Dutch Postwar Societies

Second edition of the
ÉMILE AND ALINE MAYRISCH PRIZE

In close cooperation with ArcelorMittal, and under the patronage of the Minister for Cultural Affairs of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, the non profit-making organization “Le Cercle des Amis de Colpach” governed by Luxembourg law, organizes every 4 years a contest for the award of the Émile and Aline Mayrisch Prize. The objective of this prize, which honours the memory of the former Arbed director general and of his spouse is to foster the “spirit of Colpach”, characterized by the openness to cultural currents and the promotion of the understanding between European peoples. It is endowed with the sum of 14.000 € and has been attributed for the first time in 2007 as an event of “Luxembourg and Greater Region, European Capital of Culture”.

The Émile and Aline Mayrisch Prize is open to researchers, students, journalists and other authors, residents of Germany, Belgium, France or Luxembourg and aged 24 and above. The works submitted to the contest will deal with research in the fields of history, politics, economy, social life and/or culture in the Franco-Belgo-German-Luxembourg area. They may also consist of contributions from the written press, radio and television, standing out for their pedagogical interest as regards the treatment of the above-mentioned themes.

The works will be submitted in German, French or English.

For this prize, non-published works as well as works published by the deadline that has been fixed for handing in the works to the jury will be given consideration. The deadline is February 15th 2011.

For further information, in particular about the contest rules, please visit the Web page www.colpach.lu or contact either Cornel.Meder@ci.culture.lu or Charles.Barthel@cere.etat.lu

LE CERCLE DES AMIS DE COLPACH
c/o Croix Rouge luxembourgeoise
BP 404
L-2014 LUXEMBOURG

Die wissenschaftliche Analyse des Lissabon-Urteils



Das Lissabon-Urteil des Bundesverfassungsgerichts von Juni 2009 hat die grundsätzliche Vereinbarkeit des Vertrags von Lissabon mit dem Grundgesetz bestätigt. Obwohl damit ein wichtiger Schritt hinsichtlich der Konsolidierung des europäischen Vertragswerkes getan wurde, hat das Urteil eine Reihe höchst sensibler Fragen aufgeworfen: Wie ist es um die demokratische Legitimation der EU bestellt? Welchen Platz haben die Mitgliedstaaten im Prozess der europäischen Integration und wie sind allgemeinen Änderungen, die der Lissaboner Vertrag mit sich bringt, zu beurteilen?

Das Beiheft will diesen Fragen nachgehen und so eine Gesamteinschätzung des Urteils aus der Perspektive der Europarechtswissenschaft vorlegen.

Grundgesetz und europäische Integration

Die Europäische Union nach
dem Lissabon-Urteil des
Bundesverfassungsgerichts

Europarecht Beiheft 1/2010

Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Armin Hatje
und Dr. Jörg Philipp Terhechte

2010, 333 S., brosch., 54,- €

ISBN 978-3-8329-5334-8

Bitte bestellen Sie im Buchhandel oder
versandkostenfrei unter ► www.nomos-shop.de



Nomos

Abstracts – Résumés – Zusammenfassungen

Carine GERMOND

The Agricultural Bone of Contention: The Franco-German Tandem and the Making of the CAP, 1963-1966

The making of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in the first half of the 1960s was characterized by a series of Franco-German conflicts that regularly resulted in Community crises. Based on research conducted in France and in Germany, this article explores to what extent the two countries' disagreements on the developments of the European Economic Community were responsible for the repeated crises that broke out on agricultural matters. Focusing on three key agricultural negotiations, it sheds light on the shifting power relations within the Franco-German tandem and on how both countries were able to shape Community bargains in the agricultural area.

La pomme de discorde agricole: le couple France-Allemagne et la mise en œuvre de la politique agricole commune, 1963-1966

La mise en œuvre de la politique agricole commune (PAC) durant la première moitié des années 1960 a été jalonnée de nombreux conflits franco-allemands débouchant régulièrement sur des crises communautaires. Fondé sur des recherches dans les archives françaises et allemandes, cet article explore dans quelle mesure les désaccords entre les deux pays sur l'évolution de la Communauté économique européenne ont été à l'origine des crises répétées éclatant sur les sujets agricoles. En analysant trois principales négociations agricoles, cette contribution montre l'évolution des rapports de pouvoir au sein du couple franco-allemand et la façon dont les deux pays ont été en mesure d'influencer les négociations communautaires dans le domaine agricole.

Zankapfel Agrarpolitik: Das deutsch-französische Tandem und die Entstehung der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik, 1963-1966

Die Entstehung der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik (GAP) in der ersten Hälfte der 1960er Jahre wurde durch eine Reihe deutsch-französische Konflikte gekennzeichnet, die oft zu Gemeinschaftskrisen führten. Gestützt auf Archivmaterial aus Frankreich und Deutschland, erforscht dieser Artikel die Frage in welchem Umfang die Meinungsverschiedenheiten beider Länder über die Entwicklung der EWG für die wiederholten agrarpolitischen Krisen verantwortlich waren. Durch die Analyse von drei der wichtigsten Agrarverhandlungsrunden zeigt dieser Beitrag die Entwicklung der Machtverhältnisse innerhalb des deutsch-französischen Tandems auf und verdeutlicht, wie die beiden Staaten jeweils gemeinschaftliche Verhandlungen im Agrarbereich beeinflussen konnten.