

## REVIEW ESSAY

# Europeanization, European Integration, and Globalization

by Ellen B. Pirro and Eleanor E. Zeff

Helen Wallace and William Wallace (eds.) *Policy-Making in the European Union* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Oxford University Press, 2000. 610 pp. \$30.00 (paperback) ISBN 019878242X

Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso, and Thomas Risse (eds.), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Cornell University Press, 2001. 272 pp. \$21.50 (paperback) ISBN 0801486718

Vivien A. Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*. Oxford University Press, 2002. 280 pp. \$19.95 (paperback) ISBN 0199253684

These three works represent the most recent developments in the evolution of the term “Europeanization.” Each of them uses a slightly different interpretation with different functions for this concept. The term “Europeanization” is emerging as a central organizing concept in the study of what is happening in Europe. It is important for scholars to assess its utility and value as the discipline grows.

Forty years ago, this grand experiment in multilateral governance began. With it emerged a number of theoretical explanations and the beginning of European integration. Today, the study of Europe focuses on Europeanization, while many other theories have disappeared. The three works considered here represent individual turning points in the study of the European Union. They address the question of whether Europeanization is merely a regional type of globalization or another way of talking about integration. Yet, they raise more questions than are resolved. In addition, there is a danger of overusing Europeanization as a ‘catchall’ explanation for the changes occurring in Europe, the European Union, and in the member states. Each of these authors tries to rein in this term; in a field where neither general agreement nor any shared understanding has emerged.

Early European theories concentrated on federalism and functionalism, addressing questions of creating institutions, the breadth/scope of these new institutions, and the amount or level of sovereignty which should be yielded to the supranational

---

Ellen B. Pirro is a Visiting Professor at Augustana College, Augustana, Illinois.

Eleanor E. Zeff is an Assistant Professor at Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.

body.<sup>1</sup> All agreed that economic integration was the defined goal, while political and military integration was the aspiring goal. A united Europe would be the final outcome regardless of the process and different stages.

As the European Union grew and prospered, various theories withered and were supplanted with newer ideas. Despite the fact that the European Union was operating very successfully and expanding its coverage, the member states continued both as part of the organization, and as individual nation-states with separate policies on international issues and distinctive domestic agendas. For some time, the intergovernmental approach seemed the most credible explanation for continued EU developments since complete political union had yet occurred. The rise of the constructivist approach<sup>2</sup> helped solidify this theoretical movement away from creation to operation. Research interests shifted to how the European Union operated, as opposed to if and how it would succeed; how decisions were taken, what roles were important; and as growth occurred with the addition of new countries, how, where, and why the European Union expanded.<sup>3</sup> Attention moved to EU institutions rather than theories of integration. In particular, the institutionalist approach derived from constructivist theorizing seems to hold more promise in explaining these developments.<sup>4</sup>

None of these theories have proven robust enough to provide satisfactory explanations for the European Union, let alone accurately predict its future direction. So, the tendency which has emerged is to use middle-range theoretical notions to promote partial explanations. Europeanization is one of the middle-range concepts which moves towards theory. There are four organizing notions which underlie this concept; the first three, many scholars generally agree upon while the fourth is still a topic of considerable debate.

First, the idea of European integration as a linear concept is used in middle-range theorizing about Europeanization. This notion brings forth the idea that the end goal is the complete unity of Europe—a United Europe or in some cases a United States of Europe. Helen Wallace is the closest author to a pure integrationist of the three works considered here. However, all of them espouse the goal of European integration as an end in itself, to help explain EU developments, and they all cite linear progression in the formation of European politics.

The second area of agreement is that there is a competition between explanations which offer ‘top down’ or ‘bottom up’ approaches to policy analyses. It has become apparent member states themselves have a significant impact on the development of the European Union, including how it makes decisions, and what considerations are taken into account. Robert Ladrech is one of the first to consider a ‘bottom up’ approach to Europeanization.<sup>5</sup> Cowles et al. note that while,

*Much of the book is preoccupied with what goes on at the domestic level, even though we recognize that ultimately the causal processes go both ways—activities at the domestic level affect the European level and vice versa.*<sup>6</sup>

Wallace also examines EU decision making and policy formation from the ‘top down.’<sup>7</sup> In contrast, Vivien Schmidt solely utilizes the “bottom up” approach, looking

at how national economic adaptation is occurring and its net effects.<sup>8</sup> Much is made in the literature of the mutual influences, yet most scholars concentrate on the “top down” approach.

The third organizational principle is the general agreement on the impact of Europeanization on the “deepening and widening” goals of the European Union. Deepening refers to expansion of the European Union’s policies to cover a wider range of governing areas. The new constitution’s areas of shared competence, which directly impact the member states’ operating procedures, as well as their regulations, are an example.<sup>9</sup> Wallace discusses the expansion of policies in this topic area. Widening means a commitment to adding new members and enlarging the purview of the formal institutions. Most agree increasing Europeanization includes both deepening and widening the European Union. Schmidt’s central issue is how the members incorporate and absorb the new economic regimes coming from the EU. She presses for convergence between national operations and the EU’s dictates. Cowles et al. look at the implications of new regulations and activities on the member states. None of the three volumes considered focus on expansion, which has become the most recent “hot topic” because of the addition of ten states in May 2004. All of them assume the European Union will continue to expand after 2004. All three authors see increases in the competence of the EU and greater sovereignty yielded by the national members as a continuing activity.

Fourth, in defining Europeanization several questions remain. Are Europeanization and European integration the same thing? Does Europeanization refer only to the European Union? Is it tied to the institution? Or is Europeanization simply a regional variety of globalization? How do globalization and Europeanization fit together?

It is noteworthy in much of the prior literature of these authors that Europeanization is seen as exclusive to the European Union. Within most of the literature, Europeanization deals primarily with the effects of the EU institution and its policies on its member states. However, more recent scholarship creates a broader context around this concept.

## **EUROPEAN INTEGRATION**

Earlier scholars considered integration and Europeanization to be analogous. These three scholars have chosen to make critical distinctions between the two concepts. Helen Wallace is the closest of these three to integrating ‘Europeanization’ into ‘European integration.’<sup>10</sup> She speaks of European integration as a “broad phenomenon,” fundamentally different from the process of policymaking. She sees integration as the significant phenomenon within European studies—an ongoing process of making Europe one—and Europeanization is but one component of that process. She does not, however, give us any guidance or illustration of any other components.

Vivien Schmidt charts an explicit distinction between European integration, which she sees operating at the top level, and Europeanization which takes place at the bottom. To her, European integration is an all encompassing process by which

transnational regimes and their institutions are created and maintained. In contrast, to Schmidt, Europeanization refers to the domestic impact of European integration. It is the incorporation of these integrative elements in “politics, policies and practices” which makes Europeanization work.<sup>11</sup> Europeanization then is the execution of policies designed to move European integration forward.

There are two main ways that “Europeanization” is defined and related to the European Union. Schmidt acknowledges the process of Europeanization differs both in scope and rate from state to state, but with congruence as the ultimate goal.

*I define European integration as the process of EEC/EC/EU construction and policy-formulation by a wide range of actors—representative of governmental as well as non-governmental entities, of member states as well as of the EU—engaged in decision-making at the EU level.<sup>12</sup>*

Her discussion lacks a method to determine how Europeanization is progressing in each state. This will be a critical area in documenting the success of the recently ascended states, where it is already claimed that laws have been enacted, but not put into practice. Cowles et al. equate European integration with the “functionalist” and “institutional” theoretical approaches that as a practice created the European Union. To her, integration is the end result of Europeanization.

Vivien Schmidt epitomizes the first approach as one of a number of scholars who define Europeanization as the domestic impact of European integration.<sup>13</sup> She links Europeanization with the undermining of national authority and encouraging of policy convergence between the member states and the European Union. What she suggests about the emerging EU is that everything, ranging from its formal institutions and policies to the informal processes of representation and operation, has an impact on the daily functioning of the member states. As discussed above, she distinguishes Europeanization from European integration. To the degree that member states’ policies and institutions converge with EU policies, they are Europeanized regardless of the level of integration achieved. As an institutionalist, Schmidt utilizes discourse analysis to assess the levels of Europeanization within chosen states, and their susceptibility to Europeanization. Schmidt goes on to suggest “new modes...through the EU are seen to trump national ideas.”<sup>14</sup> She demonstrates in the *Futures of Capitalism* that despite altering policies within European nations, Europeanization does not necessarily lead to policy convergence (e.g. compliance). Each country is affected differently depending on existing circumstances, history, political culture, and discourse on the issues.

Robert Ladrech sees Europeanization as a significant new development within the EU context, as more and more of its policies become components of political and economic life in the member-states and as the EU’s expanded policy scope extends into more areas of national legislation.<sup>15</sup> His focus is on how national organizations adapt to inputs from the European Union, a ‘bottom up’ approach, and the unequal impact of Europeanization on nations due to their differing political

cultures and institutions.<sup>16</sup>

Cowles et al. offer a slightly different outlook on Europeanization. While they can be aligned with institutionalists, their perspective recognizes the existence of a two-way process, whereby the EU has an effect upon individual members and the member states affect the EU.<sup>17</sup> They focus on the top down causal path, with domestic change as the outcome of EU policies. Europeanization to them means the creation of policies and institutions at the EU level.

*We define Europeanization as the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal, and social institutions associated with political problem solving that formalize interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specializing in the creation of authoritative European rules.*<sup>18</sup>

Johan Olsen, like Schmidt, utilizes the reverse approach, concentrating on domestic adaptation.<sup>19</sup> Olsen also discusses the variance of Europeanization from state to state, with differing implications, rates of change, areas, and types of changes.

*Differentiated responses and patterns of adaptation and institutional robustness can in particular be expected in political settings like the European one. First, because European institution building and policymaking are unevenly developed across institutional spheres and policy areas, the adaptive pressures on states and institutions vary... Second, differentiated responses are likely because the (West) European political order is characterized by long, strong and varied institutional histories, with different trajectories of state- and nation-building, resources and capabilities... As a result, extensive penetration of domestic institutions by European developments is taking place in some spheres, while there are also protected spaces, stubborn resistance and non-penetration in other spheres.*<sup>20</sup>

Helen Wallace, Thomas Risse, and others utilize Europeanization to signal the development of a European political culture or identity—a “we-Europe” feeling as well as the emergence of a new political entity.<sup>21</sup> This new European-ness would replace the nationalisms and nation-state focus which has prevailed since the French Revolution. Research centers around the emergence of this collective identity and the extent to which state identity and national culture are maintained, by examining the differential impact of the European Union on domestic institutions, policy making, and the methods which are being used. “Domestic adaptation with national colors” became their shorthand description of the varying domestic responses to Europeanization seen across both member and non-member countries.<sup>22</sup> Wallace also recognizes the effects of Europeanization extend to both EU and non-EU members and that the relationship between Europeanization and globalization merits discussion.

## **EUROPEANIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION**

Parallels are drawn between Europeanization and “globalization,” defined in its most simple form as the phenomenon of removing international boundaries especially in the economic area.<sup>23</sup> Many scholars, such as Wallace, see Europeanization as one

type of globalization—a regional subset.<sup>24</sup> Both are primarily economic in nature. Both phenomena have institutional bases—globalization has the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization while Europeanization has the EU. Both processes seem to be expanding their range and scope.

*The EU arena is only part of a wider pattern of making policy beyond the nation state. In many areas of public policy, including those within which the EU is active, there are broader transnational consultations and regimes. These vary a great deal in their robustness and intensity, but they are part of a continuum of policy-making that spreads from the country, through the European arena, to the global level.<sup>25</sup>*

To Wallace, the interaction of globalization and Europeanization is so close, it is hard to determine which is the leader and which the follower.

*[W]hat is the relationship between the two phenomena? Here there is something of a chicken and egg debate. Is the EU a reaction to globalization, or is it an agent of globalization? Perhaps the important pressures are global, and the Europeanization of certain policy activities is in essence a response to globalization. On the other hand, perhaps the existence of the EU has produced a different form of globalization in western Europe from that in other parts of the world.<sup>26</sup>*

But there is a divergent view, which sees Europeanization as a separate entity from both globalization and the current EU integration processes. This interpretation of Europeanization becomes a primary goal to be achieved by the European nations. Europeanization in this form is the creation of a new political entity—Europe. The European Union is one—but only one—of the institutions following this creative path. Both Cowles et al. and Schmidt take this pathway. “In defining Europeanization, we also differentiate this process from that of internationalization or globalization, more broadly defined.”<sup>27</sup>

In Cowles et al., globalization constitutes a potential threat to the EU and “Europeanization itself might respond to ‘globalization processes’ by reinforcing their trends or by shielding EU member states against their undesired effects.”<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Schmidt sees globalization as a possibly detrimental to the economic well-being of the European nations.

*At the European level, Europeanization rather than globalization has been at the centre of policy-makers’ ideas and projects. Their discussions have remained focused on all aspects of European integration, from the ‘community method’ to subsidiarity, the quandary of ‘widening vs deepening’, the extent of enlargement, and the extension of the ‘acquis communautaire’. Globalization instead seems to have been so much part of background assumptions about the necessity and appropriateness of economic openness and market-driven policies of budgetary restraint in the process of European integration that the term itself has appeared comparatively infrequently in the discourse of the EU Commission.<sup>29</sup>*

Moreover, she does believe European integration is a stronger force than globalization.

*As a set of economic pressures, Europeanization has acted both as a conduit for global forces and as a shield against them, opening member states to international competition in the capital and product markets at the same time as they protect them through monetary integration and the Single Market. As a set of institutional pressures, the European Union has gone way beyond any other international or regional economic authority with regard to the vast array of rules and rulings affecting its member states. And as a set of ideas, European integration has been driven by a common political project for economic liberalization which has been much more compelling than that of any other regional grouping of countries in the world, and which has served as a complement to the liberalizing ideas related to globalization.<sup>30</sup>*

Despite her contention that the EU is only one of the Europeanizing institutions, Schmidt focuses exclusively on the EU's efforts.

Much of the literature on citizenship and national political norms in Europe utilizes this conceptual separation between Europeanization and globalization.<sup>31</sup>

*Global market forces are not the only exogenous factors that might influence domestic institutional change. . . [N]orms and ideas can also develop outside the European Union. Transnational human rights groups and historical events like the end of the Cold War influence the discourse on citizenship and identity within the European Union. They may even 'trigger' domestic responses. . . Of course, we must also distinguish between Europeanization pressures and those emanating from the member states themselves.<sup>32</sup>*

In their discussion of Europeanization as a pathway to creation of a supranational identity, Europeanization becomes a very different notion than globalization.

"Europeanization also consists of *constructing systems of meanings and collective understandings*, including social identities."<sup>33</sup>

## CONCLUSION

What emerges from this extensive research is that Europeanization has two distinctive meanings and uses in contemporary literature. While it is detached from European integration, one school of thought, represented here by both Wallace and Cowles et al., places the concept firmly at the supranational level of the creation of European institutions designed to promote integration. Wallace suggests Europeanization rests within the European Union.<sup>34</sup> Cowles et al. and Schmidt suggest there could be Europeanization occurring outside EU institutions, and that other regimes, institutions, and processes are part of the Europeanization process. Despite their similarities in their perspective on European integration, Cowles et al. and Wallace diverge in their views of the links between globalization and Europeanization. Cowles et al. take Europeanization beyond its economic roots, seeing it as something inherently different and not tied to globalization. For Wallace, globalization and Europeanization are inextricably tied.

The other view, proposed by Schmidt, places the origins of Europeanization at the domestic level, defining it in terms of adaptation and convergence. For Schmidt, Europeanization is a regional shield against the destabilizing elements of globalization.



While they are both primarily economic, each has the potential to damage economic growth and functioning, and she would value Europeanization over globalization. Europeanization, with its meaning of incorporating social constructs and identities, approaches the early discussions of Deutsch in the creation of a European “we-feeling.”<sup>35</sup> But as all agree, European integration still remains an elusive and a long-range goal.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces, 1950-1957*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), and David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System*, (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1966).

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Wendt, “Social Theory of International Politics,” (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), and Nicholas Onuf, “Worlds of Our Making: The Strange Career of Constructivism in International Relations,” in *Visions of International Relations: Assessing an Academic Field*, ed. Donald J. Puchala, 119-141 (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> Robert Keohane, “Governance in a Partially Globalized World ‘Presidential Address,’” *American Political Science Review*, 95, no. 1 (March 2001): 1-13, and Wayne Sandholtz and John Zysman, “1992: Recasting the European Bargain,” *World Politics*, 42, no. 1, (October 1989): 95-128.

<sup>4</sup> Ian Bache, “Europeanization: A Governance Approach,” (Paper presented at the EUSA 8<sup>th</sup> International Biennial Conference, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, March 27–29, 2003), and Johan P. Olsen, “The Many Faces of Europeanization,” ARENA working papers, WP 01/02, (2002), 14.

<sup>5</sup> Robert Ladrech, “Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France,” *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 32, no 1 (1994): 84, as cited by Bache, “Europeanization,” 2. While Bache recognizes influence flows in both directions he concentrates on the top down approach.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Risse, Maria Green Cowles, and James Caporaso, “Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction,” in *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* ed., Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso, and Thomas Risse, 4 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001). While this quotation is taken from the “Introduction” authored by Risse et al., Cowles et al. is used in the remainder of this review because the description lends itself to the rest of the edited compilation.

<sup>7</sup> Helen Wallace, “The Policy Process: A Moving Pendulum,” in *Policy-Making in the European Union* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition), ed. Helen Wallace and William Wallace, 39-64 (Oxford University Press, 2000).

<sup>8</sup> Vivien A. Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, (Oxford University Press, 2002) 13-58.

<sup>9</sup> The European constitution has not yet gone into effect. The European parliament approved it on January 12, 2005, but it has yet to be ratified by the member states.

<sup>10</sup> Wallace, “The Policy Process,” 39-64.

<sup>11</sup> Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, 43.

<sup>12</sup> Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, 42.

<sup>13</sup> Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, 42.

<sup>14</sup> Vivien Schmidt, “The Europeanization of Representation in ‘Simple’ and ‘Compounded’ Systems: Changes in National Practices, Challenges to National Ideas and Discourse.” (Paper presented at the Seminar Series, “Europeanization and the Reshaping of Representation,” held by the European University Institute and the University of Florence, Florence, Italy, June 7, 2002): 3.

<sup>15</sup> Ladrech, “Europeanization of Domestic Politics.”<sup>16</sup> Ladrech, “Europeanization of Domestic Politics.”

<sup>17</sup> See Risse et al., “Introduction.”

<sup>18</sup> Risse et al., “Introduction,” 3. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>19</sup> Olsen, “The Many Faces of Europeanization,” 14.

<sup>20</sup> Olsen, “The Many Faces of Europeanization,” 14. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>21</sup> Wallace, “The Policy Process;” Thomas Risse, “A European Identity? Europeanization and the Evolution of Nation-State Identities,” in Cowles et al, 198-216; Donald J. Puchala, “Institutionalism, Intergovernmentalism, and European Integration: A Review Article,” *Journal of Common Market Studies*,



37, no. 2 (1999): 317-331; and Kevin Featherstone and G. Kazamias, *Europeanization and the Southern Periphery* (London: Frank Cass, 2001).

<sup>22</sup> Risse et al., "Introduction," 1.

<sup>23</sup> The literature on defining globalization is too extensive for consideration here. However, a good place to start is David Held & Anthony McGrew, "Globalization," Joel Krieger, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 324 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

<sup>24</sup> Helen Wallace, "The Policy Process," 48-49.

<sup>25</sup> Helen Wallace "The Institutional Setting: Five Variations on a Theme," in, Wallace and Wallace, *Policy-Making in the European Union*, 7.

<sup>26</sup> Helen Wallace, "The Policy Process," 49.

<sup>27</sup> Risse et al., "Introduction," 3.

<sup>28</sup> Risse et al., "Introduction," 4.

<sup>29</sup> Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, 42-3.

<sup>30</sup> Schmidt, *The Futures of European Capitalism*, 14.

<sup>31</sup> Thomas Risse, "European Identity? Europeanization and the Evolution of Nation-State Identities," in Cowles et al., *Transforming Europe*, 198-216; Tanja A. Borzel, "Europeanization and Territorial Institutional Change: Toward Cooperative Regionalism," in Cowles et al., *Transforming Europe*, 137-158, Jeffrey T. Checkel, "Europeanization of Citizenship?" in Cowles et al., *Transforming Europe*, 180-197.

<sup>32</sup> Maria Green Cowles and Thomas Risse, "Transforming Europe: Conclusions," in, Cowles et al., *Transforming Europe*, 221.

<sup>33</sup> Cowles and Risse, "Conclusions," 219. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>34</sup> Helen Wallace, "The Policy Process."

<sup>35</sup> Karl Deutsch, Sydney A. Burnell, and Robert A. Kann. *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957).

