Day One - Franco-German Relations in Europe

The first Group's workshop started with a topic that was by definition quite familiar to the participants: Franco-German relationships and their importance for the history of Europe. Speaking first, Fabian Link (Universität Basel) presented his PhD project dealing with castle studies in Nazi Germany. In one of its chapters he compares castle research in Germany and France. He entitled his contribution *From the "Battle for the Rhine" to a European Scientific Community* and reported of his observation that castle studies were in France as in Germany strongly interrelated with nationalist politics. Link emphasised that the political system in France was characterised by republican thought ("nation" and "État") while in Germany political thinking was much more shaped by authoritarian and national conservative ideas ("Volk" and "Rasse"). Therefore he demonstrated that French and German castle researchers in service of state and nation conceptualised their respective research objects in a very different way. As a consequence, Franco-German consent in medieval archaeology could only be established by the democratization and liberalization of the scientific landscape since the 1960s. The discussion focussed mainly on the topic of continuities and generations. Link was asked to develop the different conceptions of medieval ages in the two countries.

Then, Luc-André Brunet (London School of Economics) developed his project on Franco-German relations between 1940 and 1951, asking whether the period could be seen as a founding moment for European Integration. While it is generally held that Franco-German rapprochement and economic integration formed a post-war process, Brunet tried to challenge this idea by studying the economic links established between 1940 and 1944 in the context of wartime collaboration. He concluded that the decisive economic reorientation of the French economy towards cooperation with Germany occurred not after 1945 but rather since 1940, showing that France came to depend on German coal while turning away definitively from the British coal market. The debate concentrated on the role of individual actors and continuities regarding the supposed "rupture" of 1945 as well as the inter-war period and questioned the prominence of steel industrialists for the emergence of "dirigisme". Not all
the participants agreed with the idea that Franco-German relationships could really be unequivocally similar during and after the war. Some of them finally wondered whether, looking at the dark origins of the later democratic European project, it is possible to speak of a "negative" Europeanization.

<3>

Then one moved on to more recent times. In his talk "'Le Waldsterben': Franco-German Convergence and Divergence with regard to an Environmental Problem", Laurent Schmit (Universität Freiburg) showed that stereotypes concerning Germany shaped the French debate on acid rain and forest decline. On the one hand, Germany had been presented as a dominant economic power trying to impose its technological choices on the other EC member states. On the other hand, the French public perceived Germany as driven by the pressure of an irresponsible and irrational political movement, namely the Greens. Schmit argued that this can be seen as an example of the cognitive and normative dimension of Europeanization. He further explained that this divergence was lessened by transnational communication on possible causes of and solutions to the "Waldsterben". Related to this last aspect, the regional dynamic of this environmental debate and the role of "inter-regional" actors were discussed. Finally, the discussion raised questions about the different evolution of the French and the German environmental movements.

<4>

This first day of discussions showed that tracing Franco-German relations back to the first half of the 20th century provides a stimulating effect on analysing the process of Europeanization from the competing views about history in the late 19th century to the darkest hours of the Second World War. This session also confirmed that after a few decades of close friendship and intensive contact, some stereotypes still remained quite vivid in the collective memories of the two countries.

Day Two - Between Europeanization and Globalization
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On the second day, participants were invited to switch from the bilateral perspective to the continental and the global. In his presentation on the National-Socialist's "New economic Order" during the Second World War, Raimund Bauer (Universität Mannheim) first underlined the continuities, especially regarding economic factors which pushed for a Common Market, during the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. He posed the question if the possibilities the 3rd Reich offered to think, broaden, and implement these intellectual patterns were realised during the War. His initial findings indicate that economic interests first did not change. Enterprisers used the scope of action provided by the NS as long as it suited their aims, whereas political institutions closely followed the radicalization of the regime thus leading to conflicts between the two spheres. The participants of the discussion were unsure whether the project of "New Order" should be considered as a "Germanization" of Europe,
rather than a process of Europeanization, understood as top-down impact from the European level to the national level.

<6>

In her presentation on Container Transport and Globalization, Klára Paardenkooper (Universiteit Rotterdam) demonstrated that economic integration between the Rotterdam region in the Netherlands and the Ruhr area in Germany, a path-dependent development due to the transport channel provided by the river Rhine, was accelerated by the liberalization of European transport infrastructure until the 1980s. She also showed that the globalized economic context outside Europe soon challenged the European dimension of the process. The discussion led to the conclusion that the creation of the European institutions entailed the emergence of regional transnational integration.

<7>

In her research project “The European Union in an area of tension between uniform integration and differentiated integration”, Anja Keutel (Universität Leipzig) analyses the development of the political integration-strategy of the European unification since the 1950s. Can we describe the process of European integration as a uniform one, in which all members participate equally and are considered in the same way? Or are there structural characteristics of a differentiated integration in the past and present of the European unification project? Keutel’s research suggests that the Community strived for uniform integration, but that there were also cases of differentiated integration. She demonstrates that the number of these differentiated cases has increased in recent years. According to her, it is also possible to identify several types of distinguished integration strategies which she will analyse and describe systematically in her research project.

<8>

This second day of the conference emphasized the flexibility of the concept of Europeanization. While it was shown that the Europeanization process within the "New Order" could be as well defined as a Germanization of Europe, it appeared that the more concrete sort of Europeanization of the post-war period was partly dependent on another complementary process, Globalization, raising the question of the meaning of Europeanization as a specific and regional form of Globalization.

Day Three - Diplomacy and Diplomatic Actors
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After dealing with bilateral issues and concepts, the third day was devoted to studying the actors. Talking about the attitude of the British Civil Service towards Europe from the Schuman Plan to the first application for membership in 1961, Thomas Raineau (Université Paris IV) revealed that British civil servants had a significant margin of action during the first steps of the European project,
defending institutional positions and a British Weltanschauung of European affairs. The sources bring to light that from the first application in 1961 political actors and especially ministers started to seize the issue again, and that the Europeanization of the British Civil Service remained largely superficial when the UK entered the ECC in 1973. The debate underlined the idea that the bureaucratic structures were Europeanized, though not the individuals. Above all, the participants raised the central issue of the interpretation of these structural changes as a principal/agent problem.

<10>

Then, pursuing the analysis of elite groups, Johannes Großmann (Universität des Saarlandes) presented the example of two conservative elite circles, namely the European Documentation and Information Center (CEDI) and the International Committee for the Defence of Christian Culture to illustrate the growing impact of private and non-governmental organizations acting within a transnational network for the Europeanization of political elites and decision processes during the decades following the Second World War. Whereas the changes of the international context and the political communication of the late 1950s and the 1960s reduced the importance of these organisations that were mainly focused on concrete political action, such as anti-communist propaganda, it favoured the influence of these organisations conceiving their role as international and intercultural intermediaries. The discussion centred on the difference between the concepts of Westernization and Europeanization. It was questioned in how far elites had already been Europeanized before 1945. Furthermore, the participants pointed out the role of those European countries not involved in the institutional integration process and the unexpected process of an Europeanization of conservative groups.

<11>

Broadening the field by turning to world diplomacy, Florian Lindemann (Universität Münster) analysed the influence of Franco-German diplomatic cooperation on the development and implementation of European Political Cooperation (EPC) on the Middle-East policy from 1967 to 1977. He showed that especially West Germany suggested European or Franco-German consultation at an early stage and raised the question whether consultation and coordination in the Middle East led to Europeanization or "Francization" of national politics. He came to the conclusion that the ambition of coordinated actions was partly the result of a loss of influence, external pressure, and the desire to regain political bearing by joint actions. The will to respond with a common voice to problems related to the Israeli-Arab conflict proved to be a new reflex of coordination between the member states. The impact of external and internal pressure, such as the USA or the oil crisis, and the importance of the national past of both countries in their policy choices formed main aspects of the adjacent discussion.
The papers of the third day enunciated that, at different periods, the choices the diplomatic actors had concerning the possibility of a joint European action were quite dependent on the opinion they had of their own resources and capacities. The British were convinced that the UK was still a world power in the 1950s, then choosing not to join the European project; the French and the Germans started to think about diplomatic coordination in the 1970s to tackle a global issue.

**Day Four - Social Actors**

Since the European project has always been thought of as a potential catalyst of economic development, the participants were finally asked to discuss the role of social actors and their opinion about the process of European unification. Questioning the potential agreement of European conventions on future wages, Rémi Devémy’s (Université d'Artois) paper dealt with the analysis of convergence and divergence of the discourse and of the practices, but also with the various forms of collective bargaining in the chemical industry in the area of Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Wallonia and North Rhine-Westphalia. He noticed similarities in the discourse of tariff politics during the 1960s and 1970s and concluded that in practice the determination of wages suffered a lot from structural and traditional differences between the three countries. Thus he doubts that there might be a chance of realising collective agreements on a European level. Remy underlined that European social policy has mostly been shaped by European civil servants and not by (national) trade unions. That’s why he questions the existence of convergence in the discourse of tariff policy.

Shifting attention from the Trade Unions to the employers, Yohann Morival (École normale supérieure, Paris) presented his paper on the “Conseil national du patronat français and European integration”. He intended to assess the notion of Europeanization for the conseil national between 1948 and 1992. His presentation treated the effects of European integration on the French employers’ organisation (the CNPF). He showed that, contrary to what is generally stated in the literature on European integration, the members of the CNPF were actively suggesting the integration of Europe well before 1984. An analysis of the theory that the CNPF only belatedly took an interest in Europe demonstrates that the Europeanization process was not linear, but rather advanced in several stages of varying intensity. This study demonstrates that socialisation, itself not a linear process, must be considered as deeply related to the process of Europeanization. He concludes that Europeanization is a non-linear process which effects primarily economic and cultural elements and spreads through several economic groups, such as the European League for Economic Co-operation (ELEC), the Council of European Industrial Federations (CIFE), and the Union of Industrial and Employers’
Confederations of Europe (UNICE).

<15>

The discussion shed light on Europeanization as a slow and somehow unfinished process: Structural differences in wage negotiation remain quite significant, even in regions which lie very close to each other, while the approval of the process of unification by French employers showed varying intensity over time. The constructing of a “European social space” (F. Mitterrand) is obviously still work in progress.
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