



Exploratory Workshop Scheme

Scientific Review Group for the Social
Sciences

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**MAKING EUROPE:
THE SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE AND
THE PRODUCTION OF
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION**

Copenhagen, 4-5 February 2013

Convened by:

Rebecca Adler-Nissen and Kristoffer Kropp

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary

The ESF Exploratory Workshop “Making Europe: The sociology of knowledge and the production of European integration” took place in Copenhagen from 4-5 February 2013 at the University of Copenhagen. The workshop was convened by Assistant Professor Rebecca Adler Nissen and Assistant Professor Kristoffer Kropp.

The workshop studied the uncharted relation between social scientific knowledge and European integration building on the new wave in the sociology of knowledge (e.g. Camic, Gross & Lamont (eds.), 2011 & Jasanoff, 2004) and Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory (Bourdieu, 1996). Combining the two theoretical traditions the workshop aimed at providing a preliminary explanation of how social structures, ideas and social scientific knowledge shape cultural, political and economic institutions and processes in Europe. The new wave of sociology of science has addressed the relations between states and science, and shown how “... states ... are made of knowledge, just as much as knowledge are made of states” (Jasanoff, 2004; 3). Following Jasanoff’s framework, the workshop study the relations between European integration and the social sciences as four different ways of producing social orders: identities, institutions, discourses and representations. These instruments are addressed at the workshop through a focus on three major political aspects of the European integration process: ordering economy and production (session 1), *borders and legal orders* (session 2) and *culture and identities* (session 3).

Workshop organisation

The workshop was held over two days. One first day the organizers presented a co-authored draft paper that framed the project theoretically and analytically. This was followed by presentations by leading scholars from the disciplines of economy, political science, sociology of law, philosophy of science and sociology of knowledge. The workshop addressed three main fields in three different sessions with four presentations in each (Antje Wiener had to make a last minutes cancellation, leaving the second session with three presentations. Wiener circulated relevant material that was drawn in to the discussions). This gave 12 presentations. To each session we attached two discussants with the obligation of drawing possible connections between the presentations, connect them with the theme of the workshop and frame the following open debate.

The first session, *ordering economy and production*, addressed ideas and practices of economic integration in the EU. Presenters looked at how social scientific knowledge contributes to the design of economic institutions such as the euro, the internal market, the production of consumers, discourses on regulation and deregulation, the control of financial markets and representations of the current economic crisis.

In the second session, *political and legal borders and orders*, participants focused on the construction of a common political and legal order. They addressed how social sciences are involved in and shaped by processes of labor migration (both legal and illegal), the development of the Schengen system, production of EU citizen rights and ideas of federalism and constitutionalism in the EU’s *acquis communautaire*.

The third and last session addressed the question of how social scientific knowledge relates to the production of particular European *cultures and identities*. We deal with questions such as education, mobility and the idea of a European public sphere.

The presentations and following discussion during the workshop clearly showed that the relation between the social sciences and European integration is an understudied subject that has just entered the spotlight of social scientists. Furthermore and more important the workshop underlines the importance of this research as a way of understanding the way the social sciences interact with their object of study and how this interaction results in changes both within the social sciences and in social institutions, identities and processes under study.

2. Scientific content of the event

Introduction and aims

The conference began with the organizers presenting a co-authored draft paper that frames the project theoretically and analytically. This was followed by a presentation by our ESF representative Diego de la Hoz del Hoyo who explained the purpose of the ESF and the way in which funding possibilities were developing. This was followed by the three ordinary sessions.

Session 1: Ordering economy and production

The first session addressed ideas and practices of economic integration in the EU. We look at how social scientific knowledge contributes to the design of economic institutions such as the Euro, the internal market, the production of consumers, discourses on regulation and deregulation, the control of financial markets and representations of the current economic crisis.

Professor **Magnus Ryner**, King's College, presented a paper on the Social Sciences and the Economic and Monetary Union. Here Ryner discussed the present constitution of EU studies using the ways the European economic crisis has been addressed in EU studies as a case. Ryner argues that EU studies had an orthodox core and that the specific structure of EU studies depended both on integration telos and relations to post WWII US political science. Furthermore he argued that if EU studies should be able to address social issues such as the current crisis, EU studies needed to take into account more heterodox strands of theoretical reasoning. Ryner's presentation was followed by a presentation from Professor **Ben Rosamond**, University of Copenhagen on the European Commission and changing ideas about the internal market. Rosamond's presentation looked at the formation of the European Communities in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a moment of radical supranational institutional creation during which both economists and (especially) political scientists sought to theorize the processes of regional integration. He argued that the Commission, in both its communicative and coordinative discourse, drew extensively on the 'live' knowledge archive of both international economics and international relations to generate a strategic narrative about not only what European economic integration entailed and how it would be accomplished, but also (crucially) what kind of actor it was. Following the break, Dr. **Jay Rowell**, University of Strasbourg gave a presentation on the attempts to create a European socio-economic classification: limits of expert driven statistical integration. In Rowell's presentation he accounted for the history and struggles in the attempts to make a European Socio-Economic Classification from the 1990s and onwards. Rowell's presentation was an account of a failed attempt to form alliances between specific academic groups and the EU bureaucracy. In his account for this failure, Rowell pointed to the lack of common epistemological view point among the main social scientists, who were sociologists

interested in social class and social structures, and bureaucrats being economists or with law degrees interested in growth or rights. Furthermore Rowell pointed to the hierarchy of the EU DGs, and the fact that protagonists of the Classification represented the dominated DGs. This was followed by a presentation by Professor Emeritus **Niels Thygesen**, University of Copenhagen who gave the presentation “A practitioner’s view: Economics and the making of the Economic Monetary Union”. In this presentation Thygesen accounted for the influence of economist and economic theory in the creation of the foundation of the Euro. In addition to the discussion of the influence of economists and economic theory, Thygesen discussed the different viewpoints among nation states mainly between France and Germany.

Professor **Ole Wæver**, University of Copenhagen and Assistant Professor **Laura Horn**, Roskilde University acted as discussants of the first session. The discussion by Wæver first focused on the main question of the workshop and the analytical concepts and theories available for such a project. Wæver started by pointing to the fact that there is little doubt about the social sciences being involved in the creation of EU and European integration. Thus, the question is not whether the social sciences entangle with EU and European integration, but how and maybe most important to clarify the different ways and reasons for entanglement possibly questioning the current entanglements. There after Wæver presented an analytical model inspired from American sociologist of science and knowledge Randall Collins emphasizing the need to account first for academic reasons for changes in theories, methods and other scientific structures and not subsume they reflect external structures and interest. Any links or relations to non-academic interest or institutions are things we have to account for on their own, he argued. Horn’s discussion took another point of departure. She asked how we came about to know about EU and Europe in the way we did and how these analytical frameworks were developed. Moreover, she discussed the four paper presented in the session, with both general and more specific questions and comments.

Session 2: Political and legal borders and orders

In the second session, participants focused on the construction of a common political and legal order. We address how social sciences are involved in and shaped by processes of labor migration (both legal and illegal), the development of the Schengen system, production of EU citizen rights and ideas of federalism and constitutionalism in the EU’s *acquis communautaire*.

Following the presentation of **Antoine Vauchez** we discussed the way in which the production of European integration, and in particular its legal development, is due not only to particular “ideas” but to particular positions within a field (here reference was also made to **Antje Wiener**’s work that was circulated). To fully fledge out the sociology of science perspective in the paper, the debate circulated around questions such as: Does Law – as a particular academic discipline – have some intrinsic characteristics that make it different from other (social science) disciplines? And can this help explain the very close relationship between EU institutions and EU legal scholarship? Is it simply - as the literature on state-building will show us – that law almost per definition sees itself as producing legal, efficient and workable orders, it is performative. It is an applied or even performative science (unlike e.g. philosophy), which means that the difference between legal academic and legal practitioner is ambiguous (as we see for instance in human rights law as well as corporate law)? Moreover, we would be interested in knowing whether competing ideas from international law/national constitutional law flourished and why they failed or were marginalised? What is the dynamics in the legal field? Who has made an unorthodox reading of the treaties?

Professor **Ole Hammerslev**, University of Southern Denmark discussed *Enlargement and the circulation of institutional standards, focusing on Bulgaria*. The major question that came up during the workshop regarded differences between the various social science disciplines and their relation to the EU bureaucracy. The presenter argued that one of the reasons for the failure of “Europeanization” was that the EU bureaucrats were mainly trained as economists and did not have much understanding for the importance and power of structural sociological classification tool.

Professor **Christopher Lord** presented a more theoretical discussion on the normative foundation for a European democracy. Here he discussed differences between national and international institutions in regards of democratic control and steering. Lord argued that to take into account demands for public control, political equality and individual right when discussing EU and democratic deficits.

The discussion of session 2 was led by Professor **Hans-Jörg Trezn**, University of Copenhagen. Drawing on the presentations and Wiener’s distributed paper, Trezn pointed to the importance of institution-building in state formation and the important role that all social sciences had played in this. Whereas the two first papers has presented and discussed specific case of this in relation to EU integration, Lord’s paper reminded us that we need to link the sociological studies with more normative consideration about EU. Furthermore he asked how we could draw on the insights from Vauchez and Hammerslev in order to understand general modes of entanglement in EU integration processes.

Session 3: Cultures and Identities

The third and last session addressed the question of how social scientific knowledge relates to the production of particular European cultures and identities. We dealt with questions such as education, mobility and the idea of a European public sphere.

The first presentation by Professor **Virginie Guiraudon** Sciences Po, Paris concerned “The Routinization of EU studies: explaining the end of grand theory”. Guiraudon addressed sociology of science questions of how the ‘real’ world invents was influencing EU studies and vice-versa, she also presented a number of different hypotheses (closing of disciplinary boundaries, certain academic disciplines winning over EU studies, the different national arenas and the disengagement of the US). The discussion focused on the fact that academics are (mostly) concerned with academic questions and that we need to account empirically for the transformation of political problems and issues into academic ones.

This presentation was followed by Professor **Andrew Barry**, University of Oxford who talked about The technological constitution of Europe? In particular, the presentation addressed concepts and themes regarding technological zones and zones of qualification, devises of harmonization, measurement and the production of boundaries. The presentation used interesting empirical illustrations and during the discussion at the workshop the banana became an example just as the concept of devises found resonance as a productive thinking tool.

Professor **Adrian Favell**, Sciences Po, Paris, discussed presented the argument that a number of social scientific approaches (both critical and Foucauldian approaches) have been marginalised in EU studies and that this is evident in the way in which EU scholars have studied migration in a very particular (and narrow) way. This is interesting because in other disciplines that have approached

migration (labour market sociologists, anthropologists, human geographers, urban studies etc.), the critical approach is mainstream. To explain this marginalisation we can use sociology of science concepts and ask whether this marginalisation is due to intra-academic struggles and/or whether they are linked to the overall political and legal system of the EU?

Finally, Professor **Rosemary Deem**, University of London discussed the nature of the relationship between changes in European higher education and social science research on higher education and why does it matter. In her presentation Deem focused on the formation and structure of higher education research and how this transdisciplinary research area has been linked to European educational reforms and projects. Taking the Bologna process in to account this is highly important to understand academic dynamic and knowledge production in such loosely bound research areas and how this influences the ways academic knowledge and recommendations related to politics and policy development.

In the discussion of session 3, Professor **Carsten Strøby Jensen**, University of Copenhagen and Professor **Niilo Kauppi**, CNRS, Strasbourg, focused on the various perspectives and overlaps between the presentations. Jensen started by asking how the different social scientific disciplines have conceptualized European integration. He concluded that European integration had been under-conceptualized in sociology and that sociology as a social science disciplines mainly had dealt with negative consequences. Sociology could contribute to our understanding of European Integration by studying exactly the kinds for processes and areas presented in this session. Kauppi discussed the three papers from a classical sociology of knowledge point of view emphasizing the classical contributions on the role of knowledge in society in legitimizing politics. In the studies of the entanglement of social scientific knowledge and EU integration, Kauppi pointed to the relations and differences between academic production and everyday knowledge and the way it entangles, especially taking the weak configuration of EU in to consideration.

Conclusions

In the final wrap-up by, the conveners concluded that the papers, presentations and discussions were very thought-provoking, and while participants had approached the issue from different academic backgrounds, carrying different intellectual baggage, it should be possible to produce a coherent special issue addressing the entanglement of European integration and social science. Two general points was made in this regard. First, going forward, it is important that all contributions actively employ concepts from the sociology of knowledge (not just related theories of constructivism, institutionalism or post-structuralism). In our introductory draft we suggested a number of concepts and approaches from existing studies of relations or entanglement between the social sciences and state/society formation, which may be an inspiration.

Second, all papers needed – in some way or another – to focus on the production, evaluation and usages of knowledge. Revised papers should empirically demonstrate how specific kinds of knowledge have been produced and used. Specific attention should be given to the forms of knowledge relevant for your case and its relation to specific individuals/group/institutions/processes, ideas and power relations. What the conveners asked for was not just conceptual clarification, but also an empirical account of the way in which knowledge has been produced with a focus on the social agents taking part in these. Some of the papers presented at the workshop have already elements of what are asking for in this respect.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

The workshop successfully exploited our different disciplinary backgrounds and overlapping research interests in international political sociology and more specifically the development of European integration research. The different fields (European studies and sociology of knowledge, respectively) clearly benefit from closer cooperation and our disciplinary specialisations will complement each other. Building on the workshop, a special issue will be published based on a selection of papers that were presented at the workshop in Copenhagen. The editors of several top-ranking social science journals have already indicated their interest based on the abstracts and list of participants. We are also considering developing the project further and applying for more funding, perhaps through the framework programme.

4. Final programme

Sunday 3 February 2013

Afternoon/evening *Arrival*

Monday 4 February 2013

9:15- 09:45

Introduction:

Kristoffer Kropp and **Rebecca Adler-Nissen**

09:45 -10.00

Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)

Diego de la Hoz del Hoyo (ESF Science Review Group for the Social Sciences)

Session 1: Ordering economy and production

10:00 -11:00

The Social Sciences and the Economic and Monetary Union

Professor Magnus Ryner, Oxford Brookes University

The European Commission and changing ideas about the internal market

Professor Ben Rosamond, University of Copenhagen

11.00-11:30

Tea and coffee

11:30-12:30

The creation of a European socio-economic classification: limits of expert driven statistical integration

Dr Jay Rowell, University of Strasbourg

The practitioner's view: Economics and the making of the Economic Monetary Union

Professor Emeritus Niels Thygesen, University of Copenhagen

12:30-14:00

Lunch

14:00-15:00

Discussion of session 1 Discussion of session 1 (discussant: **Professor Ole**

Wæver, University of Copenhagen & associated professor **Laura Horn**, Roskilde University)

Session 2: Political and legal borders and orders

15:00-15:30

The social construction of EU law

Professor Antoine Vauchez, Sorbonne University

15:30-16:00

Tea and coffee

16:00-16:30

Discussion of session 2 (discussant: **Rebecca Adler-Nissen**, University of Copenhagen)

16:30-18:00

Get-together, informal social event. Place: Dept. Political Science, University of Copenhagen

19:00 *Dinner, Restaurant Orangeriet, Kongens Have, Kronprinsessegade 13, 1306 København K*

Tuesday 5 February 2013

9:30 -10:30 **Enlargement and the circulation of institutional standards**
Professor Ole Hammerslev, University of Southern Denmark

Democratic theory and the EU as a political order
Professor Christopher Lord, ARENA Centre for European Studies

10:30-11:00 **Discussion of session 2** (discussant: **Professor Hans-Jörg Trenz**, University of Copenhagen) (second part of session 2)

11:00-11:30 *Tea and coffee*

Session 3: Cultures and identities

11:30-12:30 **The routinization of EU studies: explaining the end of grand theory**
Professor Virginie Guiraudon, Sciences Po, Paris
The technological constitution of Europe?
Professor Andrew Barry, University of Oxford

12:30-14:00 *Lunch*

14:00-15:00 **The free movement of people, migration and everyday integration** **Professor Adrian Favell**, Sciences Po, Paris
What is the nature of the relationship between changes in European higher education and social science research on higher education and why does it matter **Professor Rosemary Deem**, University of London

15:00-15:30 *Tea and coffee*

15:30 -16:30 **Discussion of session 3** (discussant: Head of Department **Carsten Strøby Jensen**, University of Copenhagen & Professor **Niilo Kauppi**, CNRS, Strasbourg)

16:30- 18.00 **Concluding remarks and discussion on follow-up activities** with **Rebecca Adler-Nissen and Kristoffer Kropp**

19:00 *Dinner, Restaurant **Bibendum**, Nansensgade 45, 1366 København K*

Wednesday 6 February 2013

Morning

Departure

5. Final list of participants

Convenor:

1. **Rebecca ADLER-NISSEN**
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Science
University of Copenhagen

Co-Convenor:

2. **Kristoffer KROPP**
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Social Science
University of Copenhagen

ESF Representative:

Diego de la Hoz del Hoyo

Participants:

3. **Magnus RYNER**
Department of Social Sciences
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Oxford Brookes University
4. **Ben Rosamond**
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Science
University of Copenhagen
5. **Jay ROWELL**
Centre for European Political Sociology
(GSPE)
University of Strasbourg
6. **Niels THYGESEN**
Department of Economics
Faculty of Economics
University of Copenhagen
7. **Ole WÆVER**
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Science
University of Copenhagen
8. **Laura HORN**
Department of Society and Globalization
Roskilde University
9. **Antoine VAUCHEZ**
Centre Européen de Sociologie et de
Science Politique
Sorbonne University/CNRS
10. **Christopher LORD**
ARENA Centre for European Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Oslo

11. **Ole HAMMERSLEV**
Department of Law
Faculty of Business and Social Sciences
University of Southern Denmark
12. **Hans-Jörg TRENZ**
CEMES (Centre for Modern European
Studies)
Department of Media, Cognition and
Communication
Faculty of Humanities
13. **Virginie GUIRAUDON**
Department of Political Science
Sciences Po Paris
14. **Andrew BARRY**
Centre for the Environment
School of Geography and the
Environment.
Oxford University
15. **Adrian FAVELL**
Center for European Studies
Department of Political Science
Sciences Po Paris
16. **Rosemary DEEM**
School of Management
Royal Holloway,
University of London
17. **Carsten Strøby JENSEN**
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Social Science
University of Copenhagen
18. **Niilo KAUPPI**
Centre National de la Recherche
Scientifique (CNRS)
University of Strasbourg
19. **Thomas Koenig**
thomas.koenig@wwtf.at

6. Statistical information on participants (age bracket, countries of origin, M/F repartition, etc.) The statistics to be provided under section 6 can also include repartition by scientific specialty if relevant.

Countries of origin (by University):

Austria: 1
Denmark: 9
France: 5
Norway: 1
United Kingdom: 3

M/F repartition: 15/4