

INTEGRA International midterm meeting - Minutes

En el marco del proyecto Jean Monnet INTEGRA se llevó a cabo los días 4, 5 y 6 de julio de 2013, en el Institute for Social and European Studies, Kőzseg, Hungría, un seminario mid-term en el cual fueron discutidos los aportes individuales de los integrantes.

In the framework of the Jean Monnet multilateral program Integration as a way to modernization. An explanatory framework for regional integration- INTEGRA, a seminar will be held in Kőzseg at Institute for Social and European Studies (ISES) from 4 to 6 of July to discuss the intellectual content of the book planned as an output of the project as well as the mid-term results of the Team members' individual projects. Participants are coming from Latin America, Australia and Europe. Please find hereby the program of the seminar.

Mid term international meeting INTEGRA, Integration as a way to modernisation. An explanatory framework for regional integration 4th – 6th July 2013 ISES - Kőzseg Minutes

Group members present at the seminar:

Gerardo Caetano, University of the Republic of Uruguay- Centro de Formación para la Integración Regional (CEFIR), Montevideo, Uruguay Natalie Doyle, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia Luciana Gil, University of Bologna, campus in Argentina Mariana Luna Pont, National University Tres de Febrero (UNTREF), Buenos Aires Ferenc Miszlivetz, Institute for Social and European Studies (ISES), Kőzseg, Hungary Lorenza Sebesta, University of Bologna, campus in Argentina Pierre Tilly, University of Louvain la Neuve, Belgium

BOOK PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Thursday, July 4th, Europa House/ISES-UNESCO chair Library

Ferenc Miszlivetz (FM) opened the seminar welcoming the guests from Europe, Latin American and Australia and highlighting the objectives of the Summer Course within which the INTEGRA seminar has been framed; he then explained briefly the aims of the whole endeavour of the Europa House of Kőzseg. Lorenza Sebesta (LS) thanked FM for accepting to organize the mid-term meeting in such a perfect institutional surrounding, which for sure will provide a perfect frame for the kind of intensive discussions the seminar is due to be made of. She also greeted the students of the ISES Summer School participating at the first session of the seminar. Christine Voelkl, project advisor from the EACEA agency, was also present at the first day's presentation and discussions.

LS briefly reviewed the draft programme and asked Natalie Doyle (ND) to join her for the book presentation, which, as she explained, had been written with four hands

during the last months. She explained the origin of the ideas embodied in the project and talked about some previous Jean Monnet seminars in Buenos Aires which offered a first testing ground. She spoke about the critics advanced by Goran Therborn, in the framework of the seminar *Integración y modernización: un nuevo marco conceptual para entender la Unión Europea y el Mercosur. Teorías y prácticas de las experiencias tempranas*. co-hosted in November 2011 by the Centre of Excellence Unibo-BA and University Tres de Febrero. The Swedish scholar has also offered in his many essays and books a sociological definition of modernization using a series of sociological parameters (urbanization, alphabetization, birth rates, industrialization etc.). Therborn operationalized each parameter and measured the rates reached in each field by societies of European countries inside and outside the European Communities and found homogeneity between the two groups –which led him to dismiss the influence of integration in the process. Another critique was advanced (in the second seminar of the above-mentioned programme, held in 2012) by Liborio Mattina who considered the term “modernization” excessively biased, as it remitted to the theories of modernization introduced mainly by North American scholars between the Fifties and Sixties. These theories purported modernization to be a universally valid linear process which should follow the pattern it had experienced in the United States. As such, those theories had been used normatively by the US administration in a series of selected “underdeveloped countries” in the hope that their “development” could follow the US lines (Latin American countries being prominent among them). This resulted in a series of negative experiences which, in the opinion of Mattina (and that of many other scholars), had emptied the theory of its analytical as well as normative validity.

LS said that the starting point of the project was to reformulate the meaning of modernization as the road to modernity and try to give an encompassing definition of the latter, much broader than the sociological and/or the political science previous attempts. She said that, this way, integration would be given a pivotal role, as one crucial factor that helps redefining contemporary modernity; at the same time, this latter would be seen as an important element in the new definition of European integration the project is aiming at. She began by summarizing what was the broad definition of modernity on which partners could ultimately agree in the book presentation’s text. Modernity, she said, was here meant as being what “Western societies” had experienced due to the convergence of French Revolution ideas (mainly equality) and industrial capitalism (interpreted as offering the material resources necessary to put equality in practice). ND added that this point should be stressed in the book presentation.

She then spoke of the main agents of the process leading to modernity, the state and the market, as not being necessarily alternative. She then went on clarifying when and how these two agents had not been able to fulfil their role of modernizing agents (mainly during the Thirties, with the rising of authoritarian states and the capitalist crises). It was observed that it would be worth to clarify that when referring to “the state”, one should clarify whether the modernising thrust is directly managed through the central national authority or at sublevels.

LS then spoke about the ideological premises of the II post-world war integration as being the founding of a common ground between positions which had previously been at the opposite end of the political spectrum –i.e., in the words of Albert Hirschman, the position of those who prized *laissez-faire* policies and those who preached centralization planning. She called it “a Keynesian consensus”, while ND clarified this was not to mean that those taking these views favoured economic Keynesian policies (as a matter of fact,

she mentioned German ordoliberalism which was far from them) and suggested to use another expression in order not to create misunderstandings. After some discussion on the point, it was agreed that the common feature of the different visions which coincided and converged into European integration was the consensus of full employment as a crucial social and economic issue. The commitment to full employment provided through state action was the framework within which differences between the various economic philosophies and social models could be reconciled and translated into a common project. LS went on explaining how the process of European integration responded to this double failure with historical examples taken from the ECSC and referring, lastly, to the agricultural policy.

After the lunch break, the group reached the facilities of the Library of the Europa House, set in the splendid venue of the UNESCO chair. LS went on approaching Latin America describing how economic modernization acquired a special feature in that region because of the fact that it was framed within the so-called first globalisation (1870-1914). This meant that, as a peripheral region- highly dependent on the need of the core countries-, its economic outburst was based on primary products and agricultural commodities in opposition to the European one, which was mainly geared to industrial production. The second important feature had to do with political modernisation which was frustrated by the existence of a highly oligarchic society.

A long discussion followed the presentation, from which it came out, amongst others:

- that the interrelation between external and internal factors should be highlighted as an important element in determining the changes in relationships and contents of integration and modernisation. For example, in LA it was the interwar period and the declining demands and supplies from the central countries, which pushed industrialisation.

- that it would be worthwhile to consider the problem of modernisation and integration in the light of the current crisis, which highly questions the true meaning of both. As a matter of fact, the crisis can help us link Europe and LA experience, because LA experienced financial crisis earlier than Europe. Even so, it was suggested that this could totally shift the focus of the book.

- the importance of some crucial dichotomies should be taken into consideration by the individual papers:

1. first phase of integration/ second phase of integration
2. contrast between centre and periphery
3. left/right divide, especially as it interact with the national /international tension

- the importance of a clear periodization was also stressed. When writing the introductory presentation of the book in its final shape, ND and LS should take good note of these elements.

INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

Every paper presentation was followed by comments and questions. This cleared the path for thorough discussion, which took up most of the time for each session.

Pierre Tilly. he analysed different integration plans from the Briand plan of 1929 to the Schuman plan of 1950, with a special emphasis on their economic features. In many instances these plans questioned the role of the state as an agent of modernisation and recognized a certain decline of Europe vis-à-vis the US. Many of these plans tried to address how economic modernisation could be harmonized with social needs and advocated the necessity of economic planning as a third way between communism and liberalism.

Mariana Luna Pont. Drawing on the ideas developed by the last author mentioned by Tilly (Thomas), she concentrated on local actors during the interwar period. Recalling the fact that the 19th century is normally studied from a state-centred approach, she highlighted the transnational relationships developed among many local authorities in Europe and the USA. Her paper concentrated on 2 examples: 1) the European communal movement 2) the transatlantic urban dialogue. In this context she concentrated on the linkages between internationalism as a special kind of integration and the modernising concepts of social order held by representatives of municipalism.

Friday, July 5th, Europa House/ISES

Lorenza Sebesta. She spoke about Alexandre Kojève and his ideas on the end of history as a useful tool to focus on the link between modernisation and integration. In particular, she mentioned the concepts of classless society and the one of the universal homogeneous state as two crucial visions which were, in a way, embedded in European integration and clearly referred to the concept of political modernization. On the other hand, she emphasized the importance, in Kojève's view, of the reinterpretation on equal terms of the Hegelian concept of master and slave (and the need of the first one of recognition) in the understanding of French approaches to the German question after the Second World War.

Natalie Doyle. She presented the slight change in emphasis from her original proposal, which she now suggests should focus on the economic functionalism of European integration, that is, its institutional bias towards isolating the market from political pressures. Starting with a rebuttal of the increasingly influential idea that European integration was a neoliberal project from the start, she established a clear periodization between two phases of European integration and discussed both elements of continuity (technocratic functionalism informed by a liberal suspicion of the state) and discontinuity (abandonment of the commitment to full employment) between the two phases, in the longing for a sort of social liberalism. This led her to discuss the period of the Eighties and the renewed projects of integration as conditioned by the profound ideological shift of the Seventies in favour of a new social imaginary seeing in market autonomy a superior agency of the greater economic efficiency now required for the provision of employment in the context of the new competition emanating from the rising Asian tigers. At the same time, she established a contrast between the Eighties and the ensuing two decades, in which the end of the cold war contributed to the demise of the post WWII consensus with the objective of abandoning employment in favour of economic growth for its own sake.

Luciana Gil. Her paper addresses the tensions between the state and the market as agents of modernisation using trade barriers in two phases of the Mercosur integration processes (1991 to 2009). The paper compares a first phase (1991-2001), when modernisation was expected to be the result of neoliberal politics, and a second one (2002-2009), when integration became part of a nationalist discourse on growth and

development. She focuses on the Argentinean footwear industry as a case study which exemplifies the difficulties faced by both agents to develop creative tools to cope with modernisation.

Gerardo Caetano. He concentrated on the importance of integration for the modernisation of small countries. His paper took as an example the case of Uruguay in the framework of Mercosur, referring to its main stumbling blocks, and their reasons. He said that one of the results of these stumbling blocks could be a re-orientation of the political will in Uruguay to embrace free trade agreements as alternative ways to modernisation.

Ferenc Miszlivetz. Trying to address different elements of the relationship between regional integration and modernisation in Europe, he stressed the necessity for Europe to use different tools in different contexts. He recalled that the European Union had been, in a certain way, possible because of the NATO and Russian armies guaranteeing the borders. The end of the cold war changed the importance of both, but these changes were not addressed by European leaders. From another point of view, FM considered that the EU should serve to overcome the Westphalian system, but, as a matter of fact, historical experiences as German reunification and the Balkan wars were deeply connected to that system. He ended up saying that the current development of integration was in fact reinforcing the national states. Every paper presentation was followed by comments and questions, which cleaned the path for thorough discussion which took most of the time of each session.

PRACTICAL DETAILS OF THE PROJECT

Saturday, July 6th, Europa House/ISES

A presentation was delivered on the digital resources for sharing and disseminating information about the project, like the website, the Google drive tools, the bibliographical references software and the Jean Monnet Programme Community. Then, details of the publications were discussed. We hereby summarise the main results of the session:

1) It was proposed and accepted to change the structure of the book following the comments made by José Paradiso to the book presentation. This is the provisional new index:

Title: IDEAS

Research questions: Which were the ideas that permeated the thinking of the intellectual elites and policy makers involved in projects of integration in both Europe and LA in terms of modernisation and its links to integration? Which were the genealogies of their visions?

Ivanna Travaini
Flora Anderson
José Paradiso
Lorenza Sebesta
Natalie Doyle

Title: PRACTICES

Research questions: What were the practices through which these ideas were given flesh and bones during different moments of the integration processes?

Luciana Gil
Martín Obaya
Beatriz Larrain
Gonzalo Sozzo

Title: AGENTS

Research questions: Who were the agents of modernisation in both Europe and LA?
Which kind of integration did they favour?

Pierre Tilly/Michel Dumoulin
Mariana Luna Pont
Pascaline Winand
Sandra Negro
Paulina Astroza

EPILOGUE: authors have been asked to take into account questions of each part of the book in the light of the current crisis, in particular trying to associate the contemporary crises to the fact that both LA and Central Europe were inspired by the achievements of the first phase of European integration, but embarked on their own integrative effort at a time of ideological shift in both Europe and the West generally (in favour of the market being a superior agency of modernization).

Gerardo Caetano
Ferenc Miszlivetz

2) Final paper deadline: 15th October 2013. LS stressed the importance of being strict on this date in order to be able to comply with the deadline of the publication of the book and of the special number of the review, which is the 31st of August 2014. She also informed the partners that, as far as it is now, she received draft individual presentations by José Paradiso and Paulina Astroza.

3) Formal details of the final paper agreed: a. Length: 5.000-8.000 words. b. Structure: between 2 and 3 levels maximum. This means: TITLE 1. Subtitle 1.a. Sub- title (if necessary) c. Footnotes: Only at the end of the page (NOT in text, NOT at the end of the text). LS will provide an example to be followed by authors.

4) Languages: 5 papers will be delivered in Spanish (Paulina Astroza, José Paradiso, Gonzalo Sozzo, Gerardo Caetano, Ivanna Travaini). The English of almost all other papers will be edited by a native speaker.

5) External peer reviewers: each formal partner will provide at least one name of possible external peer reviewers, who will be invited to read 4 papers. Ferenc proposed Tibor Palánkai (Corvinus University of Budapest) and said he will facilitate the contact between him and LS; LS proposed Susana Czar de Zalduendo; ND and PT would make a proposal further on.

6) The results of the external peer review are due to be given by the end of 2013. It was suggested that after this phase ND and LS, taking account of the results of the review and the whole intellectual framework of the book presentation, should be responsible of deciding which paper would fit the English book and which one in the

Spanish special number of the review Puente@Europa. The members did not have any objection to that.

7) A draft letter of agreement for the payment of the individual papers (in Spanish) was briefly illustrated, passed to the members, and accepted by them as a suitable means to formalize the payment due to the authors.

8) Publishers: Routledge and Macmillan will be approached by ND. At the same time, she will explore the editorial conditions offered by Monash publishing house. Peter Lang will be considered as a last option possibility because of its position in the Australian ranking of research quality. FM proposed also contacting the Central European University Press, which is a publisher with peer review process. They require to see the whole manuscript. ND will check how they are ranked in Australia before contacting them. We recall here Mariana Luna Pont's (MLP) suggestion, since in the kickoff meeting the possibility emerged of co-editing with UNTREF. After that, she was able to confirm the ability of the university of doing it (it is still to be clarified whether the co-edited book could be published in English or in a bilingual version. MLP and ND will enquire about this in UNTREF and Monash University).

9) Webinars planned in the original programme will be split in Skype sessions due to time gap among the Europe, LA and Australia and because of technical limitations that emerged at the new UNIBO's premises in Argentina.

ESTA ACTIVIDAD SE REALIZÓ CON EL APOYO DE LA UNIÓN EUROPEA EN EL ÁMBITO DE LA ACCIÓN JEAN MONNET.