A thoughtful book edited by Finn Laursen. It represents the contributions of the new generation of political-economists to the grander and more structural problems of European Integration. It is a far more Americanized work compared to, say, Pelkmans and Jacquemin, both in methodology (modeling, game-theory, implicit premises of what counts as evidence and what you look for as cause) and is confidently theoretical. The first three chapters are more in the nature of system analysis, the rest are case studies. The confidence of the volume and its authors is also the hallmark of weakness: Theirs is THE way to understand the problems and THE way to think of their solution. But then why should political economists be different from economists simpliciter and for that matter from lawyers and politologists. Shocking price which even libraries will resist.

JHHW


This collection of materials is a companion to the author's text book. It is also a useful 'stand alone' for the most important instruments in the field.

JHHW


If every American knew as much about America as Professor Fischer expects them to know about the European Union... if every European knew as much about Europe as Professor Fischer expects Americans to know the old Continent.... This book has a strange quality: It is not rooted in any academic discipline – it is part history, part political science, part law, part political economy. But it works wonderfully: It provides a useful panorama for any outsider who wants not only to know about the mechanics of the Union but to feel its geist. Even if you count yourself as an expert, you will learn something new from almost every chapter. On the costly side if compared to, say, the Pinder volume reviewed above.


This is an edited volume concerning a topic of considerable political and academic importance. In its central parts the book contains country reports from both “Western” and “Eastern” Europe – of a high quality in a field which has suffered from some inflationary pressures. The concluding essay of the editors – a kind of stocktaking – cannot and does not do justice to the preceding chapters. Two introductory essays by Kommers & Thompson and by Nevil Johnson on ideas and concepts of constitutionalism are fine, thoughtful pieces. Very disappointing, however, is the unusually thin introduction to the entire book by Hesse. This is surprising given not only the richness to be found in the very volume of which he is co-editor but also given the richness of Constitutional Discourse in recent British political science by scholars like Bellamy and Castiglione and by legal theorists such as McCormick. The chapter on the European Union by Schuppert conveys the impression that the only interesting things to say about European Community constitutionalism can be said in the German literature. As an article for a German audience that would be an insult. To the broader audience of this book such an insular approach offers comic relief. The chapter by Grimm on German constitutionalism is more enlightening to general constitutional discourse than that of Schuppert on the European Union.

JHHW


Well selected, well edited and well presented – both tomes. The choices in the international law collection are, per force, personal. Some nice selections were exercised here such as the inclusion, case by case, of the principal Security Council Resolutions on the various flare points in the world since the “end” of the Cold War (Gulf War, Yugoslavia, Somalia, et cetera). Another interesting touch for readers of this Journal is the special accent given to the European dimension of many of the subjects covered. Also interesting is the chronological table of materials – the evolution of the field as seen through some of the most notable instruments. The European law collection is comprehensive and includes not only the Treaty provisions and secondary legislation but also the principal cases of the Court in each area.


This book most certainly deserves a more detailed review which, hopefully, will be published. It is sufficiently important to draw immediately to the attention of our readers. Beyond the traditional analysis of the relationship between the two legal orders there is a passionate critique of the jurisprudence of the ECJ informed, to choose one’s words carefully, by the author’s understanding of some classical liberal philosophers. Most of the factual matrix of the critique consists of what may or might be considered the discrepancy in the Court’s outlook on certain issues if they appear within an intra-Community and inter-Community context. Criticism of that phenomenon is not new, even if the book might, inadvertently I am sure, give that impression. The Court’s active or passive acquiescence in a less than full commitment to international free trade, its problematic attitude for some time in fields such as anti-dumping – have been the subject of oft biting critique, albeit in a more pragmatic way, by authors such as Van Bael & Bellis, Vermulst, Bronckers. In that respect this is Sunday’s Roastbeef, diced and spiced and served as new on Monday. But it is the spice which makes this book interesting and worthy of serious reflection. For Kuilwijk tries to situate his analysis not in a simple, intuitive context as some of his predecessors, but in a rich jurisprudential and articulate context which moves from a discrete case by case criticism to an overall critique of the supposed world view behind the Court’s jurisprudence, which, is apparently guilty not of mere injustice but of a denial of the realization of human potentiality itself. The tone of the book is quite sharp, at times gratuitously so – vintage Rasmussen. But better that than the sycophantic tone which characterizes so much writing about the European Court of Justice. Two questions remain open: Are the unflattering conclusions of the author and his understanding of the Court really supported by the jurisprudence in the field of international trade? This is not an easy question to answer since it requires not only reflection whether the cases the author cites actually support his conclusions but also a consideration of the cases the author does not cite. An authoritative conclusion must be consistent with the totality of the jurisprudence. One does not judge the health of a society by a visit to the emergency ward of a hospital. One hopes that this book will stand up better to the substantive and methodological scrutiny it is likely to evoke than, say, the somewhat similarly sharply worded work by Coppel and O’Neill in the field of human rights. My hunch on the basis of only initial research is that there is merit to much of what the author says but that the picture is far more complex and differentiated than the author would have us believe. No single or simple paradigm can explain the jurisprudence in this area. Even more interesting is to examine the world view of the author – the one he declares to have and the one implicit in his critique but never articulated. It will be a question of