

EXPLORING THE SOCIOLOGY OF EUROPE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL COMPLEX

MAURICE ROCHE



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC

CONTENTS

<i>List of Acronyms</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
1 Approaching European Society	1
2 The European Social Complex: Europe as Network and Empire?	26
PART 1 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL COMPLEX: CIVILISATIONS AND NATION-STATES	45
3 Origins of the European Social Complex: Pre-modernity, Commonalities and Europe as a ‘Civilisation’	47
4 Developing the Modern European Complex: Nation-states, Citizens and Difference	75
PART 2 THE MODERN EUROPEAN COMPLEX AND SOCIAL CHANGE: A EUROPE OF NATIONS, WARFARE STATES AND WELFARE STATES	101
5 The Modern European Complex: War and Peace	103
6 The Modern European Complex: Welfare and Citizenship	130
PART 3 THE EUROPEAN COMPLEX IN THE 21ST CENTURY: CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL CHANGE AND EUROPEAN WELFARE CAPITALISM	159
7 Contemporary Social Change and European Welfare Capitalism: The Challenges of Globalisation and Post-industrialism	161
8 The EU and the European Social Complex: The Europeanisation of Welfare States and Welfare Capitalism?	192
9 The European Civil Complex: Cosmopolitanism and the Sociology of Europe	219
<i>Bibliography and References</i>	241
<i>Author and Name Index</i>	269
<i>Subject Index</i>	273

APPROACHING EUROPEAN SOCIETY

Introduction

This book aims to introduce, to develop and to explore the sociology of Europe and this chapter, together with Chapter 2, sets the scene for this project. The book as a whole aims to make the case that we need a sociological perspective on Europe, if only to counter-balance and contextualise dominant and often misleading political and academic conceptions of Europe and of the European Union in particular, which reduce them to being mainly economic or international legal entities. However, the ground on which to develop such a sociological perspective has not yet been secured by the discipline. It has certainly not been well trodden and it remains significantly unexplored.

Evidently, Europe, even in its EU form, is not a nation-state, which is the dominant form taken by societies in the modern period. So maybe, then, it is not a society either, in which case there would be no basis on which to set out to develop a 'sociology of Europe'. Perhaps this is why, by comparison with other social science and historical disciplines which have developed active specialisms addressing the EU in particular, there has been little comparable effort of this kind in sociology, the discipline devoted to the study of 'societies'.¹ The first section (below) reflects on this negative view.

The book is organised into three parts concerned with Europe's societal history (Chapters 3 and 4), its development of nation-state-based societies (Chapters 5 and 6) and contemporary social change, particularly with respect to welfare and the social economy (Chapters 7 and 8). These will be previewed later in more detail (third main section below). First, it is necessary to review some of the senses in which both Europe and the EU can be reasonably conceptualised and studied as forms of 'society', and this review will be taken further in Chapter 2. There are some ambiguities and dualities about understanding Europe as a society, and these are recurrent features of this field. They will be reflected on throughout our discussion and two of them need to be recognised from the outset. First, there is the ambiguity that contemporary Europe is not identical to the international organisations claimed to represent

it, particularly the EU. Secondly, there is the important ambiguity that the EU can be seen either as an aggregate of nation-state societies and their differences, or as a sphere of commonalities, although it cannot easily be seen as both of these things simultaneously. The commonalities view provides some ground for seeing Europe and/or the EU as forms of society, but the aggregate-of-differences view appears to provide little ground for this. Before we go much further we need to try to clarify these two ambiguities.²

In relation to the first duality between Europe and the EU, it is worth bearing in mind that in 2005 the EU contained only 27 member states (as of 2008). This was fewer than the total number of nation-state societies occupying the area of the European sub-continent (among others, Norway, Switzerland and various Balkan countries remain outside the EU), and it is fewer than other relevant international organisations such as the Council of Europe (47 member states, as of 2008). That said, the EU remains the most organisationally developed and influential project Europeans have ever generated in the modern period to create a legally integrated and operational corporate European entity, an entity which has both international and also transnational features. Given this, and also given the fact that the EU possesses an expansionary dynamic which is likely to lead to the incorporation of many of the remaining non-EU states on the sub-continent over the coming generation, it is not unreasonable to view the EU as being significantly representative both of the sub-continent's societies and of Europe's society more collectively. So, while recognising the difference between Europe and the EU throughout this book, it is intended, and indeed is inevitable, that this difference will also be elided at various points in the discussion.

In relation to the second and more consequential duality noted above, Europe has always presented an enigmatic Janus face to those seeking to reflect on it and understand it, certainly throughout the modern period but also in preceding periods. That is to say, on the one hand Europe has appeared as characterised by its commonalities, as for instance in the recurrently influential concept that Europe is a 'civilisation'. Indeed, from some perspectives, both objective and 'Eurocentric' perspectives, it has been the world's most important civilisation.³ However, on the other hand it has also recurrently presented itself as little more than an aggregate of a variety of differences, whether ethnic, religious or national. Indeed, throughout the modern period it has regularly been an arena of often violent conflict over the (assumed) deep differences between its nation-states and their associated ideologies and collective identities.

This fundamentally dualistic character of Europe does not provide secure ground on which to base a claim that Europe is a society. 'The Europe of commonalities' might provide such a basis, but 'the Europe of differences' does not. So from the outset we need to be aware that the project of developing and exploring a sociology of Europe, of the kind undertaken in this book,

must involve a willingness not only to navigate between, but also to live with, both aspects of this duality, which is a fundamental characteristic of Europe and of Europeans' experience of 'the social' in the sub-continent over two millennia. With this in mind, in the following two sections we begin to consider the positive view that Europe *is* a society and also what this might mean.

The first section looks at commonsensical (that is, everyday and administrative) senses in which it is meaningful to speak about Europe as a society. It then goes on to consider some more general sociological and social theoretical discourses on European society, and in doing so it argues that the potential sociology of Europe needs to be intellectually located in the context of the broader challenges facing contemporary sociology.

Arguably, the discipline of sociology in general is in a period of radical overhaul and renewal of its mission and its theoretical and substantive research agendas. To face the challenge of developing the new field of the sociology of Europe involves engaging with this 'renewal agenda'. The second section outlines an analytic framework to help conceptualise the work in this new sociological field, which is opened up in more detailed and substantive ways in the main parts of the book. This framework is concerned with societies understood in terms of structure and change, that is structurally as social formations (of what will later be referred to as 'societal dimensions' and 'deep structures'), and in terms of social change (understood as transformations of these structures through processes of modernisation, globalisation and associated Europeanisation). This sociological framework is applied throughout the book both in terms of its general intellectual strategy and also in terms of the questions and debates to which its various parts and chapters are designed to be responses and contributions. As such it provides a basis for the preview and outline of the structure and content of the book, which is then provided in the third section.

In this book, then, we are concerned, among other things, with sociological aspects of historical and contemporary processes of 'Europeanisation' in European nation-state societies.⁴ Some of these processes derive from the special and powerful contemporary dynamics of EU integration, and others derive from various sources, including those of history and globalisation, which influence both European and non-European societies. To weight the discussion towards Europeanisation processes is not to underplay the persistence of the consequential European duality noted earlier, that is the persistence of a Europe characterised as much by its differences as by the commonalities with which they coexist. As indicated above, overall the discussion in this book aims to navigate between the two sides of this duality. To begin with, then, we can encounter commonsensical and social scientific views of Europe as a potential society (first main section), before turning to outline the more developed sociological framework which will be employed to structure and guide the book's discussion (second main section).

Perspectives on European Society

The idea that Europe in general and the EU as its core contemporary expression can be seen as being in some sense a ‘society’ has some credibility in both commonsensical and social scientific perspectives. However, by contrast, sociology, the discipline which claims the remit to study ‘society’, has had all too little to say explicitly about Europe.⁵ So in this section we will do two things. On the one hand, we briefly note the non-sociological ways in which Europe and the EU can be credibly seen as a society together with the limitations of these views. And on the other hand, we briefly rehearse and reflect on the curiosity of sociology’s traditional apparent indifference to Europe as a form of society.

‘Commonsense’ views of European society: everyday and administrative perspectives

Two non-sociological perspectives, which we can refer to as ‘everyday’ and ‘administrative’ perspectives, provide some initial positive views of the idea that Europe and the EU in particular can be seen as a society.⁶

An everyday perspective

From an everyday perspective a great range of categories of people across the EU member states interact with, or take account of the existence and relevance of, the EU in practical, routine and everyday ways. This is particularly so for people working in farming, in the fishing industry, or in the tourism, travel and transport industries, or who live in areas dominated by these industries. Periodic crises in these industries (involving such things as contagious diseases among animals, or the decline of fishing stocks, or safety and environmental problems in the tourism and transport industries), together with EU-level policies and actions to manage them, can be covered in the media across Europe and provide for cross-European public debate. Such crises also serve to shine a light on the extent of the routine cross-European interconnections and interdependencies which operate unnoticed or at least uncommented upon in non-crisis times.

An everyday pragmatic perspective which routinely takes account of the EU as part of ‘the furniture of the social world’ clearly is present in the life-world of members of all of the EU states which are involved in the euro currency system.⁷ Currencies are an ineradicable element of production, of consumption and of many of the transactions of everyday life in market-oriented and capitalist societies. Such a perspective is also present across Europe in such organisations as local and regional public authorities, large multinational companies, universities and law firms, employers’ organisations

and trade unions, social movements and lobby groups. Indeed, many of these kinds of industries and organisations, either themselves or through their associations, have established bases in the heart of the EU policy-making system in Brussels, or they have access to cross-European networks which, in turn, have such bases.⁸

People in these spheres interact with the EU in ways not dissimilar to the ways they interact with national states and governments in a national society. In summary, many people across Europe routinely organise their activities with reference to the existence of the EU as a broadly legitimate authority which contributes to and regulates a significant part of their social environment and which provides them with sets of rules and resources, constraints and opportunities to consider, use or engage with in the course of their activities and projects. They do this irrespective of whether they are politically opposed to or supportive of particular EU policies or indeed the EU as a whole, in the same way that people routinely orient their actions to the existence of their state as a governance system without reference to their political view of particular national governments. Having said this, the everyday view is clearly limited. It is pragmatic and largely unreflective beyond a limited instrumentalism. Also, it is essentially partial and fragmented, and thus at best it implies a picture of European and EU society as an umbrella for a bewildering mosaic of specific groups and their spheres of interest and activity.

An administrative perspective

From an administrative perspective EU agencies such as Eurostat gather and interpret comparative social data derived from a range of official surveys conducted on an annual cycle in the 27 current EU member states on such things as employment, unemployment, income, family structures and household composition, political attitudes, gender and age inequalities, and so on. In the course of communicating this to publics, users, and the media across the EU they often refer to this information as being about ‘European society’. This is comparable to the ways that official statistical administrators in nation-states publicise their information as being about national societies.

The administrative view addresses national societies as self-contained units and provides us with a picture of the EU and EU society both as an ‘aggregate’ of these units and also as an artificial domain characterised by the ‘averages’ which can be constructed between national datasets. Beyond this, such a perspective, consistently maintained over time, can either reveal or construct social trends (depending on one’s epistemology) among European national societies. These cross-European trends can be interpreted to have potentially problematic medium- and long-term implications for the continent’s national societies; European citizens and policy-makers can come to see themselves as facing common social problems. This is the case, for instance, in relation to such trends as the decline in fertility and population replacement rates, or the

general ageing of the population (both of which we consider further in our discussion of European welfare and social policy in Chapters 6–8 later). The identification of such trends in aggregate European society can provide common topics of public and political debate across Europe and also incentives for European states to coordinate their policy responses, particularly through the EU.

However, neither the everyday perspective nor the administrative perspective on Europe as a potential society provides for a perception and understanding of the EU as containing elements such as a common cultural identity, an integrated social structure, and an intra and intergenerational socialisation and social transmission system, which are among the elements typically taken, particularly in the discipline of sociology, to characterise what counts as a ‘society’. Before we consider aspects of the sociological view of Europe further we can briefly turn to some of the various reflective but non-sociological views of Europe that are present in other social scientific and humanities disciplines.

Disciplinary perspectives on European society: humanities and social sciences

The sociological framework outlined later (second main section) recognises societies as having a number of dimensions, each of which can be the object of particular social science and humanities studies. Thus sociological perspectives on societies need to remain open to and informed by a range of disciplinary studies. Indeed, it can offer some elements of a more integrated perspective (a ‘meta-perspective’) capable of contributing substantially to the intellectual coherence of the multi- and interdisciplinary studies needed by multidimensional social complexes and processes in the contemporary period.

Humanities disciplines, such as history and also archaeology, have tended to present a picture of Europe as at least a long-evolving, continent-wide arena of interconnected social movements and institution-building projects, including religion-, nation- and empire-building projects. Europe’s commonalities– differences duality is represented in history, on the one hand, by the differentiating and fragmenting visions of Europe which are dominant in the discipline and which are generated by national histories and event histories (e.g. wars). On the other hand, the commonalities view is represented by histories which take a Europe-wide view, by comparative history, and also by thematic histories of processes, which need to be tracked in their impacts and effects as reaching across many societies (e.g. plague, war, and technology).⁹ With C.W. Mills, I believe that ‘the historical imagination’ is critical to any conception of ‘the sociological imagination’.

While this is always an important aspect in the study of national societies, it is, for reasons to be discussed later (Chapter 2), absolutely essential

when approaching the study of European society and the EU. With this in mind, in Part 1 of the book we explore the historical territory in more detail by discussing the main forms, stages and factors in the long-term development of European society, both in its commonalities and its differences.

From a social sciences perspective, the disciplines of, for instance, political science and economics have generated substantial traditions of research and analysis of the EU as an economic system and as a political system, respectively.¹⁰ In particular, political science has generated analyses which see Europe, particularly the EU, as an aggregate of national differences (e.g. ‘intergovernmentalist’ perspectives on the EU) as well as more integrative views which see Europe in terms of its commonalities and which see the EU in particular as one form or another of supra-national project (e.g. ‘functionalist’ perspectives). In recent years political science has reanimated the differences view of Europe by tracking the national state and citizenship-building of the post-communist societies of Eastern Europe.¹¹ And, together with legal studies, it has reanimated the commonalities view by taking seriously the challenges presented by globalisation and world regionalisation to European societies.¹²

Given that societies are composed at least of economic and political systems together with their interconnections, then it is reasonable to assume that these disciplines imply that an EU society exists even if they do not explicate this assumption. However, these social sciences and related views are, by definition, discipline-specific and tend to be intellectually disconnected. This produces a fragmented image of the EU as a set of decontextualised (economic, political and other) structures and processes. The social whole addressed by these perspectives is difficult to see as adding up to more than the sum of the parts. Compared with this, in principle, the discipline of sociology has as part of its mission to provide analyses which draw on and integrate a range of social sciences perspectives, including aspects of the political and the economic. It has traditionally done this for national societies, and in recent decades has done something similar for ‘global society’, but it has until recently had little to say about Europe in these respects, as we note next.

Sociology and Europe

From its inception in late nineteenth-century intellectualism and academy-building, one of the most important tools of the sociologist’s trade could be said to be the concept of ‘society’.¹³ Against all of the disintegrative tendencies of our times, this concept appears to continue to make sense and to be applicable at local, national and even ‘world’ levels. Nonetheless evidently it appears to remain an enigma when applied to social organisation on the

sub-continent of Europe, in spite of the social reality of the everyday and administrative experiences and recognitions of European-level social organisation noted earlier. If nothing which can be defined as 'European society' can be said to exist, whether as fact or as potential, then there is little justification or incentive for sociologists to attempt to develop a sociology of Europe in general or a sociology of the European Union in particular.

However, against this, it might be argued that of course sociology has long been and remains committed to the study and understanding of European societies. For a start, every European nation-state has long been scrutinised and analysed at the very least by its own 'homegrown' sociological professionals and communities. Surely, then, it can be reasonably argued that, at the very least, the aggregation of all of these studies and professions constitutes a '*de facto*', 'in principle', sociology of Europe? In addition, and more convincingly, there are the long-standing and well-developed fields of comparative empirical sociology and comparative social policy analysis.¹⁴ Each of these has often taken European societies as its main field of study. Surely the comparative and empirical study of different forms of industrial and post-industrial state-capitalist, 'welfare-regime' and 'welfare capitalist' social formation among European countries amounts to a '*de facto*' sociology of Europe and of 'European society' such as it is? In addition to this, what about the more qualitative and case study-based studies of particular urban, regional, migratory and national cultures in Europe, the studies of Europe's borderlands and its cosmopolitan cities and so on, which are collected by anthropologists, social geographers and other varieties of sociologically-relevant social scientist?¹⁵

No doubt there is something to be said for all of these kinds of activity amounting to a '*de facto*' sociology of Europe. However, even if this is so, the field still awaits a clear conceptualisation and theoretical development (see below and later). And in any case it suffers from two notable weaknesses. First, it remains largely theoretically tied to the nation-state as the prime unit of analysis, and thus to an aggregative conception of 'European society' as a secondary unit of analysis. Secondly, and possibly with the exception of post-communist sociological interest in Eastern Europe's 'new nations' and their institutional 'policy culture' connections with the EU, it tends to minimise, and indeed often ignore altogether, the existence and impacts of the European Union as a social organisation, together with its integration and Europeanisation dynamics on European nation-states and national societies, within the EU, on neighbouring societies at its eastern and southern borders, and as a collective actor more widely in contemporary global society (see Chapters 2 and 8).

Unlike political science and economic analyses of the EU, which as we have noted have both developed strongly in recent years, the 'sociology of the EU' still barely exists as an enterprise and a field.¹⁶ For instance, in the sociological

community of at least one EU member state, namely the UK, research interest has been low in recent years. Compared with the plethora of variously constituted 'European Studies' higher education programmes, the UK has relatively few courses of study in the Sociology of Europe. In 1998–2000 the UK's main state-funded social sciences research agency ran a major interdisciplinary research programme studying Europe (namely the ESRC's 'One Europe or Many Europes?' programme). Compared with other disciplines, such as politics, the sociological interest in and contribution to this programme was minimal. Why this is the case is a bit of a mystery. Evidently it is not at all because sociologists are disinterested in life beyond the nation-state – witness their rapid colonisation of the study of the phenomenon of globalisation.¹⁷ However, perhaps sociology's 'rush to globalisation' is part of the problem. Things that are 'in between' the national and global levels, things like Europe, tend to get bypassed. While the references to Europe and the EU in globalisation literature often sound interested and positive, they are also usually very brief and insubstantial – they are 'EU *en passant*'.¹⁸ That said, clearly globalisation is of great significance for a sociological understanding of contemporary Europe and the EU, and we return to this later.

European public attitudes to the EU have evidently changed over time. Currently, there is Europe-wide public and political ambivalence, ranging from passively positive attitudes to indifference to scepticism – scepticism about the costs EU integration appears to bring, financial costs in particular but also the EU's much criticised democratic and legitimacy deficits. This has mounted in recent years to an unprecedented full-blown crisis for the EU in the 2005–09 period. French and Dutch publics rejected the proposed EU Constitutional Treaty in national referenda in 2005, and the Irish public did the same to the successor version, the Reform Treaty, in 2008. We will come back to this ambivalent public mood later (Chapter 9), however perhaps it has operated to undermine sociologists' interest in the field. In countries like the UK in particular, the long-standing and unrelenting anti-European prejudice of the bulk of the national press could possibly have added to academics' ambivalence. Or, less prejudicially, perhaps sociologists have come to acquiesce in some of the public perceptions of the EU as an impenetrably complex entity, most often distant and irrelevant but occasionally, and in unpredictable and excessive ways, intrusive into people's everyday lives.

Having noted contemporary mainstream sociology's traditional nation-state-centrism and its relative indifference to Europe, however, we can also observe that the field is slowly beginning to be recognised and developed both in particular areas, such as work, employment and the welfare state, and also more generally. Some of the new developments beginning to contribute to the sociology of Europe (noted above and see Chapter 9) draw in various ways from social theory, which can be understood as a broader intellectual tradition than that of sociology as such. This tradition includes, for instance, the

reflection on, analysis and critique of Western (effectively at the time European) modernity and industrial capitalist society which was initiated in the late 19th century by seminal European intellectuals such as Karl Marx, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, and developed both in liberal and in critical directions by successive generations worldwide in the 20th century. In this intellectual tradition, whether directly or indirectly, social formations beyond the nation-state (including world and European society), together with historical periods beyond the present (particularly in European history), have always received due attention. The recent sociologically-informed studies of Europe draw on this tradition in their various analysis of Europe as a complex social formation and as one which has been constructed and reconstructed by long-term forces of social change, and the discussion of Europe in this book aims to do the same.

Sociology's recent interest in the key phenomenon of social change in the contemporary period, namely globalisation, together with the reflection on its implications both for nation-state societies and for Europe, has developed in its interface with social theory. It is at this interface also that the challenges to mainstream conceptions of society and its analysis posed by the various 'post'- developments arguably associated with globalisation – namely post-modernism in culture, post-industrialism and post-Fordism in the economy, and post-nationalism in politics – have accumulated. Reflection on these challenges implies the need for a far-reaching 'post-societal' renewal of the field and enterprise of sociology (e.g. Urry 2000). This can be referred to as contemporary sociology's 'renewal agenda'.¹⁹ The new sociologies of Europe noted above recognise and respond to this 'renewal agenda' to one degree or another. My discussion in this book concurs with this view and aims to approach European society in a similar spirit. Bearing in mind the resources of the social theory tradition and related intellectual traditions, we now need to turn to a more direct, if necessarily schematic, outline of some key concepts needed for understanding contemporary Europe as a society from a sociological perspective.

A Sociological Perspective on Europe: Elements of a 'Social Complex' Framework

Perspectives on Europe, such as the everyday and the administrative, and even the multidisciplinary and the '*en passant*' perspectives of much sociology encountered above, only take us so far. To adequately approach the task of understanding Europe as a society a general sociological perspective needs to be developed. This needs to have the capacity to grasp the historical and institutional commonalities, the differences and unavoidable complications, of a sub-continental social world crowded with nation-state societies, each of

them highly self-conscious about their histories and collective identities. In this section, then, the particular framework of concepts to be deployed in this book, which can be referred to as a ‘social complex’ perspective, will be briefly outlined in general terms. In the following section, the particular selection of aspects of European society to be covered in the book’s chapters will be outlined and the relevance of the perspective to this will be indicated. The potential of the analytic framework for understanding Europe and also the EU as a special social organisation attempting to orchestrate European society will be considered in Chapter 2 and its normative implications will be reprised in the final chapter (Chapter 9).

The ‘social complex’ perspective on my interpretation is one which derives in part from classical and mainstream sociology, but which is also intended to be sensitive to sociology’s contemporary renewal agenda noted in the previous section.²⁰ It addresses society in terms of structure and change, accepting that structural analysis (cross-sectional, synchronic analysis) is an abstraction from the historical (diachronic) flow of social reality addressed in the study of social change. Also, in spite of its necessarily summary (and thus structure-emphasising) appearance, the perspective aims to be aware of the pervasive influence of agency and context in all social affairs.

Social structure: In relation to social structure, this perspective sees ‘society’ as a multidimensional social complex or ‘social formation’ of economic, cultural and political dimensions. Taking the concept of ‘social formation’ as the main unit of analysis enables sociology to engage not just with the forms of ‘society’ it is most familiar with, namely nationally organised societies, but also with the more complicated and looser structures which increasingly populate the international arena in our times, for instance networks of states and non-governmental organisations – whether at the level of ‘global society’, or, of particular relevance to understanding the EU, at the level of Europe. In addition, the concepts of social formation and social complex also aim to take account of some less routinely identified contexts and infrastructures involved in the existence and operation of societies and of individual and collective social agents, namely the social contexts (or what we will refer to as the ‘deep social structures’) of time, space and technology.

Social change: In relation to social change, the perspective takes the view that social transformation involves complex combinations and shifting balances of dimensional (economic, cultural and political) and contextual deep structural (time, space and technology) factors and dynamics. It also takes the view that social transformation is endemic in societies in the modern era. This is currently readily recognised outside sociology in the wider world of public discourse and international politics by virtue of the categorisation of societies as ‘developing’ in some cases, as ‘post-communist’ in others, and as ‘transitional’ in each case. However, going beyond this, the perspective suggests that it is

useful to regard *all* societies throughout the modern era, and certainly in the contemporary period, as having been, and as remaining, in what amounts to being a permanent state of ‘transition’. With this in mind, this book focuses on the influence of general and all-pervasive processes of modernisation and of globalisation on European social formations, arguing for the usefulness and relevance of understanding Europe’s nations and the continent’s international configurations as forms of ‘transitional society’, not only because they are modern forms compared with pre-modern forms, but also because of their dynamics within the modern era.

Overall, then, this book’s analysis aims to provide an outline understanding of the nature of, and interconnections between, on the one hand, European social formations (together with their dimensional complexes and deep structural contexts) and on the other hand processes of social transformation in contemporary Europe, particularly those of modernisation and globalisation. This develops a picture of European society in its differences and commonalities as both a complex of transitional societies and also as a transitional social formation as a whole. The rest of this section outlines these concepts and the framework further in general terms, first in relation to social formations (first dimensions and then contexts) and, secondly, in relation to social transformations.

Social formations: societal dimensions and deep social structures

Societal dimensions: economy, polity and culture

Classical and mainstream sociology and social theory developed by addressing and attempting to understand the nation-state-based forms of society and large-scale social organisation which were constructed in the course of the modernisation process, particularly from the mid-19th century, and particularly with respect to their economic or socio-economic aspects as industrial and capitalist societies. From these perspectives, societies were ultimately more or less well-integrated complexes of three key ‘societal dimensions’, namely economies, polities and cultures, typically contained within, and indeed significantly constructed by, nation-state societies. A societal dimension can be conceived as a particular sphere of institutions and interaction, together with a particular form of social inequality and division among people, and related forms of systemic interconnections (‘divisions of labour’) between them. In the economy, the institutions, interactions and inequalities take form in terms of economic production and consumption, property ownership and market exchange. In the polity, they take form in terms of power and authority, or the lack of it, within regimes or states, and particularly in modernity

terms of the nation-state. In the culture, they take form in terms of meanings and identities, values and symbols, and generally in the media and forms of communication.

This kind of dimensional analysis of the institutional differentiations of modern social structure originated in the late 19th century in 'classical' era sociology and political economy, although the founding figures of the discipline no doubt had different interpretations of the nature of, linkage between and priority among these societal dimensions. Societal structures of identity and difference, and the social divisions and inequalities of the major social categories of class that they analysed, together with the social divisions of gender and ethnicity that subsequent generations of sociology analysed, can be conceived in terms of aspects of each dimension. For instance, social classes undoubtedly have political and cultural aspects, but may be analysed as particularly grounded in the economic dimension, while gender and ethnic groups, identities and relationships undoubtedly have political and economic aspects, but can be usefully seen as being grounded in a broad understanding of the cultural dimension (particularly the persistence in modernity of traditional familial and religious organisation).

Deep social structures: time, space and technology ²¹

The concepts of social structure and social formation we are developing here need to be filled out with a concept of 'deep social structures' if we are to adequately address the particular and complex characteristics of Europe and European society. Faced with this task, sociological perspectives on Europe need to be kept open and oriented to the contributions of other and additional social sciences and humanities perspectives on Europe, not only those of economic studies, political studies and cultural studies, relating to the societal dimensions, but also as those of history and human geography, and of relevant studies of the social uses and impacts of science and technology. The concept of 'deep social structures', and the focus on time, space and technology contexts in particular, is intended to provide a basic framework for the development of the sort of multi- and interdisciplinarity needed by a sociological perspective on Europe, and is applied particularly in the historical sociological discussions of the development of European society in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

'Deep social structures' refer to some of the basic general life-world conditions which make human social life both comprehensible and viable. For the purposes of our discussion of European society in this book we can focus on three core conditions, namely time, space and technology. These can be understood as being pervading influences on and conditions of humans' social existence at all social levels, from the interpersonal, through the institutional to the systemic and societal. At the interpersonal and institutional level they contribute to our understanding of the conditions and resources required for action, and for personal and collective agency in general. At the

societal level, in combination with the analysis of societal dimensions, they contribute to what is required to understand both commonalities between national societies and also more developed multinational formations such as those referenced in sociological (rather than normative) conceptions of societal 'civilisation' (see later Chapter 3).

Deep social structures can be understood descriptively in objective, physical and 'material cultural' terms. Thus the contexts of time, space and technology can be illustrated for societies in the modern era by the environments and resources provided respectively by such things as cemeteries and clock-towers, border posts and railways, electricity generating stations and internal combustion engines – the multiplicity of such things are collected together in collective perceptions and understandings of landscapes and cityscapes as environments of social life and activity. In addition to pervasively constituting 'the furniture of the world' in this way, these basic social contexts and the materialities which exemplify them need to be understood as having both symbiotic and also symbolic relations with the structures and agencies of societal dimensions which they contextualise.

First, in terms of symbiotic relations, this is one way of understanding what might be meant by the common sociological view that basic social contexts such as time, space and technology are 'socially constructed'. That is, in addition to their pervasively constitutive role, key elements of them (and thus of the deep structural complex as a whole) are reciprocally continuously reconstructed by particular dimensional (political, economic and cultural) and inter-dimensional actions and effects (see 'social transformations' below). Secondly, in terms of symbolic relations, deep social structures can be seen as 'cultural constructs' of importance to societies' processes of producing and adapting versions of collective identity. That is, conceptions and versions of time, space and technology can be key elements of the overarching worldviews, discourses and ideologies with which sociological understanding has to engage and dialogue, and which are generated by elites and communities in the course of processes and struggles to reproduce, resist or change dominant societal self-understandings.

From a social perspective, *time* refers to the overarching context within which we can understand such things as the temporality of all action; social structuring and reproduction through events and calendars, intragenerational identity reproduction and the management of the succession of life-events in the cycle of ageing; intergenerational relations, cultural inheritance and transmission, and societal reproduction; and the consciousness and influence of history within and between long-term periods and eras.²² From a social perspective, *space* refers to the overarching context for actors and their social organisations, in which the existential facts of human embodiment, mobility and locatedness are to the fore, and thus the real, imagined and virtual spaces and places which are necessarily associated with these facts. In terms of social

construction, space refers to such things as familiar places (homes and home territories) and unfamiliar places; the built environments of cities; human-influenced but apparently 'natural' physical environments and landscapes; and the organisation of mobility within and between built and 'natural' environments.²³ It also refers to the human and social life-sustaining and life-threatening features of physical environments and habitats. From a social perspective, *technology* refers to a particular aspect of the social organisation and process of 'power', that is to the instrumentally rational social organisation of the means, the intellectual and material resources, which are required for effective actions and projects of all types, at all social levels and by all types of social agencies, in particular social complexes. Technology-as-power refers to the combination of the potential uses of material technologies together with the actual types of competences and uses associated with them and which are characteristic of particular human communities.²⁴

Each of these deep structures can be seen to be relevant both to the characterisation and understanding of the three societal dimensions (i.e. particularly economically, or politically or culturally-oriented forms of the social organisation of time and space, and of the uses of technologies), and also to the understanding of the linkages and environments of their interdimensional relations (general, e.g. 'civilisational', aspects of social time, space and technology). In addition, the deep structures of time, space and technology are only analytically distinguishable; in concrete social and historical reality they can be understood as being interconnected in many ways. For instance, perceptions of time and space can be both interconnected by the nature of the contemporary technologies of transport and also of communication, and, without acceding to an over-simplistic technological determinism, we can acknowledge that such time-space connections can be altered by changes in transport and communications technologies.

Just as we need to understand the deep structural aspects of social formations in interconnected ways, as interstructural relations at the deep structural level of social complexes, we need to do the same with interdimensional relations for the institutional and dimensional level of social complexes. Interdimensional relations have been analysed from within mainstream sociological perspectives in mainly nation-statist ways ('methodological nationalism') and in functionalist ways. This can be seen fairly explicitly in a range of areas of sociology, not least in the sociology and social history of nationalism and nation-state and welfare states.²⁵ Interdimensional relations have also come to be analysed in sociology and social theory in more open and flexible ways, focusing on such topics and concepts as 'civil society', 'the public sphere', 'citizenship', and 'cosmopolitanism'.²⁶ Work which focuses on these sorts of interdimensional topic has tended to be more open, particularly to understanding social formations in terms which reach beyond the nation-state model and its assumptions, in particular in terms deriving from concern

for the influence of global-level factors. The project to explore European society as, among other things, a complex social formation characterised by interdimensional dynamics and relations can benefit from reflecting on the work undertaken in recent sociology and related disciplines to apply such concepts in a European context, and we do this periodically throughout the book.

Finally, social complexes, as matrices of actual and possible relationships within and between social dimensions and deep structures, have been at times conceptualised in sociology (both in post-war sociology and also in recent sociology and social theory) in ways which go beyond the nation-state model and which take account of international and transnational levels and experiences. This is so, for instance, in studies of topics such as 'inter-societal systems', 'network society', 'the post-national constellation' and 'civilisations'. Each of these topics has been used to characterise and analyse Europe as a social formation, and we aim to refer to and draw on these kinds of analytical resources at appropriate points as we develop the discussion in the main body of the book.²⁷

However, it remains the case that the analysis of social formations involves abstraction from the realities of the flow and change of real societies in history. The various social dimensions and social contexts connect with each other in social reality in these processes of social transformation. So, to develop the framework for exploring and developing a sociology of Europe further, we need to consider the nature of relevant forms of social transformation next in general terms.

Social transformation: modernisation, globalisation and transition

A sociological perspective which aims to understand Europe as a society, as we have indicated in the discussion so far, needs to develop a conception of society as both a complex social formation, involving key societal dimensions (of polity, economy and culture) and social contexts (time, space and technology), and also one which is continuously in the process of transformation. Before seeing how this perspective can provide a conceptual framework for the studies of European society covered in this book a little more needs to be said about the transformation aspect. Contemporary society, not least in Europe, can be seen as the product of two major transformations, namely those of modernisation and globalisation. The discipline of sociology was created in the late 19th century largely to address and comprehend the nature and implications of modernisation. And it is currently being challenged in comparable terms by the imperative need to understand and assess the social implications of the process of globalisation. So, to approach the analysis of Europe as a society, it is necessary first, drawing on an historical sociology

approach, to briefly consider the general nature of social transformations, and then to look at modernisation and globalisation transformation processes in particular.

On the basis of the discussion of 'social formations' in the previous section, we can suggest that in general terms 'social transformations' can be said to involve complex combinations and shifting balances of dimensional (economic, cultural and political) and deep structural (time, space and technology) factors and dynamics. Social transformation is endemic in societies in the modern era. Outside sociology, in public and political discourse, this pervasiveness of change is currently recognised for some societies in the contemporary international order in their categorisation as being 'developing' and for others as being 'post-communist' societies, both thereby being identified as types of 'transitional' society. However, a sociological perspective which is adaptable to understanding European society would suggest that all societies throughout the modern era, and certainly in the contemporary period, have been and remain effectively in permanent 'transition'. So, first, sociology's general field of study is principally that of types of 'transitional society' and, secondly, this applies particularly to European society. This underlines the importance of an historical sociological approach to the development of the sociology of Europe.²⁸

Modernisation ²⁹

The social transformations of 'modernisation' characterised the development of Western European societies from at least the 18th to the 20th centuries, and they continue to characterise Eastern European societies currently (not least in their recently renewed processes of sovereign nation-state institutionalisation and industrial capitalist economic development). As such it provided classical and mainstream sociology not only with its basic field of study, but also with its great challenge and stimulus as a phenomenon not only, analytically, to map and explain, but also, normatively, to critique and seek to influence.

Modernisation involved 'revolutions' (albeit 'long revolutions' to use Raymond Williams' useful expression³⁰) in medieval and traditional social formations both within and between the three societal dimensions. Within the dimensions, long revolutions occurred in politics (to generate nation-states with increasingly influential legal systems and citizen communities), in economies (to generate, beyond subsistence agriculture, nationally organised mercantile capitalist and then industrial capitalist production and consumption systems), and in cultures (to generate common cultural worlds (mono-cultures) of language, literacy and value which would be open to the power of nationalist politics and industrial capitalist economic life). The implications of this for the relations between the societal dimensions was profound, in that they became significantly differentiated from each other in new legal and

institutional ways, in addition to then being reconnected in new ways, in the course of the modernisation process in nation-state societies.

In addition, modernisation's dimensional 'long revolutions', both separately and taken as a whole, involved the transformation of medieval social contexts. The modernisation of social contexts conveyed a new nation-state-based social organisation and cultural valuation of time, space and technology, an organisation and valuation which better reflected and facilitated the ideologies, aspirations and further development of such societies, particularly in economic and industrial capitalist terms. Modernity's national society-building projects involved the development of nation-centric and nationalistic versions of the societal contexts of time, space and technology, particularly those aspects of the contexts apparently within the control (real or aspirational) of nations (for instance, their own territories, their own histories, and their own material infrastructures and technological resources). While these processes of national cultural construction can provide insights into national societies, they can also obscure the way in which the contexts understood more generally have operated, have been perceived by other nations, and are relevant for the understanding of all of them in the transition to modernity. Further, they can obscure the extent to which, over the course of this transition, the deep structural contexts in general have been interpreted and influenced by international and now globalising forms of social action and social process.

*Globalisation*³¹

Globalisation can be seen as a particular form of modernisation, occurring in the 'late modern' or even 'post-modern' period and as involving developments which can either be regarded as taking modernisation trends to new levels ('hyper-modernisation') or as taking them beyond, and thereby undermining, the paradigm of modernity altogether ('post-modernisation'). Globalisation is argued to have begun to become a dominant vector of modern social development particularly in the late 20th century, although some would argue that it has been an underlying trend within the modernisation process from the very beginning, albeit one long unrecognised and only now becoming visible. Arguably, globalisation involves developments and transformations in the key societal dimensions and social contexts which theoretically differentiates it from, and practically takes it beyond, the social formations produced by the more familiar processes of 'modernisation'. These include developments in the societal dimensions, and also in associated aspects of the social contexts, which can be expressed both in positive terms and also in the more negative 'post'-modern terms of 'post-nationalism', 'post-industrialism' and 'post-modernism' in the political, economic and cultural dimensions, respectively.

More positively, then, globalisation has been associated in the political dimension with a ('post-national') willingness on the part of most nation-states to constrain and even subject their erstwhile 'sovereign' power and authority in

relation to transnational forms of civil society and the rule of law (law emanating, for instance, from world regional international alliances, from global-level governance organisations, in particular the United Nations, and from the theory and practice of universal human rights). In the economic dimension, globalisation has been associated with a (post-industrial) development of a new kind of information and service-based economy in the context both of new communication and transport systems and of the new organisation of economic forces, resources and spaces of capitalism and markets at the global level which they make possible. In the cultural dimension, globalisation has been associated with the ('post-modern') cultural implications of (and also with anti-modern and reactions to and rejections of) such developments as, on the one hand, the spread of consumer culture associated with economic globalisation and new communications technologies, and, on the other hand, the moral and political secularism and universalism associated with political globalisation.

Expressed in terms of the transformation of social contexts, the modernisation process involved (and continues to involve) not only profound dimensional changes but also related changes in the social organisation and cultural representation of time, space and technology. Comparably, globalisation can be argued to simultaneously qualitatively intensify and extend modernisation's deep structural changes. Thus globalisation can be said to have impacts such as 'compressing' the personal and social experience of space and time, and accelerating the pace of technological innovation and its diffusion, in all of the world's societies in ways which are both historically unprecedented and also difficult to adapt to and to control.

Globalisation's ongoing impacts on nation-state societies and their familiar patterns of interdimensional and intercontext connections have been and continue to be potentially profoundly destabilising. National polities, economies and cultures, together with the national organisation of time, space and technology, all of which characterise nation-state societies and their core institutions, are under threat from the pervasive disintegrative influence of dimensional and contextual dynamics increasingly organised at, and reflecting interests and power at, the global level. In addition, interdimensional relations in the social formation at the global level are themselves relatively disintegrated, with economic globalisation currently proceeding at a faster rate than (and thus effectively 'out of control of') political globalisation and governance at a global level. This contributes extra destabilising aspects to the impact of globalisation on national societies.

Contemporary transformations and transitional societies: globalisation, 'glocalisation' and (world) regionalism

Globalisation cannot be understood without appreciating the degree to which it renders all established social formations and societies as 'transitory societies'

and indeed stimulates the construction of new social formations. This is particularly so in relation to the two globalisation-based processes of 'glocalisation' and (world)-'regionalism', each of which is relevant to understanding contemporary Europe as a field of social transformation involving transitional societies at national, sub-national and continent-wide levels.

'Glocalisation'³² is the other side of the coin of globalisation, understood as a standardising and homogenising force, and is a response to it. Glocalisation, as an aspect of globalisation, involves the reconstruction of national and sub-national societies as locally distinctive elements within the overall emerging global 'division of labour' and social formation. This local distinctiveness can take particularly economic and cultural forms. Economically, nations and sub-national regions, faced with the forces involved in the development of global-level markets and economic coordination, tend to seek to identify and develop their potential for corporate comparative economic advantage as productive and trading entities within this emerging environment, in terms of specialisation in particular economic sectors. Comparable with this, culturally (and also in terms of the cultural industry of international tourism), nations and sub-national regions tend to respond to conditions of cultural globalisation by doing something similar. That is they tend to renew and further develop the special and distinctive aspects of their cultural identities through social and economic investment in their place-specific material culture, involving such things as architecture, cityscapes and landscapes, and their history-specific public and performative culture, involving such things as commemorative and festive events. In these terms, glocalisation dynamics help to contribute to the contemporary forms taken by the 'Europe of differences' and the continuing processes of national and sub-national differentiation of societies within Europe.

On the other hand, there is the stimulus globalisation arguably gives to 'regionalism',³³ that is the formation of world regional international associations and organisations of states and other corporate actors. We have suggested that globalisation has destabilising and at least initially disintegrative impacts on nation-state societies. This generalisation might be qualified by adding 'other than for actual or emerging 'superpowers' (notably the USA and China, respectively)' which retain significant potential for unilateral action. Given this, and with the exception of superpowers, it is understandable that groups of neighbouring states might decide to explore the potential for agreements between them which might limit these forces and impacts. While some approaches see world regionalism as some sort of alternative process distinct from globalisation, in my view, and in the view of the perspective outlined here, it is better seen as an important version and expression of globalisation, albeit an ambiguous one containing the potential to interpret and channel globalisation geopolitically in terms of a possible 'multi-polar world order'.³⁴

In terms of sociology's 'renewal agenda', then, key new sociological questions relate to the degree to which globalisation forces and factors have in fact generated and/or have the capacity to generate this new intermediate level and

form of social organisation. This level is 'transnational' from the perspective of nation-state societies but is another, albeit grander, version of 'local' from a global perspective. 'World regional social formations', then, mediate between national and global social formations and share some of each of their characteristics. In the contemporary period, efforts are being made across a number of continents and world regions to create such organisations, for instance Africa (AU), Asia (ASEAN), Latin America (MERCUSOR), and North America (NAFTA). These efforts can be said to testify to the notion that there is a systemic logic in the processes of globalisation which makes it likely that sooner or later more substantial patterns of world regionalism will appear in the world social order.

The sociological perspective we have outlined here, and will develop further in Chapter 2 (also see Chapter 9), aims to contribute to developing a sociology of Europe. It is animated by the general contemporary interest in the discipline of sociology and relatedly of social theory to renew themselves in relation to the new analytic and normative challenges posed by contemporary 21st-century social realities and social change. Central among these challenges are those connected with the social transformational influences of globalisation, together with the related influences of disintegration, reconstruction and glocalisation. Europe is an important arena for engaging with these challenges. In particular, it can be argued that globalisation and its dynamics are being refracted in the European context through the influence of the European Union, and we will look further into these issues at various points throughout this book (particularly Chapters 2, 7, 8 and 9). The EU can be argued to operate both to filter and to steer the forces and dynamics of particularly economic globalisation on behalf of member states. In addition, in terms of the political dimension, the EU arguably represents a significant attempt to develop a new level of political organisation relevant to the new situation created by globalisation's economic power to overwhelm national economies. That is it represents an experiment to achieve a relevant degree of political and social organisation at a level intermediate between the national and global levels, namely at a world-regional or continental level. As such, the EU, understood as an experiment,³⁵ potentially carries lessons for nation-states in other world regions which are currently embarking on the exploration of albeit more speculative and embryonic forms of international association-building. Globalisation dynamics pressure national societies to become 'transitional societies' characterised by simultaneously ever more 'glocal' and also ever more 'world-regional' forms of adaptation. In European terms, this means the simultaneous intensification in the contemporary period, particularly through the EU and its Europeanisation pressures, of Europe's traditionally dualistic character as a 'Europe of differences' and a 'Europe of commonalities'. The sociological framework which has been outlined here is applied to the European social complex in the course of the discussion in this book, and we can now indicate the ground this discussion covers.

Exploring the European social complex: an overview of the book

The book is structured into three main parts, each containing two chapters. In addition, two introductory chapters (this chapter and Chapter 2 following) set the scene, and a final chapter summarises some of the main analytic themes and considers their normative implications (Chapter 9). The introductory chapters outline some relevant concepts and framework which, among others, can be used to analyse Europe sociologically. As indicated above, they include the concepts of the social complex and its dimensional and deep structural aspects, together with the concepts of social change and their global, glocal and regional dynamics. In Chapter 2 these are applied to European society and illustrated in terms of seeing the European complex as, on the one hand, a network society and, on the other, a new type of empire.

Part 1 is concerned with taking an historical sociological overview of the long historical development of the European social complex from the pre-modern to the modern era, in order to understand the origins and development of European society's dualistic character as a complex of commonalities and of differences. It begins by addressing the pre-modern commonalities of Greek, Roman and Christian forms of 'civilisation' and their imperial and feudal forms of social organisation (Chapter 3). It then moves on to begin to focus on understanding the European social complex in modernity and in terms of a Europe of differences, which occupies the following three chapters. This differentiated aspect of the modern European complex is initially engaged with by addressing the nature and development of nationalism and national citizenship (Chapter 4).

Part 2 takes the analysis of the development of the European social complex in the modern era as a 'Europe of differences' further. It addresses the growth in Europe of a system of distinct nation-states which were initially constructed around the waging of war (Chapter 5), and which were later organised to promote of welfare among their national communities (Chapter 6). It considers the relevance of war and also of cultural factors in particular national religions to the development of European welfare states. It also observes the development in Europe of distinct forms and aspects of national citizenship particularly connected with war and welfare.

Part 3 is concerned with understanding social change in the EU-orchestrated European complex and particularly in that aspect of it concerned with welfare. It first considers general contemporary social changes influencing Europe and promoting common kinds of social risks and problems, particularly socio-demographic, globalisation-based and post-industrial developments (Chapter 7). It then goes on to consider the nature of the common efforts to respond to these problems in the form of the development of an EU level of socio-economic and welfare policy (Chapter 8).

Given the preoccupation of the bulk of the book with analysis of the historical and contemporary aspects of the European social complex and analytic aspects of the sociology of Europe, the final discussion (Chapter 9) turns to consider normative aspects. It focuses in particular on cosmopolitanism, a common normative theme in the contemporary sociology of Europe. It proposes a view of European society as a 'civil complex' as a relevant way of interpreting normative cosmopolitanism and applying it to the understanding and assessment of contemporary European society.

Notes

- 1 For some significant developments in the sociology and social theory of Europe, see Beck and Grande 2007; Delanty and Rumford 2005; Favell 2008; Fligstein 2008; Rumford 2002; Outhwaite 2008; and the References section for other works by these authors together with the discussion in Chapter 9. Also see Bauman (2004) and sociologically influenced work on Europe and the EU, such as Christiansen et al. 1999; Medrano 2003; Risse 2004; Rodriguez-Pose 2002; Schneider and Aspinwall 2001; Shore 2000; and Walters 2002. For relevant multidisciplinary studies, see Dunkerley et al. 2002; and Sakwa and Stevens 2006.
- 2 Also see Calhoun 2001. Generally on the contested meaning and the nature of 'European identity', see Balibar 2004; Cederman 2001; Garcia 1993a, 1993b, 1997; MacDonald 1993, 2000; Moxon-Browne 2004a, 2004b; Shore 2000; and Strath 2002.
- 3 For an overview of changing ideas of Europe from the classical era to the EU, see Pagden 2002; and Wilson and van der Dussen 1996; and for accounts and critiques of 'eurocentrism', see Amin 1989; Blaut 2000; and Hobson 2004.
- 4 On the concept of 'Europeanisation', see Borneman and Fowler 1997; Delanty and Rumford 2005; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003; and Roche 2007; also Caporaso and Jupille 2001; Cowles et al. 2001.
- 5 Besides the sociological studies indicated in note 1 above, Therborn (1995) was an early major contribution. Also see papers by Mann (1998) and Outhwaite (2006a, 2006b).
- 6 It could be suggested that there is a third significant, albeit non-sociological, view of Europe as a society of some kind, namely that present in Europe's media. Media aspects of Europe are important and will be touched on periodically in the course of the book (for instance in Chapters 2 and 8). However, for the purposes of this introductory discussion they can be downplayed since they can all too often involve the attempt to ideologically influence public opinion and national experience in relation to Europe, and particularly the EU, rather than reflecting these things as social realities (for instance, see Anderson and Weymouth 1999).
- 7 On social aspects of the euro currency, see Dyson 2002; also Fiddler 2003.
- 8 On European society and networks, see Chapter 2 and also Fligstein 2008, Chapters 1, 6 and *passim*.
- 9 See references and notes in Chapters 3–5.
- 10 On Europe and the EU as economic environments and systems see, for instance, Dyson 2002; Schmidt 2002; and Thompson 2001; and on them as political

- systems see, for instance, Dinan 2005; Nugent 2003; and Rosamund 2000. On EU integration, see Cram et al. 1999; Chrysochoou 2001; Farrell et al. 2002; and Wiener and Diez 2004.
- 11 On post-communist Eastern European countries, particularly in their relations with the EU and Western Europe, see Nugent 2004; and Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005; also Outhwaite 2008, Chapters 2, 3 and 5.
 - 12 For instance, 'neo-functionalism', 'new governance' and 'regulationist' perspectives. See Hix 1998; and Rosamund 2000.
 - 13 For relevant discussion of the concept of society in contemporary social theory and sociology, see Giddens 1984; Urry 2000, 2003; and Beck and Grande 2007.
 - 14 On comparative social policy analysis relating to Europe, see the discussion, notes and references for Chapter 6 below.
 - 15 For anthropological studies of Europe see, for instance, Bellier and Wilson 2000; and Borneman and Fowler 1997; for geographical and planning-based studies see, for instance, Jensen and Richardson 2004; Jonsson et al. 2000; and McNeill 2004.
 - 16 Although it is beginning (see note 1).
 - 17 The sociology of globalisation barely existed before the 1990s. Early contributions included Robertson 1992 and Sklair 1991. More recent contributions which have a general relevance for the analysis of Europe include, among many others, Albrow 1999; Beck 2000; Hirst and Thompson 1999; and particularly Scholte 2005. Also see Axtmann 1998; Lechner and Boli 2005; and Spybey 1999.
 - 18 Some examples could be said to include the sections on Europe in Castells (1998) and Hirst and Thompson (1999).
 - 19 On the renewal agenda particularly, see Urry 2000 and 2003 and the discussions in Chapters 2 and 9.
 - 20 For alternative interpretations and discussions of the complexity theme which are of relevance to contemporary sociology and social theory, see particularly Urry 2003, 2005a, 2005b; also Castellani and Hafferty 2007; Chesters 2004; Chesters and Welsh 2005; Thrift 1999; and Walby 2007.
 - 21 On the concept of human beings' intersubjective 'life-world' and some of its basic (here 'deep') structures, particularly in the experience of time and space and of the embodiment and instrumentalities (here 'technology') involved in human action, see the phenomenologically-derived analyses in Schutz and Luckmann 1974. Also see Roche 1973. The discussion here links this analysis to a perspective on temporal, spatial and technological phenomena and aims to see them also in material and spatial, institutional and historically changing terms. For a relevant sociological and social theoretical perspective on time and space, together with their linkage as social time-space, see Giddens 1981, Chapters 1 and 4, and 1984, Chapter 3.
 - 22 The relevance of the deep structure of social time to the understanding of European society is indicated later in the long historical perspective taken in Chapters 3 and 4, and in the discussion of the mythologisation of origins and historical narratives in European nationalist ideology in Chapter 5. It is also indicated generally in the recognition of the intrinsic historicity of European society (Therborn 1995) and thus of the relevance of an historical sociological perspective. On the latter, see Hobden and Hobson 2002; Hobson 2004; Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003; and Skocpol 1984.
 - 23 The relevance of the deep structure of social space to the understanding of European society is a key theme throughout the book, but particularly in the

- discussion in Chapter 2 of the European social complex as historico-geographic 'common ground' analysable in terms of the social spatialisation processes associated with being a 'network society' or being a 'neo-empire'. For relevant discussions, see May and Thrift 2001; and Massey 2005.
- 24 The relevance of the deep structure of technology to the understanding of European society is a key theme throughout the book, including in relation to European 'civilisations' in the classical era and the influence of Eastern technologies on Europe's development in various pre-modern periods (Chapter 3), the importance of developments in military technologies and also the industrialisation of economic production in Europe's early and mature modernisation process (Chapter 5), and the importance of post-industrial information and communication technologies in understanding contemporary modernity and the dynamics of globalisation (Chapter 8). For relevant discussions of the 'techno-economic' aspect of modern social change, see Freeman and Soete 1987; Green et al. 1999; and Hull et al. 1999.
- 25 See the discussions in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.
- 26 See the discussions in Chapters 4, 6, and 9.
- 27 Sociological characterisations of European society as some version of a social complex include the following: as an inter-societal system (Parsons 1966, 1971); as a network society (Castells 1998, and also Chapter 2 below); as a post-national constellation (Habermas, 2001); as a civilisational complex (Delanty and Rumford 2005; and also Chapter 3 below); and as a set of social fields and arenas (Fliigstein 2008); also see Outhwaite on (among other examples of European complexity) European culture as 'a complex mixture of elements of local and external origin' (Outhwaite 2008, p.14).
- 28 On historical sociology, see Burke 2005; Hobden and Hobson 2002; and Skocpol 1984.
- 29 The sociological analysis of modernisation involves a variety of long socio-historical perspectives relevant to the understanding of Europe, including among them such as those of Elias 1983, 2000; Gellner 1983, 1988; Giddens 1971, 1981, 1985; Mann 1986, 1993; and Parsons 1966, 1971. Also see the discussions in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.
- 30 Williams 1961.
- 31 On the sociological analysis of globalisation see note 17, particularly Scholte (2005), and Chapter 7 and 9 below.
- 32 On 'glocalisation', see Robertson 1992; Brenner, 2004; and Roche 2000a, Chapter 5.
- 33 On the analysis of world 'regionalism' in global society, see Gamble and Payne 1996; Schirm 2002; Scholte 2005; Telo 2001.
- 34 On the analysis of early 21st-century geopolitics as tending towards a new 'multi-polar world order' see, for instance, Grant and Barysch 2008; Katzenstein 2005; and Khanna 2008. See also the discussion of the 'new regionalism' in international political analysis in Larner and Walters 2002.
- 35 See Laffan et al. 2000; and Bauman 2004.