



Exploring
European
Social Policy

ROBERT R. GEYER

Exploring European Social Policy

*This book is dedicated to my wife, Sigrun Skogly, and
our sons, Kristoffer and Paul*

Exploring European Social Policy

Robert R. Geyer

Polity Press

Copyright © Robert R. Geyer 2000

The right of Robert R. Geyer to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 2000 by Polity Press
in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Reprinted 2007

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

ISBN: 978-0-7456-1930-9 (hb)

ISBN: 978-0-7456-1931-6 (pb)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library and has been applied for from the Library of Congress.

Typeset in 10.5 on 12 pt Sabon
by Ace Filmsetting Ltd, Frome, Somerset
Printed and bound in Great Britain by Marston Book Services Limited, Oxford

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

For further information on Polity, visit our website: www.polity.co.uk

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	viii
<i>Chronology</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xii
Introduction	1
The strategy of the book	4
Chapter outlines	7
1 European Social Policy 1950–1969	11
West European policy in the early postwar years	12
Early European integration theory	14
EU social policy in the 1950s	21
EU social policy in the 1960s	27
Theoretical evolution: the revenge of realism/ intergovernmentalism	29
2 European Social Policy 1970–1999	34
A brief revival, then collapse: from The Hague Summit of 1969 to the ‘Eurosclerosis’ of the early 1980s	35
Theoretical developments: confederalism	38
The SEA and the White Paper on the internal market project	40
The creation of the social dimension	45
Further theoretical developments: combining Sisyphus and Janus	48
The Maastricht Treaty and the recovery of EU social policy?	51
The current state of EU theory	56

3	Labour Policy: Core Areas	58
	Free movement	59
	Health and safety	72
4	Labour Policy: Extensions	81
	Employment rights and working conditions	82
	Worker participation	93
	The social dialogue	98
5	Gender Policy: From Article 119 to ‘Mainstreaming’	104
	Beginnings: Article 119	105
	The 1960s and 1970s	107
	The 1980s and 1990s	115
6	The Structural Funds and the European Social Fund	129
	Paying for EU Social Policy	
	The ECSC: buying off losers and creating markets	130
	The Treaty of Rome and the early years of the ESF and European Investment Bank	133
	The first wave of reform: the ESF and ERDF in the 1970s	136
	The Structural Funds in the 1980s: from stagnation to consolidation	139
	The 1990s: expansion, restructuring and uncertainty	144
	Debates over the future: the 1997–1999 reform process	148
7	Expansion and Extensions I	156
	Anti-poverty policy: from poverty programmes to promoting social inclusion and combating exclusion	157
	EU anti-discrimination policy against racism: from policy laggard to promoter	164
	Public health policy: from occupational to general health policy	171
8	Expansion and Extensions II	179
	Policy on the elderly: failed entrenchment	180
	Disability policy: partial ‘mainstreaming’	187
	Youth policy: always part of the mainstream?	195
9	The Future of European Social Policy	203
	The ‘map’ of EU social policy	203

Contents

vii

Implications for EU social policy	207
The next wave of EU social policy research	212
<i>Appendix: Accessing EU Social Policy</i>	214
<i>Notes</i>	216
<i>References</i>	226
<i>Index</i>	249

Abbreviations

CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CEDEFOP	European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
DG	Directorate-General
DGV	Directorate-General V
EAGGF	European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund
EAPN	European Anti-Poverty Network
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
ECU	European Currency Unit
EDF	European Disability Forum
EEA	European Economic Area
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EIB	European Investment Bank
EMS	European Monetary System
EPHA	European Public Health Alliance
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ERM	Exchange Rate Mechanism
ESC	Economic and Social Committee
ESCB	European System of Central Banks
ESF	European Social Fund
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
EU	European Union
EUF	European Union of Federalists

EURES	European Employment Services
EWL	European Women's Lobby
ILO	International Labour Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OEEC	Organization for European Economic Co-operation
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
QMV	Qualified Majority Voting
SAP	Social Action Programme
SEA	Single European Act
UNICE	Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations in Europe
UV	Unanimous Voting

Chronology

- 1948 Organization for European Economic Co-operation founded
- 1949 North Atlantic Treaty Organization founded
- 1951 European Coal and Steel Community Treaty signed in Paris by Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands
- 1957 The Treaties of Rome negotiated (signed 1 January 1958), establishing the European Economic Community
- 1961 First regulation on the free movement of labour
- 1962 European Social Fund becomes operational
- 1965 France begins a boycott of Community institutions to register its opposition to various proposed supranational developments
- 1966 Foreign Ministers agree to the Luxembourg Compromise; normal Community processes resume
- 1969 The Hague Summit: agreement to strengthen European Community (EC) institutions, enlarge membership, establish an economic and monetary union by 1980 and support social policy development
- 1973 Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom become EC members
- 1974 First Social Action Programme created
- 1974 European Trade Union Confederation created
- 1979 European Monetary System (EMS) comes into operation
- 1981 Greece becomes an EC member
- 1985 The Commission publishes its White Paper on the completion of the internal market; Luxembourg European Coun-

- cil meeting agrees the principles of the Single European Act (SEA); qualified majority voting (QMV) established for health and safety issues
- 1986 Spain and Portugal become EC members
- 1987 SEA comes into force
- 1988 Commission proposes a Social Dimension to the internal market
- 1989 The Delors Committee presents its report (Delors Report), outlining a scheme for a three-stage progression to EMU; Strasbourg European Council meeting accepts the 1988 Social Charter
- 1989–90 Implementation of the 1989 Social Action Programme
- 1991 Maastricht European Council meeting agrees to the Treaty of European Union; the treaty expands QMV for social policy and creates the Social Protocol in order to surmount the British veto
- 1993 The Maastricht Treaty ratified
- 1994 First use of the Social Protocol to pass the Works Council Directive
- 1995 First use of the Social Dialogue to create the Parental Leave Directive
- 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden become EU members
- 1995 1995–7 Medium-Term Social Action Programme launched
- 1997 The British Conservative government defeated in May; the new Labour government immediately signs up to the Social Protocol
- 1997 Amsterdam European Council agrees to the Treaty of Amsterdam; the Social Protocol is integrated into the text of the treaties
- 1998 1998–2000 Social Action Programme launched
- 1999 Special European Council meeting in Berlin, at which heads of government reach agreement on *Agenda 2000* regarding measures for integrating new East European member-state applicants

Preface

The true foundation of this book project was my failure to find ‘socialism’ in France in 1984! As a young American university student and social democrat, disgusted with the constraints of American political dialogue in the 1980s, I was determined to find real democratic socialism in the aftermath of the French Socialist Party’s victory in 1981. However, by the time I arrived in 1984 for an academic year in Paris, Mitterrand had already abandoned most of the Keynesian reflationary economic strategies that had been put in place in 1981–2 and was beginning to embrace the idea of Europe. Global and European forces, combined with French domestic politics, had overrun the Mitterrand socialist strategy. Two questions were increasingly apparent to me and much of the West European left. Could social democracy exist in any one country? If not, could it reassert itself through the European Community?

Following a year at the University of Essex, I found myself, through a combination of academic interest and fate, working in the last bastion of traditional social democracy in Western Europe in the late 1980s – Scandinavia, specifically Norway. State budgets were still massive, workers’ rights incredible, social policy universal and lavish, and hegemonic social democratic parties dominated the political process. Nevertheless, traditional Scandinavian social democracy was increasingly being pressured externally and transformed internally. During the late 1980s in Scandinavia, traditional Keynesian strategies were increasingly abandoned, state expenditure constrained and the expansion of the public sector curtailed. A key element of this transformation was the relationship of Scandinavian social democrats to the European Community. For ‘modernizing’ social democrats, abandon-

ing traditional strategies and linking to the emerging EC were necessary responses to Europeanization and globalization. Traditional national-level social democracy was dead. The best one could hope for was some type of Euro-social democracy. Traditional social democrats strongly opposed this thinking and in the early 1990s the two sides fought each other ferociously over the issue of membership in the European Union, the Swedes voting to join and the Norwegians to stay out in 1994.

I was fascinated by this political battle and the interplay between the 'modernization' of social democratic parties and their relationships to the EU. I spent several years working on this issue while I was a PhD student at the University of Wisconsin, and subsequently published a number of works on it.¹ In essence, the fate of these battles hinged on the answers to the questions of the early 1980s. However, as with most political questions, there was no clear answer. On the one hand, traditional national-level Keynesian economic controls had been lost, but national-level welfare states and social policies remained remarkably resilient to radical change. On the other, European integration had made impressive strides in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Nevertheless, EU social policy remained limited and secondary. The welfare states of Western Europe had defended themselves remarkably well, while the European welfare state was little more than a 'nightwatchman state'. The conclusion which I drew from this conflictual and uncertain state of affairs was that the earlier social democratic debates on the transition from the national welfare state to some form of Europeanized welfare state had been misconceived. The relationship between national-level social policies and the EU level was much more complicated than those earlier debates assumed. Consequently, analysing this relationship was not just a simple matter of observing the transference of policy capabilities from the national to the European level, but a complex one of charting the interplay between the two.

Following the completion of my work on the relationship between the British and Norwegian Labour Parties and the EU and my acceptance of employment in the Department of Politics at the University of Liverpool in 1996, I began to explore the development of EU social policy and its relationship to national-level social policy. Through my studies and having to teach the subject to inquisitive undergraduate and graduate students, I quickly made two discoveries: I was unhappy with the existing works on EU social policy; in order to truly come to grips with the whole complex area of EU social policy, one had to pursue a difficult two-step strategy. First, one had to have an accurate picture or 'map' of EU social policy. Second, with this map, one could then turn to the particular national arenas and examine how EU social

policy interacted with member states' social policies. The difficulty in the first step lies in the need to focus on European policy developments without ignoring national factors too much, while the difficulty in the second lies in the danger of undue concentration on national dynamics.

I began my 'first step', mapping EU social policy, in 1997. My 'second step' is in the planning stages. As I argue in my final chapter, I am certain that this type of study will be at the centre of the next wave of EU social policy research. In the end, my hope is that these two works will provide students and social policy activists with a thorough understanding of EU social policy and its interrelationship with key national-level social policies. Moreover, as I argue below, I firmly believe that the future of EU social policy lies not with the occasional well-publicized actions of the Commission or Parliament, but with the small-scale, unheralded, daily activities of social policy activists and interest groups. Often operating on minimal budgets and under enormous workloads, these groups quietly struggle to move social policies through the often Byzantine EU policy process. The results of their individual efforts are often minuscule, but the cumulative effect is essential for maintaining the future of the 'human face' of Europe.

Lastly, I would briefly like to express my thanks to a number of institutions and individuals. The University of Liverpool's Research Development Fund provided essential funding for my research. Among my Liverpool colleagues, Andrew Geddes was extremely helpful in helping me obtain funding for the book, in reviewing several chapters and in just being a good friend. Beverly Springer helped to give me the confidence to start this project. Rebecca Harkin at Polity Press was everything a writer could look for in an editor. My father, Bill Geyer, whose 'classical' education far exceeds my own, significantly strengthened my grammatical and stylistic weaknesses. Friends and colleagues in Brussels, especially Ingrid Sogner, Eamonn Noonan, Arnhild Sauer and David Spence, provided me with a place to stay and special insights into the 'real' EU policy process. Special thanks need to be extended to the more than seventy interviewees in the Commission, Parliament, Council and social policy NGOs who freely gave their time and opinions to an often befuddled academic. Most important, I would like to thank my wife, Sigrun Skogly, for her unwavering support and advice. Of course, all errors remain my own.

An interactive website for this book with further EU social policy links, updated material and further information can be found at www.social-science-forum.org

Introduction

The phenomenal growth of the European Union (EU) in the period after the Second World War and the remarkable acceleration of that growth in the 1980s and 1990s makes the need to understand the development and impact of EU policy areas on Western (and Eastern) European nation-states essential. This point is obvious in the areas of monetary, trade and economic policy. In other policy areas, particularly social policy, the role of the EU seems much less important, secondary at best, insignificant at worst. A cursory view of the early history of EU social policy would seem to support its subordinate role. The few paragraphs in the founding treaties of the EU, minor policy development in the 1950s and 1960s and the aborted expansion of social policy in the early 1970s characterize the insubstantial nature of early EU social policy development. However, with the revival of European integration in the late 1980s under the Single European Act and in the early 1990s with the Maastricht Treaty, EU social policy experienced a remarkable expansion and growth of influence. Through new documents such as the Social Charter, Social Dimension and Social Protocol, EU policies regarding labour, gender, social inclusion and so on rapidly expanded. This recent expansion raises two key questions. Why did this expansion occur and can it be sustained? Is the growth of EU social policy a positive development?

For the first question, interpretations of traditional European integration theories diverge strongly. For intergovernmentalists, representing the realist view of international relations, EU social policy, like European integration in general, is doomed to move in a Sisyphean¹ cycle of near success, then collapse. For them, deluded Europeanists

and social policy supporters have continually tried to create substantial EU social policy through the founding treaties, EU organizations and specific pieces of EU legislation. However, despite their best attempts, EU social policy has always been undercut by resistance from the member states, key interest groups (particularly European capital), by the institutional weakness of the EU, and by the feebleness of social policy within the EU itself. Hence, despite recent successes propelled by key member states, EU social policy is still subject to the will of the member states and is unlikely to make further sustainable advances.

On the other hand, theorists coming out of the functionalist and neo-functionalist tradition would agree that EU social policy has been one of the most laggard areas of policy development. From the onset of the integration strategy, EU social policy has played a secondary role and often stagnated. Even today, it remains unevenly implemented and poorly financed. Key member states and interest groups have continually opposed its development. In spite of this, theorists would point out that due to the development of the EU, to the activities of the Commission and European interest groups and the impact of 'spillover', social policy has grown in scope, importance and influence, paralleling the expanding significance and power of the EU itself. Consequently, social policy has managed to progress and should continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

The answer to the question of whether EU social policy development is positive depends on where one sits on the left–right political spectrum. Generally, for those on the right, particularly free-market liberals, the development of EU social policy has been counterproductive and a potentially dangerous threat. For them, the economic world changed in the 1980s and 1990s. Globalization has stripped Western European nation-states of their ability to control and regulate their economies, and survival in this fiercely competitive environment requires embracing these new forces, reducing national-level controls, deregulating the economy and minimizing social constraints on the functioning of the market. Their support for European integration was based on the free market and deregulatory nature of the common market strategy. As the economies of the EU member states were increasingly forced to open up to each other, European-level market forces would be unleashed, national-level social constraints would crumble and a reinvigorated European economy and society would emerge. EU social policy could undermine all of these potential gains by contradicting the basic deregulatory nature of the new era. It could enable nation-states to maintain existing social policies. It might even introduce new ones at both the national and European level. In short,

it represents the growth of the EU state beyond a minimalist, deregulatory, free-market framework.

For others, particularly on the social democratic and Christian left, the growth of EU social policy has been both tardy and frail. They agree with those on the right that growing globalization put increasing constraints on the economic controls and welfare states of the West European nations. As growth and tax revenues declined, unemployment and competition increased, putting a fiscal and political squeeze on national-level social policy. Social democrats had a growing sense that the era of the nationally based Keynesian welfare state had come to an end. As the EU was reinvigorated in the late 1980s and early 1990s, these groups hoped that EU social policy would be capable of protecting Europe's generally high level of social policy and provision from international competition, blunting the excesses ('social dumping') of the free-market-oriented common market strategy, and possibly laying the foundation for some form of new Euro-level welfare state structure as well as the Euro-market.

In this book I argue that neither of the traditional theories adequately explain EU social policy development and the current left-right debate over the impact of EU social policy is misdirected. As is argued in detail in chapters 1 and 2, EU social policy has developed, similar to the EU, due to a variety of factors. Despite its institutional weaknesses and the opposition of the member states, EU social policy has seen significant advances in the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, due to its increased embeddedness in the EU institutional process, to the growth of EU social policy NGOs and the continued success of the larger integration project, EU social policy is likely to see further development in the foreseeable future. However, as chapters 3–8 demonstrate, this progress has been very uneven both over time and between the various sub-areas of social policy. In essence, no single theory can either fully explain or predict the development of EU social policy. The concluding chapter explores the complex and contingent nature of EU social policy. At present, a number of its key sub-areas appear set for further advances. Further, the larger European and international contexts seem to support further EU social policy developments. However, changes in the larger context and in the dynamic of key sub-areas could easily change. Recognizing this complexity and uncertainty is a key step in moving beyond the traditional debates.

Obviously, this book cannot truly address the second question. The positive or negative nature of EU social policy hinges on the theoretical and moral position one takes towards welfare states and social policy in general. It is beyond the scope of this book to delve into the deep debates and numerous works on the nature and morality of the

welfare state. Nevertheless, the left–right debate over EU social policy in the 1980s and early 1990s suffered from two related weaknesses: the debate often lacked detailed knowledge of the policy and its interaction with national social policy regimes; aggravated by this lack, the debate was premised on the assumption of the imminent collapse of national welfare states and the potential development of an EU welfare state. As an increasing number of observers have recognized in the 1990s, national-level welfare states are not collapsing or converging. Moreover, the fears of or hopes for the creation of a European welfare state are both unfounded. Some EU social policy areas, particularly gender policy, have seen significant development and influence. At the same time, others, particularly policy for the elderly, remain inconsequential. The reality of EU social policy is a much more complex mix of success and failure. The aim of this book is to increase the general knowledge of EU social policy and to encourage social policy opponents and proponents to reassess their interpretations of EU social policy and shift away from a rather fruitless debate over the creation of an EU welfare state and towards the complex interaction between EU and member-state social policy regimes. In essence, the new European welfare state is not located at the EU level, but remains predominantly national. However, a new arena of social policy co-operation, co-ordination and struggle has been opened up at the EU level. The more social policy actors are able to take advantage of this level, the more likely symbiotic relationships will develop between the national and EU policy levels. As a proponent of EU social policy, I hope that this shift in debate will allow for the focusing of research and political effort on exploring the potential of this symbiotic relationship.

The strategy of the book

The book's titular objective of exploring EU social policy poses three questions. How do I define EU social policy? Why focus on EU social policy? What do I mean by 'exploring' EU social policy?

Defining social policy is never easy. Richard Titmuss, one of the founders of the study of modern social policy, lamented, 'this tiresome business of defining social policy' (Titmuss, 1974: 28). A brief glance at any basic work on this topic would show the variety of theoretical interpretations and distinctive developments of differing national social policy regimes (Lavalette and Pratt, 1997). Moreover, the EU social policy regime's very distinctive structure and dynamics further complicate the creation of a clear and concise definition. For example,

if one were to use T.H. Marshall's classic definition of social policy as the use of 'political power to supersede, supplement or modify operations of the economic system in order to achieve results which the economic system would not achieve on its own' (Marshall, 1975: 15), then one could certainly argue that the most important and substantial European social policy is EU agricultural policy. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is a massive policy area, controlling nearly two-thirds of the EU budget and with its strategies of income support, market direction, education and training could easily be seen as using political power to shape economic outcomes. Lacking a clear theoretical model, I have chosen to use the EU's practical definition of social policy, the activities of the Commission's Directorate-General V (DGV) responsible for employment, industrial relations and social affairs, as my definition of the boundaries of EU social policy. Consequently, all the main areas of DGV activity are reflected in my chapter topics. There are obvious weaknesses in this strategy, one of which is that DGV's activities have varied over time. For example, as this book goes to press it has just been announced that the responsibility for public health policy has been moved from DGV to DGXXIV. Nevertheless, DGV's activities do provide a reasonable and traceable outline of EU social policy.

Regarding the second question, one should ask how one can study EU social policy in isolation from the social policy of the various welfare states of the member states. Clearly, EU social policy is related to the development of these welfare states. EU social policy has generally been built around the institutional structures of existing welfare states as a minimalist floor underneath existing social policy regulations and rules. Throughout most of the history of the EU, member states have maintained strict control over EU social policy though the unanimous voting (UV) procedures in the Council. Moreover, one of the most interesting elements of EU social policy is its relationship and impact on differing welfare state structures. While these are valid points, EU social policy has become so important that it not only deserves specific attention as a policy area in its own right, but it has also become sufficiently substantial as a policy area to fully occupy a book-length manuscript. Further, EU social policy, with the expansion of qualified majority voting (QMV) in the Council, its expanding base in the treaties and the growing activity and influence of social policy NGOs, has increasingly escaped from direct control by member states. As such, it is essential to trace the emergence of this transition not from the perspective of the member states, but from that of the European level. This is not to say that national-level dynamics are unimportant or can be completely ignored. In this book, I often refer to national-level de-

mands and dynamics. However, in order to trace the map of EU social policy, I could mention the national-level influences only briefly. As mentioned in the preface, this book is intended to ‘map’ the policy contours of EU social policy; my second work will rectify some of the national deficiencies that are inherent in this text.

Third, what do I mean by ‘exploring’ social policy? There are two parts to my definition of exploration, my desire to explore beyond the limitations of existing works and my methodological approach. Despite its growing importance, academic understanding and debate on EU social policy remain surprisingly limited. The secondary position of EU social policy, the recent focus on economic and monetary integration and EU institutional blockages have combined to constrain the development of and interest in EU social policy. There are a few books that examine EU social policy. These include collections of essays that explore particular elements of EU social policy or bring together excellent published articles on different aspects or implications of that policy² and other works which provide some degree of overview to the development and scope of social policy.³ Unfortunately, none of these works provides a comprehensive and up-to-date examination of the development, scope and theoretical impact of EU social policy. This book is meant to fill that gap.

Exploration is also a good metaphor for my methodological approach. The study of EU social policy lies at the intersection of international relations, regional integration theory and comparative policy studies.⁴ What marks this intersection is the reliance on ‘historical institutionalism’ and the ‘comparative approach’. Historical institutionalism, an established theoretical perspective which significantly revived in the 1980s and 1990s,⁵ argues that the key nexus for policy development is in the embedded historical policy legacies of central policy institutions. By focusing on the actors and developments within intermediate-level institutions, institutionalism provides the theoretical ‘bridge between “men who make history” and the “circumstances” under which they are able to do so’ (Rothstein, 1992: 35). Closely linked to historical institutionalism is the comparative approach.⁶ As opposed to a more behaviouralist and statistically oriented comparative method, the comparative approach is less scientifically rigorous in that it tries to capture the complexity and interrelatedness of comparative politics and policy studies. As Jean Blondel wrote, the comparative approach is ‘a multi-pronged effort designed to come as close as possible to the many facets of the reality of the institutions, people, and countries which constitute the context within which government acts and develops’ (Blondel, 1981: 168).

Essentially, this methodology assumes that the primary goal of re-

search is to explore, rather than to prove. Mapping the development of EU social policy requires a knowledge and synthesis of earlier works, extensive analysis of primary documents and a detailed knowledge of the primary actors. Over the past two years, I am confident that I have reviewed all major English language texts on EU social policy, obtained most of the major primary documents (an increasingly easy task due to the internet) and acquired first-hand knowledge through my interviews with EU social policy actors.

Chapter outlines

The choice of chapter topics and overall structure of the book reflect my desire to correct the limitations of the previous literature on EU social policy and lay a foundation for further research into the relationship between EU and national-level social policy regimes. Chapters 1 and 2 provide the fundamental historical and theoretical background for the later policy chapters. Chapter 1 begins with a brief definition and history of social policy and the limited international aspects of its development. It then briefly reviews the three major theories of European integration associated with the period after the Second World War: the federalist 'vision', functionalist 'plan', and neo-functionalist 'spillover', paying special attention to the role of social policy in each. Following this, the chapter explores the foundation of EU social policy in the Treaties of Paris (1951) and Rome (1957), and then turns to the limited developments in social policy during the late 1950s and 1960s and the theory of realism. The role of social policy in realist thinking was of minimal significance and was dependent on the national interests of the various member states. The theory, sceptical of the development of the EU, fit well with the stagnation of the EU in the 1960s.

Chapter 2 begins with a brief examination of the revival of social policy in the early 1970s under the 1974 Social Action Programme and follows the uneven development of social policy throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. During this time, theoretical understanding of European integration and policy development shifted from the starkly pessimistic views of realism to the more cautiously optimistic opinions of confederalism. The chapter then examines the revival of the EU and EU social policy in the late 1980s and early 1990s under the Single European Act and 1992 Project, and explores the development of the Social Dimension, Social Charter, 1989 Social Action Programme and the impact of the EU Commission led by Jacques Delors. During this period, debates focused on the nature of and need for EU social policy.

Generally, free-market conservatives argued against it, and social democrats for it. The final section of chapter 2 discusses the most recent EU social policy developments, the growth of a more pluralist form of EU social policy formation⁷ and the theoretical transition from macro- to meso-level theorizing.

Chapters 3 and 4 focus on the crucial areas of EU labour policy. Of the various areas of EU social policy, labour policy is probably the most contentious. It reflects deep philosophical divisions within European politics and society, attracts powerful, committed and determined interest groups (capital and labour) and is obviously extremely important to the functioning of the advanced industrial economies of Western Europe. Chapter 3 explores the less controversial 'core' policies of freedom of movement of labour and health and safety policy. These were built into the earliest EU treaties, both as a strategy for creating a true European market and as a way of reassuring wary workers that their economic and social position would not be eroded by labour market integration. Of primary interest is the way in which these areas were used as 'Trojan horses' to bring in other areas of EU labour and social policy.

Chapter 4 explores the main extensions to EU labour policy that emerged after the 1970s. These included the development of policies in the areas of employment rights and working conditions, worker participation and the social dialogue. These areas emerged in the aftermath of the 1974 Social Action Programme and were justified through direct and indirect reference to the core areas of labour policy. Promoted by DGV in the EU Commission, the Parliament, socialist parties (at the national and European level) and European trade unions, these areas saw some degree of success, particularly during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Although all of them have now become firmly established within the field of EU social policy, their current strength and potential for continued expansion vary substantially.

Chapter 5 concerns the fascinating development of EU gender policy. From its beginning in Article 119 in the Treaty of Rome, ratified on 1 January 1958, through the remarkable European Court of Justice (ECJ) cases of the 1980s to the present 'mainstreaming' of gender issues, EU gender policy has been one of the most impressive areas of social policy development. Spurred on by the growth of 'second wave' feminism in Western Europe, an increasingly effective women's group lobbying organization, as well as the breakdown of the traditional family structure and male-dominated occupational structure, gender policy has made enormous strides since the 1970s. By the 1980s, gender policy had become a well-funded policy area with a significant and growing legal base. In the 1990s it proved to be one of the most important

social policy areas and was increasingly 'mainstreamed' into other policy areas.

In chapter 6 I move from the most successful area of EU social policy to the wealthiest, the EU Structural Funds, in particular the European Social Fund (ESF). In the current funding period (1994–9), the structural funds have planned to allocate a total of 138 billion ECU, of which the ESF intend to allocate around 42 billion ECU.⁸ In many ways, this is the heart of the European social project. From its very inception in the 1957 Treaty of Rome, the ESF was intended to 'improve employment opportunities for workers', primarily through encouraging mobility, vocational training and unemployment aid. As the EU progressed, the Structural Funds and the ESF expanded and moved into wider policy areas, created a more European orientation and profile, and developed a multitude of distinctive projects and programmes. A key focus of this chapter is the difference between past and present policy roles of the Structural Funds and the ESF. Are they regional or social policies, or are they just bribes for the weaker member states and social groups to keep them committed to the larger integration project?

Chapter 7 looks at three of the most recent areas of EU social policy expansion: those on anti-poverty/social inclusion, anti-race discrimination against racism and on public health. Though anti-poverty policy has its roots in the 1970s, it was not until the late 1980s that these three policy areas begin to develop at the EU level. In the 1990s these policy areas have experienced different levels of success. Anti-poverty policy development looked extremely promising in 1993 with the expanding budget of the Fourth Poverty Programme and the burgeoning concepts of social inclusion/exclusion. However, following the Council's rejection of the programme in 1994, the policy area has stagnated. Anti-discrimination policy against racism has always had a delicate position in the EU system. The EU has been reluctant to accept responsibility for a difficult policy area, while the member states have been unwilling to cede authority over it. Nevertheless, responding to the rise of far right parties in the 1980s and racist crimes in the early 1990s (particularly in Germany and France), the EU began to develop more anti-discrimination legislation against racism and has recently inserted an anti-discrimination Article into the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty. Finally, public health policy emerged out of particular health issues of the 1980s and 1990s: drug dependence; cancer (particularly where linked to smoking); AIDS; health promotion; and information. Emphasizing the importance of member-state co-operation and the information and research orientation of this policy area, the EU has pushed into the field of public health with relative ease. With

the continued importance of these health issues and the commitments made by the Amsterdam Treaty to further European public health, this is one EU social policy area which will probably expand.

Chapter 8 examines the emergence of three policy areas linked to specific social groups, the elderly, the disabled and the young. Of these three, the policy for the elderly has been the least successful within the EU policy process. Ignored in the founding treaties, not recognized until the 1974 Social Action Programme and only occasionally referred to in related policy areas of social inclusion and social protection during the 1970s and 1980s, elderly policy did not establish itself until the 1988 Social Charter, the 1989 Social Action Programme and subsequent action programmes. Its failure to gain a firm base in the Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties demonstrates its continued weakness. Similarly, disability policy made no significant appearance in EU social policy until the early 1970s. Following the 1974 Social Action Programme, a series of action programmes were created to improve the condition of the disabled in Europe. By the late 1980s, disability policy had firmly established itself in the programmatic side of EU social policy, but had yet to make significant legislative developments. Though the disabled were ignored by the Maastricht Treaty, the Amsterdam Treaty and subsequent Employment Guidelines did recognize their needs. Finally, some aspects of youth policy have been deeply rooted and very successful in the EU social policy process. Areas such as vocational training, student mobility, and employment promotion for the young have been core elements of EU policy since the Treaty of Rome. These areas of youth policy have substantial roots in the treaties, particularly the Maastricht Treaty, and are supported by substantial funding from the Structural Funds. However, outside these traditional areas, youth policy has seen little or no development.

The final chapter opens with a brief summary of the current 'map' of EU social policy. I then explore how EU social policy is not like national-level social policy, how it has become primarily regulatory, exhibiting a variety of policy dynamics, not significantly replacing or undermining national social policy regimes. I conclude with a discussion of the next wave of EU social policy research and the uncertain future of EU social policy.

I

European Social Policy 1950–1969

[The Commission] cannot conceive that the Community has not got a social purpose.

EEC, Second General Report, 1958¹

This then is the sum total of social policy measures in the Treaty of Rome: a whiff of society-creating measures in Articles 2, 117 and 118; a gesture towards harmonisation in Articles 119 and 120; and a strong element of functional social policy to encourage the mobility of labour, and the retraining of workers through the ESF.

Hoskyns, Integrating Gender

How is it that such divergent views could be held over the role of social policy in the early years of the EU? Was social policy at the heart of the early treaties of Paris and Rome that laid the foundation for the ECSC and the EEC? Or was social policy an afterthought used to placate the threatened in the integration process? Moreover, what role did social policy play in early integration theory? This chapter attempts to explore these questions. It starts with a review of the key social policy developments at the international level and within the ECSC and EEC member states in the years immediately after the Second World War. I then examine three early integration theories, federalism, functionalism and neo-functionalism as well as their interpretation of EU social policy, succeeded by an analysis of the role of social policy in the treaties of Paris and Rome, and a brief overview of major social policy developments. In conclusion I argue that EU social policy has been an uncertain and controversial policy since its creation. It has generally had a secondary role in relation to the larger goal of economic integration, but was expected to become increasingly important as integration progressed.