



framing, and interpreting (...) a cognitive approach encourages us to ask how, when, and why people interpret social experience in racial, ethnic, or national terms.” On the other hand, European patterns of solidarity have to take into account the global context of particular bases for social cohesion: “Multiple processes of globalization constitute and require globality as a historical benchmark.” [7] Europe therefore has to reconstruct and reinvent itself as a globally integrated region.

- 4 This general framework may also be helpful for the analysis of the current crisis of the European Union (EU), which has manifested itself in the refusal of the constitutional treaty in France and the Netherlands, the reservation of the European population to the start of the negotiation talks with Turkey, the opposition to the further liberalization of the service markets, the difficulties to agree upon a new EU budget for 2007-2013 and the generally fragile support of the population for the project of European integration. *We assume that this crisis reflects the threatened, primarily national bases of solidarity and the need for new, transnational bases for social cohesion and new forms of social security.*
- 5 This necessity is above all (and in a somewhat paradoxical way) a consequence of the three biggest successes of the European integration: the internal market, the Euro and the fifth enlargement. The free movement of persons, services, goods and capital (1993) and the liberalization of public services (telecommunication, transport, energy, health ...) increased the competition between the formerly relatively closed European economies. Given inflexible labor market and wage structures, the introduction of the common currency (1999) might have contributed to the low growth rates and the high unemployment ratios in larger continental-European countries. The fifth, the so-called Eastern enlargement of the EU (2004) increased the wage and tax competition also for the former member states of the EU.
- 6 The increased economic, monetary and political integration of the European states and the associated challenges are a major reason for the failure of the constitutional treaty: In autumn 2004, the majority of the population in only ten out of 25 countries was in favor of the European constitutional treaty (among them the Dutch population who refused the constitution in a referendum in June 2005; cf. European Commission 2005). Important reasons for this refusal were the neglect of the social dimension of the European integration (10 % of the European population) and the fear, that the constitution is too liberal (7 %). The continuation and deepening of the European integration therefore seems to depend crucially on the ability to handle the social and occupational consequences of the European integration. The European states and the European Union have to develop new ways of dealing with social inequalities.
- 7 This implies a double challenge: On the one hand, the established patterns of national solidarity and social security are challenged by the globalization of the economy: European patterns of solidarity and social integration therefore have to take into account the globality of Europe: Even if the EU “recognizes and respects the entitlement to social security benefits and social services providing protection in cases such as maternity, illness, industrial accidents, dependency or old age, and in the case of loss of employment” (Article II-94 of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe), the question is whether the EU and the European nation-states can guarantee these entitlements confronted with a global competition which is also a product of the European integration. A crucial question of globality studies therefore also has to be the question with what strategies a global region can defend and redefine its “regionality.” On the other hand, the concept of multiple modernities implies that universally applicable models of solidarity and social security in open, transnational spaces do not exist. Given the varieties of social security – for example the liberal, market-based forms in the US, the family- and company-based patterns in Japan and East Asia, the state- and insurance-based forms in Scandinavia and continental Europe [8]– functional necessities for compensating “globalization losers” [9][10] do not determine the concrete patterns of solidarity and social security in a globalized world. On the one hand, the EU therefore has to modernize the current, mostly national patterns of social security and social integration; on the other hand, it cannot rely on established and globally recognized supranational ways of dealing with social inequalities but has to invent its own pattern of European solidarity.
- 8 So far, the theoretical bases for dealing with the emergence of supranational patterns of social solidarity and social inequalities are extremely weak. Social classes and social security are analyzed almost exclusively in national categories. Yet we have to ask: How shall we understand the Europeanization of solidarity and social inequalities? Let me start with a definition: *‘Europeanization of social inequalities’ refers to transnational processes caused by the European integration, which shape the distribution of scarce and desired goods and positions thus shaping the life chances, the social identities, the interests and values of individuals and social groups (for instance families).* [11][12][13] The Europeanization of solidarity refers to the political level where decisions on the extent and the shape of social inequalities are made: The EU level plays a significant role not only for international transfer payments, but also for the coordinated modernization of national systems of social security, [14][15] and the development of functional equivalents to a redistributive social policy—for























Boundaries, New Structuring?”

[35] Stefano Bartolini, “Old and New Peripheries in the European Processes of Territorial Expansion” (Florence: Working Paper 2000/153, 2000).

[36] Richard Münch, “Europäische Identitätsbildung. Zwischen globaler Dynamik, nationaler und regionaler Gegenbewegung” in *Kultur, Identität, Europa*, eds. Reinhold Viehof and Rien T. Segers (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1999), 223-252.

[37] Stefano Bartolini, *Restructuring Europe. Centre Formation, System Building and Political Structuring Between the Nation State and the EU* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 369 .

[38] See Stefano Bartolini, *Restructuring Europe*, 370-74: “if there is no relation to some level of operational closure, a single market becomes only a section of the global market (...) This openness of the national as well as European legal systems can be seen as (...) a ‘privatisation’ and ‘de-territorialisation’ of the production of rights and of stabilised and generalised behavioural conformity associated with the truly transnational character of the new ‘Lex Mercatoria’ (...) The EMU cannot be used to reintroduce a level of closure of the European economies that is coherent and useful to the desired structure of the European system, and, in the end, functional to the EU interests and economic hegemony (...) the current ongoing and apparently unbound enlargement process (...) continuously redefining the borders of the system, also continuously redefines the scale and the complexity of its decision-making processes.”

[39] Stein Rokkan, *State Formation, Nation Building, and Mass Politics in Europe. The Theory of Stein Rokkan Based on His Collected Works*, ed. by Peter Flora (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).

[40] Ferrera, “European Integration and National Social Citizenship. Changing Boundaries, New Structuring?” 615f.

[41] Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson, *Globalization in Question. The International Economy and the Possibility of Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

[42] James S. Mosher and David M. Trubek, “Alternative Approaches to Governance in the EU: EU Social Policy and the European Employment Strategy,” *Journal of Common Market Studies* (41 (1), 2003), 63-88.

[43] Zeitlin et al., *The Open Method of Co-ordination in Action. The European Employment and Social Inclusion Strategies*.

[44] C. O. Meyer and G. Umbach, “Europeanization Through Policy Coordination? Govacor Final Review Meeting” (Brussels, 16-17 February 2004).

[45] Ibid. 5.

[46] Stein Rokkan, *State Formation, Nation Building, and Mass Politics in Europe. The Theory of Stein Rokkan Based on His Collected Works*, ed. by Peter Flora (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).

[47] Wolf Schäfer, “From the End of European History to the Globality of World Regions,” *Globality Studies Journal*, no. 1, June 5, 2006, 17.

[48] See note 4.

[49] Elmar Rieger and Stephan Leibfried, *Limits to Globalization: Welfare States and the World Economy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003).