

# Tensions of Europe & Inventing Europe Book Series Newsletter

December 2008

European Science Foundation

## Content

Word from the editors	1
News	
First set up book series	2
Successful NIAS application	2
Virtual Exhibit	2
Meetings	
Second book series workshop	4
Report	
Florence book series workshop	12

## Word from the editors

As we look back over what has happened since the Rotterdam 2007 conference, as well as what is coming up, it becomes abundantly clear that the network has entered a new phase of its existence. What began with position papers, programmes (and more than one good party) is beginning to pay off in the form of research, books and new and innovative projects and products.

In this issue, we are looking closer into the book series project. The first book series workshop in Florence was the starting point to draw more concrete plans for the book series and to invite possible authors. This inspiring Florence workshop was made possible by ESF. All plans will be discussed in March 2009 at a second workshop in The Netherlands. After that the challenging book series project really takes-off.

Beyond the book series, the making of the 'Virtual Exhibit' that will combine ongoing research with the collections of some of the major science museums in Europe is progressing.

This newsletter is made possible by:



TOE-IE Book Series Newsletter is produced  
by the Foundation for the History of  
Technology in collaboration with the  
European Science Foundation  
editors: Alec Badenoch and  
Jan Korsten  
[www.tensionsofeurope.eu](http://www.tensionsofeurope.eu)  
[a.w.badenoch@tue.nl](mailto:a.w.badenoch@tue.nl)  
[j.w.a.korsten@tue.nl](mailto:j.w.a.korsten@tue.nl)

Tensions of Europe & Inventing Europe Book Series Newsletter - December 2008 - page 1



## News

### First set up Tensions of Europe & Inventing Europe book series project

Following the Florence meeting a draft of the set up of the book series has been made. The planned book series will consist of six co-authored books. The authors will develop a more detailed proposal in the coming months. This will be discussed during the upcoming book series meeting in The Netherlands. As planned, they are:

1. Maria Paula Diogo, Dirk van Laak, and Matthias Middell, *Europe in the Global World*
  - How Europe was imagined and lived in (ex-)colonial and other global circulations and exchanges
2. Mikael Hård and Ruth Oldenziel, *Using Europe, Building Europe in the American Century*
  - How European transnational spaces emerged in the process of producing, distributing and using a range of consumer goods;
3. Helmuth Trischler and Martin Kohlrausch, *Knowledge Societies and Innovation Cultures in Europe*
  - How Europe became articulated through efforts to construct standards, expert knowledge and networks and large-scale projects and artefacts.
4. Arne Kaijser and Erik van der Vleuten, *Building Europe on Infrastructures*
  - How Europe (and its landscape) was constituted by the construction, and use of transnational communication, energy and transport infrastructures.
5. Andreas Fickers and Pascal Griset, *Eventing Europe. Participating in the European experience space*
  - How Europe was experienced in the production and use of (mass) media.
6. Wolfram Kaiser, Dagmara Jajeśniak-Quast and Johan Schot, *Experts and the Re-making of Europe The formation of European Governance structures from 1850s to the Present*

- How the emergence of a series European transnational spaces shaped the European integration process. This volume will explicitly focus on a reinterpretation of the European integration process.

### Successful theme group application Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study

The Netherlands Institute of Advanced Study (NIAS) has approved a theme group proposal submitted by Johan Schot for the book series project.

A NIAS research theme group is a group of international researchers who work individually and as a team on a clearly defined research topic with the aim of producing a concrete result, in this case the book series.

Besides an ideal working space at their Wassenaar property, NIAS provides necessary financial support. The theme group is planned for 2010/2011.

### Inventing Europe Virtual Exhibit "Europe, Interrupted"

In addition to the planned book series a further overarching initiative of the Inventing Europe project has now begun: an online virtual exhibit that combines the current research of the Inventing Europe projects with the collections of several major science and technology museums.

A feasibility study into the Virtual Exhibit was completed in May of this year, and based on this, the European Science Foundation has supported the initiative. This is an ambitious undertaking, involving international co-operation on a hitherto unheard of scale. The hope is that this first small exhibition will lay the groundwork, and establish a platform for future collaboration.

Eight museums initially agreed to participate in the project:

- Science Museum, London
- Musee des Arts et Métiers, Paris

- Deutsches Museum, Munich
- Norwegian Museum of Science and Technology, Oslo
- National Museum of Science and Technology, Stockholm
- Techisches Museum, Vienna
- Hungarian Museum for Science and Technology, Budapest
- Museum Centre Vapriikki, Tampere

More have expressed interest since. In July, the exhibit team consisting of Brian Fuchs (Imperial College, London) as software designer, Alec Badenoch (SHT) as content editor and Mike Flynn as author and content advisor were assembled to create the exhibit. A demonstration version of the exhibit is expected by the end of the year, and the first version of the full site is planned for early spring 2009.

The exhibit will consist of two elements: the first will be a series of short illustrated essays laid out in five themed sections, based on research of the Inventing Europe projects and illustrated with the help of the collections of the science museums. A dynamic element will then search the online collections of the various museums involved for related images and artifacts to allow users to explore the various themes of the exhibit more thoroughly. Further interactive elements are also under consideration.

The static content will be in the form of short illustrated essays, grouped in five themed sections. The exhibit takes the notion of 'interruptions' as its point of departure. These are moments where the messiness and contingent nature of both European integration and technological change (as well as the links between these processes) become apparent. Such a focus in interruptions will allow the exhibit to help draw connections between everyday experience and these broader processes, and place current issues into critical historical perspective.

Each of the exhibit's five sections highlights a different dynamic of technological circulation in Europe.

*Hurry up and Wait* explores the paradoxical dynamics of modernization. While the increased technological

connections in Europe promise and increase the speed of life, they also increase the amount of time people spend waiting. Waiting happens at the every day level of waiting for traffic lights, trains, or file downloads, but also for the promised 'worlds of tomorrow' to arrive.

*How Iron was the Curtain?* draws on the technological stories of the Inventing Europe projects to help reconsider the Cold War division of Europe. On the one hand, knowledge, technologies and artifacts circulated well beyond the Cold War boundaries. At the same time, a number of key technologies and technological efforts went into enforcing the Cold War divide.

*Breaking Points* points to the risks involved in increased integration of technologies. Here the focus is on the way in which increased network connections both allow localized conflicts (such as strikes) to take on international importance, but also for larger geopolitical issues to inject themselves into local struggles.

*Traffic Jam* is devoted to the paradoxes of auto-mobility in Europe. The automobile is perhaps the most quintessential artifact of the 20th century. Cars are both potent national symbols and also have come to signify specific ideals of individual freedom, both of which make them an interesting focal point for exploring the problematic interplay between technological circulation and European integration in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

*Lost in Translation?* explores the dynamics of standardization, from railway track gauges to communication protocols, in trying to create European unity. It will highlight standards and/or often messy conversion as key to connection between systems. On the flip side, it will show how standards form sites of contested global expansion and boundary marking.

The first version of the website will be presented at the book series workshop in March. It is hoped to that we will be able to develop and expand it in association with the book series project.

## Meetings

### 'Technology and European History. A Transnational perspective' - Tensions of Europe & Inventing Europe Book series workshop – Vught-Eindhoven-Wassenaar (The Netherlands) March 6-8, 2009

Since the first book series workshop in Florence, the plans for the series have become more concrete. Authors were invited to explore possible volume content and to prepare a more detailed proposal.

For a more in-depth exploration of the proposed content and the feasibility the workshop 'Technology and European History. A Transnational perspective' has been organized. At the workshop more detailed outlines of the books will be discussed. Other items on the agenda are organizational issues concerning the project, planning, available funds and fundraising and the role of the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS). During the workshop also the first prototype of the Virtual Exhibit will be presented.

The workshop will take place from March 6-8, 2009 at Eindhoven University, conference hotel Landgoed Huize Bergen in Vught and the Netherlands Institute of Advance Study (NIAS) in Wassenaar.

## Report Inventing Europe First Book Series meeting Florence

### European Integration in European History: A workshop to explore and develop and Inventing Europe book series

European University Institute,  
Badia Fiesolana, July 3-6, 2008

As part of the Inventing Europe's ambition to nurture a number of large and genuine international research collaborations, it

also aims at bringing together the results in a jointly produced coherent book series. To make this possible the program will pursue an intensive networking and dissemination strategy, collaborating with the Tensions of Europe Network, and other research networks, and with individual scholars in the social sciences and humanities who share its concerns. A first step in this direction was taken in July, with a workshop held at the European University Institute in Florence. A number of scholars from the Tensions network, and specifically the Inventing Europe projects, were invited, along with a number of historians from outside the tensions network as well as nine 'early career scholars', to discuss and debate the form and content of the book series.

Beginning with a basic model of a five-book series, authors were invited to prepare position papers, including book proposal: two papers per each proposed volume. Furthermore, as part of the process of getting participants thinking about their hopes for the series, each was invited to submit an image (along with title and caption) that expressed their hopes and agendas for the coming series. These were presented to the group as a whole, and then were hung for further perusal in the halls. The programme can be found on the ToE website, and many of the images you will see in these pages. The result was an intense workshop, replete with climatic (it was Florence in July) and acoustic (medieval buildings are not always suited to workshop-style discussions) challenges, in addition to the intellectual ones that were the order of the day.

*Following the initial introduction to the workshop by Stefano Bartonlini of the European University Institute, Professor John Krige of the Georgia Institute of Technology delivered a keynote address. Professor Krige spoke of the role of US technological dominance in reconstructing Cold War Europe, and specifically of US strategic aims in helping to foster major European technological projects. Here, he has kindly offered us an adapted version of his comments, which both speak to the agenda of the book series and to the challenges of the contemporary world.*



### Transnational history and American soft power

John Krige  
Georgia Institute of Technology

The new momentum gained by the Tensions of Europe project's emphasis on transnational flows of knowledge is a most welcome direction for this extraordinarily dynamic and integrating project. Those who have been studying the infrastructural technological platforms of a networked Europe will be confirmed in the wisdom of their research choice and the pertinence of their analyses. Others will perhaps be encouraged to think in new ways. For the emphasis on transnational history forces us to go beyond the limits of national histories of technology, with their often celebratory tone and political agenda, and to see the nation state as a node in a complex and interconnected network of relationships. More, it opens a space for us to interrogate the many other social actors that are engaged with technology and that transcend territorial boundaries, most obviously multinational consortia and NGO's concerned with issues like migration, displacement, pollution, epidemics and nuclear waste disposal. Transnational history is an intellectual variant of the study of globalization, the recognition that we live a world of growing

interdependence in which, thanks to technology, power is now diffused.

That said we must be careful not be deluded by talk of linking and delinking, of the circulation of knowledge and the dissolution of frontiers. These generalities tend to *flatten out* the world. They sidestep the question of power and, in particular, the asymmetries of power that are situated at specific nodes in the 'transnational' network, asymmetries that give to specific social actors the opportunity to shape, if not determine the behavior of those around them. The world is not flat but lumpy, and we ignore those lumps, and their capacity to influence the structure of interdependence at our peril. That is surely one of the lessons of the recent subprime mortgage crisis in the United States, which has reverberated throughout the global financial system and which threatens to drag the world economy into a deep recession. We are all interconnected: but some have more power to shape the physiognomy of the networked structure than others. The United States is the elephant (perhaps I should say the elelump) in the room, and no transnational study of the technological integration of Western Europe can ignore its capacity and its determination to influence events here. In what follows I shall present some theoretical tools for thinking about the place of the United States in the transnational study of European integration, as extracted from the lecture I gave at the meeting in Florence in the July this year. In particular I want to draw your attention to how the postwar production and circulation of knowledge has been instrumentalized by the US to pursue its historical urge to global expansion to expand markets and to stabilize the world system in the name of democracy and freedom.

### Science Technology and Empire

"We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality – judiciously as you will – we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too [...]. We're history's actors...and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do". Thus spoke an aide to President Bush in an exchange with Ron Susskind, a former

senior reporter for the *Wall Street Journal*, in summer 2002. Thus did he invert the negative valency surrounding imperialism, so transforming it from an outdated form of European oppression into a desirable mode of American governance. Thus did he presume that the social is infinitely plastic and malleable, ignoring local variation and the sedimented layers of history that will resist the creation and re-creation of new, imposed realities by an imperial actor. And thus did he dismiss empirically-grounded research as irrelevant to the imagined futures of policy makers at the metropolitan centre of the imperial project.

If we were to take Bush's man in the White House at face value, we could not but conclude that, as historians and as intellectuals, we are necessarily condemned to the margins of power, irrelevant irritants to the grand historical project of remaking the world in America's image. Yet empire has always had its critics who have given voice to those whom it oppressed, and its proponents who have served to enhance its respectability, and to legitimate its exploitative agenda. The claim that the United States is an empire is usually associated with left-wing historians who used it as a critical lens through which to view, first, America's internal westward expansion in the name of manifest destiny, and then the urge to global expansion to conquer markets, and to export the ideals of liberal democracy. Now, however, the tables are turned. In the shadow of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, unashamed talk of empire has, as the conservative *Washington Post* put it in 2002, suddenly become "hot intellectual property within Washington's beltway." The brilliant British historian Niall Ferguson admits to having been "a fully paid up member of the neo-imperialist gang" for over a decade and worries whether the United States will have the "stamina" to bring about effective regime change in Iraq: he openly supported John McCain for President.

Empire talk is just one strand of thinking competing for attention in the efforts to define a new global role for the United States as its power 'declines' or, more specifically as power becomes more diffuse in an interdependent world. Another popular strand of liberal thought

emphasizes the importance of non-military instruments of power. Consider for example Joseph Nye. Nye fears the costly loss of legitimacy that comes with the exercise of what he calls hard, command power. Instead, he proposes that dominant states should use soft, co-optive power. Soft power is exercised by seducing others into the American value system through the "attraction" of its culture and ideology, by leveraging admiration for its scientific and technological achievement to lock educated foreign elites into its knowledge system, and by supporting institutions "that make other states want to channel or limit their activities in the ways that the dominant state prefers." There are hints of Gramsci and Foucault in Nye's notion of soft, co-optive power, to manage consent. Nye does not recognize this formally nor would he care particularly. He is not engaged in an intellectual debate but in finding ways of implementing US foreign policy on the ground. Nye, professor of international relations, and a former dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, has also held senior positions in the Carter and Clinton administrations. He was also tipped to be John Kerry's National Security Adviser if the Democrats' presidential candidate had won the election in 2004. Nye, in other words, is as committed as is Ferguson to America's global mission. In other words claims to empire like those cited a moment ago are to be situated in the context of an *internal* political struggle in which, put crudely, neo-conservatives and liberal internationalists agree on the ends – to export and implant the American model wherever US interests require it. They simply disagree on the *means to those ends*, on how most effectively to secure the legitimacy of the American transformative project. For a man like Nye American scientific and technological leadership is one of the valuable instruments of soft, co-optive power at hand that should be used to complement the eventual threat of hard, command power. Mr Cheney, when asked what he thought of the notion of soft power, reputedly replied that he could not make sense of the term.

## Knowledge and World Order


For my purposes, knowledge is not, of course, simply contained in written reports and articles. It is also carried in the heads and hands of scientists and engineers. It is embedded in devices like a slug of enriched uranium, an inertial guidance system or a project-management chart. And it is produced in multiple sites that are funded from multiple sources that include industry, the state, foundations and other associations like NGOs. Within this complex system American scientific, technological and managerial leadership is measured by its capacity to dominate the research frontier, to produce a stream of ever more sophisticated technological devices and to organize complex technoscientific systems. In multiple case studies I have shown how the US tried to use this leadership to reshape and reorient European scientific and technological practices and institutions in the first 25 years of the Cold war. It is commonplace to see military advantage and economic strength as levers which can be used by dominant states to get others to do what they want. I want to insist that the asymmetry entailed by scientific and technological 'leadership' should be similarly understood, as Nye has taught us. It is also one of a repertoire of instruments that the United States has had at its disposal after the war to reshape Europe and beyond, a Europe whose elites were convinced, as were their American counterparts, that a strong scientific and technological capability was essential to the economic and political independence of the modern state.

The knowledge/power nexus that is crucial to the American transformative project in Europe is part of a more general attempt by the United States after WWII to put in place what Charles Bright and Michael Geyer call an American (corporate) regime of world order. During the Cold war the main coordinates of this regime were the containment of communism -- as a means of fostering the industrial recovery of the West --, and the resubordination and ordering of the suppliers of primary materials -- to feed that economic boom. This hegemonic regime moved "beyond the extension of power over others toward a direct and sustained organization of others, simultaneously, and in many parts

of the world." Knowledge played a central role in this process. American scientific, technical and intellectual leadership, and the massive investment in education after the war that made that possible were "as important as its economic and military power in making world order cohere and, more important, in developing and organizing the consent of subordinate participants." The pursuit of American leadership is not a top-down project of command and obedience, but an interactive process that is made and remade by cultivating consent. It is co-produced in an asymmetric field of force in which the subordinate or alternate partner is constantly forced to reposition itself, redefining the parameters of local knowledge production and circulation in the light of developments at the dominant centre.

To sum up, then, the main question I want us to bear in mind is how certain actors in the US have tried to use its scientific and technological strength to establish an American-led regime of order first in Europe and then on a global scale. During the global Cold war the enemy at the gates was communism, and the legitimate target of US expansion and regime change was the threat posed by the Soviet Union, and the fractions of national elites in other countries who espoused socialist or communist aspirations. Today the enemy is terrorism, a non-state actor appropriate to a global regime in which there has been a power shift away from the nation state facilitated by world-wide communications technologies. As long as the challenge to American leadership can be framed domestically as a threat to national security, so long will the US seek to maintain its scientific and technological advantage, and to instrumentalise that asymmetry in the technological knowledge/power nexus to structure a world order to secure democracy and freedom. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 were not only a shock and a tragedy, but also an opportunity, an opportunity to refashion, revitalize and relegitimate the US's global mission which, for many, had wallowed after the implosion of the Soviet Union. 9/11 triggered the resurgence of Washington's affirmation, and definition of what it sees as its global responsibility, and we neglect this at our peril.

Some readers may be inclined to think that I am exaggerating, that we live in a multipolar world with multiple centers of power of which the United States is just one among many. They may be right. But I fear that they may be being inconsistent.



One cannot celebrate mutual interdependence and transnationality in one breath, and deny that the United States had and still has a dominant role in world affairs today. Writing in the *New York Review of Books* just before the recent Presidential election Timothy Garton Ash, who defines himself as an

English European, remarked that “This is our election. The world’s election. Our future depends on it, and we live it as intensely as Americans do.” Do you agree with him? If you do, I submit that you must agree with me!

\*\*\*\*

*Pierre-Yves Saunier of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Lyon, offered provocative and often humorous commentary on the enterprise of the book series. On a constant mission to provoke conversation and creative thought, he often shifted roles between 'good cop' and 'bad cop', which left many of us wondering what he actually thought of the book series project. Fortunately, your intrepid newsletter editors managed to waylay him in the confusion of the Italian train strike long enough to intercept and photograph some secret correspondence with his 'home government'. His true thoughts are thus revealed:*

*Fiesole, Hotel Aurora, 6 July 2008*

*Dear Granny,*

*I am writing you from Italy before leaving for the station, lest I forget about my impressions while toiling through the Italian railway network on a strike day. You will remember from our conversations that I felt very embarrassed when I began to write my comments for the opening sessions of this 'Inventing Europe' workshop. After all, I am not an historian of Europe, and you know I have never invented anything. Yet I do not regret having accepted the invitation.*

*You'll remember it had been a long time I had been connected with this crowd of historians of technology. I had read their work, and liked it very much, but unfortunately had to decline two previous invitations to join their meetings. That was likely a good thing, other wise they would not have invited me to this one. And it was quite exciting. Mind you, they are after something bigger than their former selves. They believe, and I think they are right, that they can flex the analytical muscle they have gained through their study of technological aspects in the history of modern Europe in order to gain new insights on the history of Europe. That is, to see the history of Europe as a story of flows, links, appropriations and their demise. And they want to make not one, but several connected books from this platform. To do so, they had invited other technoignorants –yes Ma'am, I was not the only one- who might share this perspective and get on board.*

Tensions of Europe & Inventing Europe Book Series Newsletter - December 2008 - page 8



*As you can imagine, there were as many views about how to do this as there were people in the room. And many were at odds with one another. Some wished to focus on the 20<sup>th</sup> century, or even on its second half, while others insisted on starting from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century; some insisted on links and flows but yet others saw no interest there; some forgot about Eastern Europe and some wanted engineers not to be forgotten; some wanted 4 volumes, other 7 and still others did not want to speak of volumes at all. It was very interesting to see disagreement developing steadily, instead of the mild mellow consensus that usually perspires from meetings where so much is involved (in terms of research and writing funds).*

*For a while, it even seemed that the discussion might turn into Demolition Derby IV because of the divergence on some of these points, but this did not happen because these guys have been building up a community for a while. I guess any other group would have fallen into pieces when it was stated that the transnational perspective that was embraced by the project organizer was not shared by fellow travellers. But these people can start from a disagreement instead of being blocked by it, as it happens in most of our conferences and meetings. Accordingly, all these disagreements were stated and considered, instead of working silently to undermine the atmosphere. And you probably would not believe we had very few, if any, ego trips, and almost everyone kept focused about the agenda, instead of lecturing the room about their own achievements (and yes, I also resisted my usual leaning in this direction). In other words, these guys could almost make you like the academic crowd. Just like the representative from the European Science Foundation, with his insistence on the priority to be given to knowledge stakes, could make you like European science policies and consider Framework Programs as a mere accident. As you can see, my misanthropy was put to the test. But I did not falter.*

*Clearly, this was more a brainstorming session than a policy and planning one, but it is likely that no balancing act was expected to have been drafted at the end of these three days. They are now left with a huge pile of options, and I bet they can sort this out. This will likely mean dramatic adjustments of the initial plan, but the result should be quite exciting. What they have to find is where the encounter between the historians of technology and other types of historians of Europe should take place: within the whole series itself, within some volumes, within some chapters? It will not be easy, but I do hope they will do it. The history of Europe is saturated from the predominance of two axes, on one hand the focus on European values, and on the other the emphasis on European construction. What is at stake here is the possibility to break away with this stalemate and, as we say in sweet France, with the 'half goat/half cabbage' compromises it has generated.*

*Your obedient grandson,*

*Pierre-Yves*

*PS: By the way, you were right not to get on the train with me. The rumours that filled the European Research Area about their wild parties are largely overblown. Their Heavy Funk Psychedelic band, "The Tensations", gave no set yesterday, so you could not have checked out its power to electrify the academic crowd. But, they have something they call 'committed spectators' in their attending list. If your knitting can be considered as a commitment, and I will plead for this, you might have a chance to see their show some other times. I have autographs of the singer, drummer and the lead guitarist for you, though. But believe me, they look better on the CD jacket.*



(with thanks to Dobrinka Parusheva)

\*\*\*\*

*One feature of the workshop was the active participation – in now time-honoured ToE tradition – of a number of scholars early in their career. They performed a number of roles as part of the workshop, thinking along as potential researchers for the proposed volumes, presenting their own work as part of an afternoon 'poster session', and finally presenting an 'artistic reflection' of the workshop, in the form of 'Inventing Europe: Big Brother'. One such 'ECS', Valentina Fava, recently of the European University Institute, reports on her experiences working hard and playing hard...*

A fine day in the middle of an Italian summer in the gardens of a former Romanesque monastery with a spectacular view on Florence, the transnational history of European integration entered the quiet existences of nine 'early career scholars' (henceforth ECSs). The competences necessary to become an ECS were common to the requirements of many jobs, but the magnificence of the place, and the three days period of service, could be considered as competitive, in comparison. Once arrived at the European University Institute, however, the ECS to be soon realized that despite the Italian location the rhythm was Dutch and Dutch was also the time of the beginning (and end) of activity. Well before 10am, on a hot and damp Friday morning, they were already engaged in ardent discussions on the nature of the book series discovering at their expenses that 'early career scholars' are not intended to be passive listeners or microphones takers as in the best Italian

academic tradition but they have on the contrary more than one fundamental role. In fact, they were asked to give proof not only of unquestionable intellectual skills but also of less obvious physical and artistic ones. There were actually different rituals to be followed in order truly to bear the title of 'ECS'. The theoretical nature of the first challenge proved especially hard for the small group: to define what an 'early career scholar' is, as opposed to a 'simple' research assistant. A few brave souls attempted some excursions to the realm of "grown-up" scholars – hoping to have a little fun with some of the "hot" issues of the workshop: the intellectual power-relation between the history of European integration, of European technology and the "transnational question", the suspect place of Eastern Europe in the global world and finally the *liaisons dangereuses* between the book series and the Tensions of Europe community. All too soon the "practical agenda" entered the picture...leaving the ECS wondering whether the book series' intellectual agenda could really be distinguished from its practical one (i.e. funding) and which role, research would have had in their unpredictable agenda.



(Many thanks to Valentina for the photo – which shows early career scholars, hard at work inventing Europe, no doubt...)

There was no time for such a meditative mood, however: already broken by the Florentine nights, populated by storms of hungry mosquitoes, the ECS had to give proof of their physical resistance presenting their artistically designed posters. According to the formal ritual, the presentations had to be repeated for three times in front of a different audience, allowing everybody – with the exception of the ECS – to take a relaxing break in the shady and fresh cloisters of the Badia Fiesolana. And, in fact, the discussion was actually reaching, in a *crescendo* of hot

and humidity, the *apex* of tension, with the order and framework of the imagined volumes being totally subverted. The ECS to the rescue again: only the ECS's artistic reflections on the tensions of the European integration could, as in the best Aristotle's cathartics, calm down hearts until the liberatory dances were finally opened and the workshop closed.



Trains = 'soppresso' Florence Station, 7 July 2008



(an example of European co-operation we can improve on...)

### Proceeding from here

The workshop generated lively discussions about nearly every facet of the structure, content and procedure for the book series, a dialogue that did not cease with the participants' departure from Florence. Consultations continued by email, and a new plan for a series of edited volumes was drawn up. Proposals for five volumes have now been commissioned. These are to be multiply-authored volumes, written by a coalition of senior and junior scholars. Talks are continuing as to the precise content and author constellations. We will certainly keep you posted on developments from here.