

EDITOR'S NOTE

This issue of *Perspectives on Europe* features a mini-forum on national models of integration in Europe. In both academic and popular venues, debates about European approaches to integrating immigrants typically invoke distinct national approaches or models, such as those commonly labeled 'assimilationist,' 'republican,' or 'multicultural.' The inherent presumption is that different countries exhibit distinctive approaches which reflect national values and histories. Yet the notion of models as an analytical approach has been increasingly criticized by academics as too normative, simplistic, and static.

The four essays in this forum take a wide range of views on this growing debate. The essay by Ines Michalowski, Ruud Koopmans and Stine Waibel argues that 'model' as an analytical concept needs to be made more useful through greater precision and measurement. Their essay summarizes findings from a large-scale comparative data-gathering project that seeks to refine the existing definitions of national immigration models using 42 indicators of citizenship and integration policy in ten European states. This provides a useful starting ground for thinking about the complexities involved in assessing immigration and citizenship policy in Europe.

In their essay, Jan Willem Duyvendak and Peter Scholten examine a single national model that has commanded particular interest among scholars and policy-makers: namely, the Dutch integration model, which is widely viewed as the most coherent expression of a multicultural model. While not rejecting the notion or utility of models, Duyvendak and Scholten argue against this common view with the proposition that multiculturalism is actually only one of three powerful discourses that have shaped Dutch integration policies. Their argument thus casts doubt on whether any nation can be accurately described by a single ideal-type.

Sara Wallace Goodman shares Duyvendak and Scholten's healthy skepticism about the empirical accuracy of national models but, like them, does not reject their potential utility. However, she does advance the view that models are less useful as predictors of which policies nations will pursue than as *post hoc* descriptions of their existing policy mixes.

And, in the final essay of this group, Christophe Bertossi takes up the essential idea, the same idea postulated by Goodman, that models should be seen as dependent variables to be explained, rather than as independent variables. Indeed, Bertossi takes the most skeptical view of the utility of thinking about integration policy in terms of models and asks, "What if National Models of Integration Did Not Exist?"

Altogether these four essays provide a diverse set of views and stimulating

arguments, and I would like to thank Erik Bleich of Middlebury College for taking the lead in organizing the forum.

The other essays in this issue present equally stimulating voices on a wide-range of issues. In a comparative piece, Jette Steen Knudsen takes us inside Danish and American corporations to understand why women, contrary to the image of Denmark as a paragon of gender equality, enjoy greater opportunities for advancement within American firms. Her study suggests that the gender equity promoting elements of European welfare states have less impact on female professional advancement than do diversity promotion policies and practices within firms. Thus, the key to supporting women's advancement may lie more in changing firm practices than expanding welfare state programs such as maternity leave or childcare.

In her essay on judicial interaction within the EU, Elaine Mak gives us a concise and insightful overview of the multi-level legal system that has emerged in the European Union. She poses the question: Does this model have lessons for other emerging multi-level legal orders, whether connected to regional initiatives like NAFTA or Mercosur or to functional spheres such as financial market regulation? Her essay highlights in particular the key role of dialogue between courts operating at different levels in producing a functioning governance order.

Sofia Perez's essay on financial oversight within Europe provides us with insights into the challenges and pitfalls faced by the newly created European financial regulatory structure known as the Larosière model. She draws these insights by looking at the domestic experiences of three distinct types of regulatory structure found in pre-crisis European states and helps us make sense of differences among them.

And, finally, Claudia Schrag tackles a nagging and persistent problem for the European Union: namely, how to enhance its legitimacy among Europeans. Schrag argues that an oft-overlooked dimension of the struggle for legitimacy is the socially-constructed component of legitimacy that involves the creation of inter-subjective agreement about what is legitimate, and that is a discursive process. In so doing she suggests that we need to go beyond public opinion surveys and reconstruct how discourse among diverse groups changes their views of the European Union.

In closing this note, I would like to thank Siovahn Walker, the new Director of the Council for European Studies, who has also generously taken on much of the hard work of copyediting and producing this journal. I hope you enjoy reading these articles as much as I did.

Richard Deeg
Editor