



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Writing the Rules for Europe: Experts, Cartels, and International Organizations  
by Wolfram Kaiser and Johan Schot (review)

Elisabeth van Meer

Technology and Culture, Volume 57, Number 2, April 2016, pp. 483-485 (Review)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: [10.1353/tech.2016.0050](https://doi.org/10.1353/tech.2016.0050)



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/619072>

is useful to an audience beyond historians of science and technology. She demonstrates how policies enacted as a consequence of the Great War “reflected Americans’ growing faith in the power of the federal government to shape the economy and to aid business in the early twentieth century” (p. 236).

RICH HAMERLA

Rich Hamerla is the associate dean of the Honors College and a professor of the history of science at the University of Oklahoma. Besides publications in the history of chemistry, Hamerla teaches classes on weapons of mass destruction and science and the cold war, and he has publications addressing biological weapons.

---

### **Writing the Rules for Europe: Experts, Cartels, and International Organizations.**

By Wolfram Kaiser and Johan Schot. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Pp. 396. \$95.

The European Union (EU) generates considerable controversy, much of it centered on its techno-economic legislative activities. For example, in 1994, before there even was a euro, the European Commission issued Regulation 2257. It required bananas produced or imported into the European Community to have “a minimum grade of 27 mm,” while bananas of the highest class could not have “abnormal curvature.” Euroskeptics ridiculed “Eurocrats” for regulating away the nature of a banana. Supporters insisted the law protected consumers and did not ban anything; the lowest class of bananas was allowed all “defects of shape” as long as “the flesh of the fruit” was not affected.

How today’s EU has become such a defining yet controversial legislative project is explained in *Writing the Rules for Europe*. The book offers an exciting new history of European integration, finding its answers in Europe’s long technological trajectories. It dismantles the official account, in which the EU was first envisioned by politicians, like Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, and Paul-Henri Spaak, at the end of World War II. “The Europe of this volume has been constituted during the last 150 years or so,” the authors emphasize, “through the creation of a set of rules by a variety of organizations, committees, and experts operating inside them” (p. 1). The earliest precursors to the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Community (EEC), and the EU include the Association of German Railway Companies in Berlin (1846), the International Telegraph Union in Paris (1865), and the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome (1905). These initiatives already pursued border-crossing obligations, liabilities, rates, rights, shared data pools, signaling systems, standards, etc. Their ambitious rule-writing forged the first fragmented, often competing, technologically integrated “Europes” (p. xiv).

APRIL  
2016  
VOL. 57

The authors also stress such expert competition over “Europe” did not end when the postwar institutions started: “The EEC’s great difficulties with creating a common transport policy [is one case] in point” (p. 299). In the 1950s, the Union International des Chemins de Fer (UIC) refused to be superseded by a new European transport authority. The UIC preferred its own sector-specific, pan-European, even global, railway regime, dating back to 1922. UIC experts did not want to serve as a vehicle for economic integration (beyond rail transportation), particularly not one committed to start with just six “core” West European states; they feared losing their rule-writing autonomy (as delegates of Ministries of Transportation) to foreign offices and economic ministries. The longevity of an organization like the UIC also exemplifies how experts forged continuities, for their own careers and their institutions, across the ruptures of world wars and cold war. Europe’s long twentieth-century history was consequently produced by “hidden” integration processes that “were (and are) not obvious to ordinary citizens of Europe” (pp. 4–5). Because experts cultivated a “technified realm,” outside of established parliamentary and diplomatic processes, Europe’s rules have always been written behind closed doors, at congresses and committee rooms, long before the EU was criticized for its lack of transparency in the postwar era.

This book also breaks considerable new grounds with its format. It is the fourth volume in the series *Making Europe*, each co-written by two or three authors. This facilitates the multilingual research required for transnational conclusions: the authors draw on West European (English, French, German, and Italian) and East European (Czech, Polish, and Hungarian) archives and publications. The text also includes dozens of archival images that visualize and underscore arguments. The book is further divided into three sections: chapters 1–3 lay out the foundation, growth, and crises of European technocratic expertise; chapters 4–7 offer sector-specific analyses of transportation (particularly railways) and heavy industry (particularly steel cartelization); chapter 8 provides a final account of “Europe” post-1945. All chapters offer a wealth of new institutional evidence, though that does mean that between the intro, the three sections, and the conclusion, the reader travels from 1850 to 2000 three times.

*Writing the Rules for Europe* decentralizes Europe, while highlighting European agency. Extra-European influences are included but not emphasized. Instead, this volume makes the important point that European integration has been always been a diverse all-European affair, not just the prerogative of West Europeans. The authors point out how East Central European states already participated in railway wagons organizations and steel cartels in the interwar period. Moreover, in the midst of the cold war, both West and East Europeans embraced new institutions like the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, in order to resist Americanization and Sovietization (the latter being pursued more by the Organisa-

tion for European Economic Co-operation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance). In short, *Writing the Rules of Europe* is an important new book. In dismantling the political myth of Europe, the authors unearth a long-standing institutional history of competitive, international rule-writing, by expert committees and cartels, that helped link and define Europe technically.

ELISABETH VAN MEER

Elisabeth van Meer is adjunct professor of history at the College of Charleston. She has published on experts and international relations in nineteenth- and twentieth-century East Central Europe and is currently completing her first book *The Heart of Europe: Expertise, Americanization, and State-Building*.

---

**Le gouvernement des technosciences: Gouverner le progrès et ses dégâts depuis 1945.**

Edited by Dominique Pestre. Paris: La Découverte, 2014.  
Pp. 315. €27/\$42.95.

This book, edited by historian of science Dominique Pestre, is ambitious in its goals, its theoretical framework (building on Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Judith Butler, most notably), and its stakes, explicitly described in the introduction. *Le Gouvernement des technosciences* makes its choices with firmness and assurance, and it presents a wide range of authors well-known in France for their contributions to history and sociology of science and technology. Many of these have previously joined forces, in particular on the study of the Anthropocene.

Pestre builds a strong *fil rouge* for his project, which justifies in and of itself the reader's attention to the book. Unsatisfied by the use of notions such as co-production, agency, hybridity (p. 17)—key concepts for science and technology studies (STS), which he does not repudiate, but considers susceptible to dogmatic uses—he aims at bringing greater nuance to this literature by re-introducing not only the temporal dimension, but also a way to think about asymmetries and reproduction phenomena in the face of determinism and contingency.

Sovereignty, governmentality, and governance are never far removed, in a gameplay that varies the scales of analysis and questions regulation in its supranational, global, and long-term “glocal” dimensions. These concepts are gathered around the concept of “government” as defined by Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose in *Governing the Present* (2008)—the “historically constituted matrix within which are articulated all those dreams, schemes, strategies and authoritarian manoeuvres of authority that seek to shape the conduct of others in desired directions” (p. 54 in Miller and Rose).

Thus, the book is neither constructionist nor structuralist, and attempts to identify both what is modifying and what is perpetuating—