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European Studies as a Field of Knowledge
– theoretical, methodological and practical reflections
Europe as a field of knowledge

Europe is a highly topical concept. It is often used as if its meaning were unproblematic. In reality, however, the concept of Europe is filled with a multitude of different meanings depending on the perspective of the person using it. Moreover, it is highly changeable over time. In post-war Western Europe the concept has become a synonym for the EC/EU in everyday parlance, which is a particularly clear expression of the hegemonic structures established over the years by this project. It may even be suspected that today’s Eastern Europeans have begun to regard Europe in this way. If so, they are outside Europe. The concept still, of course, carries a wide range of meanings, and since the disappearance of the Iron Curtain, this ambiguity has increased rather than decreased. Historical meanings and dividing lines have returned to make the world of the European difficult to survey. A situation like this risks leading to a heightened orientation towards familiar structures, such as the European Union or the nation, and to the building of new walls around these well-known units.

European Studies as humanistically based area studies

What is Europe? What does a European identity mean? These are fundamental questions in the study of Europe. They should be constantly asked from various angles, without necessarily receiving any unambiguous answers. The starting point for this approach is the humanities, the study of history and culture, with a heavy emphasis on a critical attitude to current politics and societal conditions and trends. In the case of European Studies this means, for example, a critical stance on the project of the European Union, and on the renewed nationalism that is presented as an alternative to “the bureaucracy in Brussels”. An important feature of this humanistic approach is the application of a deep historical perspective on the present. This places our own times and our “Zeitgeist” in a broader context and can therefore help to relativize the absolute claims that are made nowadays. This will allow us to see
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that Europe has meant very different things to different people in the different parts of Europe and at different times in its history; that the nations we often regard as absolute in our narrow contemporary perspective are the products of chance and processes of historical change, to take two examples of important insights that can be gained.

This is a general starting point from the perspective of the human sciences. But what are the characteristics of European Studies in more concrete terms? To begin with: what premises does the subject of European Studies build on as regards the theory of science?

If we look at practice, we see that this is definitely an open question. European Studies is in many cases based on a more or less unreflected notion of Europe and an unorganized multidisciplinary approach. A few different subjects are brought together on the theme of “Europe” and together allowed to constitute European Studies. The study is also quite often ethnocentric in an unreflected way, with the student’s own nation state as the given point from which to observe Europe as an external phenomenon. European Studies often tend to be EU Studies, and there is indeed a demand for knowledge of this kind today. In this case, the subject often tends to become a subdivision of political science and law.

When taking an intellectual stance on the subject designation “European Studies”, the question of the scholarly legitimacy and the status of the subject in terms of theory of science immediately becomes acute (cf. Parker 1997). European Studies is obviously not a discipline of a traditional kind, with its own theories, its own methods, its typical forms of source material; in short, European Studies is not an epistemologically defined discipline. Subjects such as sociology, economics, or history, because of the stability and constraints imposed by intradisciplinary rules and approaches to the acquisition of knowledge, can work with an otherwise open field of study. The limits to the field of study in these subjects are not defined, so to speak, externally, by a selected study object, but internally, by the disciplinarily regulated choice to study certain aspects of our reality.

European Studies is not a discipline of this kind. European Studies, unlike traditional disciplines, is quite simply not defined in terms
of the regulated and uniform way in which one attains knowledge. It seems more obvious to define European Studies *ontologically*, or externally, that is, in terms of the object of study. This is how area studies are usually defined, and it is of course natural to regard European Studies as area studies.

A difficulty with viewing European Studies in this way is that it does not unequivocally solve the problem of the theoretical status of the subject. For Europe is a notoriously elusive and mutable phenomenon, changing like a chameleon through history and depending on the observer's geographical, cultural, social, gender-related, and political standpoint (cf. Persson & Lindström 1999). If the object of study is supposed to carry the subject, it is unfortunate if this study object is so unstable. Defining European Studies as EU Studies may even be one way out of this dilemma, in that it would create a somewhat more stable study object. The EEC/EC/EU is of course hardly an unchanging entity, but there are boundaries to it, and at any given point of time it can be defined relatively unambiguously in terms of geographical extent and shared institutions and goals.

There are, however, several problems with an orientation towards EU Studies, some of which we shall look at in more detail below, but above all, for many people this choice gives far too narrow a framework in which to pursue European Studies. It is of course necessary to study the EU at a time when the development of the European Union is becoming increasingly significant for individual countries and individuals alike. Yet the EU is perceived here mostly as a collection of institutions, treaty texts, and regulatory systems which are little more than an extension of the nation-state reality that is studied in the disciplines of political science and law. Europe is of course much more comprehensive and difficult to define than this.

We are then forced to search for the stability somewhere other than in the study object. A kind of return to an epistemological strategy has been proposed: to bring in historical sociology as the theoretical and methodological backbone of the subject (see Parker 1997). A solution of this kind would ground European Studies in the historical, processual, and structural study of European society,
its institutions and forms of organization, its culture and community (or cultures and communities). This is in many ways an attractive solution. It brings the social sciences and humanities together in a concerted approach to the object of study – Europe. The study object can now be defined in a stable but simultaneously open way, in that the processes and structures, the institution and forms of organization that are studied will prove to be only partly overlapping, and with ramifications far beyond the European “core”. Particularly with the globalization of European society starting in the sixteenth century, the study of Europe will also be situated in a global context.

In addition, historical sociology already has a tradition of studying Europe. American macro-sociologists, such as Charles Tilly and Michael Mann, to name two of the more influential scholars, have been working for a long time with the broader issue of the development of collective forms of organization in human history. Their interest has chiefly been geared to the question why the (nation) state has become such a dominant institution in recent centuries. Yet they also study the rival forms of organization which have gradually been eliminated by the state, or subordinated to it, and since their field primarily consists of Europe, it is of interest for European Studies to relate to their research.

Despite its advantages, the choice of historical sociology as a foundation for European Studies has some serious disadvantages, at least if we look at the whole from the critical humanistic standpoint proclaimed above. One important disadvantage is that the “concerted approach” of historical sociology tends towards the objectification of analytical concepts and a determinist view of historical development. Historical sociologists work with a conceptual apparatus that is centred on the present, where the “State” is the completely dominant concept. There is of course a risk that they see states where there are none, and – even more importantly – they do not see a lot of other interesting things since they are only looking for states.

Historical sociology, however, has a wider field of study than the state. Yet the fundamental question – how it came about that the institutions and forms of organization that dominate (or are
deemed by some people to dominate) our times could have developed out of history – leads to a focus on the present, that easily ends up in determinism. To simplify somewhat, the task to be carried out is to sort and order the jumble of historical phenomena with the aid of the conceptual apparatus of historical sociology and to draw the historical lines leading to the goal: our times and our society.

One consequence of this is that the description of the world through time by historical sociology tends towards a historical overdetermination of our own times and the immediate future. The lines of development that are described in history acquire such weight and direction that they narrow the forward field of vision. What happens, if you like, is a reduction of the perceived expectations. To put it in post-modern terminology, historical sociology quite simply tends to construct a “grand narrative” about Europe, a narrative with an internal logic and coherence that links history and the future in a particular uniform way and thereby restricts the perception of what can be done today. In contrast, the critical humanistic approach seeks to problematize and deconstruct these grand narratives about Europe (or about the nation, for that matter), in order to give scope for the multitude of narratives and outlooks (over time and over the European area). The aim is to widen the expectation horizon.

Another disadvantage of historical sociology is that the return to a form of epistemological strategy leads to a reduction of the potential of area studies. By prioritizing the historical sociological conceptual apparatus in the study of Europe, one limits the epistemological field without gaining any ground on the ontological level, that is to say, one reduces the theoretical and methodological arsenal while sustaining the restrictions on the object of study. European politics, or European economics, would seem like an unnecessarily restricted field of study, at least if a knowledge of Europe was the aim of the studies, and on the level of theory of science, European historical sociology, despite its clear advantages, is a parallel case.

Another way forward is to retain the ontological strategy, that is, to stick to Europe as the object of study but simultaneously to benefit
from the potential of area studies, the openness of the epistemo-
logical field (the multidisciplinarity or interdisciplinarity). Yet the
problem of the unstable object of study then returns. But is it a real
problem? It is, strictly speaking, a problem common to area studies
as such (see e.g. Holmén 1994), which has not prevented this scien-
tific genre from flourishing. If such a strategy is grounded in the
approach of the human sciences declared above, the instability of
the study object may actually seem like an advantage. Every field of
knowledge that is defined ontologically naturally tends to contrib-
ute to the objectification of its field of study. This is particularly
ture if there is an active endeavour to give the object in question a
stable definition, an endeavour which actually seems to go against
the preferred critical humanistic outlook.

The way hitherto most frequently used to give European Studies a
reasonably stable study object, the choice of the EU, may exemplify
the problem. The objectification and determinism that are
described in the case of historical sociology above may be seen in
another, more pronounced form in the ideologization of European
Studies which risks arising if one defines the object of study as the
EC/EU. European Studies of the EU type tends to contribute to the
construction of a grand narrative on Europe, to give the concept of
Europe a more or less definite meaning, and above all to give
Europe a clear demarcation line. Yet a grand narrative that is
chiefly based on a relatively narrow experience of an elitist eco-
nomic and bureaucratic integration in certain parts of Western
Europe during a few decades in the second half of the twentieth
century naturally has its limitations. The internal coherence and
plot of the narrative, for example, does not exactly seem to further
the planned eastward expansion of the Union, since the Eastern
European experience is totally absent from the narrative. The role
of Eastern Europe in this narrative on Europe is mostly that of a
field in which to pursue a kind of Western European “inner coloni-
alism”. To take just one example: On the scholarly level, an ideo-
logically coloured limitation like this can be devastating, and is
directly in conflict with the efforts of critical humanism to pro-
mote diversity of experiences and outlooks and to broaden the
expectation horizon.
A historical parallel to this kind of trend in European Studies can be found in the alliance between the state and scholarship in the construction of the nation state. The majority of our modern humanistic and social science disciplines were established in symbiosis with the nation state, and the result in practice was a kind of nation-state studies. With the “nation” and the “people” as guiding categories, and with nationalism as the ideology, subjects such as history, ethnology, economics, and political science helped to “order the world” and teach people to see the world in terms of “nations”, “peoples” and “nation states”. A grand narrative about the nation was constructed, a narrative that got lost in the dawn of history, thereby giving the nation and the nation state a timeless character (see e.g. Hall 1998; Hettne, Sörlin & Østergård 1998). Teaching people to take a certain division of the world for granted is one example of the objectification of analytical concepts, a determination of experiential space and a reduction of expectations. In addition, of course, it shows the problematic relation of scholarship to politics and ideology.

Nation-state studies is a particular organization of the production of knowledge that has worked well for a long time, but at the end of the twentieth century, structural transformations and societal processes have weakened the political, economic, and cultural hegemony of the nation state. The result is that several of the traditional human and social sciences have begun to find it increasingly difficult to handle the changes. At first glance, European Studies should be better equipped for the challenges, particularly since the growth of a united Europe is an important part of the changes that threaten the nation state. Yet the end of the Cold War helped to lead the transformation processes in partly new directions, a development that does not entirely suit the traditional form of European Studies as EU Studies. In the 1990s the European project found itself in several difficulties. The disappearance of the Iron Curtain is especially important in this connection. It meant that the European integration project lost one important raison d’être, the struggle against communism, and the sense of a European community that had been built into Western European thinking in the post-war years, lost its hitherto distinct eastern border (cf. Persson & Lindström 1999).
In this situation, the European Union finds itself at a crossroads unable to choose which way to take. This identity crisis is reflected in an identity crisis for the European Studies that was tied in various ways to the European Union project. Regardless of how this crisis is resolved, it will be problematic to let European Studies be steered by the political project that the European Union constitutes. The aspiration for political unity in Europe will then be interwoven with European Studies in the same way as the national project was interwoven with several of the traditional disciplines. The experiential space is defined as the emergence of the united Europe, and the expectation horizon is limited, the diversity of outlooks is standardized. There is even a palpable risk that European Studies will be shaped as an active instrument in the construction of a European identity and ultimately in a renewed European self-assertion in the global arena. In short, we may have a European nationalism, in which the role of European Studies will be to contribute to the construction of a European national narrative.

In the light of this, it seems possible to argue that the definition and demarcation of the field of study should be kept open. If one proceeds from a critical humanism, this might even appear self-evident. “Europe” is a historically and culturally programmed concept which has undergone numerous transformations, and which is given different meanings from different standpoints. At the same time, it sums up a complex societal and cultural reality. The complexity and mutability that are thereby conceptualized in the term Europe are preferable from a critical humanistic perspective to the search for an unambiguously defined Europe. This is the purpose of giving European Studies the form of humanistically based area studies.

The method of European Studies: multidisciplinarity and comparison

The historical relativization of our contemporary experience is fundamental for the scientific attitude advocated here. The fundamen-
tal historical orientation guarantees that European Studies will not get stuck in narrow contemporary perspectives, instead furthering a vision that goes beyond present-day problems and hopes. The fact that European Studies, as advocated here, will take on a distinct historical orientation does not mean that the subject should consist solely of the study of European history. The historical perspective has a fundamental role in this context, but the discipline of history will leave room for other epistemological systems.

The multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary approach, which will be made possible by leaving the epistemological field open in this way, means that different disciplines’ divergent (re-)constructions of, approaches to, and notions about Europe can be contained within the subject. They can be allowed to play against each other and together help to capture “Europe”, if only provisionally. The other fundamental element in the methodological arsenal of European Studies is the use of systematic comparison, within Europe as well as between Europe and the rest of the world. By working actively with the problem of borders and identities, Europe can be permitted to appear in different guises depending on the comparison in question (whether internal or external comparison), and depending on the point of the observer in time and place. In the encounter between the different fields of tension which are created here, between different disciplines and between different comparative approaches, Europe emerges in shifting forms (see figure 1).
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Systematic comparison should question the European identity by letting Europe’s inner diversity stand out, and by showing similarities and connections to other cultures and continents. It should also seek the distinctive European identity by comparing Europe with other civilizations and cultures, and by looking for similarities within Europe.

As regards internal comparison – the search for both inner similarities and inner diversity – one should first of all operate with units such as regions, ethnic groups, and religions, and with conceptual pairs such as south–north and west–east, all of which help to free the internal comparison in the geographical dimension from the pattern of nation states. At the same time, the nation states have in many respects set their distinctive stamp on the development between state areas, so it is also important to contrast states with each other in comparative studies. Secondly, to deepen the internal comparison one should operate with conceptual pairs such as individual–collective, town–country, immigrant–native, centre–periphery, male–female, tradition–modernity, which throw a more finely meshed net over the European area.

The external comparison, Europe’s distinctiveness in relation to the rest of the world, and links and similarities between Europe and other continents, should operate with pairs of direct opposites such as Europe–Russia, Europe–America, Europe–China, Europe–Africa and Europe–the “Orient”, or today perhaps Europe–Islam. In all these cases the simple opposition is complemented by all the ties that unite Europe with each opposite. Russia’s position in relation to Europe is controversial and ambiguous, but many would regard Russia as a part of Europe. Europe’s relation to the elusive “Orient” is perhaps the oldest and most persistent of all Europe’s counter-images, which is evident today in the form of a dynamic Islamic regeneration. The similarities between Europe and the USA are striking, at least if one regards the USA from a North-West European point of view. From certain places in Southern Europe, perhaps South America seems more closely related. The explanation for these two examples is that the societies of North and South
America were formed in a historical process in which Europe (or certain parts of Europe) had a strong presence. As a result of emigration, Europe is closely intertwined with these “Others”. Conversely, the European colonies have affected the mother countries, both through returning Europeans, through immigration and through cultural influence of a more indirect nature; the Americanization of Europe in the post-war era is an example of the latter. Immigration from outside Europe is not only linked to colonialism; since the Second World War the Middle East in particular has made its mark on Western and Northern Europe.

Systematic internal and external comparison is especially important for showing that Europe (and the world at large) looks different from different “European” viewpoints. In this way, it also furthers a decentering of the national, ethnocentric experience, without for that matter helping to establish Europe as a new hegemonic level in the cultural organization of the world, in other words, contributing to European nationalism. Not least of all, internal comparison breaks up and relativizes the national categories which in practice rule many of the traditional scholarly disciplines. Yet the external comparison with its focus on Europe as a whole also has this effect. Comparison as a method thus contributes to the critical potential of European Studies.

The multidisciplinary approach may also be said to further the critical potential, in that the outlook of individual disciplines on the European problematics is not allowed to stand alone and unchallenged. The perspective of historical sociology, to return to the discussion above, is one of many outlooks that are thus contrasted. Humanistic subjects such as ethnology/anthropology, literature, and history of ideas work hand in hand with social sciences such as political science, economics, and sociology. The multidisciplinary approach will guarantee that Europe remains an elusive, changeable phenomenon, despite all our attempts to narrate and depict Europe in a unified way. The encounter between the human and social sciences is utilized here, but this distinction is also softened, both with the aid of boundary-crossing subjects such as historical sociology, cultural sociology, economic history, and social history, and because the encounter between humanistic and social science
approaches should ideally take place within the framework of one and the same part of a course or a research project.

Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary expressions describe positions in a partly new field for the humanities and social sciences. It is therefore not unequivocally clear what is meant when these words are used. They encapsulate an endeavour to break disciplinary isolation, to cross boundaries and thereby find new angles from which to approach old problems, and to make it possible to tackle problems which the old division into scholarly disciplines could not handle, or could not even discover.

In certain cases, this ambition can be satisfied by the establishment of a new subject, for example, breaking a new subject out of an older one, or by creating a hybrid between two or more traditional disciplines. These are the ways in which the traditional division into disciplines has developed over the last hundred years. History in particular has shed special fields which have become new disciplines (economic history, political science), but has also had approaches from other subjects and generated hybrids through the establishment of subjects such as historical sociology and historical anthropology (the New Historicism of comparative literature is a conceivable example on the methodological level). The formation of new subjects crossing old boundaries in order to relate to new problems will no doubt continue in the future. Yet this generally happens as one-off events which give rise to a new scholarly discipline.

Systematically tackling the problem of disciplinary isolation and blind fields, however, requires a different approach. It is here that concepts such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary come into the picture. Not aspiring to create a new, epistemologically defined discipline, but instead keeping the epistemological field open is of course a systematic and flexible way to relate to the origin of new fields of knowledge and to find new approaches to old ones. The boundaries between disciplines thus come into focus, and the aim is to create the conditions for systematic boundary crossing and encounters between disciplines, or for dissolving the boundaries. The difference between creating interfaces and dissolving boundaries may partly be said to lie in the difference between multidiscipli-
plinary and interdisciplinary work: the latter represents a more radical approach. Interdisciplinarity involves very close cooperation, perhaps even an outright fusion between disciplines. This cooperation can lie at different levels. The most radical form, and the most difficult to realize, is when the interdisciplinary method is combined in one and the same teacher or researcher. Another, more realistic form, at least if one wants to make interdisciplinarity a more widespread method, or the foundation for institutionalized scholarship, is intimate organizational cooperation across boundaries. The interdisciplinary method is then contained within the framework of individual courses or research efforts. Intimacy is important if interdisciplinarity is to be achieved. A research project, or a course, which is based on individual contributions by representatives of different disciplines is an example of multidisciplinarity rather than interdisciplinarity.

A criticism that may be levelled against interdisciplinarity pursued in the way described above is that it may tend to be disorderly, eclectic, unsystematic, or undisciplined. The risk of a lack of discipline and stringency in the working method is an argument for multidisciplinarity, that is, letting several intact disciplines work side by side, rather than bringing them together at a basic level in the production and communication of knowledge. Multidisciplinarity thus becomes a guarantee of intact scientificness.

A critical attitude to multidisciplinarity as described here, on the other hand, insists that the price of this scientific guarantee is rather too high. In practice, this multidisciplinarity will not lead to the crossing of any borders. There is a grave risk that representatives of separate disciplines will work individually, isolated from each other under a shared roof which in reality proves to be imaginary. No fruitful meetings will take place if the practical outcome is a number of parallel tracks which can best be described as multiple monodisciplinarity.

Despite this description, multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity are not firmly defined categories. This theoretical and methodological field is so open that it contains numerous interpretations and outlooks. When described as above, however, the terms can be used to capture the desired method. For European Studies, as pro-
posed here, multidisciplinarity is chosen as the description of the approach when the multiplicity of disciplinary and disciplined approaches to the European problematic, to Europe, has an intrinsic value. The encounter between disciplines and angles of approaches is fundamental for the form of area studies advocated here. It is partly in this encounter that Europe emerges in its various guises. On the other hand, this multidisciplinarity must allow itself to be inspired by the interdisciplinary method. It must be a unified multidisciplinarity. This is best realized on the organizational level, where the balance between disciplinary independence, on the one hand, and boundary crossing and encounters, on the other hand, must be maintained.

Unified multidisciplinarity and systematic internal and external comparison are thus the methodological foundation for the European Studies advocated here. Together they create a number of fields in the shifting encounters where “Europe” appears in its various forms. “Europe” becomes the object of detailed study, but at the same time the identity and boundaries of the study object remain indeterminate. As a result of the multidisciplinarity and systematic comparative method, the critical humanistic approach is thus also the method with which this “Europe” is studied. The conclusion of the argument here is that European Studies should be pursued in the form of humanistically based area studies, working in a multidisciplinary and systematic comparative way.

European Studies in practice

The discussion about the overall approach and the methodological foundation should naturally end by being brought down to the question of how European Studies should be pursued in practice. The presentation above gives the guidelines for a drive for multidisciplinary European Studies with an historical orientation which is planned for the new university college in Malmö.

European Studies exists as a subject at numerous universities and colleges in Sweden, in the rest of Europe, and to some extent in other parts of the world. There is, for example, the EU initiative to
participate in the establishment of European Studies in countries where the subject has not existed before; above all there has been talk about Asia. A great deal of the European Studies that is institutionalized in Europe in general and in Sweden in particular is characterized by:

1. a focus on the EU, or
2. teaching practically oriented knowledge (“country knowledge”, language with realia, etc.).

The combination is not unusual (practically oriented knowledge about EU institutions, EC law, EU English/French), but there are also practically oriented courses with a broader and deeper approach to Europe (e.g., also comprising Eastern Europe or studying an individual country in depth), just as there is academically oriented EU Studies (chiefly in political science, law, and economics).

The European Studies advocated here is of a different type, but a type that can embrace several of the types of European Studies mentioned above. It will be a matter of academic studies rooted in the humanities, taking a broad and concerted grasp of the European problematic. A knowledge of the changeability manifested throughout European history will be the entrance to a critical humanistic approach to current trends and conceptions. The studies will be grounded in theory of science and methodology, elements of which will be found at every level of study.

Realizing multidisciplinarity on this basis is a particularly great challenge. The humanistic and historical foundation of the subject requires a counterweight in social science and in the orientation to current affairs. Ideally, this means a multidisciplinary teaching staff, and later a research team, in both cases working very closely together. Multidisciplinarity requires a great deal of the students’ and even more of the teachers’ ability to bring the multidisciplinary element into the studies. The ideal case is of course that the students already have their base in a scholarly discipline, perhaps having also tried a second subject. Yet the teachers must also be able to deal with students who have no previous study background. In this case the assembled experience of the students
should be used in such a way that students with a longer study background work together with beginners on individual study tasks, such as writing papers and essays. The angles of approach to Europe in different disciplines will be presented both in the form of required reading and in the form of guest lecturers and teachers from different disciplines. The problem of multidisciplinarity itself will also be introduced in the tasks that the students work with independently.

The actual organization of education in European Studies of the type presented here undoubtedly requires detailed analysis, especially as regards the practical design of the individual courses. The design that is presented is moreover an ideal which must take concrete shape in the encounter with the teaching situation. It should nevertheless be regarded as desirable to try to live up to the high level of ambition stated here. The aim is European Studies with a firm basis in theory of science and a well thought-out methodology, of a type which is in extremely short supply in Sweden today, and which is totally lacking in the region where Malmö University College is located. Moreover, it has the potential to be interesting in a European perspective.

The fact that this venture is planned to take place at Malmö University College has both advantages and disadvantages. The chief advantage is the expressed multidisciplinary ambition at Malmö University College, which reaches all the way through the organizational field. Up to now this ambition may not have yielded so much. The desired multidisciplinarity has at best led to various forms of multiple monodisciplinarity, where representatives of different traditional disciplines work independently side by side, within a framework which has been given new names that sound multidisciplinary. But as long as the ambition is maintained, this will change through time. The main disadvantage is the eternal problem of a young university: the lack of a fixed base of established research and education on which to lean for support. For European Studies at Malmö University College the strategy will therefore be to set the multidisciplinary goals high and work with fixity of purpose to achieve them. To begin with, support should be sought in the established academic institutions, both internation-
ally and regionally, chiefly in the ramified and well-developed research on Europe at Lund University.
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