



HAL
open science

The European Civil Service as a Social Group: a political sociology perspective

Didier Georgakakis

► **To cite this version:**

Didier Georgakakis. The European Civil Service as a Social Group: a political sociology perspective. Joachim Beck, Franz Thedieck. The European Dimension of Administrative Culture, Nomos-Verlag, p. 283-298, 2008. halshs-00122141v1

HAL Id: halshs-00122141

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00122141v1>

Submitted on 27 Dec 2006 (v1), last revised 18 Nov 2008 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The European Civil Service as a Social Group

Didier Georgakakis
Groupe de sociologie politique européenne
UMR 7012 CNRS/Université de Strasbourg
didier.georgakakis@urs.u-strasbg.fr

European civil servants can be considered in two different ways. On the hand, they represent one of the most powerful myths of contemporary politics. The “Eurocrat” is now an incontrovertible figure with regard to the questions related to the European Union. This figure takes different forms and is characterized by a changing intensity depending on the social areas and climates. He is sometimes considered as a dreamer, sometimes as the arm which controls the ultra-powerful machinery or sometimes as the Trojan horse of globalised liberalism. On the other hand, the European official is regarded nearly everywhere as an agent of a small group controlling a machine that deprives States or people by setting up rules and directives.

These various and contradictory images indicate that common representations of power are projected onto this group. However, these projections end up hiding the essential. We have indeed little information about this group and even less about the socio-political conditions of its collective force. For a long time, the objective of studies on Europe was to describe status and collective identity in a more or less enchanted way, thereby reflecting the representations produced by the European civil servants themselves. This research was thus based on limited empirical data and imposed the image of European civil servants as prime mover of the cognitive integration of elites (Wallace & O’Neil 1996).

In the last decades, these studies were completed by anthropological research and policy studies. The anthropological research have shown that European civil servants shared strong values and a series of cultural dispositions which can be noticed through their belief in the beneficial effects of the Community method and European agreements, multiculturalism or a view of the world focused on long term future (Abélès & *alii* 1993, Schor 1999). Policy studies have shown that the invocation of the Community interest was a resource frequently mobilized by European civil servants. From this point of view, only European civil servants are capable of incarnating the general European interest in the context of negotiations and debates opposing diverse national interests.

The available scientific literature pays little attention to the conditions of production and interiorization of this “common culture” and even less to the links between this culture and the ability of the European officials to embody the Community interest or to – what should be at the heart of the reflections on power in the Union – what can explain the possible success of this operation.

These questions are significant in a context in which European civil servants are for lot of people the archetype of the “European elites”. I would like to develop the elements of a book in preparation to answer these questions and analyse the socio-political processes of the group construction. I will also study the framework of analysis and the possible perspectives which could result from such approach.

I. The framework of analysis

Before giving some elements on the group construction, I would like to point out some enigmas of this group and the conceptual tools used to resolve them.

1. European civil servants as a socio-political enigma

How should we understand that European officials have, at least in part, this « charisma derived from their function » (as Weber would have said) which enables them to invoke the Community interest in a more legitimate way than others? If we do not take into account their formal skills, this is really not obvious and constitutes our first enigma. European construction is due to a very recent process. Contrary to national civil servants, European civil servants do not benefit from a credit based on the history and tradition of a State. They even have to face the particularly changing context which results from the successive enlargements of the European Union. On what is based the belief that a Finnish or Swedish European official represents the Community interest whereas these countries entered in the UE less than ten years ago? And even more so for Polish or Lithuanian?

All these questions stumble over the same point, that is to say the mystery of the collective existence of European civil servants, our second enigma. The existence of a corps of European officials is not self-evident. The European civil servants represent in reality a more than improbable collective unit. The existence of such an integrated corps is first of all a nearly unique case in the sociology of international civil servants. Before being European, European civil servants come from very different cultures as it was often shown. It is the case with regard to their national *habitus* and their “administrative cultures”. Even though the bureaucratic organisation contributes to this collective work, it does not mean that these officials share the same causes and values. In other words, considering themselves as *European* civil servants rather than civil servants is not something natural.

This reality can be undoubtedly explained by historical elements. From this point of view, we can say that the European officials are fulfilling the prophecy of Jean Monnet by considering the institutions as a laboratory for new men. If we do not want to have a naïve view of the relationships between the prophet and his community, we have to analyse the relative success of this prophecy. We have indeed to break with the tautological uses of history and their legal corollary by explaining their durability through their legal status. The existence of this corps is not only due to its creation or to the creation of its status. On both points, it is important to remember that the constitution of a “core” of actors does not necessarily mean that it will gather around it a sufficient number of agents to form a group sufficiently strong to outlast the particular conditions presiding over its creation.

Even if this problem is already known in the sociology of social groups, it is particularly acute in the case of the European civil servants. This is the third enigma. The morphological growth of this group, 500 agents in the 1960s to approximately 20,000 today, consistently challenged the relative group homogeneity. Every enlargement, despite being supported by officials, brings its share of questions and doubts about the continuity of the group and its values. The repeated critical situations of European construction often brought the conflicts of national interests to the surface and constituted a threat for the “European” character of the group. It is particularly the case when the Intergovernmental Conferences about the institutional future of Europe or the budget negotiations fail.

How should we then understand the existence of this group? How can we explain its continuous collective strength in spite of the constant radical transformations? The processes of the socio-political construction of the group, which are permanently renewed, can explain this continuity. Our hypothesis is that these processes have contributed to give to its members a common mission and to construct a *group identity* adapted to their individual path and to their original and objective position, that is to say between States and interest groups or even as civil servants at the service of an emerging political order denied as such. They also contribute to renew the group by perpetuating it but also by adapting it to the new situations it has to face. Moreover, when these processes are blocked, they cause what the observers call the “sluggish climate” or even the “crisis” within the European institutions.

2. The processes of the socio-political production of the group as research object

Focusing our research on the socio-political processes of the group construction seems to be a good method to try to lift the veil from the mystery of the collective power of European civil servants. However, this analysis needs some precisions. First of all, we have to define the term of group. Considering the European officials as a group does not mean necessarily that we take into account its homogeneity. The sociology of social groups encourages us to take some distance from the common use of this term and to maintain the “right” distance, that is to say neither too near in order to see only the divisions nor too far in order to consider it in as an already existing or reified collective unit (Boltanski, 1982).

It is the same case for European civil servants. The analysis of these officials shows that there are many internal divisions. These divisions are linked to national membership, to its consequence on working habits (Abéles and *alii* 1993) and to its influence in some sectors. They can also be due to the rank, career or functions held. What does a Director-General of the Commission who worked before in cabinets of national ministers or members of the Commission and a young graduate who have just passed the A8 competition or a trilingual secretary have in common? The competition between sectors (Cini, Christiansen) and the symbolical hierarchies which divide the Commission can also explain these divisions. It is not the same thing to be a member of the Directorate-General for Competition, independent DG which is on a roll, than of the Directorate-General for Social Affairs. And this is not to mention the political divisions linked to the views of Europe or of economic policies (Hooghe).

However, we can not imagine representing European civil servants as individuals dissociated from a powerful collective unit. The group exists under an institutional form with a status guaranteed and renewed by the practice of disciplinary commissions and of the First Court of Instance of the Court of Justice of the European Communities, which settles the disagreements between the institutions and their staff. This group has pay scales which contribute to its prestige, external enmities and its own pride. It is represented by socio-professional organisations whose competitions are based on trade-union and non-national cleavages. The group is mobilized during the days of action or demonstrations when the status or pay scales are threatened. These different types of actions are opportunities to revive the common values and views shared by its members such as “skill, independence and continuity” to repeat the motto of the trade-unions of the European Civil Service.

Once a “good distance” has been kept, we have to analyse the encounter between the group and its members. In this context, it is necessary to give another precision. What do we mean

by “process of socio-political production” of the group? This question is part of the recent scholarly debates on European construction.

We have perfectly understood that these questions can not be resolved through an intergovernmental or rationalist reading which pays little attention to European officials. Even if from this point view, the perspective adopted here is closer to what is called the “constructivist” school (*JEPP*, 1999), the objective is to break with its typical inclination at the international and European levels. In order to continue and often sociologize the neo-functional research, the objective of neo-institutionalist and today constructivist perspectives is to analyse the processes of production of European values, of European socialization and the production of the collective resources of European officials. These perspectives enable us to determine our research subject on the content of its values and to refocus the debates on the construction of Europe in the framework of the common controversies of social sciences’

Despite its contributions, the new constructivist school does raise questions. It particularly results in constructions which pay little attention to the objective structures that enable the “constructions” studied to take root and to last. By focusing on the symbolical outlines of the European civil servants’ identity, it nearly completely ignores the empirical analysis of the processes of production and of interiorisation of its values. What are indeed the mechanisms and structures of production of these values? And what about their legitimacy and probability to exert their effects? What do we know moreover about the routinization of its values and the more or less important congruence which link these structures at different moments? Without such types of questions, the analysis of the construction of values unfortunately suggests a nearly-substantialized or idealist view of identity. How is it possible to understand the changing and plural character of identities and the causes of the superposition of identity forms (collective, sectorial, institutional) mentioned by the same authors (Christiansen 1997) without asking these questions?

These questions are far from being resolved by the perspectives of the constructivist trend. However, the disagreement also raises a second series of questions. This research only gives little information about the conditions of interiorisation of this identity. Is there a predisposition to the officials’ European vocation? How is this vocation distributed within the group and how does it vary with time? What are the consequences of this vocation on the ability to play a role and to represent the Community interest? Who is the more likely to embody this interest within the group and in favour of what kind of process? All these questions deal with the processes of construction and in particular of the construction of the Europeanity of the group’ members. But, contrary to what is suggested by the constructivist school, these questions can only be resolved once the role and the status of all the structures, both mental and objective characteristic of European civil servants, will have been re-evaluated.

These criticisms do not only aim at reminding the weight of the structures in the processes of social construction. They are at the heart of the analysis suggested here considering the fact that the study of the construction of this group leads to the central question of the production of a structure. The different questions enumerated before enable us to understand that the ability to invoke the Community interest represents thus much more than a simple resource. It is an incorporated practice which consists less in a capacity of representing the Community interest than in defining it from a common “point of view”, as Panofsky describes it in his study on Gothic architecture of the XII century. Even if the European civil servants manage to

keep the partners of European policies at a distance, to conciliate the different opinions or to use simultaneously reason and faith in Europe, the processes of the group production have created more than a collective identity in the common meaning of the word. It is indeed a common, long-lasting, structured, cognitive and practical framework which is at the same time adjustable to collectively maintain the actors of interest groups and the representatives of the States at distance. It also enables them, in return, to construct the “architectures” which contribute to the objectivation of the Community interest.

This is the enigma of the group’s strength, beyond the effects of legitimization caused by the processes of production of the group. This enigma raises the question of the production of a real “*habitus*” (as would have said sociologists like Norbert Elias or Pierre Bourdieu) of the European Civil Service. We will answer this question by analysing the encounter between the group’s objectivation and the conditions of interiorization of its collective history.

II. Some elements of the empirical survey: objectivation of the group and incorporated history

The common theme of this survey will be focused on two elements. Our first objective is to analyse the objectivation of the group and its transformation into a tangible corps considering three processes which seem crucial and little studied by the available literature: the construction of a series of representations leading to the representation of a common “figure” (first research area), the structuring of a series of mobilization practices of the group considered as a collective unit (second research area), and the institutionalization of a personnel policy which contributes to objectivize the group as regards the legal plan, wages and communication (third research area).

2. 1. Objectivation processes

First of all, this survey analyses the processes, both collective and competitive, of construction of the Eurocrat’s figure, of his symbolical outlines and his representations in the structures of production of identity and of the stylization of life (first research area). The identity of the officials is neither the result of an intrinsic process nor a mechanical effect of their geographical or socio-political situation. It is the consequence of a dynamic process which plays a particular role in the context of tension between Member States and European institutions. The *a priori* stigmatised figure of the Eurocrat is constructed and updated through the representations of the State and with national political configurations seen through the prism of Europe. Memoirs written by civil servants or militants of Europe stylise the European civil servant by inverting the stigmata attached to national bureaucrats (for example Spinelli *The eurocrats* published in 1963).

These processes are not so simple and show the influence of these images or representations. These representations are not ephemeral and can not be reduced to specific circumstances. They are part of more important processes of European construction. In the first case (the use of the Eurocrat’s figure by the political staff), the analysis allows to show that the genesis of this representation (or of this story) is not only due to opponents’ speeches, necessarily circumstantial or expressed during electoral campaigns. These representations are also an important part of the speeches from political supporters of Europe. Authors such as Claude Radaelli have shown how national governments used Europe to make acceptable measures which are hardly acceptable for the opinion. There are many examples, in particular on the “social field”. The remarks which I have made on the Eurocrat’s figure in France show that, beyond the governmental uses, the use of the Eurocrat’s figure is linked to a structural mechanism

heavy with redefinition or re-qualification of the political job as intermediary of Europe. This speech can often be heard as regards the transformations of the presidential figure and is made by the Ministers for European Affairs. It is important not to limit this dimension to the idea that Europe is only a justifying argument for politicians. However, this is linked to practices which tend to transform them into broker or interest representatives. The function is thus redefined in this more general process still without observing, in big countries for example (but an analysis is necessary for the new ones), the socio-morphological transformations of the political staff (Georgakakis. 1999a)

We can note the same phenomenon with regard to the stylization processes by the group itself. These are not isolated images. Even if the processes of production are far from being perfectly coordinated, they are nevertheless converging and can be found in recurrent forms in memoirs written by former members of the Commission, the portraits made by the internal communication such as the *Commission en direct* (Georgakakis. 1999b) or other internal magazines such as those published by the trade-unions (Georgakakis 2002).

These stylization processes are so important because they are associated with representation processes of the group as reflected in the creation of the European Civil Service's trade-unions (second research area). The trade-unions have been until now little studied but their presence is not neutral. They act as a structure which gives some images of the group but their role is much more important: the socialization of the group, the acculturation of the new members, the distribution of goods and services which enable them to have a significant position within the European institutions. Moreover, this activity is far from being static and is a condition for the maintenance of the group and of its values promoted by the dynamic of conflict characteristic of the field of trade-union representation and of the competition between trade-unions to represent the group. Once again, we have to take into account the social dynamics of these interactions. They can be seen through the regular work of electoral mobilization of the trade-unions during the elections of the staff committee. They can also be seen through the collective mobilizations also initiated by the trade-unions in the situations of reform as for instance the wage reform which lead to the elaboration of methods of adjustment of wages or the administrative reforms of the institutions. In this context, the weight of history is also very important because these processes have always been the same (but not necessarily in the same form) since the 1970s. The recognition of the trade-unions in the context of the Kinnock reform and the construction of places to elaborate the future of the European Civil Service (such as the creation of the GRASPE in 2001) clearly show the vitality of such processes without taking into account the services done by the trade-unions in the scope of their work of mobilization (Georgakakis 2002, 2006)

The trade-union mobilizations also contribute to associate the values of the group with tangible realities such as the wages and status of its members, obviously related to staff policies within the European institutions. The third research area on the objectivation of the group will deal with the evolution of these policies. As regards this point, we will study the socio-historical dynamics which emerged from staff policies and its by-products: the negotiation on the status in the sixties, the negotiations on the method to adjust wages or the internal communication policies such as in the newspaper called the *Commission en direct* since the mid-1990s. Many resources show the sociological importance of these processes¹.

¹ A first look at these documents enables us to find approximately 200 boxes on these issues. We can also add the references available in the archives of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg considering the structuring debates which took place about the status of the European Civil Service at the end of the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s between the COe and the different communities.

We do not want to say that the group is the subject of a tangible reality because of its status and codification. However, the group is based on the fact that this codification is a constant process. It is the case during the negotiations on the status and quantity (and quality) of the staff. The tables which sum up the positions of the different institutions and partners of reflection and their evolution, which is described in the archives of the Commission, is a convincing example of these contributions. We could find many other examples of the vitality of these processes in particular the case law of the European Civil Service which was the principal reason of the creation of the Court of First Instance in the 1980s and more recently of the administrative Court.

2. 2. The conditions to acclimatize to the group

At the end of this first part, we can note that in spite of the differences or divisions existing within the Commission (as in any other bureaucracy and they are maybe stronger there than elsewhere), there is a whole heavy and long-lasting process which contributes to the construction and structure of the group. However, we can not limit our study to this analysis. Indeed, one could think, and it would be another form of tautology (sociological, this time), that the group now exists in an intangible form because it was the subject of a process of social construction. Our survey will then be focused on the condition of its perpetuation following three complementary points (which are here briefly summarised).

The first point will deal with the predispositions of the agents who join the European Civil Service and the conditions of expression and adjustment of their “vocation” (Suaud). These agents share common values which are relatively long-lasting. However, it is not the same thing for their *habitus* which converge in spite of their national membership and in particular as regards their weak dependence to the State or nation. This fourth research area will indeed analyse the social conditions which contribute to their vocation but also the steps of the entrance examination considered as a structure which selects and updates the social and political dispositions already compatible, that is to say denationalised. The analysis here encompass a series of qualitative and quantitative data about the candidates for European Union and in-depth interviews of the members of the jury of the EU open competition. It's also be based on direct observation surveys carried out by institutions preparing candidates for European Union (such as, among others, CEES and the ENA of Strasbourg).

We have to add two supplementary elements to these questions about the way the social and political dispositions of the civil servants firmly root the values and collective capital of the group (on the European institutional capital, Georgakakis, Delassalle, 2006). The first one (fifth research area) deals with the internal competitions within the group and the mechanisms of appropriation of these values (that is to say its collective “value”) which are differential and differentially efficient depending on the different functions held by the members. If this corps exists and distances from national references, it is for different reasons. The own stakes of the group really enclose it and in particular with regard to the competition for the definition of the collective capital. This capital is the witness of the oppositions within the same movement of the different definitions of Europe and of the legitimate properties to govern it. We have to draw particular attention to this process because this competition permits to revive, update and certainly to give a definition of the group's values and to adapt it to the morphological transformations. We will base our analysis on the statistical data and in-depth interviews made for the survey on Directors-General of the Commission.

The second element (sixth research area) will be focused on the role of the different situations on this ability to institute the group. We will first analyse the long-lasting situations which raise the question of the generations which follow one another and of the resultant tensions. As it's often said, the role of the European Commission has changed, from "administration de mission" to "administration de gestion". We would like to show to what extent this change also corresponds to morphological transformations of the corps and the ways to embody, believe and ultimately interiorize its collective values. Objectivized tensions still continue between the generations who entered the European Union in the sixties and the current generation. It is also the case as regards the ways to be a member of the group and the vocation of the European civil servants. However these situations are also critical. They can provoke a crisis and show one of the brakes upon this process: the return to national *habitus*, as a more ancient and deeper disposition, which puts a limit to the definitive construction of the European *habitus*.

Published datas dealing with this working paper

Georgakakis, 1999b, « Les réalités d'un mythe : figure de l'eurocrate et institutionnalisation de l'Europe politique », in D. Dulong et V. Dubois, (dir.), *La question technocratique*, Strasbourg, Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, collection « science politique de l'Europe », 1999, p. 109-128.

Georgakakis, 1999b, « Les portraits de fonctionnaires dans la *Commission en direct* », communication à l'atelier sur les institutions européennes, animé par Eve Fouilleux et Cécile Robert, Congrès de l'Association Française de Science Politique, Rennes, septembre 1999

Georgakakis, 2001, « Les instrumentalisations de la morale. Lutte anti-fraude, scandale et nouvelle gouvernance européenne », in J.-L. Briquet et P. Garraud, (dir.) *Juger la politique*, Presses universitaires de Rennes, coll « Res Publica », 2001, p. 263-286.

Georgakakis, 2002, « Une mobilisation formatrice : les eurofonctionnaires contre la réforme du statut (printemps 1998) » in D. Georgakakis, (dir.) *Les métiers de l'Europe politique. Acteurs et professionnalisations de l'Union européenne*, Strasbourg, PUS, 2002, p. 55-84.

Georgakakis 2002 c, 2006 « Les syndicats de fonctionnaires et la construction de la fonction publique européenne », in Renaud Dehousse et Yves Surrél, *L'institutionnalisation de l'Europe*, l'harmattan, à paraître en 2004. (première version disponible sur le site de l'AFSP/congrès de Lille). English version to be proposed in *Journal of European Public Policy* : "Civil servant unions and social construction of the European civil service : sociological perspectives on eurocrats identity »

Georgakakis, 2004, « Was it really just 'poor communication'? Lessons from the Santer Commission's resignation » in Andy Smith (Ed.) *Politics and the European Commission. Actors, interdependence, legitimacy*, London, Routledge, 2004, p. 119-133.

Georgakakis, de Lassalle, 2005 : « Les directeurs généraux de la Commission européenne : premiers éléments d'une enquête prosopographique », *Regards Sociologiques*, 2005, p. 6-33.

Georgakakis, de Lassalle, 2006 : « L'europanisation du personnel politico-administratif européen : sociographie des directeurs généraux de la Commission européenne », in O. Baisnée et R. Pasquier, *L'europanisation des sociétés nationales*, Paris, CNRS, sous presses. English version to be proposed to *Journal of Common Market Studies*. "The Europeanization of political and administrative careers. The case of the directors-general of the Commission" (avec Marine de Lassalle)