The ERASMUS Generation:
French Student Mobility in Europe 1987-1997

A Thesis

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty of the

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Arts in History

Annalise R. Walkama

Spring 2017

The ERASMUS Generation:
French Student Mobility in Europe 1987-1997

Annalise R. Walkama

APPROVED:

Jordan Kellman, Chair Professor of History and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts	Chad Parker Associate Professor of History
Richard Frankel Associate Professor of History	Mary Farmer-Kaiser Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I first began this thesis, I had only a vague idea of what I wanted to write about and absolutely no idea how the whole process would unfold. I am sincerely indebted to the many individuals who supported and encouraged me as I figured it all out along the way.

This project would not have been possible without the wise guidance and counsel of my chair, Dr. Jordan Kellman. Despite his many other commitments, he was on board from the very beginning and steered me through the ups and downs of research, writing, and editing. I am extremely grateful for his many proofreading sessions and insightful feedback, which helped produce a thesis that I am very proud of. My committee members, Dr. Chad Parker and Dr. Richard Frankel, challenged me to think critically in the classroom and enriched my understanding of history, providing me with the tools to first begin this process. Dr. Robin Hermann and Dr. Kathryn Edwards were also a wealth of knowledge and encouragement over the last two years. Even when I was no longer their student, they were continuously supportive and always willing to help. Together, these scholars provided a network of support that sustained me during my time at the University of Louisiana.

Additionally, I would not have survived graduate school without the camaraderie of my fellow graduate students, especially my witty thesis sidekick Kelsey Jagneaux, who inspires me with her passion and commitment to her work. Special thanks also go to my partner, Kelson, whom I never would have met had it not been for study abroad. He respects and shares my love for learning and has encouraged me in my academic pursuits, even when it meant moving across the country (and the world). I cannot adequately express what it means to have his love and support.

Above all I would like to thank my family, especially my parents, Jim and Marsha. Everything I am today is because of them. I have missed out on many things—both highs and lows—over the last four years, yet they have remained unwavering in their support for me. They are my biggest cheerleaders and my greatest inspiration in life. My parents first encouraged me to go abroad when I was 17 and have patiently waited for me to return home on every adventure since. They never once questioned my decision to study history and have always supported my quest for knowledge. My mom, in particular, has shown me how education can enrich and transform the lives of others. Her dedication to her students and passion for teaching has greatly influenced my own love for education. She is a strong and confident woman who raised me to be the same. Along with the encouragement of my father, she paved the way for me to go out and fearlessly chase my dreams.

Lastly, I would like to thank my sister, Madison. This year she overcame many obstacles and spent a semester abroad in Italy. This experience restored her confidence and brought happiness back to her life. Her endless courage and strength inspires me every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Everything began there, when my plane took off...oh boy this isn't a story of a plane that takes off, rather it's a story of taking off. I can finally begin to tell you everything…everything began there."[1] These are the closing lines from the 2002 French film *L'Auberge Espagnole*, the story of a university student from Paris who spends a year studying in Barcelona through the ERASMUS program, the European Union's educational exchange network for university students and professors. At the end of the movie, Xavier, the main character, stands on a runway as planes take off above him and reflects on how his life has changed since he first left France.

L'Auberge Espagnole has become a sort of cultural icon for the study abroad experience of young Europeans. The movie follows the ups and downs of Xavier's year in Spain as he navigates life in a foreign country, makes new friends, and struggles to stay afloat in school. At the advice of a family friend, Xavier chooses to study in Barcelona so that he can learn more about Spanish economics and perfect his language skills with the goal of getting a job at the French Ministry for the Economy and Finance. In the end, his hard work pays off and after graduation Xavier accepts a position with the Ministry. On the first day of work, however, he realizes that this is not the life for him and instead decides to pursue his childhood dream and become a writer. During the scene on the airplane runway, Xavier recognizes that his year in Spain has changed the trajectory of his life and his perspective on the world. "I am French, Spanish, English, and Danish," he says,

---

[11] "*Tout a commence là, quand mon avion a décollé… Oh là là c'est pas une histoire d'avion qui décolle… Ou plutôt si c'est une histoire de décollage… Je peux enfin commencer à tout vous raconteur… tout a commence là…*" All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. Romain Duris, *L'Auberge Espagnole*, directed by Cédric Klapisch (2002; France: Mars Distribution, 2013), Netflix.

remembering his hodgepodge of roommates in Barcelona. “I’m not one, but many. I’m like Europe; I’m all of that. I am a true mess.”[2]

The European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) is the world’s largest study abroad network and was the first major European Community initiative to integrate higher education in Europe.[3] Launched in 1987, the program established credit and diploma equivalencies between member states, which made it possible for students to study abroad as part of their degree programs. Previous to ERASMUS, there was no centralized European structure to facilitate these exchanges, nor was there an equivalency system for the higher education institutions. In many ways, Xavier’s fictive experience in *L’Auberge Espagnole* represents the reality for many French ERASMUS students who studied abroad during the 1990s and early 2000s when the European Union was just coming to fruition. He must jump through the bureaucratic hoops of simply being accepted in ERASMUS, he struggles to find an apartment in a foreign city, and experiences frustration when his professor refuses to lecture in Spanish and instead teaches in Catalan. Also like many real students, career aspirations motivate Xavier’s decision to study abroad. His family friend assures him that the new market under the Euro is creating a plethora of new jobs, but applicants must have the correct qualifications,

[2] *“Je suis français, espagnol, anglais, danois. Je suis pas un, mais plusieurs. Je suis comme l’Europe, je suis tout ça. Je suis un vrai bordel.”* Ibid.

[3] Community refers to the European Community (EC). In 1993, the Maastricht Treaty replaced the European Economic Community (EEC) with the European Community, signifying Europe’s commitment to political and social integration along with economic cooperation. The treaty also introduced European citizenship and established the European Union (EU). The European Community was one of the pillars of the European Union until the Treaty of Lisbon (2007), which restructured the EU and eliminated the Community. I use the word Community or European Community throughout this work since ERASMUS was originally a Community initiative and to remain consistent with the language in my primary sources. “Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union,” *Official Journal of the European Union*, updated June 6, 2016, EUR-Lex Database, accessed April 6, 2017, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12016M/TXT&qid=1491540431803&from=EN.

specifically multilingualism and a good knowledge of the European market. From this perspective, ERASMUS fits into Xavier's plans for his future and ultimately helps him to achieve his long-term goal. Although he abandons his dream job at the Ministry, this storyline fits in with the way that Europe had marketed ERASMUS from its inception—as a vehicle for producing an experienced and multinational workforce. *L'Auberge Espagnole* propagated the notion that study abroad was a way to advance professionally. Yet the movie ultimately frames ERASMUS through a different lens. While in Spain, Xavier meets students from all over Europe and slowly begins to view them not as foreigners, but as friends. His roommates are no longer just members of different national communities, but citizens of Europe, a community to which Xavier also belongs. In the end, Xavier's experience in ERASMUS changes more than his career path; it transforms his identity.

Over the course of the twentieth century, international educational exchanges have evolved from a few bilateral partnerships available for a minority of students to a massive network of exchanges traversing the globe. Study abroad has become a common and sometimes necessary part of the university experience. This growth derives from a number of factors including increased access to higher education, advancements in transportation, and the rapid communication and interconnectivity of globalization. In Europe, the increased mobility of university students is greatly indebted to the ERASMUS program and the integration of the higher education system at the hands of the European Union. Since 1987, students and professors from participating member states have had the opportunity to study and teach abroad, thereby creating a cooperative network that transcends national frameworks of education. ERASMUS established a system of equivalencies for diplomas, credit transfers, and coursework that made it possible for students to integrate time abroad

into their normal curriculum. It also put a greater emphasis on foreign language acquisition, specifically learning other EU official languages. Through the ERASMUS program, the integration efforts of the European Union transcended the traditional areas of diplomacy and economics and entered the lives of university students.

Although European unification was not official until the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, the years leading up to this date incited a flurry of activity in the member states as they prepared to transition to the single market. This thesis focuses specifically on France's place in the ERASMUS program from 1987-1997 to demonstrate how students took on an active role in the European Union as engaged citizenry and models for the image of European identity. Throughout these ten years, Community rhetoric emphasized the need for citizens to travel to other member states, form new relationships, and invest in the creation of a European identity. Tapping into the higher education system and harnessing student mobility provided a model for this process and allowed the Community to construct students as the ideal future workforce. France was a crucial member of ERASMUS from the very beginning, ranking consistently as one of the top three importers and exporters of students during the 1990s. This thesis further explores how France occupied such a dominant place in the program and why the French were so committed to expanding their study abroad network. I argue that French success in the ERASMUS program was motivated by the desire to attain a central place in the "People's Europe" of the future. In order to excel in ERASMUS and thereby participate in the process of Europeanization, the French expanded existing structures of national support to propel their students into the European Community and to attract foreign students to France.

To illustrate this process, I focus on three main factors: education, funding, and language. Each of these factors structures a part of my argument and together they explain France's place within ERASMUS. Education includes France's established history of study abroad and the general structure of ERASMUS that enhanced France's position in the program. The predicament of funding for study abroad—what students expected, how the program determined need, and the amount actually provided—demonstrates the role that finances play in educational exchanges. This section also clarifies the crucial relationship between student mobility and student grants, exploring how Community funding affected the specific situation of French students. Lastly, language provides the third pillar to my analysis, revealing that like disparities in funding, language also influenced student mobility flows. Framed within the context of Europe's promotion of multilingualism, France benefited from the status of French as a widely spoken Community language, but also had to contend with the possibility that other languages could detract from its popularity and thus destabilize France's position in ERASMUS.

An analysis of these factors reveals the inequalities that riddled the ERASMUS program and the atmosphere of intense competition that member states experienced as they struggled for resources, exchange partnerships, and status within the program. Although many have lauded ERASMUS as one of the few initiatives that most Europeans support, it would be wrong to characterize the program as a total success simply because more students are studying abroad today than thirty years ago. It would also be unwise to assume that because ERASMUS was a creation of the European Community it eliminated disparities between member states and created an equal opportunity network for students. I demonstrate that inequality did exist and although ERASMUS worked to correct this situation, it was the

competitive nature inherent in the program that kept the member states engaged and constantly working to send more students abroad.

To reconstruct the history of ERASMUS and France's unique role in it, I have relied primarily on two types of sources. The first are official European Union documents, which include the European Commission Annual Reports on education, the ERASMUS program and SOCRATES (umbrella program for ERASMUS in late 1990s), Commission Press releases, and a variety of surveys and external evaluations of ERASMUS conducted at the request of the Commission. The other source types relate to the press. I rely primarily on the extensive archival collection of the French newspaper *Le Monde,* as well as a few other publications. The European Union documents inform my analysis of the program's structure, goals, and major developmental issues during the first decade. These sources also lay out the official Community rhetoric concerning the growth of study abroad in Europe and the relationship between civic engagement and European identity. My analysis of the press helps to frame the specific situation of France in ERASMUS. While the Community documents and reports are a general summary of the entire program with little emphasis on the individual member states, newspaper sources bring into focus the issues that were most pertinent to the French and illustrate how French society constructed study abroad as part of university culture. These press sources also help to humanize ERASMUS. The voices of the students, administrators, and French public are totally absent from the Community reports, except for the surveys that students responded to anonymously. Here again, their experiences and thoughts appear as nothing more than statistics in a report. Thus, whenever possible, I have tried to include articles about ERASMUS students, education officials, and the reactions of general public about issues related to study abroad. I have also relied on a series of

interviews with the ERASMUS founders Domenico Lenarduzzi and Hywel Ceri Jones to help reconstruct what ERASMUS meant to the individuals responsible for its creation.

My analysis of the role of the French in ERASMUS fits into a growing body of literature on educational exchanges and university students that has been developing since the early 2000s. This is a relatively new field for historians, yet it has roots in the older disciplines of transnational history and tourism and travel studies. Both have contributed to scholars' interest in the internationalization of higher education, and in students as historical actors. While transnational history only dates back to the 1990s, studies on travel and tourism have roots in the cultural turn of the 1970s, when historians began to analyze travel as a social practice that mediates between the private and public spheres. [4]

In the historiography of twentieth-century France, scholars have examined leisure travel to explain domestic issues such as cultural identity, social policy, and consumption.[5] Stephen Harp explores advertising and French identity though the domestic tourism industry, specifically the Michelin Company.[6] Others, like Julian Jackson, analyze the expansion of the welfare state in the thirties from a cultural rather than political perspective.[7] Studies on international relations also look toward new cultural sources such as students, expatriate

[4] Foundational works in this field are Valene Smith's collection *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), particularly anthropologist Nelson H. Graburn's article "Tourism: The Sacred Journey," and Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). More recent is sociologist John Urry's study *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (London: Sage Publications, 1990).
[5] Ellen Furlough and Shelley Baranowski's collection of essays consider the role of class in leisure travel in Europe and relate travel to the development of collective identity. Baranowski and Furlough, *Being Elsewhere; Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001).
[6] Stephen Harp, *Marketing Michelin: Advertising and Cultural Identity in Twentieth-Century France* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2001).
[7] For more on the welfare state and travel, see Julian Jackson, "Le Temps des Loisirs: Popular Tourism and Mass Leisure in the Vision of the Front Populaire," in *The French and Spanish Popular Fronts: Comparative Perspectives*, eds. Martin Alexander and Helen Graham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 226-253.

groups, and travelers.[8] These perspectives have reimagined the Cold War, Franco-American relations, and the formation of Europe.[9] My thesis also fits in with the trends in cultural and transnational scholarship about France that reconceptualize France's relationship with Europe and the world.

The development of the field of transnationalism further encouraged historians to examine travelers as agents taking part in historical change. As the name suggests, transnationalists construct history outside of the framework of the nation and study how people, goods, and ideas move across borders to forge the links of the globalized world. From this perspective, historians chart the networks of globalization in new and dynamic ways that reframe the traditional narrative of international relations and focus instead on non-state actors and organizations. Travel is one such network that allows non-state actors to engage in transnational activities. "Travellers create or join a discussion about the relative characteristics, positions and roles of the places they visit for fun, work, profit, or spiritual and secular enlightenment," explains Pierre-Yves Saunier. "The linkage is also about coming 'home' and 'abroad.'"[10] For those who study educational exchanges, this distinction between "at home" and "abroad" is essential to the process of identity building that takes place for students traversing the globe. Historians like Whitney Walton and Vanessa Fong examine

[8] A general history of American tourism in France can be found in Harvey Levenstein's two volumes series. Levenstein, *Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998) and *We'll Always Have Paris: American Tourists in France Since 1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). For more on the Americanization of France and the expatriate movement, see Nancy L. Green, *The Other Americans in Paris: Businessmen, Countesses, Wayward Youth, 1880-1941* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014).

[9] Furlough also addresses tourism and mass consumption from the French perspective in, "Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s-1970s," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40, no. 2 (April 1998), 247-286. Christopher Endy similarly frames American tourism in France within the context of mass consumption. Endy, *Cold War Holidays: American Tourism in France* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004). Richard Ivan Jobs, "Youth Movements: Travel, Protest and Europe in 1968," *The American Historical Review* 114, no. 2 (April, 2009), 376-404.

[10] Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History: Theory and History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 37.

internationalized higher education through a comparative lens to understand how study abroad transforms students' identities and perspectives. [11] Walton uses the term "cultural internationalism" to describe the process of self-reflection that American and French students underwent when forced to confront their national identity after time spent abroad. In her view, study abroad engenders the process of cultural internationalism, reconfiguring students' national identities and situating them within a larger global community.[12]

While Walton limits her scope to educational exchange between the United States and France, scholars also observe the process of identity building at work in the broader field of youth culture. Richard Ivan Jobs explores the postwar reconstruction of France through the generational term *nouvelle vague* or "new wave." His examination of the cultural meanings of youth points to the role that age can play in historical analysis. Jobs argues that society associated national reconstruction in France with young people, hinging their aspirations for the future on a newer and younger generation.[13] This deeply intertwined relationship between "new" and "young" contributed to the atmosphere of rejuvenation and cultural reconstruction in postwar France. Similarly, Christina Norwig analyses how the concepts of youth and generation contributed to the process of European integration in the 1950s. She draws on scholarship about generational thinking and the "myth of youth" to explain how society constructs youth as a powerful political and social force in the process of nation building. [14] Norwig argues that members of the European Youth Campaign in the 1950s took advantage

---

[11] Whitney Walton, *Internationalism, National Identities, and Study Abroad: France and the United States, 1890-1970* (Sanford: Stanford University Press, 2010) and Vanessa Fong, *Paradise Redefined: Transnational Chinese Students and the Quest for Flexible Citizenship in the Developed World* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 2011.
[12] Walton, *Internationalism, National Identities, and Study Abroad*, 3-5.
[13] Richard Ivan Jobs, *Riding the New Wave: Youth and the Rejuvenation of France After the Second World War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.)
[14] Chrstina Norwig, "A First European Generation: The Myth of Youth and European Integration in the Fifties," *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 2 (2014), 251-260.

of the “myth of youth” to actively participate in the creation of a supranational European identity.

Both Jobs and Norwig situate the cultural construction of youth within the frame of identity, explaining how generational thinking has constructed young people as the future of national or supranational communities. From this perspective, youth gain agency in the historical narrative as active contributors during moments of profound national rebuilding or change. This study builds on these ideas and identifies how generational thinking played out in France in the context of the European Union. In the 1990s, Community rhetoric constructed students in much the same way as it had in the 1950s, drawing parallels between youth and the future and also associating young people with one of the primary opportunities in the process of identity building. While the European Youth Campaign only lasted seven years, the ERASMUS program is going on its thirtieth year and operates in far more countries than the campaign of the fifties. Although scholars outside of the discipline of history have examined ERASMUS within the framework of the European Union, these political scientists, linguists, and education specialists are not concerned with the place of ERASMUS within a larger history of educational exchanges and youth culture. ERASMUS must be contextualized within both the historical narrative of study abroad and the political framework of the European Union’s development.

Today, study abroad and the ERASMUS program are still fundamental parts of the university experience in France and the network continues to expand. French students currently rank as the most mobile nationality in ERASMUS, with nearly 40,000 setting off to other countries in 2014/2015. France is also the fourth most popular study destination in the

program, as well as worldwide.[15] The stereotypes that we associate with study abroad and the central themes of *l'Auberge Espagnole* remain pertinent. French students still chose to study at a foreign university hoping to have a transformative life experience as Xavier did or to acquire skills abroad that will help them land their dream job. Ultimately this project aims to explain how we have arrived at a point where study abroad holds such a central position in the realm of higher education today. What motivated France to continue expanding its exchange network? Why were French students so intent on going abroad? What did all of this mean for French identity and France's place in Europe? The answers to these questions speak to the role that young people play in an increasingly interconnected world where questions of identity still persist. For ERASMUS, this story is even more significant given that the words "Brexit" and even "Frexit" are on the lips of many in Europe. Before we can understand what these "exits" might mean for the European higher education system, we must first understand how this integrated network came about and how ERASMUS students contributed to the formation of the European Union.

[15] Statistical data regarding ERASMUS comes from the European Commission's 2017 report on ERASMUS mobility as reproduced by the Campus France. Data concerning student mobility globally is from UNESCO's 2016 report. Elsa Tabellion, "Les étudiants français sont désormais les plus nombreux à partir en ERASMUS," *Le Monde*, February 22, 2017, accessed February 22, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/campus/article/2017/02/21/les-etudiants-francais-sont-les-plus-nombreux-a-partir-en-erasmus_5083221_4401467.html.

CHAPTER ONE:
The ERASMUS Program and Education in the European Community

I was always convinced that Europe could not become a reality without mobilizing the youth. Its construction was not a long calm river, but from an economic and political perspective, it was at that time [mid-1980s] more or less a great success. But these victories were not enough to develop this feeling of belonging that was essential to the creation of strong and united Europe. Yet, in the 1980s, the French, the Belgians, the Spanish or the Italians were not concerned by this enormous challenge. Nonetheless, we were convinced that without a citizens' movement there could not be a Europe. The challenge was to fully mobilize the young people of Europe.[16]

- Domenico Lenarduzzi, founding member of ERASMUS

In 1986, the year the European Community Council of Ministers proposed the ERASMUS program, less than one percent of students living in the Community studied in a different member state.[17] During the first year of the program, 3,000 students and 3,000 university professors traveled to study and teach in a foreign country.[18] As of 2017, over four million students have benefited from this system of university exchanges—the largest in the world—that ERASMUS began coordinating in the 1980s.[19] Domenico Lenarduzzi, an Italian

---

[16] "*J'ai toujours été convaincu que l'Europe ne pourrait se réaliser qu'en mobilisant sa jeunesse. Sa construction n'a pas été un long fleuve tranquille, mais d'un point de vue économique et politique, elle était à ce moment-là plutôt une belle réussite. Mais ces victoires ne suffisaient pas à créer cet esprit d'appartenance indispensable à la création d'une Europe forte et solidaire. Or, dans les années 1980, les citoyens français, belges, espagnols ou italiens ne se sentaient pas concernés par ce chantier monumental. Reste que nous étions persuadés que sans mouvement citoyen, il ne pouvait pas y avoir d'Europe. Le défi a été de mobiliser ces jeunes de l'Europe tout entire.*" Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Danièle Licata in "Domenico Lenarduzzi(fondateurd'Erasmus):'L'Europe ne pouvait se realizer qu'en mobilisant sa jeunesse,'", EducPros international interviews, January 22, 2014, accessed February 26, 2017, http://www.letudiant.fr/educpros/entretiens/domenico-lenarduzzi-fondateur-d-erasmus-l-europe-ne-pouvait-se-realiser-qu-en-mobilisant-sa-jeunesse.html.

[17] With the exception of students from Belgium, Germany, and the United Kingdom, that percentage had remained the same throughout the ten previous years. Frédéric Gaussen, "Vers l'Europe des universities," *Le Monde*, April 3, 1986, accessed September 21, 2016, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1986/04/03/vers-l-europe-des-universites_2919066_1819218.html.

[18] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1987* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, April 15, 1988), 6, Archive of European Integration (AEI), University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 26, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/31780/1/COM_(88)_192_final_2.pdf.

[19] Jean-Claude Lewandowski, " Programme Erasmus: Quel bilan après trente ans d'existence?" *Le Monde*, January 3, 2017, accessed January 18, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/campus/article/2017/01/03/programme-erasmus-quel-bilan_5057092_4401467.html and Martine Jacot, "Erasmus +, un success européen né il y a trente ans," *Le Monde*, January 5, 2017, accessed January 18, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/campus/article/2017/01/05/erasmus-un-succes-europeen_5058143_4401467.html.

economist who worked for the European Commission for forty years, is commonly referred to as the "father of the ERASMUS Program. " Lenarduzzi joined the Directorate General for Education and Culture in 1981, then part of the Task Force for Human Resources, Education, Training, and Youth and was later appointed Deputy Director-General of the Directorate General of Education and Culture in 1999.[20] Hywel Ceri Jones is another "father" of the program. A Welsh educator from the University of Sussex, Jones developed the Community's policy for education from 1973-1993 when he served as Director for Education, Training, and Youth Policy and later Director of the Task Force for Human Relations.[21] At the University of Sussex, he learned of an exchange program that allowed students from all disciplines to study at a foreign university and use those credits to help complete their degree. A program of this nature was extremely rare in the 1970s, as there existed no course or even diploma equivalents between European countries. This system at the University of Sussex inspired Jones to develop a similar network at the European level, which he called Joint-Study Programs (JSP). Over the next decade, Jones worked with other Community officials like Lenarduzzi to develop the JSPs into a cooperative higher education network that would eventually become the ERASMUS program. "I was persuaded that such an idea could also be encouraged on the European stage," said Jones in a recent 2017 interview, "Happily, the Ministers of Education agreed, and it took 10 years to demonstrate that the initial pilot scheme could work, engaging universities across Europe and establishing

20 The Commission appoints three Directors General and two Deputy Directors General," December 8, 1999, European Commission Press Release, European Commission Press Release Database, accessed February 26, 2017, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-99-956_en.htm.
[21] "Origins of the Erasmus programme – interview with Hywel Ceri Jones," February 22, 2017, ERASMUS+ UK, accessed March 12, 2017, https://erasmusplus.org.uk/blog/origins-of-the-erasmus-programme-percentE2percent80percent93-interview-with-hywel-ceri-jones.

the necessary legal and financial basis for the European Union (EU) to develop educational collaboration and run the Erasmus programme."[22]

For Lenarduzzi and Jones, the European Community was not just about economic success; it was about creating an identity and a world perspective. This was an identity that transcended national boundaries and emphasized cooperation, integration, and inclusion. To get citizens to conceive of themselves as part of a European community and not just an economic partnership, the Commission chose the domain of education. It was a path to creating a European identity that implicated neither Community politicians, nor government representatives from member states, but rather the people themselves and more specifically young people. The ERASMUS Program gave students the opportunity to become personally invested in the Community through travel and education, expanding their perspective beyond their respective member states. [23] Study abroad was a way to stimulate the mobility of citizens and to prepare a segment of the population to work throughout the Community and sustain the economic partnerships that were at its core. Developing this incredibly ambitious reform of the European higher education system, however, did not come without challenges and certainly did not happen overnight.

During the first decade of the program, ERASMUS underwent many changes to keep up with the growing level of student demand and incorporation of new member states into the Community. The maintenance of the program was not an easy task, especially from a financial perspective, since the growth of the exchange system required a constant increase in funding. This chapter explores the major issues that arose during the development of

[22] Ibid.
[23] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Solange Berger in "Erasmus: 25 ans d'échanges," *La Libre*, June 23, 2012, accessed February 26, 2017 http://www.lalibre.be/economie/libre-entreprise/erasmus-25-ans-d-echanges-51b8ecffe4b0de6db9c70a70.

ERASMUS and the creation of a cooperative higher education system in Europe. I discuss Community education programs prior to ERASMUS, focusing mainly on how ERASMUS was able to build on these smaller initiatives and resolve many of their major problems. I also explain the general structure of the program during the first ten years, including the incorporation of ERASMUS into the larger educational initiative SOCRATES. This chapter examines ERASMUS as a whole in order to provide the necessary context for the specific problems that France faced as part of ERASMUS treated in the later chapters. I pay particular attention to the difficulty of incorporating so many member states into a cooperative higher education system, especially with regard to the issues of funding and student mobility. I also focus on the Community discourse of identity, cooperation, and youth. I draw on the work of Christina Norwig and Richard Ivan Jobs to explain how generational thinking constructed students as ideal European citizens. Interwoven among this history is the commentary of ERASMUS founders Domenico Lenarduzzi and Hywel Ceri Jones, the two people most responsible for the program's implementation. Their reflections on the early years of ERASMUS articulate the struggles that members of the European Commission dealt with as they tried to establish and maintain the program and reveal how those involved with ERASMUS at the highest level viewed educational exchanges in the context of European integration.

Setting the Stage for ERASMUS in the European Community

In an article for *Europe* magazine in 1987, Jean-Claude Crapoulet, a professor at the University of Aix-en-Provence, lamented a lack of mobility among European students. He noted that the Europe of the twentieth century was a vast departure from the Middle Ages, a

time when students and professors were extremely mobile and "real 'men of the world.'"[24] Crapoulet was not alone in his desire for a more internationalized system of education. Jones and other officials at the Task Force for Human Resources, Education, Training, and Youth were eager to initiate an education reform that would reach a wide segment of the student population and promote cooperation in the higher education system. This reform was of course the ERASMUS program, but this was not the first effort to integrate higher education in Europe. Education reforms at the Community level date back to the 1970s when the Community began taking on an active role in education. Up until this point, the European Community had little involvement in education, possibly due to the vague language in the Treaty of Rome regarding the ability of the Community to interfere in educational affairs.[25] The Treaty of Rome did not include provisions about academic cooperation and diploma recognition, but it did specifically acknowledge the need for vocational training in an integrated economic community. Thus, until the 1970s when lawmakers began to conceive of education as part of vocational training, there was no movement for the Community to become involved with universities or students.

European educational initiatives must also be seen in the context of the European Community's own history. The development of the Community in the 1950s came in the wake of the Second World War, a time of rebuilding and unification for Europe. The focus was on economic expansion and negotiating a strong position amid the conflict between the

[24] Jean-Claude Crapoulet, " Universities Plan European Diploma," *Europe*, April, 1987, Archive of European Integration (AEI), University of Pittsburgh, accessed October 21, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/44597/1/A7650res.pdf.

[25] Scholars disagree about whether "vocational training" included educational development, but most agree that this vague wording caused educational programs to develop slowly. The Maastricht Treaty of 1991 was the first to official state the Community's role in education. Anne Corbett, *Universities and the Europe of Knowledge: Ideas, Institution, and Policy Entrepreneurship in European Union Higher Education Policy, 1955-2005* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 9-10.

United States and the Soviet Union. Since the nature of the Community was initially economic, there was neither room for educational development, nor concern for it.[26] Following the Hague Summit of 1969, where lawmakers first broached the subject of culture in the European Community, the Council of Education Ministers for Education began slowly developing an educational policy that fit with European integration. In 1974, the Ministers presented the first Community program for education. Although lawmakers expressed interest in a cooperative system, they remained adamant that the Community had to respect the diversity of each member state.[27] Brad Blitz argues that the formation of this education policy "evolved out of the need to satisfy certain basic freedoms recorded in the Treaty of Rome, the most important of which are the freedom of establishment and the freedom of movement."[28] Education, notes Blitz, was not yet able to "break free from the economic area."[29] Although the Community publically committed to developing education as part of integration, this policy fit in with the economic framework of the Community and was not yet concerned with the formation of a European identity. Also in 1974, the European Court of Justice ruled that since education had the potential to aid in the creation of a common market, then it was in fact a concern of the Community, even if the Treaty of Rome had not explicitly referenced it. This ruling set the precedent for Community actions related to education, the largest of which would be the ERASMUS program.[30]

[26] In his article published in 1987, Fritz Dalichow assesses how the EEC has neglected "academic recognition" (the recognition of study periods, qualifications, entrance requirements, etc.) in favor of professional and vocational coordination. Dalichow, "Academic Recognition Within the European Community," *European Journal of Education* 22 (1987), 39-56.
[27] Brad Blitz, "From Monnet to Delors: Educational Co-operation in the European Union," *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 2 (May, 2003), 200-201.
[28] Ibid,199.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid, 202-203.

In 1976, the Community took its first steps toward integrating the higher education system with the establishment of the Joint-Study Programs (JSP). At this time, the major struggle for Jones and others working with the Community's education policy was to create a cooperative system that did not encroach on the member states' existing national education structures. The second major issue was funding.[31] The JSPs were a massive undertaking and there was much to be sorted out in order to develop any kind of integrated network. The Community had to create a system for the recognition of diplomas and credit transfers, and improve language instruction so that students could travel for their studies. At this time, there was no centralized arrangement for exchanges between universities, and admission to a higher education institution varied by member state. The transfer and recognition of credits was also a major hindrance, as many universities did not recognize a student's coursework in another member state and admissions requirements often varied from university to university without a national system to set standards.[32] Some universities also had foreign entrance fees or foreign student quotas and all required a sufficient level of language fluency, yet there was little funding for language preparation for students who did not meet the criteria. This complete lack of centralization hindered the development of study abroad and engendered inequalities between member states based on national standards. The United Kingdom, for instance, attracted well below half the number of students that Germany and France did due to its federally mandated foreign student fees. Despite being an Anglophone country, the

[31] For a detailed discussion on the evolution of Community education police, see Anne Corbett, "Ideas, Institutions and Policy Entrepreneurs: Towards a New History of Higher Education in the European Community," *European Journal of Education* 38 no. 3 (September, 2003),322-323.
[32] *Admission to Institutions of High Education of Students from Other Member States*, (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, September 22, 1978), 3-6, AEI, University of Pittsburgh University of Pittsburgh, accessed October 23, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/32720/1/COM_(78)_468_final.pdf.

increased tuition for exchange students was a major deterrent, especially compared to countries like France where all students could attend public universities for free. [33]

The Joint-Study Programs aimed to overcome many of these barriers to encourage cooperation between universities. Under a JSP exchange, students and professors could study and teach in another member state and the institutions involved in the network recognized foreign diplomas and credits earned abroad. For students, this meant that time spent abroad did not detract from their academic progress and contributed to the completion of their degrees. Although the JSPs eliminated foreign student fees for participants, funding from the Commission went to the development and coordination of the exchanges, rather than to the students.[34] The Joint-Study Programs were therefore a stepping-stone to more comprehensive educational reform and called attention to the major issues facing an integrated higher education system. What became abundantly clear during this time was that constructing a university network required a massive budget that could fund the development of the exchange program and provide some sort of financial award to students and professors. The challenge for Community administrators like Jones and Lenarduzzi was to impress upon member states the importance of students in Community development. Even more challenging was convincing national governments to invest in and support such a large-scale education initiative.[35]

Developing the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students

[33] Ibid.
[34] Dalichow, "Academic Recognition Within the European Community," 48-49.
[35] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Daniela Vincenti in "Domenico Lenarduzzi: 'Le Programme Erasmus ne pourrait plus être lance aujourd'hui,'" EurActiv Interviews, September 22, 2011, accessed Febraury 7, 2017, http://www.euractiv.com/section/social-europe-jobs/interview/lenarduzzi-erasmus-would-not-get-off-the-ground-today/.

Although ERASMUS is known today as one of the most successful European Community programs, getting member states on board with the initiative was an uphill battle for three years. Beginning in 1984, Lenarduzzi and Jones set out to develop a system for diploma recognition between member states and to establish equivalency standards for the various national curriculums. This was an unprecedented reform for European education and there existed no frame of reference on which to base the new system and no previous budgetary allocation for such a program. Individual member states were furthermore hesitant to abandon their own standards in favor of a European one.[36] According to Lenarduzzi, member states also balked at the financial requirements of developing ERASMUS: "They said 'bravo, bravo' it's a great idea. But as soon as we mentioned the necessary budget, they had a change of attitude."[37] Some member states actually favored exchange programs for professors rather than students, which they felt was a more frugal use of the Community budget. In their eyes, one professor teaching abroad would interact with a greater number of students than a student on exchange; therefore, an exchange network of professors would reach the most students and was also the cheaper option.[38] Unlike the governmental representatives of the member states, students were immediately on board with ERASMUS, as they understood the difficulty of study abroad and desperately desired change for the system. Although the development of ERASMUS did require the financial commitment of individual member states, the program would never have become a reality without the initial financial support of the Community to establish the exchange networks, create the new credit transfer system, and provide the initial funding for the students. As will be discussed in the

[36] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Danièle Licata, "Domenico Lenarduzzi (fondateur d'Erasmus)."
[37] "*…ils disaient "bravo, bravo", c'est une bonne idée. Mais lorsque nous parlions du budget nécessaire, ils changeaient d'attitude.*" Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Daniela Vincenti, "Domenico Lenarduzzi."
[38] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Solange Berger, "ERASMUS."

next chapter, ERASMUS was extremely successful at convincing national governments to invest in the program and find alternative sources of funding for their students. Thus, despite the initial hesitation on the part of member states, ERASMUS and the field of educational exchange soon came to be a crucial part of higher education in Europe.

On May 14, 1987, the European Community Council of Ministers officially adopted the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students, better known by the acronym ERASMUS. Like the Joint-Study Programs, ERASMUS was concerned with the recognition of diplomas and credits between member states, the issue of funding students outside of their home university, the importance of language acquisition, and the need for an improved information flow throughout the Community. This initiative was even more expansive, integrating the mobility of students and teachers with the development of joint-curriculum programs, a massive university network, and funding for participants. In the initial Council Decision on ERASMUS, the document constructs students as both a future workforce and as "intellectual resources" for the Community:

> Whereas the further development of the Community depends to a large extent on it being able to draw on a number of graduates who have had direct experience working and living in another Member State;
>
> Whereas the competitiveness of the Community in world markets depends on ensuring that the entire intellectual resources of the universities in the Member States are harnessed to provide top quality levels of training for the benefit of the Community as a whole.[39]

[39] "Council Decision of 15th June 1987 adopting the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)," *Official Journal of the European Communities,* June 25, 1987, EUR-Lex Database, accessed October 21, 2016,

When breaking down the specific objective of the program, the Council Decision again connects student mobility to the creation of a "pool of manpower with first hand experience of economic and social aspects of other member states."[40] Yet to "harness the full intellectual potential of the universities in the community," there must be an integrated network like ERASMUS to provide students with the opportunity to gain this experience.[41] This network also affords students the opportunity to personally experience integration, "thereby creating the basis upon which intensified cooperation in the economic and social sectors can develop at the Community level."[42] Lastly, educational integration improves interactions between citizens from different member states "with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe."[43] From this brief summary of the program's goals, it is evident that mobile students are a central piece in the "People's Europe" of the future. They are the future workforce and model citizens and as both they are a resource for the Community. The ERASMUS program was thus a way to harness this resource and implicate the field of higher education in the identity building process in Europe. With this type of discourse, the Community constructed young people as the gateway to a future that was stronger, better, and different from the Europe of the present. If the People's Europe was the future, students most certainly wanted to take part, and ERASMUS gave them the tools the Community said were necessary.

This kind of generational rhetoric, however, was not unique to European unification in the 1990s. Nation building in Europe during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries first employed these cultural images about the power of the youth to inspire and unite citizens.

---

http://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31987D0327&qid=1490575795458&from=EN.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

Richard Ivan Jobs gives the example of the young people in postwar France and symbols of a democratic future that contrasted to the painful past of Vichy and collaboration. He argues that France invested in young people through cultural programs such as sporting events and professional development "to create an ideal citizenry capable of active participation in a modern republic based on democratic and egalitarian ideals."[44] Conversely, the proliferation of youth organizations under regimes such as the Nazis demonstrates how generational thinking can incite youth participation in an authoritarian as well as a democratic state. As Christina Norwig has shown, cultural images about a generation such as the "myth of youth" can also be applied to a post-national context. In her study of the European Youth Campaign of the 1950s, Norwig finds that young people united "in a transnational community bound together by political values, youthfulness, masculinity, and the willingness to make sacrifices for the defense of the common good."[45] Building on the worker of scholars who have examined generational thinking in a national context, she contends that young people translated national rhetoric about the "myth of youth" into a supranational context and constructed themselves as the future European generation.[46] It is this same kind of generational thinking that the European Community implemented to engage students in the ERASMUS program and in Europe more generally. This vision of a generation of students that was well traveled and multilingual, and above all an asset to the Community, is a reoccurring theme in discourse surrounding ERASMUS.

[44] This articles was later included as a chapter in Jobs' book *Riding the New Wave.* Richard Ivan Jobs, "Building community and reconstructing citizenship in the Youth and Culture Houses of postwar France," *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 12, no. 3 (August, 2004), 206.
[45] Norwig, "a First European Generation," 258.
[46] Norwig references Robert Wohl's study on the "Generation of 1914" in Europe and Mark Roseman's work on the history of generational thinking in Germany.

As has been established, student mobility was the main goal of the ERASMUS program, but to achieve this goal, the Community also had to address other pertinent issues such as funding, program coordination, and academic recognition. To address these factors, the ERASMUS Program had four main actions: [47]

1. The European University Network
2. Student grants scheme
3. Recognition of foreign diplomas and periods of study abroad
4. Complementary measures

Each of these worked toward the central purpose of facilitating student mobility, while also developing the integrated higher education network. The European University Network concerned the development of student and staff mobility through Intra-University Cooperation Programs (ICPs) and study visits. ICPs were exchange programs between universities that allowed students to complete a portion of their studies in another member state, usually a semester or year. These exchanges involved a partnership between universities—during the first few years it was only two universities, but the ICPs later grew to support an average of three to four—and all participating universities fully recognized and accepted the credentials students earned from time spent abroad. [48] Financial support for ICPs was available at a maximum of 25,000 ECU per university.[49] Study Visits also aided in the development of the European University Network. For this project, the Commission awarded grants to teaching and administrative staff members to work and teach in a different

[47] "Council Decision of 15th June 1987 adopting the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)."
[48] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1987*, 8-9.
[49] These grants covered the cost of the development and coordination of the exchanges, such as travel costs for staff that were organizing the ICP, the translation of documents, or use of marketing materials. Financial support for the students came the student grants under Action 2.

member state. The Study Visit Program permitted the University Network to strengthen their cooperative partnerships and develop administratively. It also allowed students who were not able to participate in an ICP to still benefit from the program with a visiting teacher from another member state.[50]

The European University Network helped to resolve many of the key issues that the joint-study programs had initially identified as problematic. Coordination of the universities, however, was not the only hindrance to student mobility in Europe. Funding was also a major obstacle to higher education institutions wishing to develop partnerships. Action Two, student grants, worked in conjunction with the European University Network to finance the exchange network. Students were eligible for up to 5,000 ECU of support for a one-year period of study outside of their home country. The grants covered expenses such as travel costs, language preparation, and the cost of living in another member state.[51] A National Grant-Awarding Authority (NGAA) in each member state selected and distributed grants to students participating in an ICP. Although the Commission established the 5,000 ECU maximum, few member states were ever able to fully support all of their students. In the 1987/1988 academic year for example, French universities comprised 53.8 percent of ICP participants, whereas less mobile member states like Greece and Denmark made up 7.8 percent and 6.5 percent respectively.[52] Due to their high participation level, French universities were only able to support 25 percent of their students, yet almost all Danish and Greek students received student grants.[53] In part, these early issues with funding students derived from the budgetary structure of the ERASMUS program, which allocated the most

[50] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1987*, 17-18.
[51] Ibid, 19.
[52] Ibid, 37.
[53] Ibid, 7.

money to Action One so that the European University Network could develop as fully as possible. After 1989, the majority of the budget shifted to support student grants.[54] Nonetheless, funding would remain a crucial issue for the program as the Commission attempted to stimulate mobility to less visited countries, distribute resources among all member states, and increase the amount of student grants awarded per person in countries with a high level of demand.

Due to the nature of this project, Actions One and Two are most pertinent and will therefore receive the most analysis. Actions Three and Four of the ERASMUS Scheme concern the administrative structure of the program and complimentary measures to support Actions One and Two. Action Three focused on academic recognition of time spent abroad with the development of three projects: the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS), the European Community Network of National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC Network), and joint-curriculum development projects. The Commission designed these programs to make study abroad more appealing to students and to further consolidate the higher education system in Europe. These projects eliminated the possibility that time spend studying in another member state would go unrecognized by a home university and helped integrate exchange programs into the regular curriculum. Like the European University Network, institutions taking part in the ECTS system were eligible for student grants, but the project did not go into operation until 1988. In contrast, the NARIC Network was actually in existence before the ERASMUS program, but was adopted into the larger education scheme to maximize the number of potential participants and to benefit from ERASMUS funding.[55] Action Four focused on a variety of complementary

[54] Ibid, 5.
[55] Ibid, 22.

measures such as the circulation of informative publications about the ERASMUS program, the distribution of ERASMUS prizes to students and staff members, and support for consortia between European universities. Publications included a directory of universities in Europe, *ERASMUS Newsletter,* a guide to the NARIC Network, and the *ERASMUS Guide*, a description of all the ICPs supported under the ERASMUS program.[56]

ERASMUS and the SOCRATES Program

With the exception of a few minor changes, these four actions would remain relatively permanent until 1995, when the European Commission integrated ERASMUS into a larger Community initiative known as SOCRATES.[57] The first phases of this program, SOCRATES I, existed from 1995-1999. The overall goal of SOCRATES was to bring a European dimension to education at all levels. The program therefore established new initiatives that expanded beyond the higher education system. ERASMUS was still one of the major pillars of SOCRATES, but the program now incorporated students of all levels and types.[58] SOCRATES had three chapters, the first of which related to higher education and contained ERASMUS. The second chapter focused on education at the primary and secondary level with the COMENIUS program, which created school partnerships, facilitated teacher exchanges, and aided in the education of migrant children. The third chapter contained a variety of "horizontal measures" such as distance learning and adult education.[59]

---

[56] Ibid, 25.
[57] In 1989 the Commission moved the joint curriculum development projects and study visits from Action 3 and 4 into Action 1, as they fit better with the European University Network. *Proposal for a council decision amending Decision 87/327/EEC adopting the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)* (Brussels, May 29, 1989), 4, AEI, University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 27, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/9322/1/9322.pdf .
[58] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1994* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, September 8, 1995), 20, AIE, University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 26, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/10068/1/10068.pdf.
[59] The LINGUA program was also adopted into SOCRATES and was integrated under the third chapter, Horizontal Measures. *Final Report from the Commission on the Implementation of the SOCRATES Programme*

Although some ERASMUS officials worried that the specific goals of the program would be lost once it became part of the larger SOCRATES agenda, ERASMUS proved "strangely indestructible" and continued to thrive.[60]

The adoption of SOCRATES was a watershed moment for the Community not only because it was the largest educational initiative thus far, but also because of the massive investment in human capital that the program represented. Since the creation of ERASMUS, official Community rhetoric had stressed the importance of students as a gateway to Europe's future success. The Commission had designed the program "to harness the full intellectual potential of universities in the Community" and "to ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experiences of intra-Community cooperation."[61] The mobilization of students at the university level molded a workforce that had the potential to benefit not only a single member state, but the entire Community as well. SOCRATES also expanded the reach of the program, more than doubling the number of original members. In 1995, the program contained fifteen member states and three countries in the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.) In 1998/1999, ERASMUS admitted Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia. The following year it further expanded to Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Slovenia.[62]

1995-1999 (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, December 2, 2001), 24-25, AIE, University of Pittsburgh, accessed October 16, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/33396/1/COM_(2001)_75.pdf.

[60] Ute Lanzendorf and Teichler, "ERASMUS Under the Umbrella of SOCRATES: An Evaluation Study," in *ERASMUS in the SOCRATES Program Findings of an Evaluation Study,* ed. Ulrich Teichler (Bonn, Germany: Lemmens, Verlags, & Mediengesellschaft, 2002), Academic Cooperation Association Publications, accessed November 30, 2016, http://www.acasecretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/2002_ERASMUS_in_the_Socrates_Programme.pdf.

[61] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1987*, 4,

[62] *SOCRATES 2000 Evaluation Study*, ed. Ulrich Teichler, Jean Gordon, and Friedhelm Maiworm, (Study for the European Commissions, November 2000),25, European Commission Database of Evaluation Files, accessed November 30, 2016, http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/search/download.do;jsessionid=45PZTJSQcr3NQcJ3nlkHpTy2jyD2spxNFn2wJJcj412VHhmfssxq!1601440011?documentId=2729.

Given the status of university students as citizens on the brink of entering the workforce, it is not all that surprising that the Community invested in the development of initiatives like ERASMUS, COMETT, and LINGUA. To expand educational programs to students outside of the higher education system, however, indicated the Community took extremely seriously its commitment to instill a European perspective in students, even those only in primary school. This expansion also reinforced Europe's commitment to the mobility of students, teachers, and ideas. During the first year of the SOCRATES program, Edith Cresson, European Commissioner for Education, Research and Social Services and the former Prime Minister of France, complained that Europe's educational schemes were still moving too slowly. "It is one of the most remarkable paradoxes of Europe," Cresson proclaimed, "goods, capital, and services circulate more freely here than people and ideas."[63] While programs like ERASMUS and SOCRATES had been increasing the number of mobile students each year, by 1995 the Community had yet to reach its goal of 10 percent student mobility, an ambitious objective the European Commission initially set out in 1987.[64] One of the major deterrents to this goal was of course the distribution of student grants to member states. The paradox of the program was that the more successful integration efforts were in Europe, the further the budget had to stretch to meet the level of student demand. For member states like France, a country with a well-established history of study abroad, ERASMUS was an immediate success. The Community funding, however, was insufficient

[63] "*C'est l'un des plus remarquables paradoxes de l'Europe: les marchandises, les capitaux et les services y circulent plus librement que les hommes et les connaissances*." Michel Delberghe, "Le Programme Socrates définit les limites d'un 'espace éducatif européen,'" *Le Monde*, June 6, 1995, accessed January 15, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1995/06/29/le-programme-socrates-definit-les-limites-d-un-espace-educatif-europeen_3542467_1819218.html.

[64] In the Commission's 1989 evaluation of the first two years of ERASMUS activity, the report stated that the program had neither the financial resources nor adequate enough support from all member states to achieve their goal of 10 percent student mobility by 1992. *Proposal for a Council Decision amending Decision 87/327/EEC adopting the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)*, 6.

from the beginning. Negotiating a position of power within the program to ensure the continued mobility of French students thus required the participation of the national government to supplement the student grants. These and many other issues specific to the situation of France in the ERAMUS program will be explored in the next chapter.

The National and Supranational in the ERASMUS Program

When the European Commission decided to pursue education as a gateway to creating a European identity and future workforce, they could not have envisioned the many difficulties that would arise during the first decade of the program. Nonetheless, ERASMUS has remained a successful program in the EU and is a staple of university life in Europe. When interviewed in 2014, Lenarduzzi stated that he always knew ERASMUS would succeed. He doubted, however, that the creation of such a large-scale initiative would be possible today. His reasoning was both financial and cultural. First, the current budgetary structure demands that the Commission set the total budget for the program in advance. For example, the present budget for ERASMUS, known now as ERASMUS+, is €16.4 billion for the entire six-year period (2014-2020), with the individual budgets and programs for each academic year already in place.[65] This "Soviet" style of planning, according to Lenarduzzi, is extremely exclusive and leaves no room for new initiatives or accommodation.[66] Although the Commission does have a mid-program review of the budget, in the past, it could assess the finances annually and make changes to the individual Actions as needed.[67] There was also more room for creativity and to develop new initiatives throughout the duration of program, rather than establishing everything in advance. One reason that the Commission

[65] Jacot, "Erasmus +, un success européen né il y a trente ans."
[66] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Daniela Vincenti, "Domenico Lenarduzzi."
[67] Particularly in the late 1980s and early 1990s, this included redistributing funding between Actions or launching new programs like the European Credit Transfer System.

avoided this current style of long-term planning during the first decade of ERASMUS was simply the novelty of the program and the lack of integration in the Community's higher education system. Most universities were not yet fully dedicated to establishing cooperative programs or developing a "European dimension" in education, especially from a financial perspective. This halfhearted commitment on the part of member states forced Lendaruzzi and other coordinators to focus on the short-term just to keep the program moving forward.[68]

Wavering support for globalization and the integration of Europe also affected the creation of initiatives like ERASMUS. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, globalization was the omnipresent concept that helped push these cooperative programs to the top of the agenda in the European Community. Despite initial resistance from member states, the benefits of a mobile student population and engaged citizenry came to be associated with the economic success of the Community. Member states began to value an international component to the higher education system and developing the exchange networks that ERASMUS and other programs had to offer was crucial to this process. Although ERASMUS is still hailed today as "an unquestionable success for the European Union" and a program that "elicits only praise," the idea that an integrated Europe is the inevitable future is no longer universally accepted.[69] "We are no longer at the time when people dreamt of a certain Europe," Lenarduzzi said, "Things change."[70] For the third decade of the ERASMUS program, this change has been particularly evident. 2017 is the thirtieth anniversary of ERASMUS and the sixtieth anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. In the past year, the European Union has witnessed the historic "Brexit," leaving a potentially gaping hole in ERASMUS with the

[68] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Daniela Vincenti, "Domenico Lenarduzzi."
[69] Lewandowski, " Programme ERASMUS."
[70] Domenico Lenarduzzi, interviewed by Daniela Vincenti, "Domenico Lenarduzzi."

departure of one of the program's most powerful members. When asked in February 2017 about what his birthday wish for ERASMUS would be, Hywel Ceri Jones said he hoped "the UK will give high priority to securing its continuing full engagement with [ERASMUS]."[71] Despite Brexit, the United Kingdom has pledged to stay in ERASMUS+, yet there is no telling how anti-European sentiment could influence the British place in the program in the future. For France, the current presidential race holds the possibility of National Front leader Marine Le Pen securing a spot in the second round of elections. As a nativist and anti-globalization party, the National Front has taken aim at ERASMUS. The youth branch of the party, Front National Jeunesse (FNJ), recently accused the European Union of exercising too much control in the higher education system and hindering the development of study abroad because of their lack of funding for French students. To preserve and grow the educational exchange network, the FNJ argues, France must act on its own and remove the shackles of the European Union entirely.[72]

The argument that the European Union restricts the development of French university exchanges forgets, of course, that the network itself would not have been possible without the funding and coordination on the part of the Community dating back to the 1970s. Although France did have educational exchanges prior to Community involvement and continues to develop partnerships outside of this network, the vast majority of its students study within the ERASMUS program. Not to mention an initiative of this scale with coordination between so many countries is far too grand a project for one member state to develop, no matter how advanced its education system. This argument does, however, bring up the negotiation of

[71] "Origins of the Erasmus programme."
[72] Gaëtan Dussausaye, "Pour sauver Erasmus, sortons de l'Union européenne!" January 9, 2017, National Front press releases, accessed February 8, 2017, http://www.frontnational.com/categorie/communiques/.

national and supranational structures at work in a program like ERASMUS, including the consolidation of identities, the contribution of funding, and of course the inherent competition that arises from such a large organization. These themes were and are important to the development of ERASMUS and become especially crucial at a time when, as Lenarduzzi observed in 2014, constituent members are challenging global cooperation more openly than ever.

CHAPTER TWO:
The Debacle of ERASMUS Funding and the French Response

In May of 1998, the French newspaper *Le Monde* featured an article about the success of the ERASMUS program in Europe. The author interviewed five different students, some French and some foreign-born, who had all participated in either a semester or a year abroad. Anne, a student from Lille, described her newfound interest in British politics after witnessing firsthand the election of Tony Blair while she was studying at Oxford. Another French student explained how she was recently hired for her dream internship after spending a year studying economics in Germany. The importance of that semester abroad on her CV was "undeniable."[73] Susanne, a German student on exchange in Lille, remarked that her time in France has helped her see past stereotypes and become more open to other cultures. Despite the rigorous nature of the French university system, Susanne affirmed that the experience was overwhelmingly positive. Silvana, a French sociology student, proudly listed the new friends from around Europe she met while studying in Rome. A self-described "staunch Europhile," Silvana summed up her friendships simply: "we are all European!"[74]

From this interview in *Le Monde*, several common stereotypes about the benefits of international education become clear: studying abroad fosters a more Europe-conscious mindset, study at a foreign university is beneficial for a CV, and of course, time spent abroad is a way to dismantle stereotypes, and develop a tolerance for other cultures. Behind these images of well-traveled and culturally sensitive young people, however, lurked the reality of an immense financial burden. Anne received an ERASMUS scholarship for her year abroad,

---

[73] Sandrine Blanchard, "Découvrir une autre culture, une autre façon de vivre, voir ailleurs," *Le Monde*, May 26, 1998, accessed October 21, 2016, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1998/05/26/decouvrir-une-autre-culture-une-autre-facon-de-vivre-voir-ailleurs_3647178_1819218.html.
[74] Ibid.

but still needed assistance from her parents to cover her lodging and day-to-day expenses. For Stéphanie, the French student who found her dream internship after studying in Germany, financing her exchange program required a combination of French and ERASMUS scholarships, personal savings, and an overall tightening of her budget to make ends meet. Similarly, Silvana's new friendships in Rome also came at a steep price, including juggling multiple part-time jobs while in Italy to pay her rent each month.[75]

As the article indicates, participating in an exchange program was not easy; it required advanced preparation and was a massive financial undertaking for many students and families. Even with the availability of scholarships from the European Community and other national and regional French resources, few students received enough funding to cover all costs. In France, the overwhelming popularity of the ERASMUS program from the very beginning forced the European Commission to stretch its limited budget extremely far. *Le Monde*'s laudatory article about the merits of study abroad may have only featured five students, but their accounts provides a quite accurate portrait of France's place within the larger system of international education in Europe during the 1990s. By 1998, the European Union was already five years old and the ERASMUS program was eleven years old. During ERASMUS' first decade of existence, French students were consistently one of the two most mobile nationalities along with the British. France was also the second most popular student destination next to the United Kingdom. In 1998/1999, the year that Silvana, Stéphanie, and Anne studied abroad, French students comprised the largest percentage of the ERASMUS program by nationality, with more than 16,000 studying in a different member country. In total, there were over 97,000 students in the entire program for that year.[76]

[75] Ibid.
[76] *Final Report from the Commission on the Implementation of the Socrates Programme 1995-1999*, 26.

In a little over a decade, ERASMUS expanded to support nearly four times the number of students originally envisioned in 1987.[77] During this time, the structure of the program evolved to match the ever-growing applicant pool and the increasingly dominant place of international education in Europe. Underscoring this development was the struggle to meet the needs of individual members states and to equally distribute funds. Community rhetoric dictated that mobile students were the gateway to a "People's Europe" of cooperation, integration, and harmony. France therefore committed to expanding its culture of study abroad and internationalizing the higher education system. To ensure that French students could continue to participate in ERASMUS exchanges, especially given the high level of demand, France created external funding schemes that complimented the program's student grants. As a result, the cost of supporting student mobility and thereby creating model European citizens rested almost entirely on the back of the French government.

Chapter One has established the history of cooperative education in Europe and addressed some of the larger issues of integrating the European higher education system. This chapter focuses specifically on French students and presents the framework for how education, finances, and language created the unique conditions for France in ERASMUS. I begin with an explanation of the history of study abroad in France to show how study abroad developed as part of the culture of education in France and to demonstrate why French students were such eager participants. I next explore the allocation of resources in the program and various methods of funding that the French developed to compensate for their financial position in the program. I present this situation as one where the French government

[77] In a press release from May of 1987, the European Communities Commission stated that the program would support 25,000 students for the next three academic years. *ERASMUS adopted* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, May 21, 1987), AEI, University of Pittsburgh, http://aei.pitt.edu/60194/1/ISEC.10.87.pdf.

at the national and regional level encouraged students to study through ERASMUS, but also had to find the means to financially support them.

This negotiation of national and supranational financing meant that not every student received the same amount of funding, and often some students received no funding at all. These inequalities in France derived from existing disparities in funding for education in the regions. Certain regions had the resources to invest in international education through the creation of regional scholarships for students, or already had universities with an existing history of educational exchange. These discrepancies in both funding and access to study abroad mirrored a larger situation in Europe. Even with the overarching control of a supranational organization, ERASMUS was not able to create an equal opportunity system. The French moreover were aware of this and often expressed hostility toward the entire ERASMUS structure. The lack of Community funding for French students further compounded this anger. As the 1990s progressed, however, the incentive to support study abroad increased as the ERASMUS network expanded. Although the French did not stop criticizing the system, it became apparent that the idea of "Europeanized" higher education was now the norm.

The History of Educational Exchanges in France

"If ERASMUS was, at first, an operation destined to grab attention, what success! Its impression goes far beyond its reality," quipped the opening lines of a 1989 *Le Monde* article.[78] French higher education, stated the author, had been "seduced by a promised

[78] *Si Erasmus était, au départ, une opération destinée à frapper les esprits, quelle réussite ! Son aura dépasse de très loin sa réalité*." "Beaucoup de demandes, peu d'argent: Les inconvénients du success," *Le Monde,* March 3, 1989, accessed October 6, 2016, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1989/03/02/beaucoup-de-demandes-peu-d-argent-les-inconvenients-du-succes_3544953_1819218.html?xtmc=beaucoup_de_demandes&xtcr=1.

godsend" in the form of the ERASMUS program and French universities had consequently submitted more Intra-University Cooperation Program (ICP) applications than any other member state for the 1988/1989 school year.[79] Although ERASMUS only accepted half of those applications, France still made up 20 percent of all ICPs, more than any other member state for that academic year.[80] The problem was that the National Grant Awarding Authority (NGAA) in France then had to distribute grants to each ICP to provide funding for participating students. To avoid the awkwardness of privileging certain programs over others, the NGAA chose to simply divide up the grants equally so that each program (and each student) received the same amount of Community funding. Due to the overwhelming number of students in participation, the grants amounted to 850 francs per month for each student, much less than the original requests.[81] For the French, ERASMUS was beginning to seem like less of a godsend and more of a wake-up call to the difficulties of participating in an integrated higher education system.

France's enthusiastic response to ERASMUS during the initial phase (1987-1989) was not an aberration, but rather a continuation of a well-developed history of educational exchange. Well before any Community education initiatives, French universities were already developing partnerships with other institutions. In 1975, the year before the launch of the Joint-Study Programs, slighly more than 3,000 French students studied in a different member state.[82]Although this number was low compared to study mobility under

[79] Ibid.
[80] These figures refer to French applications as the coordinating institution of an ICP, not just general involvement. *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1988* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, March 16, 1989), 28, AIE, University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 26, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/32783/1/COM_(89)_119_final.pdf.
[81] " Beaucoup de demandes, peu d'argent."
[82] Overall, only .5 percent of university students studied in another member state in 1975. *Admission to Institutions of High Education of Students from Other Member States*, 1.

ERASMUS, French students in the 1970s were still fairly mobile, ranking third after the British and Germans. France was also the second most popular destination for foreign students after Germany. This attraction was partially financial, as all students could attend French universities for free regardless of their nationality. Although there was a language requirement for foreign admissions, this was not very problematic given the prevalence of the French language in Europe.[83] The enthusiasm for study abroad on the part of French students, however, dates back further into the twentieth century and involves partnerships both inside and outside of Europe.

Franco-American exchanges were some of the earliest to develop in France and became a fruitful way to expand the international dimension of French universities. Medical students were among the first Americans to pursue higher education in France in the mid-nineteenth century.[84] At this time, however, Germany represented the model for higher education and attracted many more American students than France. This preference on the part of Americans engendered a fierce competition between France and Germany, prompting French academics to revitalize and modernize their own education system. This included simplifying their curriculum, offering degrees that were easily attainable for foreign students, and even improving advertising to attract new students. [85] These modifications, along with the outbreak of the First World War, and the consequent souring of relations with Germany, helped to cement a strong relationship between the United States and France in the domain of education.

---

[83]In contrast to counties like the United Kingdom, where the federal government "recommended" a fee for foreign students, France was a practical host country and therefore had the second highest enrollment of foreign students after Germany. "Existing Provisions in Member States of the European Community Concerning Admission of Students from Other Member States" in *Admission to Institutions of High Education of Students from Other Member States*, 2-12.
[84] Green, *The Other Americans in Paris*, 29.
[85] Walton, *Internationalism, National Identities, and Study Abroad*,13-15.

The Fulbright Program, the Junior Year Abroad Program, and the Franco-American exchange are just some examples of educational exchanges developed in the mid-twentieth century. There was also a burgeoning expatriate community of Americans in Paris in the early twentieth century that developed Franco-American cultural organizations and even transplanted their own clubs such as the Daughters of the American Revolution. American students were part of this transnational community that allowed average Americans, although many at this time were elite, to engage in international relations through cultural mediums rather than explicitly diplomatic channels.[86] These educational partnerships helped to improve France's engagement in international higher education and attracted students of all nationalities to study in France. In 1962, France was the third most popular destination in the world for foreign students. By 1968, it had surpassed Germany and was second only to the United States, hosting more than 36,000 students that year.[87] Exchange programs between European and American universities developed a precedent for study abroad in France that enriched the field of education and French society as a whole.

Early partnerships between American and French universities were no doubt crucial to developing a strong base for study abroad in France, but the exchange programs also demonstrated a larger cultural phenomenon: the role of students in international relations. The development of study abroad programs during the twentieth century came amid the chaos of war and tense global conflicts such as the rise of fascism and the Cold War. Both the French and American governments used international education to promote international relations between their countries or dismantle stereotypes during times of tense political

[86] Green focuses in particular on the American youth who arrived in France with limited funding and subsequently relied on American cultural organizations for financial support while they lived in Paris. Green, *The Other Americans in Paris*, 183-200.
[87] Ibid, 145.

conflict. During the Cold War, student exchanges were a way to promote a positive image of the United States as a strong capitalist power, a task especially important for Franco-American relations given France's precarious position between the United States and the Soviet Union.[88] Similarly, when relations between France and the United States were tense, students studying abroad were given the chance to act as "unofficial ambassadors" for their country and to establish positive relationships in their host country.[89] As higher education became more internationalized in the second half of the twentieth century, France continued to rely on students as unofficial diplomats on the global stage. The development of the ERASMUS program represented a new dimension for the role of students in the globalized world, as educational exchanges were not only cultivating relationships between member states, but also helping to integrate the entire European Community and create a strong base for the People's Europe of the future.

When the Community began pushing for the development of higher education initiatives in the 1970s, France was well placed to succeed in the program given the existing history of exchange programs and international dimension in universities. Along with Germany and the United Kingdom, which both boasted a strong international education component in higher education (the UK also benefited from being an Anglophone country), France developed partnerships through the Joint-Study Programs (JSP) that expanded their exchange network around Europe. This in part explains why these three countries were so dominant during the first phase of ERASMUS (1987-1989), as many of the exchanges from

[88] Ibid, 5.
[89] Christopher Endy discusses the role of American tourists in France as "unofficial ambassadors" in the context of the Cold War. Students serve many of the same functions as tourists, such as improving international relations and stimulating local economies, and are in many ways their own type of tourist. For more on Franco-American relations through the lens of tourism, see Endy, *Cold War Holidays.*

the JSPs became Intra-University Cooperation Programs (ICPs) under ERASMUS.[90] The European Commission also initially privileged reciprocal agreements when selecting an ICP; it was thus easy for member states with existing exchanges to polarize the flow of students.

From 1987 to 1989, France, the United Kingdom, and Germany were the three most powerful states within the program; they participated in the most ICPs and "exported" the most students. In 1987, the trio monopolized over 60 percent of the mobility flow within all ICPs, indicating a serious imbalance between these states and the rest of the Community.[91] The European Commission immediately recognized that this inequality was problematic for ERASMUS, since the purpose of the program was to develop a cooperative higher education network that benefited all member states. This predicament also illustrates the correlation between funding and student mobility. France, Germany, and the United Kingdom inundated the Commission with ICP applications, but because of their high volume of demand received less funding. Underscoring this problem was language acquisition and educational development in member states. [92] While France benefited from a strong basis of international education and a language that was commonly taught around the Community, these factors also hindered French students because a high level of demand meant less funding.

Developing Additional Funding Schemes During the Early Years of ERASMUS

[90] The Commission initially selected almost 40 percent of the JSPs to become ICPs in 1987/88 and later added even more to their network. Given the difficulty of establishing new partnerships during the first year of ERASMUS, the Commission relied on existing exchanges to form a strong basis for the program. *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1988*, 11.

[91] This percentage slowly decreased over the next two years (48.5 percent in 1988/1989 and 42 percent in 1989/1990.) *Report of the Experience Acquired in the Application of the ERASMUS Programme 1987-1989* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, December 13, 1989),60, AEI, University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 27, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/5681/1/5681.pdf.

[92] Although the UK, France, and Germany continued to play a dominant role in ERASMUS, states in southern Europe like Spain and Italy would eventually improve their student mobility and take on a greater role in the 1990s. After the addition of the European Free Trade Association members to the program in 1992, Scandinavian countries became popular destinations due to the prevalence of the English language in their universities. Their students also exercised considerable mobility in the Community for the same reason.

Although many supported and acknowledged the benefits of study abroad during the early years of the ERASMUS program, some in French higher education were skeptical about the capacity of ERASMUS to bring about the bold changes the Commission had proposed. One thing that was immediately evident was that France would have to develop external sources of funding to compliment the ERASMUS student grants. During the first three years of the program, the budget was set at 85 MECU, a sum that the Commission negotiated down from the original proposal of 175 MECU. Although they did tier the budget to increase each year, the Commission soon realized their mistake in not allocating more of the budget to student grants.[93] During the first year alone, the ratio of student demands to available student grants was already at 5:1.[94] The original Council decision establishing the ERAMUS program designated 5,000 ECU as the maximum amount of funding available per student per year, but even the least mobile member states were receiving approximately half that amount.[95] Thus, for countries like France, the second highest ICP participant after the United Kingdom, there was little hope for sufficient funding.

The precarious funding situation involved both the coordination of the National Grant Awarding Authority in France and the European Commission. Beginning in 1988, every member state except Portugal established a NGAA to distribute funds to the ICPs. The NGAA in France was essentially an arm of ERASMUS that worked as a liaison between the ICPs and the program, sharing information and allocating resources. The NGAA of course had to make the difficult decision of how much funding each ICP would receive, which often

[93] *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1987*, 2,
[94] The funds increased each year, climbing from 10 million in 1987, to 30 million in 1988, and finally 45 million in 1989. *Ibid*, 2-3.
[95] In 1988, Portugal and Greece, two of the least mobile states, each received over 2,000 ECU per student per year, but their ICP participation was less than 10 percent, compared to France's participation at over 50 percent. Funding taken from *Report of the Experience Acquired in the Application of the ERASMUS Programme 1987-1989*, p 64. ICP participation taken from the *ERASMUS Programme Annual Report 1988*, 3.

created conflict between an ICP and the Grant Authority. Good communication and a positive relationship between these two agencies and the larger ERASMUS program were crucial. In France, the NGAA was part of the CNOUS (*Centre national des oeuvres universitaires et scolaires*), a national student services agency under the larger umbrella of the Ministry of Higher Education and Research.[96] France additionally had an ERASMUS and later SOCRATES Advisory Board. This administrative structure with the NGAA as part of the Ministry of Education was less common compared to other member states, but it did improve information flow. Conversely, the NGAA as part of the Ministry of Education could also slow communication and NGAA staff were often caught up in the morass of French bureaucracy. [97]

Although the NGAA was a branch of ERASMUS in the French government, this organization only distributed Community funds. The development of regional and other national funding schemes occurred independently of the ERASMUS program, but not without significant encouragement from the European Commission. Funding students had always been one of the central purposes of ERASMUS, but the Community student grant system was never large enough to fund all students. When member states began to complain about the lack of funding, ERASMUS clarified that their student grants were never meant to cover all the costs of study abroad from travel to lodging or meals. ERASMUS grants were for "mobility" and designed to "compensate the supplemental costs" incurred by time spend abroad and not to cover "the entirety of the costs."[98] The Community thus implicated the

[96] Stéphanie Caillé, Jean Gordon, Sander Lotze, and Marijk van der Wende, "The Implementation of SOCRATES at the National Level," in *SOCRATES 2000 Evaluation Study*, 349.
[97] Ibid, 349-350.
[98]"Les regions au secours d'Erasmus: De nombreuses collectivités locales proposent des aides aux étudiants pour compenser l'insuffisance des bourses de la Communauté européenne," *Le Monde*, September 12, 1990, accessed September 1, 2016, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1990/09/12/les-regions-au-secours-d-

national governments to help reduce the disparity in funding. The 1989 Summary Report of the first phase included specific reference to the need for member states to work as a compliment to ERASMUS:

> ERASMUS has highlighted certain disfunctions (accommodation, social security, language training, absence or insufficiency of national grants, obstacles to academic recognition) at the same time as giving rise to a certain pressure to resolve them at Member State or Community level. Examples of complimentary measures in various Member States which ERASMUS has been directly responsible for stimulating include the creation or strengthening of systems of grants for study abroad, legislative measures to facilitate exchanges and academic recognition, grants to supplement ERASMUS support (often at the initiative of regional authorities), new facilities for learning in less frequently taught Community languages.[99]

Aside from just national support in funding, it was the individual universities in France and the higher education officials that were responsible for developing the partnerships, promoting the program, and attracting students. From this perspective, the universities played a central part in building the ERASMUS network for French students. Again, the Community recognized this reliance on member state support:

> Another characteristic of the ICPs within the European Community is that they are, in most cases, established at faculty or department level. The key role of initiators and directors of programmes at university department level has been highlighted by several experts. These experts conclude that ERASMUS is first and foremost the

erasmus-de-nombreuses-collectivites-locales-proposent-des-aides-aux-etudiants-pour-compenser-l-insuffisance-des-bourses-de-la-communaute-europeenne_3991074_1819218.html.

[99] *Report on Experience Acquired in the Application of the ERASMUS Programme 1987-1989*, December 13, 1989, 12.

> work of individuals (at all levels of the university hierarchy), who often receive limited or fragile support (political and financial) from their institutions, but whose personal commitment is the essential precondition for the lasting success of ERASMUS.[100]

Although the Community expressed appreciation for these university individuals, the amount of work they shouldered was overwhelming and extremely frustrating, especially in the early years of the program. In 1989, Michel Volovitch, a professor of genetics at the University Paris Diderot, expressed his frustration at coordinating exchanges with foreign universities: "We wrote hundreds of letters, but with no result. They didn't even reach the right person. The only universities that we work with today are the ones that we have met on site or in Paris."[101] The insufficient funding for students, inadequate housing, and overall lack of communication within ERASMUS also angered him. "The personal investment of the professor in charge continues throughout the entire process: he is all at once a travel coordinator, secretary, nanny. It's an enormous job…sometimes I wonder if it's even reasonable."[102]

Despite the frustration of officials like Volovitch, the French remained committed to developing partnerships and also to financing study abroad for their students. According to Albert Prévos, director of the CNOUS (*Centre national des oeuvres universitaires et scolaires*), from 1987 to 1993, the funding predicament that the ERASMUS program engendered was actually a good thing for France, since it called attention to the lack of

---

[100] Ibid, 10.

[101] "*Nous avons écrit une cinquantaine de lettres mais sans résultats. Elles ne sont même pas parvenues à la personne concernée. Les seules universités avec qui nous travaillons aujourd'hui sont celles que nous avons rencontrées sur place ou à Paris.*" " Beaucoup de demandes, peu d'argent."

[102] "*L'investissement personnel du professeur responsable se poursuit tout au long de l'opération : il est à la fois organisateur de voyages, secrétaire, nounou. C'est un travail énorme… Parfois je me demande si c'est bien raisonnable.*" Ibid.

resources available for students wishing to study abroad.[103] As early as 1989, before France had established any national system for awarding international study grants, regions began providing complementary scholarships for ERASMUS students. At that time, French higher education professionals estimated that a student would have between 2,000 and 3,000 francs in monthly expenses, yet the ERASMUS grants amounted to less than 900 francs per month.[104] For most, this covered the cost of housing, but left nothing for day-to-day expenses or travel.[105] Regional funding therefore helped to defer the additional costs of studying abroad and worked in conjunction with the ERASMUS grants. The Rhône-Alpes region (now Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes) was one of the first to award international mobility scholarships to students and supported students at universities in cities like Grenoble and Lyon. In 1989, the region doubled the aid offered from ERASMUS, granting students an additional 1,700 francs per month.[106]

Rhône-Alpes' funding scheme for students inspired other regions to help defer the cost of study abroad and increase the number of French universities participating in ERASMUS partnerships. By the early 1990s, the Rhône-Alpes region had increased their funding to between 2,400 and 3,000 francs a month. Nine other regions and thirteen departments had also established international mobility funds for students.[107] While some amounts were designated per month and some were grants for the entire year, most

[103] Ibid.
[104] Cost based on an estimate of monthly fees for studying in Germany or the Netherlands, which was between 2,500 and 3,000 francs monthly. Ibid.
[105] French exchange coordinators also pointed out that for students coming from big cities like Paris, lodging at their home university was also an additional cost. Many did not want to give up their apartments and risk not having somewhere to live when they returned from abroad, so they chose to pay their rent at home while they were gone.
[106] "Beaucoup de demandes, peu d'argent."
[107] "Les rendez-vous de l'Europe universitaire: Le coup de pouce des régions, *Le Monde,* March 25, 1993, accessed January 18, 2016, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1993/03/25/les-rendez-vous-de-l-europe-universitaire-le-coup-de-pouce-des-regions_3913814_1819218.html.

scholarships were at least equivalent, if not more than the Community funding students were receiving from ERASMUS. By the 1993/1994 academic year, ERASMUS representatives in France estimated that more than 3,500 French students had benefited from complementary regional or departmental aid to fund study abroad.[108] In 1990, the French Ministry of Education established for the first time a national funding scheme for students studying abroad. A lump sum of 10 million francs was designated for a national student mobility grant, which awarded each student 375 francs per month.[109] For students whose local governments did not provide funding for international education, at the very least, the federal government was able to offer support and supplement the ERASMUS grants. National funding, however, amounted to significantly less than departmental or regional funding, thus a student's best option for maximum funding came from local scholarships or a combination of all three.

Local aid, however, was more than just a kind gesture on the part of France. Regions often thought of their mobile students as "ambassadors" and saw their time abroad as an advantage to the local community, as well as to the student.[110] Mobile students were an extremely beneficial marketing tool for French universities, departments, and regions, which could all publicize the European dimension of their education system. Funding students became a "political prize" for regions throughout France that wanted to boost the reputations of their higher education institutions and benefit from a local workforce with experience in Europe.[111] Regions and departments also benefited from French universities participating in ICPs because of the connections these exchange networks forged with foreign cities and even

[108] Ibid.
[109] "Les régions au secours d'Erasmus."
[110] Ibid.
[111] "Les rendez-vous de l'Europe universitaire."

specific disciplines, such as business or engineering.[112] Some regions, like Rhône-Alpes, funded students under the condition that upon returning to France, they would work locally and transfer their skills acquired abroad to the local economy.[113] In this instance, mobility grants were a way for the region to directly benefit from their investment in students. Although not all regions supported this work contact between students and local governments, localities did benefit in some way from funding students, even if it was just developing a better image for their university system.

Student Mobility Funding During the SOCRATES Years and Beyond

From a regional perspective, it is clear that there was competition in France for both funding and to develop ERASMUS partnerships, but this competition only intensified throughout Europe as the entire program expanded in the mid-1990s. In 1995, when ERASMUS was integrated into SOCRATES, there were fifteen European Community member states participating in the program, as well as Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway. Over the next two years, the program expanded into Eastern Europe and would continue to do so in the early 2000s.[114] Thus, what began as a twelve-member program in 1987 contained twenty-seven participants only a decade later. This growth necessitated the expansion of the budget and the structures designed to facilitate mobility, specifically funding and language training. This also meant that more students were applying to ERASMUS and that the Commission had to distribute grants to more countries. This is particularly problematic considering many of the additions to ERASMUS under SOCRATES

[112] Business programs were consistently one of the top two disciplines represented in ICPs from 1987-2000. Engineering also became a dominant program in ICPs in the mid-1990s.
[113] "Les régions au secours d'Erasmus."
[114]Those countries included Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Slovenia. *Report from the Commission on the initial implementation phase of the SOCRATES program, 1995-1997* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, February 12, 1999), AIE, University of Pittsburgh, accessed October 16, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/5676/1/5676.pdf.

were countries that required Community support because they had no existing history of educational exchange, little national funding for students, and also had an uncommon national language, hence the need for language preparation.

The first year of ERASMUS' absorption into SOCRATES, the budget was set at 850 MECU (5.6 million francs). Funding for student grants increased by approximately 860,000 ECU. This sum, although notable, actually represented a decrease from the amount allocated to student grants the previous year before ERASMUS was integrated in SOCRATES.[115] Throughout the phase of SOCRATES I (1995-1999) the overall budget and funding for student grants in particular would continue to fluctuate. Thus, even with integration in a larger community scheme, the money needed for student grants was not always increasing, although demand from students was constantly on the rise. By 1995, average Community aid to French students had fallen to 110 ECUs a month, which was about 710 francs. The Ministry of Education still contributed an additional 150 francs and regions like Aquitaine awarded students up to 3,000 francs per month.[116] The fluctuating budget of ERASMUS under SOCRATES affected the amount of funding available for students, resulting in some years where as many as 20 percent of French students did not receive a student grant.[117]

This uncertainly on the part of the Community support increased the burden on regional and national funding sources, as well as on the students. Consider the situations of Anne and Silvana, two of the students from Lille that *Le Monde* featured in its 1998 article about the success of ERASMUS. Anne, the student who spent a year studying at Oxford,

---

[115] Budget increase the previous year (from 1993 to 1994) over 2 MECU. *Final Report from the Commission on the Implementation of the SOCRATES Programme 1995-1999*, 24-25.
[116] Delberghe, "Le Programme Socrates définit les limites d'un 'espace éducatif européen."
[117] This year specifically was 1997, when the overall ERASMUS budget decreased and the funds allocated for student grants decreased by 4.6 million dollars. *Survey into the Socio-Economic Background of ERASMUS Students* (Brussels, Commission of the European Communities, January 18, 2000), 49, AEI, University of Pittsburgh, accessed September 27, 2016, http://aei.pitt.edu/63088/1/COM_(2000)_4_final.pdf.

received an ERASMUS student grant of 12,000 francs. This grant was still not enough to make a dent in her expenses, as her lodging alone cost 16,000 francs for the year.[118] Anne's parents therefore paid for the remaining costs like travel and day-to-day expenses. Silvana faced a similar financial situation with her semester in Rome. At Lille-1, Silvana was a student on scholarship; however, the article does not specify if she was able to use those funds during her time abroad or if she was the recipient of an ERASMUS scholarship. What the article does make clear is that the cost of living in Italy far exceeded Silvana's available budget. Her rent totaled 13,000 francs for only five months, a sum greater than what ERASMUS allocated Anne for her entire year at Oxford.[119] Silvana thus turned to part-time jobs to fund her study abroad program. Even if she did receive an ERASMUS scholarship, the amount that the NGAA allocated for a semester still would not have been enough to pay her rent.

Although *Le Monde's* article is lacking some of the pertinent details needed for this study to assess the students' specific financial circumstances, the experiences of Anne and Silvana actually illustrate quite accurately the general situation for French students who participated in ERASMUS. The individual financial situations of students varied, including how they financed their studies—scholarships, family contributions or personal savings—and the cost of living in the different member states and cities. As was the case with Silvana, studying in Rome meant that her rent for five months was nearly that of Anne's rent for an entire year. For some students, the cost of living while studying abroad also included expenses they may not have normally incurred while in France. This pertains specifically to lodging, which was an additional cost for students who normally lived with their family

[118] Blanchard, "Découvrir une autre culture, une autre façon de vivre, voir ailleurs."
[119] Ibid.

while attending university in France.[120] Although the ERASMUS student grants were not meant to defer the entire cost of study abroad, for French students they were not even enough to cover minor expenses.

The experiences of Silvana and Anne demonstrate the complicated financial situation that most French students faced when they chose to study abroad. Although the European Commission classified France as a country with a "medium level" of public support for students, the development of these national and regional funding sources did not come without problems. In an article from 1990, *Le Monde* contemplated how a cooperative higher education system in Europe could exacerbate the inequalities of the French university system. In the 1990s, crafting the reputation of a university as an international hub was important to attract foreign students to France and to attract French students inside the hexagon. The article notes that universities in wealthier regions, especially those along France's border such as Rhône-Alpes and Midi-Pyrénées, had diverse economies and offered students a wide variety of degree programs. Also, because of their location, these universities appealed to students from neighboring countries, enhancing their reputation for international education. Conversely, universities in regions with a less diverse economy, specifically those surrounding Paris like Bourgogne and Picardie, offered programs specific to the local economy and tended to attract only local students.[121] Furthermore, these regions had to compete with the universities in Paris. The article uses the example of the university to explain how the European Union can intensify regional inequalities, rather than eliminate

[120] This phenomenon was not limited to France, but was a general complaint for ERASMUS students. In a 1998 survey about student experiences in ERASMUS, one third of French students indicated that they lived at home while attending university in France. *Survey into the Socio-Economic Background of ERASMUS Students*, 37.
[121] "Une stratégie pour l'Europe," *Le Monde*, April 24, 1990, accessed February 26, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1990/04/24/une-strategie-pour-l-europe_3962902_1819218.html.

them. It also illustrates the relationship between regional, national, and supranational structures, be they in education or any other sector, pointing out that all three exist together and that none functions in complete isolation.

This article again points to the relationship between the regions, member states, and the European Community. In order to develop and maintain ERASMUS, all three had to function together. As the Community continued to push for greater mobility in higher education to create the "People's Europe," the burden fell increasingly onto individual member states to support this system. From the member states, it trickled down to the regions and individual universities to procure funding and establish the ICPs. As this chapter explains, France's history of educational exchange made it easier to integrate into the ERASMUS system. The international component to the French higher education system dates back to the early twentieth century when universities first began courting American students. The development of those networks during the interwar years and especially during the Cold War created a cultural appreciation for study abroad in France and also put in place the necessary structures in the higher education system to accommodate foreign students. By the 1970s, when the Community established the Joint-Study Programs, France was eager to develop a cooperative European system for their students. The transition from the JSPs to ERASMUS allowed France to expand its existing study abroad network in Europe and made it easier to develop Intra-University Cooperation Programs.

Once it became apparent that Community funding would not be able to sustain the level of student demand in France, the state developed alternative sources of funding to maintain the ERASMUS network and provide the support students needed to go abroad. This process, however, also exposed the regional inequalities in the higher education system,

which the ERASMUS program only intensified. Since Community rhetoric constructed young people as the foundation for the European Union, the regions had an enormous incentive to create student mobility grants and improve the international component of their universities. For those regions who lacked the funding for study abroad or whose universities had no existing exchange networks, the process of internationalization left them isolated. This predicament in France reflected the larger situation in ERASMUS where certain member states were not adequately prepared to transition into the cooperative higher education system. The interwoven relationship between regional, national, and supranational support for ERASMUS in the French experience proves that this overarching Community program could not exist on its own. However, financial support from the state and the established history of education exchanges are not the only two factors that helped France to succeed in ERASMUS. As the Chapter Three will demonstrate, language also played a central role in ERASMUS and helps explain why France occupied such a dominant position in the program during the 1990s.

CHAPTER THREE:
The Place of Language in the ERASMUS Program

In 1989, linguistic specialists from twenty-five countries met at a symposium in Paris to assess the place of language in the European Community.[122] Organizers christened the gathering the Estates General of Languages and declared "a new right to languages, be they maternal, regional or foreign."[123] Just as a national language had been crucial to the growth of nationalism and the spread of democratic ideas during the revolutionary period, participants believed that the preservation of member states' national languages was crucial to the development of the European Community. The convention focused on topics such as foreign language instruction, the influence of technology on language, and the relationship between language and international cooperation. Denis Girard, Inspector General of the French Ministry of Education and organizer of the symposium, strongly advocated for multilingualism in the Community, framing language as central to the cultural diversity of Europe. Although he acknowledged the status of English as the dominant global language, Girard opposed the idea of a monolingusitic Europe and cited foreign language instruction as the best way to promote international cooperation and preserve the linguistic and cultural diversity of Europe.[124]

---

[122] I use the word language often in this section to refer to a variety of topics, such as foreign language instruction (foreign meaning a language other than a student's native language), national languages (a member state's official language or languages), official European Community languages (which change throughout the 1990s as more are recognized), and even regional or unofficial Community languages like Luxembourgish and Gaelic. I also employ the word language in the general sense, meaning a system of words used to communicate. I have tried to be as specific as possible when I use the term "language," especially to distinguish between the languages students spoke in the Community- native tongue, foreign or second language, official and national languages.

[123] "Les états généraux des langues: Le multilinguisme fait partie des droits des Européens," *Le Monde*, April 27, 1989, accessed March 4, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1989/04/27/les-etats-generaux-des-langues-le-multilinguisme-fait-partie-des-droits-des-europeens_4105614_1819218.html.

[124] Ibid.

This "Estates General of Languages" took place at a pivotal moment in the development of the European Community. Advocates for the integration of Europe had long acknowledged the crucial role of languages in facilitating not only economic and political cooperation between member states, but also cooperation between citizens. [125] Community rhetoric framed multilingualism as a gateway to navigating Europe and to building relationships with others. It also correlated multilingualism with the cultural diversity of Europe and encouraged citizens to learn another Community language so that they could travel, experience life in other states, and connect with the local culture and history.[126] It is therefore no coincidence that the Estates General of Languages coincided with the creation of the European Community's language exchange program LINGUA. The European Commission established LINGUA two years after ERASMUS to improve the quality of foreign language education (any language other than a native language) in Europe and the quantity of students studying a foreign language, especially the less common languages.[127] LINGUA's intent to widen the linguistic scope of the Community outside of the dominant languages fit in with the overall push for multilingualism within Europe and also coincided with a similar struggle in the ERASMUS program. As early as 1988, ERASMUS officials were aware of a major disparity in mobility flows that concentrated students in member states

[125] Beginning in the mid-1970s, modern language instruction was part of the Community's action program for education. In 1984, the Council and Ministers for Education established the first guidelines for the improvement of foreign language (any language other than a native language) fluency in the Community. *Teaching of Foreign Languages* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, April, 18 1988),4, AEI, University of Pittsburgh, accessed March 4, 2017, http://aei.pitt.edu/3845/1/3845.pdf.
[126] The relationship between mobility, Community engagement and language is a constant theme in Commission reports about LINGUA and also ERASMUS and later related programs like SOCRATES.
[127] The "LINGUA languages" included the nine official Community languages- Danish, Dutch, English, Italian, French, German, Greek, Portuguese, and Spanish- plus Irish and Luxembourgish, two unofficial regional languages.

with commonly spoken languages. Member states with less widely spoken languages attracted fewer students and struggled to create exchange partnerships.

Although the official position of the European Commission and French authorities like Inspector General Girard aligned with a vision of a multicultural and multilingual Europe, the reality of the European Community was that language supremacy was inevitable. The Community adhered (and still adheres) to a strict policy of multiple official languages, yet the Anglicization of Europe and the place of English as the most commonly spoken second language accelerated as the Community has developed. The supremacy of English as a global language has plagued France for much of the twentieth century, especially in the context of postwar fears about the Americanization of French culture. The status of English as the dominant Community language further engendered fears about the cultural homogenization in Europe as a result of integration. Thus, although the French supported multilingualism in the Community, this was often more of a defense mechanism to promote the teaching and speaking of French abroad, rather than a true commitment to a multicultural Europe. Multilingualism from the French perspective had the possibility to strengthen francophone networks in Europe, but also could destabilize the position of French through the development of other Community languages.

This chapter places language within the framework of the ERASMUS program, specifically examining how the Community's commitment to multilingualism affected factors such as student mobility flows and foreign language instruction. I present language as a crucial determining factor in the power dynamics of ERASMUS and demonstrate that for France, the relationship between language and study abroad was neither wholly positive nor wholly negative, but rather a complex negotiation. I first examine what multilingualism

meant for France, especially with the growth of English as a global language and within the context of the regional language movement in France. I next explore the effects of multilingualism in ERASMUS and LINGUA, focusing mainly on the inequality in student mobility flows and how the European commission attempted to resolve these issues. The previous two chapters have addressed the issues of funding and educational structures in France as crucial to student mobility, but the role of language was a third piece of the puzzle that determined the success and struggles of France in ERASMUS.

English as the new *lingua franca*

"This country, cretinized by the false deadline of 1993, aspires to do nothing but disappear."[128] This strongly worded quote appears in a 1988 letter from an anonymous *Le Monde* reader complaining about the growth of English second language instruction in the French education system. The letter was actually a response to an article about the intrusion of foreign (specifically American and Japanese) children's programs on French television channels. Although the original article focused on the economic difficulties of French television in the 1980s, the response letter concentrated on the cultural and linguistic ramifications of foreign television for children.[129] Outraged at the Americanization of children's shows, the author declared that the proposed education reforms to teach English in primary schools were further undermining French history and culture. Not only were children spending time in front of the television watching shows about American superheroes and GI

[128] "*Ce pays, crétinisé par la fausse échéance de 1993, n'aspire qu'à disparaitre*." "Quelle culture pour nos enfants?" *Le Monde,* August 14, 1988, accessed March 4, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1988/08/14/quelle-culture-pour-nos-enfants_4092712_1819218.html?xtmc=quelle_culture_pour_nos_enfants&xtcr=1.

[129] The original article addressed the growth of Japanese and American children's shows in France and the financial difficulties of French cartoonists to produce content for the same price or cheaper. "Rediffusions: achats japonaise et américains…Pauvre télévision pour enfants," *Le Monde,* July, 27, 1988, accessed March 4, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1988/07/27/rediffusions-achats-japonais-et-americains-pauvre-television-pour-enfants_4084604_1819218.html?xtmc=pauvre_television_pour_enfants&xtcr=1.

Joes, the French government was also expanding English language education in schools. To the author, the French youth were suffering from the pervasive influence of English and losing touch with their culture, hence the not-so-subtle jab at the Maastricht Treaty and France's commitment to improve foreign language instruction. To elaborate on this point, the letter cited a recent conversation with a fourteen year-old boy who was able to name twenty American rock musicians, but was unfamiliar with traditional French folk songs like *Auprès de ma blonde.* "I am no scoutmaster," the author wrote in closing, "but that shocked me anyway."[130]

Although the original topic of the first article was more concerned with the threat of foreign companies on French media, this reader's response letter drew interesting parallels between the education system, television, and the supposed "threat" that English posed to French culture. The author furthermore connected these topics to the Maastricht Treaty and related the expansion of the European Union to the encroachment of English into the lives of children. The author is not interested in the economic slump in French television, but is more concerned with how English in general is encroaching on the French education system and on France in general. While this sentiment was certainly not limited to the education sector, the increased emphasis on English second language instruction and the teaching of foreign languages in general was problematic for many French. This anxiety relates to the broader culture of language preservation in France that has manifestoed itself in a variety of official and unofficial organizations and government policies related to the protection of French. Robin Adamson sums up this protectionist movement in the face of globalization:

[130] *"Je ne suis pas chef scout, mais ça m'a quand même fait un choc." Anonymous, "*Quelle culture pour nos enfants?"

> For the French, their language defines and shapes both personal and national identity; it has been […] the force that binds many disparate elements into one proud identity, a confident monolingual people…The unique role of the French language in shaping the nation and its citizens, the almost mythic stature its speakers attach to it, have forced it on to the front line of language defence where it is now the European standard-bearer, the symbol of the determination of the French people not to succumb to the inimical globalizing forces that seem to be attacking them on many fronts: economic, cultural and linguistic.[131]

The *Académie française*, the *Alliance Française* and the *Organization Internationale de la francophonie* (International Organization for Franciphonia) are all examples of cultural organizations that use language as the driving force to spread and protect French culture, or in the case of the *Académie*, to maintain the purity of the French language.[132] Janet Horne points out that the *Alliance Française* was originally a colonial institution that used "the propulsive force of culture and language to anchor French imperial power."[133] While certain parts of the francophone world were happy to take part in the *Alliance*, the French forced others to join the organization as part of an imperial project that used language, education, and cultural as forms of soft power to assert French supremacy abroad.

The French government has also played an active role in asserting the importance of the French language and culture. In the twentieth century in particular, the global reach of American culture and mass consumption led to a reassertion of French traditions. As Richard

---

[131] Robin Adamson, *The Defense of French: A Language in Crisis?* (Multilingual Matters Ltd.: Clevedon, Somerset, United Kingdom, 2007), xvi.
[132] Michael Brenner and Guillaume Parmentier, *Reconcilable Differences: U.S.- French Relations in the New Era* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002), 58-59.
[133] Janet Horne, "'To Spread the French Language is to Extend the *Patrie*:' The Colonial Mission of the Alliance Française," *French Historical Studies* 40, no. 1 (February 2017), 97.

Kuisel has argued, anti-American sentient in France after the Second World War developed from the fear that modernization and the American social model threatened French national identity. To the postwar generation, there was such as thing as "Frenchness" and the arrival of Coca-Cola and refrigerators had the potential to destabilize their "French way of life."[134] France's financial dependency on the United States after the Second World War further intensified this situation, contributing to the growing sense of resentment many French felt toward American culture.[135] We must also consider this hostility in the context of the Cold War, when the French found themselves faced with not one, but two Superpowers, both of which wielded greater military, economic, and cultural influence than France. Resistance to the encroachment of the English language was therefore related to the larger struggle against the expansion of American culture through mass consumption, especially in music, film, and television. In 1959, President de Gaulle established the Ministry of Culture, which promoted French cinema through a further subsidization of ticket prices and created the *Maison de Culture* cultural centers. Jack Lang, cultural minister in the 1980s under François Mitterand, charted a similar course and doubled the budget for the Ministry. Lang even went so far as to boycott an American film festival to protest against the importation of foreign culture. [136] The government also developed protective legislation to preserve the use of the French, most

[134] Richard Kuisel, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 232-233.
[135] Frank Costigliola has dubbed this relationship the between the United States and France the "Cold Alliance," due in part to their differing political perceptions and also to the United State's struggle to respect and work with France as an ally during the Cold War. For more on U.S.-French relations during this time, see Costigliola, *France and the United States: The Cold Alliance Since World War II* (Farmington Hills, MI: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1992).
[136] Philip H. Gordon and Sophie Meunier, *The French Challenge: Adapting to Globalization* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), 45.

notably the 1975 Bas Lauriol Law, which established French as the official language for all public documents and commerce. [137]

Anxiety over cultural imperialism in France further intensified in the 1990s as globalization reduced trade barriers and technological advancements made it even more difficult to stem the flow of foreign cultural influence. At the 1993 Uruguay Round negotiations, the French led a successful fight against American efforts to eliminate trade barriers for "cultural goods" like film and television. Four years later during discussions about the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI), which created investment regulations for members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United States broached the issue again and attempted to eliminate barriers for cultural investments. The French mobilized, led this time by Jack Lang, and framed free trade for cultural goods as a direct threat to national cultures. As a result of this highly publicized campaign, the French left the MAI negotiations altogether and the agreement failed.[138] French anxiety over the Americization of culture has manifested itself most visibly in the television and film industries and consequently resulted in a new wave of protective legislation in the 1990s that also aimed to safeguard the use of French. In 1992, the French Parliament declared French the official language of the Republic.[139] Similarly, the Toubon Law (1994) mandated the use of French in all advertisements, television, and radio and set a 40 percent quota for the minimum amount of French language songs that a radio station could play during peak hours (5:30a.m.-10:30p.m.). This law furthermore designated French

[137] William Safran, "Pluralism and Multiculturalism in France: Post-Jacobin Transformations," *Political Science Quarterly* 118, no. 3 (Fall, 2003), 445.
[138] Gordon and Meunier, *The French Challenge,* 47-48.
[139] Safran, "Pluralism and Multiculturalism in France," 445.

as the official language for all national exams, theses, or dissertations produced at a public educational institution.[140]

French resistance to cultural imperialism, specifically from Anglophone countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, often defends French culture by expressing a general commitment to cultural diversity. Yes, American films may be popular in France and in Europe at large, but the government, including the European Community, must also respect the individual cultures of the member states. In this reasoning, preserving cultural diversity in Europe is the best way to preserve French culture. The French apply this same argument to the movement for multilingualism, but in fact linguistic diversity within France has been highly contested since the sixteenth century. In the Jacobin tradition of French political culture, a strong centralized state is crucial to the success of the nation; internal dissent from any institutions or social forces such as ethnic minorities is interpreted as a threat to the nation. To produce the kind of uniform citizenship that Jacobins desire, the state relies on the education system to promote the shared history and national culture of France. Part of this history and culture is the French language, which is also the tool of the education system to produce citizens and a sign of belonging to the French nation.[141] In this view, ethnic and religious minorities do not fit into the national culture and the use of regional languages detracts from supremacy of French. The first half of the twentieth century in France saw the reemergence of this Jacobin ideology and the suppression of ethnic minorities and regional languages as a result. In the 1970s, however, a movement for the recognition of regional identities, culture, and languages took root in many countries including France. In 1970, the Deixonne Law permitted the teaching of regional languages such as Breton and

[140] Gordon and Meunier, *The French Challenge,* 49.
[141] Safran, "Pluralism and Multiculturalism in France," 442-443.

Basque in certain high schools. During the Socialist regime of the 1980s, the government further asserted its commitment to promoting regionalism with laws expanding regional language instruction, funding for cultural centers, and various minority language publications.[142]

Linguists have argued that the movement for the preservation of French is more intense in France than in any other non-Anglophone member state precisely because of the state's willingness to defend the national language. Organizations like the *Alliance française* and *Académie française* have equivalents in other European countries, but no other country has legislation similar to the Toubon Law, which represents federal legal intervention into the preservationist movement.[143] Once again, the Jacobin emphasis on language as a tool of the centralized government to create a uniform national identity is at work here. The French also have more cultural and linguistic preservation organizations than their European neighbors.[144] This movement to defend French is juxtaposed to France's own struggle to come to terms with its regional languages and their place within the national community. France has still yet to ratify the European Charter for the Protection of Regional or Minority Languages under the premise that it would be unconstitutional to validate the right to regional languages, since French is the official language of the Republic. Although President Holland campaigned on his promise to ratify the Charter, his recent attempt in 2015 failed.[145]

---

[142] Ibid, 444-445.
[143] Adamson, *The Defense of French*, 138-142.
[144] Ibid, 139.
[145] France originally signed the Charter in 1999, but Parliament has still not ratified it. "Le Sénat rejette le projet de loi sur les langues régionales," *Le Monde*, October 27, 2015, accessed March 4, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/politique/article/2015/10/27/le-senat-rejette-le-projet-de-loi-sur-les-langues-regionales_4798050_823448.html?xtmc=le_senat_rejette_le_projet_de_loi_sur_les_langues_regionales&xtcr=1.

By the late 1980s when the ERASMUS program was just beginning, many in France had become less tolerant of the regional movement and instead declared a renewed commitment to preserving the French national culture and French language. The expansion of the European Union and the push for a multilingual Europe also contributed to this shift. It is important to note however that these national reforms should not be interpreted as simply a total rejection of English, but rather as the struggle of the French to come to terms with how their national language would fit in the globalized world. The Jacobin tradition of suppressing ethnic-minority languages illustrates the value that France places on the French language as vital to the political functioning of the state and to national culture. This does not mean, however, that it is impossible for minority languages to coexist alongside French or that other Community languages cannot thrive in France. The central place of language in constructing French national identity helps to explain why so many were resistant to the expansion of English with the European Community. As Peter Kraus points out, English is a global language quite unlike any other of the past because of its wide geographic and social reach. Before English, Latin and French were the two dominant languages in Europe. Although people across the continent spoke these languages, their social reach was relatively small. Latin was largely confined to the church and a very small literate minority of society, and French was the language of the European aristocracy and intelligentsia. English is a completely new kind of *lingua franca.* Not only do citizens from all over Europe speak English, it has also moved into all areas of the economy—science, technology, media, education, business—and touched people of all social classes. Forms of soft power like cinema and music in particular have brought English into the lives of those formerly

excluded from learning a dominant global language.[146] The education network in Europe that was developing at the end of the twentieth century, including programs like ERASMUS and LINGUA, made this wide social reach possible and brought English even further into the lives of young people across Europe.

The Relationship Between Study Abroad and Language

With the European Community expanding and particularly with the looming deadline of the creation of the European Union in 1993, France in the early 1990s faced an uncertain future regarding the place of its national culture and language within a larger supranational European structure. In the years leading up to 1993, the European Commission inundated member states with rhetoric about multilingualism, prompting debates in France over foreign language instruction, national identity, and the potential loss of French culture. In an anonymous 1989 opinion piece for *Le Monde*, the author addressed all of these issues and called on the French to embrace multilingualism as a way to preserve the French language and to negotiate a strong place for French citizens in the European Union. The letter recognized that it was "unnecessary and pointless" to try to stem the tide of English's expansion in Europe and France.[147] English was an inevitable part of the globalized world, and if parents wanted to let their children study English as a second language that was fine, as long as it did not completely take the place of other Community languages. Rather than succumbing to the dominance of a single language, the letter encouraged readers to embrace

[146] Peter Kraus, "Europeanization and the New Politics of Language," *Essays on Europe and Culture Series,* European Cultural Foundation Network Finland, 2010: 29-34.
[147] "Point de Vue: Europe: le défi des langues," *Le Monde,* September 14, 1989, accessed March 4, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1989/09/14/point-de-vue-europe-le-defi-des-langues_4129854_1819218.html?xtmc=le_defi_des_langues&xtcr=1.

the linguistic diversity of Europe in order to protect the unique national cultures of each member state.

> If Europe does not want to lose its spirit, impoverish its culture, forget its history, if it wants to establish itself in the twenty-first century, dawning like a new world power, rich from its past, impregnated by its potential, contributing effectively between East and West, North and South to global stability, it must take charge of its multilingualism […] I don't fight against any language, English no more than another […] Simply, I am defending French, as it is the duty of anyone to defend the language that they have received from their country.[148]

Here we see not only a clear link between multilingualism and the preservation of French, but also the concept of *patrie*; this emotional link between language, belonging, and identity.

During the early 1990s when ERASMUS was still young and the integration of the Community was unfolding, the French had to contend with the possibility that study abroad could promote the instruction and use of French in other member states, but also increase the Anglicization of France with expanded English language instruction. They also had to face the reality that multilingualism in Europe could actually detract from the use of French in other states in favor of another Community language. Just as regional languages in France jockeyed for recognition in the face of an omnipotent national language, French also had to struggle with other Community languages to remain relevant in the wake of English supremacy in Europe. The expansion of ERASMUS over the course of the 1990s and the

[148] *Si l'Europe ne veut pas perdre son âme, appauvrir sa culture, oublier son histoire, si elle veut s'imposer dans ce vingt et unième siècle naissant comme une nouvelle puissance mondiale, riche de son passé, fécondée par ses potentialités, contribuant effectivement, entre l'Est et l'Ouest, entre le Nord et le Sud, à l'équilibre mondial, elle doit prendre en charge son plurilinguisme.... je ne combats aucune langue, pas plus l'anglais qu'une autre... Simplement, je défends le français, comme c'est le devoir de quiconque de défendre la langue qu'il a reçue de son pays*." Ibid.

development of foreign language instruction in France and in other member states did indeed transform the realm of higher education for students as the possibility to study and even work abroad became a reality for thousands of students that were becoming better equipped to travel around the Community.

Language skills were vital to the growth of study abroad and ensured the success of students at foreign universities. For the European Community, multilingual citizens made political, social, and economic integration much easier. Education thus played a role in helping to produce those citizens and to propagate a culture when multilingualism became the norm. The development of this culture implicated the national education systems, putting an intense emphasis on foreign language training that began in primary school and extended all the way to the university and beyond. Thus, just as funding from national organizations made study abroad more accessible for students from certain member states, so too did language. To understand how language was able to affect student mobility, we must take into account a variety of factors including whether a student's native language was common throughout Europe, whether they lived in a bilingual member state, what the quality of foreign language instruction was in their education system, and what languages their state offered for them to study and at what point in their education. All of these factors related to language influenced a student's ability to study abroad and helped direct their choice in foreign study destination. For instance, a student born in Luxembourg in the early 1990s would have been in an extremely favorable position to participate in an ERASMUS exchange. As a trilingual state, Luxembourg itself was a multilingual environment and on average its young people spoke 2.5 languages, compared to the average of 1.5 for the rest of the community. Aside from French, German, and Luxembourgish (not a recognized

Community language), nearly all young people learned English in school and an extremely high percentage also spoke it. [149] Luxembourgeois students had many options for study abroad without any additional language preparation.

Although funding was a major factor in the integration of the higher education system in Europe, it was evident quite early that language also helped structure and guide the development of ERASMUS. Language clearly influenced student mobility patterns and further engendered existing inequalities within the program stemming from the national educational systems and funding for education. During the first ten years of ERASMUS, states with limited foreign language instruction in their education system faced greater difficulty integrating into the ERASMUS network. In contrast, member states with traditionally popular languages like France, Germany, and Spain experienced a consistent influx of students. Similarly, states offering a wide range of university programs in English, such as the Scandinavian countries, fared extremely well in the program, despite having uncommon national languages.

The French, the French Language, and Student Mobility in ERASMUS

Chapter One has already demonstrated that France's established history of study abroad within Europe and elsewhere strengthened the country's position in the program. These exchange networks stemmed in part from the popularity of French in Europe, which attracted foreign students and made France a practical choice for study abroad. Once ERASMUS began developing an even larger higher education network, other member states continued to seek out partnerships with France simply because it was a feasible choice for

[149] All data from the 1990 Eurobarometer poll. *Young Europeans in 1990* (Brussels: European Commission Directorate-General for Education, Training, and Youth, May, 1991), 79, Eurobarometer Reports Archive, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives_en.htm.

their students who may have already had prior French language training. For French students, France's commitment to foreign language education—especially in the years leading up to 1993 when the French increased the foreign language quota for students from one to two—students were well prepared to study in another member state and had more options for exchange programs.

In 1987, the first year of the ERASMUS program, there were nine official languages in the European Union. Of those nine, young people ages 15-24, the primary university population, most often studied English as a foreign language, with French ranked second.[150] The dominance of English as the most popular language in the European Union is not surprising, but it was certainly an issue for ERASMUS coordinators who were trying to develop programs in their own member states and attract students. The United Kingdom has consistently remained the most popular destination for students dating back to the first years of ERASMUS, a pattern clearly linked to the limited options many students faced in the late 1980s when selecting a study abroad program simply based on their foreign language skills. In a 1987 Eurobarometer Poll, over a third of young Europeans (15-24) indicated that language mastery was the greatest deterrent to studying or working in another member state. Language was cited as a greater difficulty than finding employment or financing time abroad.[151] In this survey, as with the actual mobility in the ERASMUS program, the United Kingdom was the most popular study destination. With young Europeans from ten of the twelve member states indicating that the UK was their first choice for foreign study.

[150] The nine language included Danish, German, French, Italian, Dutch, English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Greek. The 1987 Eurobarometer survey includes data from 1985, but it still clearly indicated that English was the most commonly studied foreign language among young people in the years preceding ERASMUS. *Young Europeans in 1987* (Brussels: European Commission Directorate-General for Education, Training, and Youth, September 1988), 57, Eurobarometer Reports Archive, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives_en.htm.
[151] In the 1987 Eurobarometer, 7,000 young people were surveyed, approximately 600 per country. In the twelve member states there were approximately 50 million young people. Ibid, 87.

Although France did rank second in the Eurobarometer survey, the nationalities that selected France as their first choice for work or study were typically francophone member states like Belgium and Luxembourg.[152] This survey demonstrates how the dominant Community languages guided the movement of students around Europe. Again, we also see how member states with a shared national language developed partnerships due simply to linguistic practicality. It was easier to develop exchanges and integrate foreign students into a university if there was a common language involved and of course a common language facilitated the general bureaucratic process that accompanied study abroad.

In the early years of ERASMUS when there were only twelve participating member states, most students did not have the luxury of studying in a country with which they shared language. The majority of ERASMUS students during the first phase came from the United Kingdom, France, and Germany and thus relied on their national education systems to prepare them for study abroad. At this time, the Community played no role in the foreign language instruction structure within the individual member states. What languages students spoke and their possibilities for learning another Community language depended entirely on where they lived and the education system within that member state. In 1989, the European Commission ranked the twelve states based on foreign language instruction and mastery of those languages among the population. For language instruction, France was positioned relatively well and ranked fifth behind Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Denmark. Concerning actual language proficiency, the French fell in the middle, coming in sixth behind the four aforementioned member states and Germany. The French Ministry of Education defended its position, pointing out that the top four countries in both categories

[152] Ibid, 84-86.

were either bilingual (Luxembourg and Belgium) or states where few Europeans spoke the national language (the Netherlands and Denmark), hence the emphasis on foreign language instruction. The Ministry also argued that Germany had surpassed France in foreign language proficiency due to the similarities between the Germanic languages, specifically the relationship between German and English. [153]

Foreign language training had always been part of European integration efforts, but it was the development of study abroad through the ERASMUS network that connected students with the push for multilingualism. The education system was an obvious vehicle for producing citizens with the linguistic capabilities to navigate the Community, but ERASMUS went beyond that to provide a practical opportunity for students to use those skills. Yet in the early 1990s, the need for the Community to take on an active role in expanding the teaching of Community languages in the member states became evident. First, because of the disparity in mobility flows in ERASMUS. These inequalities pointed to the need to for national education systems to improve language instruction so that students were better prepared for study abroad. Second, the overall push for multilingualism in Europe from 1989-1993 in preparation for the creation of the European Union necessitated the expansion of the educational structures that would allow multilingualism to thrive. In both of these scenarios, education became the vehicle for producing a European identity and for promoting the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the European Union.

Although the Community framed multilingualism as a way to preserve the diverse cultures of the Europe, it also marketed linguistic capabilities as a practical and even necessary aspect of life in Europe. Together, the arguments of necessity and identity—

[153] “Les états généraux des langues."

multilingualism being central to European identity—constructed multilingualism as the standard for students, future professionals, and citizens in general. A 1988 Commission Report on foreign language sums up this phenomenon:

> It is clear that a knowledge of several Community languages by as many citizens as possible is bound to contribute mightily to the economic, technical, scientific and cultural development of the Community and thus to its internal cohesion, while respecting the cultural identity of all. The freedom of persons, goods, capitol and services—a primary objective of the Treaty of Rome, the Single European Act and the completion of a single European Market in 1992—will certainly be much easier to achieve if the teaching of modern languages is intensified in the years to come.[154]

Again, the relationship between the economic integration of the Community, the role of citizens, and language are clear. Once it became apparent that an integrated higher education network was possible, the European Commission capitalized on the system to not only get students traveling, but also to improve foreign language instruction and practice around the Community. The birth of the LINGUA program shortly after ERASMUS represented Europe's commitment to multilingualism and to creating citizens equipped to navigate the Community. LINGUA focused on improving training for language instructors, teaching a wider variety of Community languages at universities, and establishing exchanges for students in technical schools.[155]

---

[154] *Teaching of Foreign Languages*, 2.

[155] *The LINGUA Programme: A Report presented by the Commission in accordance with Art. 12 of Council Decision 89/489/EEC establishing the LINGUA programme* (Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, December 13, 1991), 1-2, AEI, University of Pittsburgh Libraries, accessed March 4, 2017, http://aei.pitt.edu/33447/1/SEC_(91)_2411_final.pdf.

The LINGUA Program opened up a wide array of opportunities for France to not only boost the instruction of French in other member states, but also to expand foreign language instruction in France. This was cause for excitement for many in the university system saw an opportunity to develop new projects for students to learn another Community language. Such was the case for Claire Blanche-Benvéniste, a linguistics professor at the University of Provence in Aix-en-Provence. With financial support from LINGUA and in cooperation with visiting ERASMUS students, Blance-Benvéniste and two other colleagues developed a trilingual education program in 1993 that allowed for French students to learn Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese at the same time. For an hour and half each week, French students and ERASMUS exchange students met to study the three romance languages. Students dedicated a half hour to each language and practiced oral and written comprehension through the translation of short texts. Blance-Benvéniste and her colleagues translated only the titles of the texts into French and the students completed the rest. Before translating, ERASMUS students from Italy, Spain, and Portugal would read the texts in their respective native languages for the French students. The French students then translated the short paragraphs phrase by phrase, using context, phonetics, and etymology to decipher the text. Rather than stopping to look up a word that they were unfamiliar with, the students simply replaced it with the word "thing" and proceeded with the translation as best they could until they arrived at the end.[156]

[156] "EDUCATION-CAMPUS: Langues romanes en simultané à Aix-en-Provence: Des étudiants apprennent, en meme temps, l'italien, l'espagnol et le portugais. Une experience originale soutenue par la Communauté européenne," *Le Monde*, April 2, 1993, accessed March 9, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1993/04/02/education-campus-langues-romanes-en-simultane-a-aix-en-provence-des-etudiants-apprennent-en-meme-temps-l-italien-l-espagnol-et-le-portugais-une-experience-originale-soutenue-par-la_3917864_1819218.html.

In many ways, Blance-Benvéniste's unique program perfectly fulfilled the Community's goal of an integrated learning network that constructed European identity. This trilingual education initiative encouraged students to develop practical language skills with curiosity as the driving force, rather than drilling grammar and focusing on conjugation charts. Without immediately rushing to a dictionary, students used situational context and existing knowledge to translate the texts, much like a real-world scenario.[157] They also developed an understanding of the etymological relationship between the three languages to advance their linguistic repertoire. From this perspective, students learned to focus not on what made each language different, but how they were similar. The presence of the ERASMUS students further enhanced this inclusive perspective on language. For an hour and half each week, Blance-Benvéniste's students became model European citizens, using language to carry them through Italy, Spain, and Portugal, developing a diverse linguistic and cultural understanding of Europe as they completed this fictive journey.

Outside of developing new teaching programs such as the trilingual language initiative at the University of Provence, the LINGUA program also responded to some of the basic problems that had plagued ERASMUS during the first three years of the program, namely the inequality in mobility flows. During this phase of ERSAMUS, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom dominated the mobility flow and exchanged the most students. The European Commission was quick to identify this problem and looked toward foreign language training as one solution to this massive disparity in student flow. After 1989, the European Commission instituted language requirements for ERASMUS and began funding

[157] Ibid.

preparatory courses for students before they studied outside of their home country.[158] This change in part helped to divert student flow out of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom and encouraged students to travel to member states with less common languages by providing the resources they needed for proper language training. Together LINGUA and ERASMUS fit in well with the Community's vision of the future of European society. The 1990 annual report after LINGUA's first year clearly framed the program within the context of a multilingual Europe:

> In adopting this general objective, the Community deliberately chose a strategy of action involving the diversification of the foreign languages on offer in education and training programs, thus promoting the lesser taught of the Community languages, rather than promoting one or two priority languages. Given the rich diversity of European linguistic and cultural traditions, the option taken through the adoption of the LINGUA program is that all the official languages of the Member States of the community should be more widely taught throughout the Community…[159]

Eventually, the European Commission integrated both LINGUA and ERASMUS under the umbrella of the SOCRATES Program in 1995. Both programs helped to further integrate the education network in Europe and contributed to the creation of a European dimension in education that was the ultimate goal of the Community. Although ERASMUS was specific to the higher education system, from the perspective of the European Commission, both programs "stress[ed] the political and social dimensions of citizenship, encourage[ed] the development of communication and intercultural skills and cater[ed] in a balanced fashion

[158] *Proposal for a council decision amending Decision 87/327/EEC adopting the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)*, 4.
[159] *The LINGUA Programme*, 1.

for the cognitive and affective aspects of learning."[160] Once under the umbrella of SOCRATES and with a much larger budget, the LINGUA program was able to fund more projects like foreign language teacher trainings and teach abroad programs for future teachers. In 1996, the Community expanded foreign language preparation for students in higher education and created intensive language preparation courses specifically for ERASMUS students studying in countries with less common languages.[161]

Did Language Affect France's Position in ERASMUS?

In 1997, ten years after the creation of the ERASMUS program, English once again scored as the most common foreign language among young people according a Eurobarometer Poll. Fifty-four percent of respondents spoke English as the first language after their native tongue compared to the 34 percent in 1987. Twenty percent of students spoke French as a foreign language in 1997.[162] France had also remained one of the top three exporters of students in the ERASMUS program during the past decade and the United Kingdom was still the most popular destination. Although it is not surprising that English was the most common Community language among young people in 1997, part of this growth during the 1990s derived from the incorporation of Finland and Sweden into the Community. As with other Scandinavian countries, English was a central part of their education system and an extremely high percentage of young people spoke fluent English. While the French were still clearly behind English as the most popular Community language, they nonetheless ranked second and had for the most part maintained their position in

[160] *Report from the Commission on the initial implementation phase of the SOCRATES programme 1995-1997,* 7.
[161] Ibid, 8.
[162] *The Young Europeans: Eurobarometer 47.2* (Brussels: European Commission Directorate-General for Education, Training, and Youth, 1997), 40, Eurobarometer Reports Archive, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives_en.htm.

ERASMUS. Data from Eurobarometer polls in 1990 and 2000 also clearly indicate that French maintained its popularity in Europe, ranking above other common languages such as Spanish, German, and Italian.

What, then, are we to make of the intense language reforms that the European Community rolled out in the 1990s, and how did they affect France? One thing that is clear for the ERASMUS program in general is the relationship between education and travel, as well as education and foreign language study. In 1997, the most common reason for young people to travel was for holiday, but the second most cited reason was for educational purposes. Students were thus establishing a relationship between travel and study and for many, study abroad was their reason to travel. More young French than any other nationality indicated that their reason for going abroad was to learn a new language or participate in an exchange program.[163] Education also played a role in which groups chose to study another Community language and to travel; young people pursuing higher education expressed the most interest in learning another language and in travel in general.[164] This is trend is clean in data from both 1990 and 2001.[165] In both 1987 and 1997, students represented the category of young people most willing to learn a foreign language or to continue studying a language, again linking education to foreign language study.

Regarding the use of French among non-native speakers, this statistic is encouraging in the context of the Community's expansion of language instruction and commitment to multilingualism. In 1987 only 9 percent of respondents to the Eurobarometer Poll indicated

[163] Ibid, 59-60.
[164] Ibid, 49 and 55.
[165]For specific date from 2001, see *Les Jeunes Européens en 2001: Eurobarometer 55.1* (Brussels: European Commission Directorate-General for Education, Training, and Youth, August, 2001) Eurobarometer Reports Archive, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_151_fr.pdf.

that they could hold a conversation in French.[166] By 1997, around 20 percent of young people could now do so, an increase that had more than doubled during the decade. [167] Although French remained the second most popular language, there was a similar upsurge for those speaking German, the third most popular language.[168] These developments, although beneficial for France, make sense given the already established history for French instruction in the Community. For the lesser common languages, such as Greek, Portuguese, and Italian, there was nowhere near such growth. In 1987 only 2 percent of young people spoke Italian, and no respondents indicated that they spoke Greek or Portuguese. Ten years later, those percentages had barely increased. Approximately 4 percent of students now spoke Italian and still less than 1 percent spoke Greek and Portuguese. Spanish, however, followed a trend similar to French and German and increased from 4 percent in 1987 to nearly 9 percent in 1997. That same year, young people also ranked Spanish as the Community language they most wanted to learn in the future. English actually ranked third behind both Spanish and French in this poll. [169] The steady growth of young people speaking Spanish also correlated with Spain's progression as a study destination in ERASMUS. By 1997, Spain had surpassed Germany and was the third most popular host country for students.[170]

In some ways, it is clear that the European Community was able to continue building on the foundation of education and travel that began in 1987 with the ERASMUS program. The European emphasis on multilingualism was a further incentive to travel and largely affected the educated sector of European society, specifically young people. The growth of

[166] *Young Europeans in 1987*, 55-57.
[167] *The Young Europeans: Eurobarometer 47.2*, 43.
[168] Young people speaking German also doubled in the 1990s from 8% to 16%.
[169] *The Young Europeans: Eurobarometer 47.2*, 53.
[170] *Survey into the Socio-Economic Background of ERASMUS Students*, 27

programs like ERASMUS and LINGUA gave students more opportunities for travel and were in line with the Community rhetoric that constructed mobility and multilingualism as crucial parts of European identity. In 1997, however, difficulty with language was still the most commonly cited deterrent to studying and working abroad for young people; almost 40 percent of respondents indicated that language was a problem while abroad. As in 1987, language was even more problematic than funding.[171]

Overall, the first decade of ERASMUS saw mixed results for the position of France in the program. English still remained the most popular language and the addition of Scandinavian countries presented a new channel for ERASMUS students wishing to study in an Anglophone country, as these countries typically offered courses in English. Despite this, French as a Community language for young people did experience a steady increase and in fact, Scandinavian countries expressed a great interest in learning French.[172] France also remained one of the top three countries creating ICPs and presented their students with an ever-growing network of possible exchanges. These partnerships also meant that foreign students had the opportunity to study in France, and given the status of French as a Community language, the country remained a popular destination. As we have seen, however, Community attempts to divert mobility flows into member states with lesser-spoken languages were not very successful from the perspective of foreign language instruction. Less common languages did not experience the dramatic increase in popularity of Spanish and German, despite the best efforts of ERASMUS and LINGUA. For France, resistance to the intrusion of English into both the education system and French culture was far from over. Debates over when it was appropriate to begin teaching English and how best

[171] Ibid, 62
[172] *The Young Europeans: Eurobarometer 47.2*, 53.

a student could learn a second language continued in the late 1990s. The Jacobin attitude toward language and identity also persisted, despite the push in the Community to accept multilingualism. As the ongoing debate over the European Charter on Regional or Minority Languages demonstrates, the French still cling tightly to their vision of "Frenchness" and its relationship to language. In the twenty-first century, however, this debate focuses less on regionalism and more on the integration of former colonial populations into French society. The supposed incompatibility of various Muslim and Arabic speaking populations with the French national community represents the latest chapter in the French discussion of identity.

Despite this complicated relationship with language, it is clear that France remained committed to increasing student mobility and attracting foreign students to study in France throughout the 1990s. The pervasive Community rhetoric about travel, identity, and multilingualism encouraged French students to pursue study abroad and gave the French government an incentive to invest in international education. As this chapter has demonstrated, language was central to the European higher education network and to the mobility of students. In a broader perspective, language was also crucial for European integration efforts and multilingualism became a hallmark of European identity. Part of the role of ERASMUS in developing model European citizens was to reinforce this multilingual commitment and to demonstrate to the Community the relationship between mobility and language. For ERASMUS, language was an indispensible part of the cooperative exchange system and France's position in the program is a testament to this. Although funding and the preexisting educational structures significantly influenced student mobility, language was also a fundamental factor that determined France's place within the European higher education network.

CONCLUSION

"Far from the clichés spread by the movie *L'Auberge espagnol* (which are sometimes the reality), ERASMUS is certainly an experience that every student should live!"[173] These are the opening lines to the first article in a series for *Le Monde Campus* that follows one French student's year abroad with ERASMUS. This "year in ERASMUS" series chronicles the life of Réda Mérida, a third-year political science student at the University of Lille-II, who is currently studying in Rome. In his short columns, Réda recounts his struggles—figuring out his Italian fiscal code card (similar to a Social Security card) and triumphs—meeting his first friends at ERASMUS social events. In the midst of trying to figure out why Italians talk with their hands and drive so fast, Réda also reflects on what study abroad means to him and what it has meant for Europe in the thirty years since ERASMUS was created.

In his most recent article, Réda explains the concept of the "ERASMUS generation." This phrase refers to the first generation of Europeans born after unification. As such, the ERASMUS generation has only known European citizenship and has benefited the most from programs like ERASMUS that encourage mobility and cooperation. In Réda's opinion, it is this generation that is ready to steer the Community into the next phase: "Armed with [our] education, [our] experiences, and [our] openness to the world, [our generation] is the best equipped to take control of the European project."[174] From his perspective, the ERASMUS generation has a distinctly transnational quality because of the ability of students

---

[173] Réda Mérida, "Chronique d'une année ERASMUS à Rome: le depart," *Le Monde Campus*, October 27, 2016, accessed March 26, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/campus/article/2016/10/27/chronique-d-une-annee-erasmus-a-rome-le-depart_5021369_4401467.html.

[174] "*Mais forte de son instruction, de ses expériences et de son ouverture sur le monde, elle est la mieux dotée pour reprendre le projet européen en mains*." Réda Mérida, "La génération Erasmus à la rescousse de l'Europe?" *Le Monde Campus*, March 3, 2017, accessed March 26, 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/campus/article/2017/03/02/la-generation-erasmus-a-la-rescousse-de-l-europe_5088465_4401467.html?xtmc=erasmus&xtcr=12.

to move around Europe and due to the influx of foreign students (non-Europeans) who also study in Europe. According to Réda, the ERASMUS generation "will be the ambassadors that will contribute to the *rayonnement* of the European Union internationally."[175]

In many ways, this article about the role of ERASMUS in 2017 represents yet another wave of generational thinking in the European Union. We can't make sense of it, however, without understanding the original ERASMUS generation, the first group of young people to take part in the integrated higher education system in Europe. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, these students departed to study abroad and consequently set the precedent for educational exchange in the European Community. As the Cold War came to a close, Europe looked to unification as a way to strengthen its position in the world and compete with superpowers like the United States. This degree of economic and political integration, however, also required a deep level of commitment to the European project from the citizens. To promote this civic engagement and to help facilitate the process of identity building in Europe, the Community turned toward students. While having a round of beers in a pub with a colleague, Hywel Ceri Jones had outlined his vision for a cooperative higher education system on the back of an envelope. This was the unofficial first meeting about what would later become the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students, ERASMUS.

The creation of ERASMUS empowered young people to take on a central role in the European Community. The program integrated the higher education system in Europe and eliminated barriers that had previously rendered study abroad nearly impossible. ERASMUS provided students with the tools to become mobile, multilingual, and to experience life in

[175] "*Ils seront les ambassadeurs qui participeront au rayonnement de l'UE à l'international."* Ibid.

another member state, forging that essential connection among citizens that the Community needed. Students became a resource to the Community and acted as unofficial ambassadors when they traveled to other member states. They demonstrated what it was like to be an engaged European citizen.

Scholars have identified these instances of transnational contact among young people throughout twentieth-century Europe. Whitney Walton describes how Americans studying in France the after the Second World War underwent a transformative process of self-identification when forced to confront what it meant to be American.[176] Nancy Green explores the American expatriate community in Paris in the early twentieth century and the proliferation of Franco-American cultural organizations that allowed Americans to connect with the French.[177] Richard Ivan Jobs examines the 1968 protests through the perspective of youth travel to explain the development of a transnational political identity among young people in Europe.[178] Christine Norwig tells the story of the European Youth Campaign, which educated young people in the 1950s about how to be part of a unified Europe.[179] These scholars, as well as those who study tourism and travel, have helped historians reframe the narrative of French history through transnational agents and transnational networks.

This study has attempted to build on this work by tracing the transnational web of French ERASMUS students during the 1990s. The early years of the ERASMUS program allow us to understand how European unification played out at the local level among people who were not politicians or diplomats. They explain how Community rhetoric constructed students as central to unification and used ERASMUS as a vehicle for producing model

[176] Walton, *Internationalism, National Identities, and Study Abroad.*
[177] Green, *The Other Americans in Paris.*
[178] Jobs, "Youth Movements: Travel, Protest and Europe in 1968."
[179] Norwig, "A First European Generation."

citizen. This study also draws on the work of historians like Norwig and Jobs who have identified how the cultural image of "youth" and generational thinking have contributed to the formation of a European identity in the past. It also explores the difficulties of creating into integrated European higher education system from the French perspective. When placed in the broader history of France in the late twentieth century, this story connects to debates over cultural imperialism and French identity, and the longer history of educational exchanges and transnational contact between students dating back to the nineteenth century.

As I have argued, Community discourse about students was essential to the creation of the "People's Europe;" it motivated the French to participate in ERASMUS and to maintain a dominant position in the program. The place of France in ERASMUS during the 1990s reveals some of the paradoxes of student mobility in Europe. Dating back to the Joint-Study Programs of the 1970s, France had a history of European educational exchanges that made its transition into the program much easier than other member states. Franco-American exchanges from earlier in the century helped establish a cultural appreciation for study abroad and also paved the way for a smooth transition into a European system.

As I demonstrated in the last chapter, language also played a key part in student mobility in the ERASMUS program. From this perspective, France benefited from the widespread use of French in Europe. The national education system also helped prepare students for study abroad with foreign language instruction in the primary and secondary schools. Even amid the global sweep of English as the new *lingua franca*, France still exported more students than the United Kingdom and remained one of the top three study destinations from 1987 to 1997. Finally, to compensate for the lack of Community funding that French students received, the state came up with its own form of national and regional

grants. Although ERASMUS was a Community initiative, it was actually the French government and national structures of support—financial and otherwise—that maintained this supranational program. The simple reality was that French students could not participate in ERASMUS, nor could they become mobile European citizens, without the help of France.

This balance of French and European, national and supranational, took place throughout ERASMUS, not just with funding. It is the cultural internationalism that Whitney Walton writes about—the reexamination of one's identity after time spent abroad—that is what is most important about the ERASMUS experience. Data from the European Union's surveys on youth in Europe and from ERASMUS' socioeconomic surveys both indicate that students overwhelming agreed that ERASMUS was a positive cultural, social, and academic experience.[180] Yet there is currently no historical scholarship on the first generation of ERASMUS students to understand what exactly made their time abroad "positive."

This thesis has only begun to tell the story of the ERASMUS generation. To examine their lives, their experiences while abroad, and to understand what it meant for them to take part in the creation of the "People's Europe" would provide insight into how the process of identity building worked in the ERASMUS program. More generally, research into these kinds of transnational networks that empower young people to travel and engage in international relations reveals the agency of youth as historical actors. If indeed we are at a moment where a second ERASMUS generation is beginning to traverse the world, now is the time to investigate that first generation to better understand what role travel, education, and young people play in the creation of the globalized world.

[180] I am referring specially to the Eurobarometer series "Young Europeans" from 1990, 1997, and 2001. Also, the "Survey into the Socio-Economic Background of ERASMUS Students," published in 2000.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Digitized Archival Collections:

Academic Cooperation Association (ACA). ACA Publications. http://www.acasecretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/2002_EASMUS_in_the_Socrates_Programme.pdf.

Archive of European Integration. University of Pittsburgh. http://aei.pitt.edu/.

EUR-Lex. European Union Law Archives. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html.

EUROPA. European Commission Archives. http://ec.europa.eu/historical_archives/index_en.htm.

Newspaper Collections and Articles:

Dussausaye, Gaëtan. "Pour sauver Erasmus, sortons de l'Union européenne!" January 9, 2017. National Front Press Releases. Accessed February 8, 2017. http://www.frontnational.com/categorie/communiques/.

Le Monde. Le Monde Archives. http://www.lemonde.fr/.

Interviews:

Jones, Hywel Ceri. 2017. Interviewed by ERASMUS+ UK Blog. *ERASMUS+ UK*, February 22. Accessed March 12, 2017, https://erasmusplus.org.uk/blog/origins-of-the erasmus-programme-percentE2percent80percent93-interview-with-hywel-ceri jones.

Lenarduzzi, Domenico. 2014. Interviewed by Danièle Licata. *EducPros*, January 22. Accessed February 26, 2017. http://www.letudiant.fr/educpros/entretiens/domenico-lenarduzzifondateur d-erasmus-l-europe-ne-pouvait-se-realiser-qu-en-mobilisant-sa jeunesse.html.

--- 2011. Interviewed by Daniela Vincenti. *EurActiv.* September 22. Accessed Febraury 7, 2017, http://www.euractiv.com/section/social-europejobs/interview/lenarduzzi-erasmus-would-not-get-off-the-ground-today/.

---. 2012. Interviewed by Solange Berger. *La Libre*, June 23. Accessed February 26, 2017 http://www.lalibre.be/economie/libre-entreprise/erasmus-25-ans-dechanges-51b8ecffe4b0de6db9c70a70.

Movies:

Klapisch, Cédric, dir. 2002. *L'Auberge Espagnole.* Mars Distribution. Netflix, 2013.

Secondary Sources:

Adamson, Robin. *The Defense of French: A Language in Crisis?* Multilingual Matters Ltd.: Clevedon, Somerset, United Kingdom, 2007.

Blitz, Brad. "From Monnet to Delors: Educational Co-operation in the European Union." *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 2 (May, 2003): 197-212.

Brenner, Michael and Guillaume Parmentier. *Reconcilable Differences: U.S.- French Relations in the New Era.* Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002.

Corbett. Anne. "Ideas, institutions and Policy Entrepreneurs: Towards a New History of Higher Education in the European Community." *European Journal of Education* 38 no. 3 (September, 2003): 315-330.

---. *Universities and the Europe of Knowledge: Ideas, Institution, and Policy Entrepreneurship in European Union Higher Education Policy, 1955-2005.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Costigliola, Frank. *France and the United States: The Cold Alliance Since World War II.* Farmington Hills, MI: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1992.

Dalichow, Fritz. “Academic Recognition Within the European Community.” *European Journal of Education* 22 (1987): 39-56.

Endy, Christopher. *Cold War Holidays: American Tourism in France.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Fong, Vanessa. *Paradise Redefined: Transnational Chinese Students and the Quest for Flexible Citizenship in the Developed World.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Furlough, Ellen. “Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s 1970s.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40, no. 2 (April 1998): 247-286.

Furlough, Ellen and Shelley Baranowski, editors. *Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Gordon, Philip H. and Sophie Meunier. *The French Challenge: Adapting to Globalization.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.

Green, Nancy L. *The Other Americans in Paris: Businessmen, Countesses, Wayward Youth, 1880-1941.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Harp, Stephen. *Marketing Michelin: Advertising and Cultural Identity in Twentieth-Century France.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Horne, Janet. “’To Spread the French Language is to Extend the *Patrie*:’ The Colonial Mission of the Alliance Française.” *French Historical Studies* 40, no. 1 (February 2017): 95-127.

Jackson, Julian. “Le Temps des Loisirs: Popular Tourism and Mass Leisure in the Vision of the Front Populaire.” In *The French and Spanish Popular Fronts: Comparative Perspectives,* edited by Martin Alexander and Helen Graham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Jobs, Richard Ivan. “Building community and reconstructing citizenship in the Youth and Culture Houses of post-war France.” *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 12, no.3 (August, 2004): 205-220.

---. *Riding the New Wave: Youth and the Rejuvenation of France After the Second World War.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007

---. “Youth Movements: Travel, Protest and Europe in 1968.” *The American Historical Review* 114, no. 2 (April, 2009): 376-404.

Kuisel, Richard. *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Levenstein, Harvey. *Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

---. *We’ll Always Have Paris: American Tourists in France since 1930.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

MacCannell, Dean. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Norwig, Chrstina. “A First European Generation: The Myth of Youth and European Integration in the Fifties.” *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 2 (2014): 251-260.

Saunier, Pierre-Yves. *Transnational History: Theory and History.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Safran, William. “Pluralism and Multiculturalism in France: Post-Jacobin Transformations.” *Political Science Quarterly* 118, no. 3 (Fall, 2003): 437-465.

Smith, Valene. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

Urry, John. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies.* London: Sage Publications, 1990.

Walton, Whitney. *Internationalism, National Identities, and Study Abroad: France and the United States, 1890-1970.* Sanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Walkama, Annalise R. Bachelor of Arts, Youngstown State University, Spring 2013;
Master of Arts, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2017
Major: History
Title of Thesis: The ERASMUS Generation: French Student Mobility in Europe, 1987 1997.
Thesis Director: Dr. Jordan Kellman
Pages in Thesis: 99; Words in Abstract: 173

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the role of educational exchanges in the process of European unification from the French perspective. It focuses specifically on the integration of the European higher education system and the creation of a study abroad network through the European Community program ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) during the 1990s. France's tenuous position in ERASMUS was one of both power and vulnerability, especially concerning the limited Community funding allocated to French students and the growth of English as the dominant global language. Through an examination of official European Community documents and the French press, this thesis analyzes French motivations for participating in the ERASMUS program and identifies how the practice of study abroad represented a convergence of national and supranational identities. Scholarship on ERASMUS is extremely limited and has not yet been contextualized within a longer historical narrative of transnational student networks. This thesis, therefore, seeks to provide that context and to enhance the agency of young people as active participants in the process of globalization.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Annalise Walkama was born on January 24, 1992 in Youngstown, Ohio. She grew up in the suburb of Poland and attended Youngstown State University, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in History with a minor in French. Before beginning a Master's program at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, she studied at the *Centre international d'études françaises* at the *Université catholique de l'Ouest* in Angers, France. In the fall of 2017, she will begin the doctoral program in History at Purdue University.