

**Political Science 202:
Politics of the European Union**

Prof. Mark A. Pollack

461 Gladfelter Hall

E-mail: mark.pollack@temple.edu

Office hours: Tuesday, Noon – 2:30 p.m., 4:30 – 5:00 p.m.

The European Union (formally the European Community) has been described as “an extraordinary political experiment,” “the most original political concept since the American Constitution was drafted in 1787,” and “surely one of the most important political experiments in Europe in modern times.” From its beginnings as the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951, the European Union today has grown to a supranational polity composed of 15 member states (soon to be 25 after the coming enlargement in 2004), governed by an ever-growing set of political institutions, and sharing common economic and social policies, a common foreign and security policy, and (for some member states at least) a common currency, the Euro.

This course seeks to explicate and understand the European Union in its dual aspects: as a *process* of international or regional integration, tying existing nation-states such as France, Germany, and the United Kingdom into an “ever-closer Union of peoples”; and as a *polity* or political system with its own institutions, policies, and policy processes. As we shall see, the study of the European Union increasingly blurs the boundaries between international relations (concerned with the relations among states) and comparative politics (concerned with the workings of domestic political systems), and we will draw from both fields in our effort to make sense of the EU and its workings.

The course is arranged in four parts. In the first part, we explore both the political history of European integration in the post-war era, and the various theories put forward by political scientists to explain and understand the process of European integration. Next, in part two, we turn from European integration as a process to the workings of the EU as a political system, including its core institutions and its legislative, executive and judicial politics. In part three, we turn for several weeks to look at the substance of EU policies, including the core project of completing a European internal market, the single currency, the incomplete development of a “social Europe,” and the Union’s ambition to play a more important role alongside the member states in Justice and Home Affairs. Finally, we conclude in part four with an analysis of the key challenges facing the EU in the coming years, including the challenges of enlargement, the “Europeanization” of domestic politics, the negotiation and later rejection of a new “Constitution” for Europe, and EU relations with the United States and the rest of the world.

Prerequisites: PS 52, Foreign Governments and Politics, and PS 53, International Politics, or permission of instructor.

Course requirements: The requirements for this course are:

1. a series of four 1-2 page papers (double-spaced!) in response to the study questions for the weekly readings, to be handed in at the *beginning* of lecture on the *first day* of the weeks selected. These papers are intended to demonstrate that you have read and thought about the *assigned readings*, so please be sure to write your essays with specific reference to relevant readings. Students may select any four weeks of the course between weeks 2 and 13, subject to the condition that at least two of the papers must be completed during the first eight weeks of the course. Please note that some weeks are irregular, and begin on a Thursday, so consult the syllabus for the precise dates for each week. Please note also that *late papers will not be accepted* (5% per paper, for a total of 20% of the grade);
2. participation in class discussion (including discussions of the required readings as well as the current events discussions), 10% of the grade;
3. a 3-5 page abstract and working bibliography for a research paper on a topic of your choice, due on Thursday, November 2nd (10% of the grade);
4. an 8-15 page research paper on a topic of your choice, drawn from primary as well as secondary sources, and due on or before Tuesday, December 5th (30% of the grade); and
5. an in-class final exam, to be administered during exam period (30% of the grade).

Required readings: The following books, marked with an asterisk in the weekly readings, are on order at the Temple University Bookstore.

- Simon Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, 2nd edition (New York: Palgrave, 2005)
- Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Mark A. Pollack, eds., *Policy-Making in the European Union*, 5th edition (New York: Oxford, 2005).

Please be sure to buy the correct, up-to-date editions of these books, as earlier versions will be out of date and unhelpful; or you can find both books on reserve at Paley Library. All other *required* readings will be made available via Blackboard.

In addition to these required readings, the syllabus lists a number of *recommended* readings on various topics. These readings will generally not be discussed in class, but are included for students with an interest in doing extra research in one of these areas. Finally, in addition to these secondary sources, we will hold a special session during the first half of the term on the use of *primary* sources, discussing how to find these sources, how to search through them efficiently, and how to cite them in written work.

Sources for current events in the EU. In addition to these readings, students are strongly encouraged to read a good European daily newspaper, or one of the growing number of good websites devoted to EU politics. The best news site for EU politics is *euobserver* at <http://www.euobserver.com>. Other useful websites include the EU's own *Europa* website at <http://europa.eu.int>, and *Eupolitix* at <http://www.eupolitics.com>. The semi-weekly newsletter *European Report* offers excellent and detailed coverage of the EU, and is available through the Lexis-Nexis database, which can be found on the Temple Library server. The best English-language daily newspaper coverage of the EU can be found in the Financial Times, which has a good web site at <http://www.ft.com>, and offers special rates for students during the semester.

While there is no fixed requirement to read any specific source of current EU news, we will begin each Tuesday with a brief **discussion of current events** in EU politics, and students are urged to prepare for these discussions by consulting regularly one or more of the above web-sites for the most important stories of the week.

Note on Academic Misconduct

All students in this class are expected to adhere to Temple University standards on academic conduct. In recent years, I have had increasing experience with students plagiarizing work from either printed sources or internet web sites, and I therefore consider it important to clarify the course policy regarding plagiarism and other types of academic misconduct. All students should, in all assignments, fully and unambiguously cite sources from which they are drawing important ideas and/or sizable quotations (for example, more than eight consecutive words or more than 50% of a given sentence or paragraph). Failure to do so constitutes plagiarism, which is a serious act of academic misconduct and *will result in a failing grade for the course*, as well as the possibility of notification of the infraction to the Dean of Students and academic dismissal. Similarly, cheating during exams, copying written assignments from other students, or providing answers to others during exams are considered acts of academic misconduct. Given the seriousness of these infractions, there will be no second chances and no leniency. Please avoid them at any cost. If you are unfamiliar with policies about plagiarism or other types of academic misconduct, you may wish to consult the on-line guide to "Quoting, Paraphrasing, and Acknowledging Sources," available at <http://www.wisc.edu/students/plagiarism.pdf>; or if you still have remaining doubts or specific questions, raise them directly with me.

Disability Policy

This course is open to all students who meet the academic requirements for participation. Any student who has a need for accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss the specific situation as soon as possible. Contact Disability Resources and Services at 215-204-1280 in 100 Ritter Annex to coordinate reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities.

Temple University policy on the freedom to teach and learn:

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The

University has adopted a policy on Student and Faculty Academic Rights and Responsibilities (Policy # 03.70.02) which can be accessed through the following link: http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy_no=03.70.02.

For our purposes in this class, it is worth noting that we will debate a number of topics, some of them controversial, ranging from the sources of European integration to the adoption of EU policies in areas like defense, social policy, and gender equality. Throughout class discussion and in written assignments, students will be graded, *not* on their specific political or intellectual opinions, but on their ability to reason and justify a particular opinion, particularly with respect to the required readings for the course. However controversial the subjects covered in the class, all students should strive to maintain a civil and cordial tone, even with those who may disagree with them.

SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND LECTURES

PART I: THE HISTORY AND THEORIES OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

Week 1: Introduction: European Integration as a Process, and the EU as a Political System (Aug 29; no class on the 31st)

Required Readings

* Dinan, *Ever Closer Union*, introduction, pp. 1-6.

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 1, pp 1-17.

Recommended Readings (Good General Texts on the EU)

Neill Nugent, *Government and Politics of the European Union*, 6th edition (Duke University Press, 2006).

John Peterson and Elizabeth Bomberg, *Decision-Making in the European Union* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999).

John Peterson and Michael Shackleton, *The Institutions of the European Union*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Dick Leonard, *The Economist Guide to the European Union*, 8th edition (London: Profile Books, 2002).

Jeremy Richardson, *European Union: Power and Policy-Making*, 3rd edition (London: Routledge, 2005).

Ian Bache and Stephen George, *Politics in the European Union*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Elizabeth Bomberg and Andrew Stubb, *The European Union: How Does it Work?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez, eds., *European Integration Theory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Michelle Cini and Angela K. Bourne, eds., *Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies* (New York: Palgrave, 2006).

John T.S. Keeler, "Mapping EU Studies: The Evolution from Boutique to Boom Field 1960-2001," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 551-82.

Knud Erik Jorgensen, Mark A. Pollack, and Ben Rosamond, eds., *The Handbook of European Union*

Politics (New York: Sage Publications, forthcoming 2007).

No study questions this week!

Week 2. The Origins of the EU, and of Integration Theory (Sept. 5, 7)

Required Readings

Desmond Dinan, *Ever Closer Union*, chapter 1, pp. 9-35.

Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), chapters 1 and 3 ("Introduction" and "Neofunctionalism").

Desmond Dinan, *Ever Closer Union*, chapters 2-4, pp. 39-80.

Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*, Chapter 4 ("Backlash, Critique, and Contemplation").

Study Questions (please choose just **one** of these questions, not both)

1. Why did France, Germany, and four other countries agree to begin the process of European integration with the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951? And why did neofunctionalists like Ernst Haas believe that the process of European integration, having begun so modestly, would snowball into an ongoing process of political integration?
2. By the late 1950s, the neofunctionalist spill-over process predicted by Ernst Haas seemed to be in full swing, only to have the process apparently derailed in the 1960s by French President Charles de Gaulle? Looking beyond the personality of de Gaulle, (1) analyze why the decades of the 1960s and 1970s appeared to have falsified Haas' neofunctionalism, and (2) assess whether the 1960s and 1970s were a period of progress, or rollback, or a mix of the two, in the integration process.

Recommended Readings

Karl W. Deutsch, et al. (1957). *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Ernst Haas (1958). *The Uniting of Europe* (Stanford University Press).

William Diebold (1959). *The Schuman Plan: A Study in Economic Cooperation, 1950-1959* (New York: Praeger).

David A. Mitrany (1966). *A Working Peace System* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books).

Haas, Ernst B. (1976). "Turbulent Fields and the Theory of Regional Integration," *International Organization* 30: 173-212.

Jean Monnet (1978). *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday).

François Duchêne (1994). *Jean Monnet: The First Statesman of Interdependence* (New York: W.W.

Norton and Company).

Lindberg, Leon N. and Scheingold, Stuart A. (1970). *Europe's Would-be Polity* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).

Pentland, Charles (1976). *International Theory and European Integration* (London: Macmillan).

Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe*, chapter 2.

Berthold Rittberger (2001). "Which Institutions for Post-War Europe? Explaining the Institutional Design of Europe's First Community," *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 5: 673-708.

Stanley Hoffmann, "Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe," *Daedalus*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (1966).

Newhouse, John (1967). *Collision in Brussels*. New York: Norton.

Helen Wallace and William Wallace, *Policy-Making in the European Communities* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977).

Pattison de Menil, Lois (1978). *Who Speaks for Europe? The Vision of Charles de Gaulle* (New York: St Martin's Press).

Peter Cocks (1980). "Towards a Marxist Theory of European Integration," *International Organization*, Vol. 34, pp. 1-40.

Taylor, Paul (1983). *The Limits of European Integration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Milward, Alan, *The European Rescue of the Nation-State* (2nd edition, London: Routledge, 2000).

Desmond Dinan, *Europe Recast: A History of the European Union* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2004).

Desmond Dinan, ed., *Origins and Evolution of the European Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Week 3: The Relaunching of Europe, and the Revival of the Theoretical Debate (Sept 12; no class the 14th)

Required Readings

Dinan, *Ever Closer Europe*, pp. 81-111.

John Zysman and Wayne Sandholtz (1989). "1992: Recasting the European Bargain." *World Politics*, 41: 1-30.

Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), introduction and chapter 4.

Study Question

1. The Single European Act of 1986 is widely considered to be the relaunching of the integration process after several decades of stagnation, but explanations for the SEA have been varied, largely reflecting the old neofunctionalist/intergovernmentalist debate of the 1960s and 1970s. In your essay, present in brief outline the respective explanations for the SEA put forward by Zysman and Sandholtz and Moravcsik. Which explanation do you find more persuasive, and why?

Recommended Readings

Richard Corbett (1987). "The 1985 Intergovernmental Conference and the Single European Act," in Roy Pryce (ed.), *The Dynamics of European Union* (New York: Croom Helm).

Tranholm-Mikkelsen, "Neofunctionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete?" *Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (1991), pp. 1-22.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1991). "Negotiating the Single European Act," in Robert O. Keohane and Stanley Hoffmann (eds), *The New European Community* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Andrew Moravcsik (1993). "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31: 473-524.

Maria Green Cowles (1995). "Setting the Agenda for a New Europe: The ERT and EC 1992," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 33: 501-26.

Week 4: From Community to Union, and the Birth of Theoretical Pluralism (Sept 19, 21)

Required Reading

Dinan, *Ever Closer Europe*, Chapters pp. 111-182.

* Mark A. Pollack, Chapter 2, "Theorizing EU Policy-Making," in Wallace, Wallace and Pollack, pp. 14-48.

Study Questions (Answer only one of the following two questions)

1. Former Commission President Jacques Delors once said that the early 1990s witnessed an "acceleration of history" in the EU, and indeed the period since 1990 has been a busy one, characterized by both steps forward and crises. Without trying to cover *all* of the events of the past 16 years, (a) identify a few of the *most important* developments in the EU since 1990, and (b) state briefly the primary way or ways in which the EU of 2006 differs from the EU of 1990.
2. Writing in 1994, Simon Hix argued that theories of the European Union had to some extent moved on from the traditional questions of integration theory (What drives integration? Is it a self-sustaining process? What will the end point be?), and began to ask different questions. Without trying to cover all possible theories of the EU, outline briefly the primary theoretical approaches to EU studies today, and discuss the different kinds of questions that each one asks about the Union.

Recommended Reading

Historical Developments

Richard Corbett (1994). *The Treaty of Maastricht*. Harlow: Longman Current Affairs.

Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe*, chapter 5.

Bobby McDonagh (1998). *Original Sin in a Brave New World: The Paradox of Europe: An Account of the Negotiation of the Treaty of Amsterdam*. Dublin: Institute of European Affairs.

Andrew Moravcsik, and Kalypso Nicolaidis (1998). "Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam: Interests, Influence, Institutions," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37: 59–85.

Theoretical Debates

Simon Hix (1994). "The Study of the European Community: The Challenge to Comparative Politics," *West European Politics* 17: 1-30; and subsequent debate with Hurrell et al.

James Caporaso and John Keeler (1995) "The European Union and Regional Integration Theory," in Carolyn Rhodes and Sonia Mazey, eds., *The State of the European Union* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).

Geoffrey Garrett and George Tsebelis (1996). "An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism," *International Organization*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 269-99.

Pierson, Paul (1996). "The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutionalist Analysis," *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 123-163.

Christiansen, Thomas, Knud Erik Jorgensen, and Antje Wiener, 1999. "The Social Construction of Europe," *Journal of European Public Policy* 6: 528-44.

Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Something Rotten in the State of Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration," *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (1999).

Jeffrey T. Checkel and Andrew Moravcsik, "A Constructivist Research Programme in EU Studies?" *European Union Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (June 2001), pp. 219-49.

Joseph Jupille, and James A. Caporaso (1999). "Institutionalism and the European Union: Beyond International Relations and Comparative Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 429–44.

Mark Aspinwall and Gerald Schneider, eds. (2000). *The Rules of Integration: Institutionalist Approaches to the Study of Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).

Keith Dowding (2000). "Institutionalist Research on the European Union: A Critical Review," *European Union Politics*, 1: 125–44.

Markus Jachtenfuchs (2001). "The Governance Approach to European Integration," *Journal of Common Market Studies*

Craig Parsons (2002). "Ideas as Causes: The Origins of the European Union," *International Organization* 56(1): 47-84.

Wiener and Diez, *European Integration Theory*, esp. chapters 4-8.

PART II: THE EU AS A POLITICAL SYSTEM

Week 5. The EU as a Political System; the Commission and Executive Politics (Sept 26; no class the 28th)

Required Reading

* Helen Wallace, Chapter 3, “An Institutional Anatomy and Five Policy Modes,” in *Policy-Making in the European Union*.

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 2.

Study Questions (Answer only one of the following two questions)

1. In her chapter, Helen Wallace reviews the basic institutional architecture of the European Union, and discusses five distinct “policy modes” modes in today’s EU. What are these five policy modes, and how important a role does the executive Commission play in each?
2. Simon Hix’s chapter, looking at executive politics broadly, identifies a “dual executive” in the EU. Who are the two members of this dual executive? And what role, or roles, does the Commission play in the executive politics of the Union?

Recommended Reading

Laura Cram (1994). “The European Commission as a Multi-organisation: Social Policy and IT Policy in the EU,” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1: 195–217.

George Ross (1995). *Jacques Delors and European Integration*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Michelle Cini (1996). *The European Commission: Leadership, Organisation, and Culture in the EU Administration* (New York: Manchester University Press).

Christian Joerges and Jurgen Neyer (1997). “Transforming Strategic Interaction into Deliberative Problem-Solving: European Comitology in the Foodstuffs Sector,” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4: 609–25.

Neill Nugent (2000). *The European Commission* (New York: St Martin’s Press).

Liesbet Hooghe, 2002. *The European Commission and the Integration of Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

John Peterson, “The College of Commissioners,” in Peterson and Shackleton, eds., *The Institutions of the European Union*, pp. 71-94.

Mark A. Pollack (2003). *The Engines of European Integration: Delegation, Agency and Agenda Setting in the European Union* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Dionyssis G. Dimitrakopoulos, *The Changing European Commission* (Manchester University Press, 2004).

David Spence and Geoffrey Edwards (eds.). *The European Commission*, 3rd edition (London: John Harper Publishing, 2006).

Jonas Tallberg, "Executive Politics" in Jorgensen, Pollack and Rosamond, eds., *The Handbook of European Union Politics* (New York: Sage, forthcoming 2007).

Week 6. Legislative Politics and Judicial Politics (The Council, the EP, and the ECJ) (October 3, 5)

Required Reading

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapters 2, 3.

Simon Hix, Abdul Noury, and Gerard Roland (2002). "A 'Normal' Parliament? Party Cohesion and Competition in the European Parliament, 1979-2001," EPRG Working Paper, No 9, available on-line at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/eprg/working-papers.htm>.

Lisa Conant, "Judicial Politics," in Jorgensen, Pollack and Rosamond, eds., *The Handbook of European Union Politics* (New York: Sage, forthcoming 2007).

Study Questions (Answer only one of the following two questions)

1. What do Hix et al. mean when they refer to the European Parliament as a "normal" Parliament? In what sense is it "normal" and in what sense (if any) does it remain unique or *sui generis*?
2. The study of the European Court of Justice produced one of the most vigorous debates in EU studies, pitting the neofunctionalist perspective of Anne-Marie Burley (later Slaughter) and Walter Mattli against the intergovernmentalist views of Geoffrey Garrett and his colleagues. What was the central disagreement of this debate, according to Hix and Conant, and what, if any, resolution have we seen to the debate? Looking beyond that debate, what do the authors identify as the "cutting edge" questions in the study of the ECJ today?

Recommended Reading

The ECJ and Judicial Politics

Geoffrey Garrett (1992). "International Cooperation and Institutional Choice: The European Community's Internal Market," *International Organization*, 46: 533–60.

Burley, Anne-Marie and Mattli, Walter (1993). "Europe Before the Court: A Political Theory of Legal Integration," *International Organization*, 47: 41–76.

Geoffrey Garrett (1995). "The Politics of Legal Integration in the European Union," *International Organization*, 49: 171–81.

Walter Mattli and Anne-Marie Slaughter (1995). "Law and Politics in the European Union: A Reply to

Garrett,” *International Organization*, 49: 183–90.

Walter Mattli and Anne-Marie Slaughter (1998). “Revisiting the European Court of Justice,” *International Organization*, 52: 177–209.

Karen J. Alter (1998). “Who are the Masters of the Treaty? European Governments and the European Court of Justice,” *International Organization*, 52: 125–52.

Geoffrey Garrett, R. Daniel Kelemen, and Heiner Schulz (1998). “The European Court of Justice, National Governments, and Legal Integration in the European Union,” *International Organization*, 52: 149–76.

Paul Craig and Grainne de Burca (1998). *EU Law: Cases, Text and Materials*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Renaud Dehousse (1999). *The European Court of Justice: The Politics of Judicial Integration* (New York: St Martin’s Press).

Brown, Lionel Neville and Kennedy, Tom (2000). *The Court of Justice of the European Communities* (London : Sweet and Maxwell).

Stone Sweet, Alec, and Brunell, T. L. (1998). “Constructing a Supranational Constitution: Dispute Resolution and Governance in the European Community,” *American Political Science Review*, 92: 63–81.

Weiler, Joseph H.H. (2000). *The Constitution of Europe: “Do the New Clothes Have an Emperor?” and Other Essays on European Integration* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Karen J. Alter (2001). *Establishing the Supremacy of European Law: The Making of an International Rule of Law in Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Conant, Lisa (2002). *Justice Contained: Law and Politics in the European Union*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

The European Parliament, the Council of Ministers, and Legislative Politics

George Tsebelis and Geoffrey Garrett (2000). “Legislative Politics in the European Union,” *European Union Politics*, 1: 9–36.

– – (2001). “The Institutional Foundations of Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism in the European Union,” *International Organization*, 55: 357–90.

Richard Corbett (2000). “Academic Modelling of the Codecision Procedure: A Practitioner’s Puzzled Reaction,” *European Union Politics*, 1: 373–78, and responses by Crombez et al.

Richard Corbett, Francis Jacobs, and Michael Shackleton (2005). *The European Parliament*, 6th edition (London: John Harper Publishing).

Amie Kreppel (2001). *The European Parliament and Supranational Party System: A Study in Institutional Development* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Simon Hix, Tapio Raunio, and Roger Scully, eds., “Fifty Years on: Research on the European Parliament,” special issue of the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (April 2003).

Clifford Carubba et al. (2003). “Selection Bias in the Use of Roll-Call Votes to Study Legislative Behavior,” EPRG Working Paper No. 11, available on-line at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/eprg/working-papers.htm>.

Simon Hix, Abdul Noury and Gerard Roland (2005). “Power to the Parties: Cohesion and Competition in the European Parliament, 1979-2001,” *British Journal of Political Science* 35(2), 209-234

European Parliament Research Group Working Papers Series, available on-line at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/eprg/working-papers.htm>.

Hayes-Renshaw, Fiona, and Helen Wallace (2006). *The Council of Ministers*, 2nd revised and updated edition (London: Palgrave).

Thomson, Robert, Frans N. Stokman, Christopher H. Achen and Thomas König (2006). *The European Union Decides* (New York: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

PART III: EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PUBLIC POLICIES

Week 7: The Internal Market: The Core of the European Union (October 10, 12)

Required Readings

* Alasdair R. Young, "The Single Market," Chapter 4 in Wallace, Wallace, and Pollack, *Policy-Making in the European Union*, pp. 93-112.

* Stephen Wilks, "Competition Policy," Chapter 5 in Wallace, Wallace, and Pollack, *Policy-Making in the European Union*, pp. 113-140.

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 8, "Regulation of the Single Market," pp. 235-251.

Study Question

1. We all know, by now, that the European Union is first and foremost an "internal market" linking together the 25 member states of the EU. But what specifically is an internal market? How has the EU gone about *creating* such a market? And to what extent can we really speak about the European Union as a single market like the United States?

Recommended Readings

John Pinder (1968). "Positive Integration and Negative Integration: Some Problems of Economic Union in the EEC," *The World Today*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 88-110.

Alan Dashwood (1983). "Hastening Slowly: The Community's Path Towards Harmonization," in Wallace, Wallace, and Webb, eds., *Policy-Making in the European Community*, pp. 173-212.

Jacques Pelkmans and Alan Winters with Helen Wallace (1988). *Europe's Domestic Market* (New York: Routledge).

Giandomenico Majone (1996). *Regulating Europe* (New York: Routledge).

Kenneth A. Armstrong and Simon J. Bulmer (1998). *The Governance of the Single European Market* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Alasdair Young and Helen Wallace, *Regulatory Politics in the Enlarging European Union: Weighing Civic and Producer Interests* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Michelle Egan (2001). *Constructing a European Market: Standards, Regulations and Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Walter Mattli, ed. (2001). "The Politics and Economics of International Standards Setting," special issue of *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (June).

Lee McGowan and Stephen Wilks (1995). "The First Supranational Policy in the European Union:

Competition Policy,” *European Journal of Political Research*, 28: 141–69.

Michelle Cini and Lee McGowan (1998). *Competition Policy in the European Union* (New York: St. Martin’s Press).

Jonathan Faull and Ali Nikpay (1999). *The EC Law of Competition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Week 8: Flanking the Internal Market: Expenditure Policies, and Justice and Home Affairs (Oct. 17, 19)

Required Readings

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 9, “Expenditure Policies,” pp. 271-308.

* Wallace, Wallace, and Pollack *Policy-Making in the European Union*, read **at least one** of the following according to your interests:

- chapter 7 (“The Common Agricultural Policy,” by Elmar Rieger);
- chapter 8 (“The Budget,” by Brigid Laffan and Johannes Lindner);
- chapter 9 (“Cohesion and the Structural Funds,” by David Allen);
- chapter 14 (“Fisheries Policy” by Christiane Lequesne)

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 11, “Citizen Freedom and Security Policies,” pp. 344-373.

* Sandra Lavenex and William Wallace, “Justice and Home Affairs,” chapter 18 in Wallace, Wallace, and Pollack, *Policy-Making in the European Union*.

Study Questions (Answer only one)

1. The European Union is often characterized as a “regulatory state,” with Brussels active in promulgating regulations but having a relatively small budget worth only about 1.27 percent of EU gross domestic product. Still, the Union *does* have a budget, and it spends part of this budget redistributing funds among EU member states, regions, and groups of citizens. In a short essay, describe how the EU spends its annual budget, and who benefits (and who loses) from the EU’s redistribution of funds.
2. Starting in the 1970s, and accelerating in the 1990s into the current decade, the EU has created a “Justice and Home Affairs” policy seeking to coordinate issues like police and judicial affairs that until very recently were held closely by states as an integral part of national sovereignty. What, specifically, is Justice and Home Affairs policy about, and why have the EU member states moved to adopt such a policy over the past few decades?

Recommended Readings

Jeffrey J. Anderson (1990). “Skeptical Reflections on a Europe of Regions: Britain, Germany, and the ERDF,” *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 417-47.

Marks, Gary (1993). ‘Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC’, in Alan Cafruny and

Glenda Rosenthal (eds), *The State of the European Community 2: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Pollack, Mark A. (1995). "Regional Actors in an Intergovernmental Play: The Making and Implementation of EC Structural Policy," in Sonia Mazey and Carolyn Rhodes (eds), *The State of the European Union, 3: Building a European Polity* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner).

Hooghe, Liesbet (ed.) (1996). *Cohesion Policy and European Integration* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Laffan, Brigid (1997). *The Finances of the European Union* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

Bache, Ian (1998). *The Politics of European Union Regional Policy: Multi-Level Governance or Flexible Gatekeeping?* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Week 9: Economic and Monetary Union (October 24)

Required Readings

* Kathleen R. McNamara, "Economic and Monetary Union," chapter 6 in Wallace, Wallace and Pollack, *Policy-Making in the European Union*, pp. 141-160.

* Simon Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 10, "Economic and Monetary Union," pp. 309-343.

Study Questions

1. Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) is unquestionably one of the major steps forward in the process of European integration over the past decade. What *is* EMU? How, basically, does it work, and why do your authors believe that many of the EU's member states have been willing to give up their national currencies in favor of the Euro?
2. Both McNamara and Hix make the distinction between monetary and fiscal policy, noting that the former is centralized (for members) in the European Central Bank, while the latter is merely coordinated through instruments like the Stability and Growth Pact. In a short essay, (a) spell out the difference between monetary policy and fiscal policy and (b) discuss the problems that have cropped up as a result of having a single monetary policy but only a looser coordination of fiscal policies in the EU.

Recommended Readings

Peter Ludlow (1982). *The Making of the European Monetary System* (London: Butterworth).

Kenneth Dyson and Kevin Featherstone (1999). *The Road to Maastricht: Negotiating Economic and Monetary Union* (New York: Oxford University Press).

McNamara, Kathleen R. (1999). *The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in the European Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Barry Eichengreen and Jeffrey A. Frieden, eds. (2000). *The Political Economy of European Monetary Integration* (Boulder: Westview Press).

Paul De Grauwe (2003). *The Economics of Monetary Union* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Week 10: Social Europe? (Oct 26, 31, Nov 2)

Required Readings

Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, "The Making of a Polity: The Struggle over European Integration," in H. Kitschelt, P. Lange, G. Marks and J.D. Stephens, eds., *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

* Hix, *The Political System of the European Union*, chapter 8, "Regulation of the Single Market," pp. 245-270.

* Wallace, Wallace and Pollack, read *all* of the following chapters:

- Chapter 10, "Social Policy," by Stephan Leibfried
- Chapter 11, "Employment Policy," by Martin Rhodes
- Chapter 12, "Environmental Policy," by Andrea Lenschow

Sonia Mazey, Jo Shaw, Amy Elman and Mark Bell (2002). "EUSA Review Forum: Progressive Europe? Gender and Non-Discrimination in the EU," *EUSA Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pages 1-7, available on-line at: <http://www.eustudies.org/GenderForum.pdf>

Study Questions (Answer only one of the following questions)

1. During the 1990s, analysts like Wolfgang Streeck and Fritz Scharpf noticed a stark asymmetry in the European Union, which appeared to be eliminating national social regulations (some of which were a barrier to the free movement of goods, services, labor and capital) without the capacity to put in place new social regulations at the EU level. And other scholars, like Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, depicted European integration as a right-left struggle between the "neoliberalism" of a pure single market and the "regulated capitalism" of an EU with progressive, high-standard social and environmental policies. Based on your reading of existing EU social, employment, environmental and sexual equality policies, discuss which of these two visions seems to be winning out, on balance, in today's EU.
2. While the EU has adopted "hard" or binding regulations in some areas of social policy, in other areas the Union has opted instead for the "soft-law" approach of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), designed to coordinate national policies, establish benchmarks for best practice, and put "peer pressure" on member states to improve their own national policies. How does the OMC appear to be working in areas such as employment policy, where it has been tried? Is the OMC a creative means to move ahead with progressive policies, or an excuse for inaction, or somewhere in between?

Recommended Readings

Social Policy and the Open Method of Coordination

Paul Pierson and Stefan Leibfried, eds. (1995). *European Social Policy* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution).

Streeck, Wolfgang (1996). "Neo-Voluntarism: A New Social Policy Regime?" in Gary Marks, Fritz W. Scharpf, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Wolfgang Streeck, *Governance in the European Union* (Thousand Oaks, CA and London: SAGE).

Volker Eichener (1997). "Effective European Problem-Solving: Lessons from the Regulation of Occupational Safety and Environmental Protection," *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4: 591–608.

Martin Rhodes, Janine Goetschy, and Jim Mosher (2000) "The Lisbon European Council and the Future of European Governance," *ECSA Review*, 13/3: 2–7; available on-line at: <http://www.eustudies.org/lisbonforum.html>.

Dermott Hodson and Imelda Maher (2001). "The Open Method as a New Mode of Governance: The Case of Soft Economic Policy Co-ordination," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39: 719–46.

Fritz W. Scharpf (2002). "The European Social Model," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 645-70.

James S. Mosher and David M. Trubek (2003). "Alternative Approaches to Governance in the EU: EU Social Policy and the European Employment Strategy," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 41, No.1, pp. 63-88.

S. Borras and B. Greve, eds. (2004). "The Open Method of Coordination in the European Union," special issue of *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2004).

Jonathan Zeitlin and Philippe Pochet with L. Magnusson, eds., *The Open Method of Coordination in Action: The European Employment and Social Inclusion Strategies* (Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2005).

For an excellent bibliography of work on the Open Method of Coordination, see web page of The European Union Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, OMC Research Forum: <http://eucenter.wisc.edu/OMC/open12.html>.

Environmental Policy

Stanley P. Johnson and Guy Corcelle (1990). *Environmental Policy of the European Communities* (London: Graham & Trotman).

Christoph Knill and Andrea Lenschow, eds. (2000). *Implementing EU Environmental Policy: New Directions and Old Problems* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Zito, Anthony (2000). *Creating Environmental Policy in the European Union* (London: Macmillan).

John McCormick (2001). *Environmental Policy in the European Union* (New York: Palgrave).

Andrew Jordan, ed. (2002). *Environmental Policy in the European Union: Actors, Institutions and Processes* (London: Earthscan).

Andrea Lenschow (2003). *Environmental Policy Integration: Greening Sectoral Policies in Europe* (London: Earthscan Publications).

Gender

Ilona Ostner and Jane Lewis (1995). "Gender and the Evolution of European Social Policies," in Paul Pierson and Stephan Leibfried, eds., *European Social Policy*.

Catherine Hoskyns (1996). *Integrating Gender: Women, Law and Politics in the European Union* (London: Verso).

Ellis, Evelyn (1998). *European Community Sex Equality Law, 2nd edition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

R. Amy Elman, ed., *Sexual Politics in the European Union: The New Feminist Challenge* (Berghahn Books).

Rees, Teresa (1998). *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies* (New York: Routledge).

Mark A. Pollack and Emilie Hafner-Burton (2000). "Mainstreaming Gender in the European Union," *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7: 432–56.

Sonia Mazey, *Gender Mainstreaming in the EU* (London: Kogan Page, 2001).

PART IV: CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Week 11: “Europeanization” of National Politics; Enlargement and its Consequences (Nov. 7, 9)

Required Readings

Tanja A. Börzel and Thomas Risse, “Europeanization: The Domestic Impact of EU Politics,” chapter 25 in Jorgensen, Pollack and Rosamond, eds., *The Handbook of European Union Politics* (New York: Sage, forthcoming 2007).

* Ulrich Sedelmeier, “Eastern Enlargement,” chapter 16 in Wallace, Wallace, and Pollack, eds., *Policy-Making in the European Union*.

Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, “The Study of EU Enlargement: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Findings,” in Michelle Cini and Angela K. Bourne, *Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies*, pp. 96-116.

Study Question

1. What do we mean by “Europeanization,” according to Börzel and Risse? How might the EU create pressures for change inside the member states of the EU? Is there evidence that the EU really is resulting in changes in the EU’s various member states? If so, what do these changes look like?
2. What kinds of questions does the 2004 enlargement of the European Union pose for students of European integration, according to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier? What evidence do we see of “Europeanization” in the new member states of the EU, and what mechanisms seem to be driving the changes we see?

Recommended Readings

On Europeanization

Tanja A. Boerzel and Thomas Risse (2000). “When Europeanization Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change,” RSC Working Paper No. 2000/56, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, Florence. Available on-line at: http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/00_56.pdf.

Maria Green Cowles, James A. Caporaso, and Thomas Risse (2001). *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli, eds. (2003). *The Politics of Europeanization* (New York: Oxford University Press).

On Enlargement

Frank Schimmelfennig (2001). “The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union,” *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 47-80.

Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (2002). "Theorising EU Enlargement: Research Focus, Hypotheses, and the State of Research," *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(4): 500-528.

Andrew Moravcsik and Milada Vachudova (2002) "Bargaining Among Unequals: Enlargement and the Future of European Integration," *EUSA Review*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 1-3, available on-line at: <http://www.eustudies.org/MoravcsikVachudovaEssay.pdf>.

Jacoby, Wade (2004). *The Enlargement of the European Union: Ordering from the Menu in Central Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Vachudova, Milada Anna (2005). *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, eds., *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).

Week 12: The Democratic Deficit, the Constitution, and the Current Crisis (Nov. 14, 21; no class the 16th)

Required Readings

Michael Th. Greven. (2000). "Can the European Union Finally Become a Democracy?" in Michael Greven and Louis Pauly (eds), *Democracy Beyond the State? The European Dilemma and the Emerging World Order* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield).

Andrew Moravcsik, "In Defense of the Democratic Deficit: Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (November 2002), pp. 603-624.

Andreas Follesdal and Simon Hix, "Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik," *European Governance Papers*, No. C-05-02.

Re-read Dinan, *Ever Closer Union*, pp. 170-182 (brief historical discussion of the Treaty of Nice, the Convention, and the Constitutional Treaty).

European Commission, *Summary of the Constitutional Treaty*, 28 June 2004, accessed at <http://europa.eu.int/constitution>.

Alberta Sbragia, et al., "Symposium: The EU Constitution? RIP?" *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (April 2006), pp. 237-72, essays by Sbragia, Hooghe and Marks, Aarts and van der Kolk, and Milner.

Visit *euobserver* page on the Constitution, at: <http://euobserver.com/18>.

Study Questions

1. Beginning in the late 1980s, critics of the European Union noted that the EU had begun to take an increasing number decisions that directly affected the lives of European citizens, yet these decisions were generally taken by officials that were at best indirectly accountable to the people –

a problem that became popular known as the EU's "democratic deficit." What, according to Greven, are the fundamental causes of this deficit, and why is it unlikely to be fixed in the near future? Why, by contrast, does Andrew Moravcsik argue that the EU is not "broken" (from a democratic perspective) and doesn't require fixing? Why, finally, do Follesdal and Hix believe that the democratic deficit is more serious than Moravcsik (and another analyst, Giandomenico Majone) thinks, and what do they recommend as to fix the problem? Which view do you find most convincing, and why?

2. During the first half of this decade, a European "Convention" created a draft Constitution for the Union, which was in turn amended by the member governments into a "Constitutional Treaty" for ratification by each of the 25 member states. As is well known, however, the French and Dutch electorates both rejected the Constitutional Treaty, plunging the EU into a "constitutional crisis" from which it has yet to emerge. In a brief essay, consider the following three questions: (a) What, in essence, does the Constitutional Treaty say? (b) Why has it proven so difficult to ratify this Treaty? And (c) what options do the members of the EU have regarding the Constitutional Treaty from here?

Recommended Readings

The Democratic Deficit

Fritz W. Scharpf (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Larry Siedentop (2000). *Democracy in Europe* (Hammondsworth: Penguin).

Johan P. Olsen, Alberta Sbragia and Fritz W. Scharpf (2002). Symposium: "Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?" *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 310-24.

The Treaty of Nice (background to the Convention/Constitution)

David Galloway (2001). *The Treaty of Nice and Beyond: Realities and Illusions of Power in the EU* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Peter Ludlow, George Ross, Eric Philippart, Sophie Meunier, Kalypso Nicolaidis, Grainne de Burca and Bruno de Witte (2001). "Analyzing the Treaty of Nice," *EUSA Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 311, accessible on-line at <http://www.eustudies.org/NiceTreatyForum.html>.

Wolfgang Wessels (2001). "Nice Results: The Millennium IGC in the EU's Evolution," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 197-219.

George Tsebelis and Xenophon Yataganas (2002). "Veto Players and Decision-Making in the EU After Nice: Policy Stability and Bureaucratic/Judicial Discretion," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 283-307.

The Convention and the Constitutional Treaty

Joseph H.H. Weiler, "A Constitution for Europe? Some Hard Choices," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (2002), pp. 563-580.

Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe, available—with much other supporting documentation, at the website of the European Convention: <http://european-convention.eu.int>. Read Part I, esp. Articles I-1 to I-29, and skim the index (at the end of the document!).

Peter Norman, *The Accidental Constitution: The Story of the European Convention* (Brussels: Eurocomment, 2003).

Week 13: Europe and the World (Nov 28, 30)

Required Readings

- * Wallace, Wallace and Pollack, *Policy-Making in the European Union*
 - Chapter 15, “Trade Policy,” by Stephen Woolcock
 - Chapter 17, “Foreign and Security Policy,” by William Wallace

A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy, Brussels, 12 December 2003.

Additional readings on foreign policy, trade policy, and transatlantic relations to be distributed in class.

Study Questions

1. Since the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957, the European Commission has represented the member states of the Union on trade issues vis-à-vis the rest of the world, negotiating the various rounds of the World Trade Organization as well as other bilateral agreements with individual states or groups of states. Throughout the history of the EU, third parties feared a protectionist “Fortress Europe,” while other analysts in France and elsewhere have feared that the Commission would pursue a neoliberal free-trade agenda with the rest of the world. In a short essay, describe the Commission’s role in international trade policy: What does the Commission do? What kinds of trade policy has it sought to implement? And how effective has it been?
2. Outside the trade arena, William Wallace points out, the EU has pursued a “painful path from shadow to substance” over the past three decades. What does the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy look like today? What have been its strengths and its successes, and what have been its weaknesses and failures?

Recommended Readings

Trade and Economic Policy

Sophie Meunier, *Trading Voices: The European Union in International Commercial Negotiations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Common Foreign and Security Policy

Fraser Cameron, *Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

Ian Manners, "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2002), pp. 235-58.

Michael E. Smith, *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy: The Institutions of Cooperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, eds., *International Relations and the European Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

John Vogler and Charlotte Bretherton, *The European Union as a Global Actor*, 2nd edition (New York: Routledge, 2006)

Transatlantic Relations

John Peterson (1996). *Europe and America: The Prospects for Partnership* (2nd edition, London: Routledge).

Mark A. Pollack and Gregory C. Shaffer, eds. (2001). *Transatlantic Governance in the Global Economy* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).

Eric Philippart and Pascaline Winand, eds. (2001). *Ever-Closer Partnership: Policy-Making in US/EU Relations* (Brussels: PIE-Peter Lang).

Daalder, Ivo (2001). "Are the United States and Europe Heading for Divorce?" *International Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 553-67.

William Wallace (2001). "Europe, the Necessary Partner," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp. 16-34.

Mark A. Pollack and Gregory C. Shaffer, eds., *Transatlantic Governance in the Global Economy* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001).

Robert Kagan, *Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order* (New York: Random House, 2003).

John Peterson and Mark A. Pollack, eds., *Europe, America, Bush: Transatlantic Relations in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Routledge).

Andrew Moravcsik (2003). "Striking a Transatlantic Bargain," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2003.

P. Gordon and J. Shapiro, *Allies at War: America, Europe and the Crisis over Iraq* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2004).

Week 14: Wrap-up and Review (Dec. 5)