

# INRL20160: The Politics of the EU 2019-2020

Dr. James P. Cross

12 weeks - 24 hours of lectures

# Introduction

This course draws on a range of political science research on European integration and European Union politics to analyse the development of the EU and how it operates today. The course addresses one of the most important questions in the study of European politics and international organisations: Why did a diverse group of states construct what is currently the world's most extensive example of international integration? The course provides an extensive overview of the contemporary EU, including its institutions and policymaking processes using approaches from modern political science. We will assess how the EU is coping with economic and political challenges to its prosperity and legitimacy. By the end of the module, students will have a thorough grounding in EU politics and the manner in which EU institutions function and cooperate to make policy.

## Contact details and office hours

If you have any questions about the course, please consult the syllabus before contacting module instructors.

### Points of contact with module instructors

- **Email:** Please put the course code (INRL20160) in subject line of all correspondences.

**Lecturer** - James Cross: [james.cross@ucd.ie](mailto:james.cross@ucd.ie)

**Teaching assistant** - Natalia Umansky Capasa: [natalia.umansky@ucdconnect.ie](mailto:natalia.umansky@ucdconnect.ie)

- **Office hours:** If your question remains unanswered via email, office hours on weeks when lectures takes place are available by appointment.

## Learning Outcomes

### Knowledge and Understanding

Following this course students will develop a range of important transferable skills.

### Substantive knowledge

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Understand and apply the major theories of European integration.
- Understand the contemporary politics of European integration.
- Display knowledge of the objectives and functioning of key EU institutions and policies.
- Critically assess the successes and failures of EU policies.

## Skills (Intellectual and Transferable)

The lectures will encourage you to:

- Listen carefully and critically to orally-presented argument
- Develop selective and efficient note-taking methods
- Make links between material presented at different times, on different issues

The written work in the course (blog-post assignment and examination) will require you to:

- Select relevant material from lectures, literature, news sources, and the web
- Understand, analyse and assess that material
- Produce a sustained, structured and informed answer
- Write in a concise and cogent style

## Assessment

### End of year exam

There will be a formal **two-hour examination** at the end of the semester as scheduled by the examination office. This examination will constitute 80% of your final mark. Example exams demonstrating the structure and requirements of the end of year exam will be distributed in due course.

There will be **8 questions** on the exam and you have to **answer 2** of them.

### Blog-post assignment

In addition to the end of year exam, you will be required to submit a blog-post assignment. The blog-post assignments are intended to assess your substantive knowledge of European integration and apply the insights you have gained from the course to current issues facing the EU and European integration. Good blog posts should show consistency in argument, clear structure, simple and direct writing, good punctuation and evidence of wide reading. The relatively short length of the post means that students must prioritise what they include in their text. They need to think carefully about what elements of their argument need to be developed and what elements can be given less attention. You should endeavour to include graphs, data, and existing research findings in the academic literature, with accurate referencing where appropriate. Your answers should demonstrate your ability to:

- Identify important, relevant and recent developments in European integration.
- Identify the debates and academic authors in the discipline that address these developments
- Understand and apply the main theoretical approaches covered in the course to analyse EU politics

- Critically assess these approaches by drawing on the secondary literature on European integration as well as empirical evidence and data

To aid you in preparing your assignment, we will provide 2 lectures on best practice and writing skills. The lectures are aimed at helping you with your assignment and will revolve around the development of a relevant question and framing a concise argument to answer your chosen question. These lectures will be held on **Monday 27th January** and **Monday 3rd February** in the regular room and time of the normal lecture.

Following this, writing groups shall be organised in Week 4 and 5 so that your idea can be workshopped and developed under the tutorage of Natalia Umansky, the module teaching assistant. You are required to sign up to a workshop date via Brightspace at the start of the module.

Prior to the reading groups, you will be required to submit a **250 word outline** of your blog post. This should include the question, and rationale behind the question, and your main line of argument, which at this early stage will be in a basic form. This outline will be provided to two other students who will be required to provide feedback on the question (such as, is it leading, loaded, or too wide); the argument, and the feasibility of the overall claim to be argued in the 1,000 words of the blog post. The date for these exercises and the dates of the reading groups will be provided in due course. The 250 word outline will be submitted via Brightspace ahead of the workshops.

The following guidelines should be adhered to when preparing your final assignment submission:

- The text should be *strictly* under **1000 words**.
- This 1000 words **word count does not include the bibliography**.
- This blog-post assignment will constitute **20% of your final mark** in this module.
- Your blog-post assignment should be submitted no later than **5 p.m. on 6th March 2019**.
- You will be required to submit a **PDF copy of your assignment electronically via Brightspace**. Google how to do this if you do not know how to do so already.
- You will also have to submit a declaration of authorship form via Brightspace, which can be found here: <https://www.ucd.ie/spire/t4media/School%20Declaration%20of%20Authorship%20form%202019%20Web.pdf>
- **No hard copy is required.**

A selection of the best blog posts shall be published (with the author's consent) on the Dublin European Institute's blog found at [www.europedebate.ie](http://www.europedebate.ie). This widely read and highly visible platform provides the opportunity for students to contribute to the public debate about European integration in a concrete manner to a national and international audience. It also allows students to publicly demonstrate their mastery of their chosen topic in a professional context, and as such represents a great opportunity to build a profile for future employers be they in academia, the public sector or the private sector.

Examples of excellent example blog posts to inspire you can be found at <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/euoppblog/> and [www.europedebate.ie](http://www.europedebate.ie). What you will notice about the blog posts on these sites is that they take insights gained from the political science

literature, and use these insights to make a concise argument about current issues in EU integration and policy making. Please consult and explore this webpage at length to get an idea of what is expected of you.

## Grade explanation

The various grades/classifications reflect the extent to which an answer displays essential features of each of these elements (and their relative weighting). At its simplest: the better the analysis, the wider the range of appropriate sources consulted, the greater the understanding of the materials read, the clearer the writing style, and the more structured the argument, the higher will be the mark.

The following provides an indicative outline of the criteria used by markers to award a particular grade/classification. If you are in any confusion about how to correctly approach referencing and bibliography issues, there are many good guides available online (Here for instance: <http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/Guide69.pdf>). Proper referencing is **ESSENTIAL** in a good assignment.

### Grade: A

#### *Excellent Performance*

A deep and systematic engagement with the assessment task, with consistently impressive demonstration of a comprehensive mastery of the subject matter, reflecting:

- A deep and broad knowledge and critical insight as well as extensive reading;
- A critical and comprehensive appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- An exceptional ability to organise, analyse and present arguments fluently and lucidly with a high level of critical analysis, amply supported by evidence, citation or quotation;
- A highly-developed capacity for original, creative and logical thinking
- An extensive and detailed knowledge of the subject matter
- A highly-developed ability to apply this knowledge to the task set
- Evidence of extensive background reading
- Clear, fluent, stimulating and original expression
- Excellent presentation (spelling, grammar, graphical) with minimal or no presentation errors
- Referencing style consistently executed in recognised style

## **Grade: B**

### *Very Good Performance*

A thorough and well organised response to the assessment task, demonstrating:

- A thorough familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Well-developed capacity to analyse issues, organise material, present arguments clearly and cogently well supported by evidence, citation or quotation;
- Some original insights and capacity for creative and logical thinking
- A broad knowledge of the subject matter
- Considerable strength in applying that knowledge to the task set
- Evidence of substantial background reading
- Clear and fluent expression
- Quality presentation with few presentation errors
- Referencing style for the most part consistently executed in recognised style

## **Grade: C**

### *Good Performance*

An intellectually competent and factually sound answer with, marked by:

- Evidence of a reasonable familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Good developed arguments, but more statements of ideas
- Arguments or statements adequately but not well supported by evidence, citation or quotation
- Some critical awareness and analytical qualities
- Some evidence of capacity for original and logical thinking
- Adequate but not complete knowledge of the subject matter
- Omission of some important subject matter or the appearance of several minor errors
- Capacity to apply knowledge appropriately to the task albeit with some errors
- Evidence of some background reading
- Clear expression with few areas of confusion
- Writing of sufficient quality to convey meaning but some lack of fluency and command of suitable vocabulary
- Good presentation with some presentation errors
- Referencing style executed in recognised style, but with some errors

## **Grade: D**

### *Satisfactory Performance*

An acceptable level of intellectual engagement with the assessment task showing:

- Some familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Mostly statements of ideas, with limited development of argument
- Limited use of evidence, citation or quotation
- Limited critical awareness displayed
- Limited evidence of capacity for original and logical thinking
- Basic grasp of subject matter, but somewhat lacking in focus and structure
- Main points covered but insufficient detail
- Some effort to apply knowledge to the task but only a basic capacity or understanding displayed
- Little or no evidence of background reading
- Several minor errors or one major error
- Satisfactory presentation with an acceptable level of presentation errors
- Referencing style inconsistent

## **Grade: D-**

### *Acceptable*

The minimum acceptable of intellectual engagement with the assessment task which:

- The minimum acceptable appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Ideas largely expressed as statements, with little or no developed or structured argument
- Minimum acceptable use of evidence, citation or quotation
- Little or no analysis or critical awareness displayed or is only partially successful
- Little or no demonstrated capacity for original and logical thinking
- Shows a basic grasp of subject matter but may be poorly focussed or badly structured or contain irrelevant material
- Has one major error and some minor errors
- Demonstrates the capacity to complete only moderately difficult tasks related to the subject material

- No evidence of background reading
- Displays the minimum acceptable standard of presentation (spelling, grammar, graphical)
- Referencing inconsistent with major errors

### **Grade: E**

#### *Fail (marginal)*

A factually sound answer with a partially successful, but not entirely acceptable, attempt to:

- Integrate factual knowledge into a broader literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework develop arguments
- Support ideas or arguments with evidence, citation or quotation
- Engages with the subject matter or problem set, despite major deficiencies in structure, relevance or focus
- Has two major error and some minor errors
- Demonstrates the capacity to complete only part of, or the simpler elements of, the task
- An incomplete or rushed answer e.g. the use of bullet points through part / all of answer
- Little or no referencing style evident

### **Grade: F**

#### *Fail (unacceptable)*

An unacceptable level of intellectual engagement with the assessment task, with:

- No appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- No developed or structured argument
- No use of evidence, citation or quotation
- No analysis or critical awareness displayed or is only partially successful
- No demonstrated capacity for original and logical thinking
- A failure to address the question resulting in a largely irrelevant answer or material of marginal relevance predominating
- A display of some knowledge of material relative to the question posed, but with very serious omissions / errors and/or major inaccuracies included in answer
- Solutions offered to a very limited portion of the problem set



- An answer unacceptably incomplete (e.g. for lack of time)
- A random and undisciplined development, layout or presentation
- Unacceptable standards of presentation, such as grammar, spelling or graphical presentation
- Evidence of substantial plagiarism
- No referencing style evident

### **Grade: G**

*Fail (wholly unacceptable)*

No intellectual engagement with the assessment task

- Complete failure to address the question resulting in an entirely irrelevant answer
- Little or no knowledge displayed relative to the question posed
- Little or no solution offered for the problem set
- Evidence of extensive plagiarism
- No referencing style evident

### **Grade: NG**

*No grade (no work was submitted by the student or student was absent from the assessment, or work submitted did not merit a grade).*

## **Extenuating circumstances**

In the case that a student will not be able to meet an assessment deadline or will be absent from the course for an extended period of time, and this is known **IN ADVANCE**, they should consult the UCD policies on extenuating circumstances found here:

<http://www.ucd.ie/registry/academicsecretariat/extc.htm>.

It is important that in such cases you make the issue known to the lecturer as soon as possible. The sooner that the lecturer is made aware of the situation, the more likely it is that you can be accommodated.

## **Late assignment submissions**

If a student submits an assignment late, the following penalties will be applied:

- Coursework received at any time within two weeks of the due date will be graded, but a penalty will apply.
  - Coursework submitted at any time up to one week after the due date will have the grade awarded reduced by two grade points (for example, from B- to C).

- Coursework submitted more than one week but up to two weeks after the due date will have the grade reduced by four grade points (for example, from B- to D+). Where a student finds they have missed a deadline for submission, they should be advised that they may use the remainder of the week to improve their submission without additional penalty.
- Coursework received more than two weeks after the due date will not be accepted.

## Plagiarism

The university policy on plagiarism can be found here:

[http://www.ucd.ie/registry/academicsecretariat/docs/plagiarism\\_po.pdf](http://www.ucd.ie/registry/academicsecretariat/docs/plagiarism_po.pdf)

Plagiarism is taken extremely seriously throughout the university and academia in general. The school has systems in place to detect plagiarism and these systems are fully implemented. You need to be very clear about what constitutes plagiarism and avoid it at all costs. The library has a good guide to help you avoid plagiarism that can be found here:

[http://www.ucd.ie/library/supporting\\_you/support\\_learning/plagiarism/](http://www.ucd.ie/library/supporting_you/support_learning/plagiarism/)

Any student caught plagiarising will be subject to penalties in accordance with university policy.

## Course reading

### Required readings:

The following texts shall be used extensively throughout the course, so it is recommended that they are purchased:

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. European Union Politics. Oxford University Press.
- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan. 3rd Ed.

### Recommended Readings

The following books provide a general overview of the topics that will be covered in this module.

- Wallace, H., Pollack, M.A. and Young, A.R. eds. 2015. Policy-making in the European Union. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bomberg, E., Peterson, J. and Corbett, R. 2012. The European Union: how does it work?. Oxford University Press.

- Bache, I., Bulmer, S., George, S. and Parker, O. 2014. Politics in the European Union. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Hix, S. 2013. What's Wrong with the Europe Union and How to Fix it. John Wiley & Sons.
- Majone, G. 2009. Dilemmas of European integration: the ambiguities and pitfalls of integration by stealth. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, J. and Shackleton, M. 2012. The institutions of the European Union. Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, R. 2011. Resolving controversy in the European Union: legislative decision-making before and after enlargement. Cambridge University Press.
- Wiener, A. and Diez, T. 2009. European integration theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

In addition to these readings, students should keep up to date on current European affairs by reading daily newspapers, or one of the many websites devoted to EU politics. This reading is essential as it will allow you to keep up to date with current affairs in the EU and identify potential blog post topics. These websites include the following:

- <http://www.euobserver.com>
- <http://europa.eu.int>
- <http://www.eupolitics.com>
- <http://www.ft.com>
- <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/>
- <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/>

## Brightspace

Please make sure you have access to the module in Brightspace as soon as possible. It is the student's responsibility to make sure that they are signed up to the module correctly and they know how to submit coursework through the appropriate Brightspace assignment tab. If you have any issues with Brightspace contact the Brightspace support people to resolve the issue.

Furthermore, module materials such as this syllabus and announcements made outside lectures shall be on Brightspace. As such, Brightspace is an important communication tool for the module.

# Detailed course programme

## Week 1

### Introduction and the history of European integration

#### Study questions

- What are the major challenges, threats, and opportunities facing the EU today? How do you think these issues will affect the EU and shape its future?
- What are the main milestones that the integration process in Europe went through?
- How has the European integration project developed over time and how has the policy remit of the EU evolved?

#### Key reading

- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 1.
- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. European Union Politics. Oxford University Press. Chapter 1-3.

#### Further reading

- Urwin, D.W. 2014. The community of Europe: A history of European integration since 1945. Routledge.
- Dinan, D. 2010. Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration. London: Palgrave Macmillan. Chapters 1-6.
- Marks, G. 2011. Europe and Its Empires: From Rome to the European Union. Journal of Common Market Studies 50(1), pp.1-20.
- Nugent, N. 2010. The Government and Politics of the European Union. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, Part 1: Chapters 1-7.
- Bache, I. and George, S. 2011. Politics in the European Union. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapters 5-11.
- Diebold, W. 1959. The Schuman Plan. New York: Praeger.
- Dougan, M. 2008. The Treaty of Lisbon 2007: Winning Minds not Hearts. Common Market Law Review 45, pp.617–703.
- Gray, M. and Stubb, A. 2001. Keynote Article: The Treaty of Nice–Negotiating a Poisoned Chalice?. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 39(s1), pp.5-23.
- Magnette, P. and Nicolaidis, K. 2004. The European Convention: bargaining in the shadow of rhetoric. West European Politics, 27(3), pp.381-404.
- Majone, G. 2006. The Common Sense of European Integration. Journal of European Public Policy 13(5), pp.607-626.
- Piris, J-C. 2010. The Lisbon Treaty: a legal and political analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Week 2 and Week 3

### Theories of European integration

#### Study questions

- Describe the main logic behind neofunctionalism as a theory of European integration. Can this theory successfully explain how we got to where we are now in terms of EU integration?
- Describe the main logic behind intergovernmentalism. Does this theory do a better job of explaining the European integration project than neofunctionalism?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of both theories of integration?
- What are the three different types of institutionalism? How do they differ from one another?
- How do institutionalist theories differ from the 'grand' theories of integration that went before?
- How successful are institutionalist theories at explaining EU politics?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Pérez-Solórzano Borragán, N. (eds.) 2019. *European Union Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapters 54-5
- Moravcsik, A. 1993. Preferences and Power in the European Community. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31(4), pp.473-524.
- Aspinwall, M. and Schneider, G. 2000. Same Menu, Separate Tables: The Institutional Turn in Political Science and the Study of European Integration. *European Journal of Political Research* 38, pp.1-36.

#### Further reading

- Hoffmann, S. 1966. Obstinate or obsolete? The fate of the nation-state and the case of Western Europe. *Daedalus*, pp.862-915.
- Haas, E.B. 1976. Turbulent Fields and the Theory of Regional Integration. *International Organization* 30, pp.173-212.
- Monnet, J. 1978. *Memoirs*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bache, I. and George, S. 2011. *Politics in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 1.
- Haas, E.B. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haas, E.B. 1961. International Integration: The European and Universal Process. *International Organization* 15(3), pp.366-92.
- Haas, E.B. 1975. *The Obsolescence of Regional Integration Theory*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies.

- Hooghe, L and Marks G. 2001. *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jupille, J. and Caporaso, J.A. 1999. Institutionalism and the European Union: Beyond Comparative Politics and International Relations. *Annual Review Political Science* 2, pp.429-44.
- Moravcsik, A. 1998. *The Choice For Europe: Social Purpose And State Power From Messina To Maastricht*. Cornell University Press, Chapter 1, 7.
- Nugent, N. 2010. *The Government and Politics of the European Union*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, Chapter 23.
- Pollack, M.A. 2003. *The Engines of European Integration: Delegation, Agency and Agenda Setting in the EU*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollock, M.A. 2005. Theorizing the EU: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance? *Annual Review Political Science*. 8, pp.357–98.
- Rosamond, B. 2000. *Theories of European Integration* London: MacMillan, Chapters 2 and 3.
- Sandholtz, W. And Sweet Stone, A. 1998. *European Integration and Supranational Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weiner, A. and Diez, T. 2009. *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2nd Edition).
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. 2009. A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1), pp.1-23.
- Pierson P. 1996., The path to European Integration: An Historical Institutional Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*. 29(2), pp.123-63.
- Tsebelis, G. and Garrett, G. 2001., The Institutional Foundations of Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism. *International Organization* 55(2), pp.357-90.
- Bickerton, C.J., Hodson, D. and Puetter, U. 2014. The new intergovernmentalism: European integration in the post-Maastricht era. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53(4), pp.703–22.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2015a. What’s the news in ‘new intergovernmentalism’? A critique of Bickerton, Hodson and Puetter. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 53(4), pp.723–30.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2015. Liberal intergovernmentalism and the euro area crisis. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(2), pp.177-195.
- Puetter, U. 2016. The centrality of consensus and deliberation in contemporary EU politics and the new intergovernmentalism. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(5), pp.601-615.

- Puetter, U. and Fabbrini, S. 2016. Catalysts of integration—the role of core intergovernmental forums in EU politics. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(5), pp.633-642.
- Kleine, M., and Pollack, M. 2018. Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Its Critics. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1493–1509.
- Moravcsik, A. 2018. Preferences, Power and Institutions in 21st-century Europe. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1648-1674.
- Meunier, S., and Vachudova, M. A. 2018. Liberal Intergovernmentalism, Illiberalism and the Potential Superpower of the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1631–1647.
- Hix, S. 2018. When Optimism Fails: Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Citizen Representation. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1595–1613.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2018. Liberal Intergovernmentalism and the Crises of the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1578–1594.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2018. European integration (theory) in times of crisis. A comparison of the Euro and Schengen crises, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(7), pp.969-989
- Schmidt, V. A. 2018. Rethinking EU Governance: From Old to New Approaches to Who Steers Integration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1544–1561.
- Naurin, D. 2018. Liberal Intergovernmentalism in the Councils of the EU: A Baseline Theory?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1526–1543.
- McNamara, K. R. 2018. Authority Under Construction: The European Union in Comparative Political Perspective. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.1510–1525.
- Jones, E. 2018. Towards a theory of disintegration, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(3), pp.440-451.

## **Week 4**

### **Executive politics and writing workshops**

#### **Study questions**

- How is the European Council structured? What strengths and weaknesses arise from this structure in terms of its ability to influence the direction of the EU?
- How is the European Commission structured? How does it fit into the institutional structure of the EU?
- Does the institutional structure of the Commission help or hinder its ability to make policy?
- What roles do the European Council and Commission play in the political system of the EU? How do their roles differ?

- Explain principle-agent theory. Does this theory successfully describe the sources of Commission power and influence in EU politics?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. *European Union Politics*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 10, Chapter 11 (part about European Council)
- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. *The political system of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 2.
- Pollack, M. A. 1997. Delegation, Agency, and Agenda Setting in the European Community. *International Organization* 51(1), pp.99–134.

#### Further reading

- Rauh, C. 2019. EU politicization and policy initiatives of the European Commission: the case of consumer policy, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(3), pp.344-365
- Delreux, T. and Adriaensen, J. eds., 2017. *The Principal Agent Model and the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Delreux, T. and Adriaensen, J. 2017. Twenty years of principal-agent research in EU politics: how to cope with complexity?. *European Political Science*, pp.1-18.
- Conceição-Heldt, E. 2010. Who controls whom? Dynamics of power delegation and agency losses in EU trade politics. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(4), pp.1107-1126.
- Nugent, N. and Rhinard, M. 2016. Is the European Commission Really in Decline?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 54(5), pp.1199-1215.
- Brown, S.A. 2016. The Commission and the Crisis: Chief Loser or Unexpected Winner?. In *The European Commission and Europe's Democratic Process*, pp.69-78. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Bauer, M.W. and Becker S. 2014. The unexpected winner of the crisis: the European Commission's strengthened role in economic governance. *Journal of European Integration*. 36(3), pp.213–29.
- da Conceição-Heldt, E. 2016. Why the European Commission is not the “unexpected winner” of the Euro crisis: A comment on Bauer and Becker. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(1), pp.95-100.
- Bauer, M.W. and Becker, S. 2016. Absolute Gains Are Still Gains: Why the European Commission Is a Winner of the Crisis, and Unexpectedly So. A Rejoinder to Eugénia da Conceição-Heldt. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(1), pp.101-106.
- Fabbrini, S. and Puetter, U. 2016. Integration without supranationalisation: studying the lead roles of the European Council and the Council in post-Lisbon EU politics. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(5), pp.481-495.



- Bailer, S. 2014. An Agent Dependent on the EU Member States? The Determinants of the European Commission's Legislative Success in the European Union, *Journal of European Integration*, 36(1), pp.37-53.
- Egeberg, M. 2006. Executive Politics as Usual: Role Behaviour and Conflict Dimensions in the College of European Commissioners. *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(1), pp.1-15.
- Franchino, F. 2009. Experience and the Distribution of Portfolio Payoffs in the European Commission. *European Journal of Political Research* 48(1), pp.1–30.
- Franchino, F. 1999. Delegating Powers in the European Community. *British Journal of Political Science* 34(2), pp.269–93.
- Dinan, D. 2010. *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, Chapters 7-8.
- Bunse, S. 2009. *Small States and EU Governance: Leadership through the Council Presidency*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cini, M. 1996. *The European Commission: Leadership, Organisation and Culture in the EU Administration*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Franchino, F. 2009. Experience and the distribution of portfolio payoffs in the European Commission. *European Journal of Political Research* 48(1), pp.1-30.
- Häge, F.M. 2008. Who Decides in the Council of the European Union? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46(3), pp.533-58.
- Häge, F.M. 2016. Political attention in the Council of the European Union: A new dataset of working party meetings, 1995–2014. *European Union Politics* 17(4), pp.683–703
- Hayes-Renshaw, F. and Wallace H. 2006. *The Council of Ministers*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hooghe, L. 1999. Images of Europe: Orientations to European Integration Among Senior Officials of the Commission. *British Journal of Political Science* 29:345–367.
- Hooghe, L. 2002. *The European Commission and the Integration of Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooghe, L. 2005. Several Roads Lead to International Norms, But Few via International Socialization: A Case Study of the European Commission. *International Organization* 59: 861-898.
- Rasmussen, A. 2007. Challenging the Commission's Right of Initiative? Conditions for Institutional Change and Stability. *West European Politics* 30(2), pp.244-64.
- Tallberg, J. 2008. Bargaining Power in the European Council. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46(3), pp.685-708.
- Thomson, R. 2008. National Actors in International Organizations: The Case of the European Commission. *Comparative Political Studies* 41: 169-92.

- Tsebelis, G. and Garrett G. 2000. Legislative Politics in the EU. *European Union Politics* 1, pp.9–36.
- Wallace, H., Pollock, M, and Young, A.R. 2010. Policy-Making in the European Union. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 4.
- Wonka, A. 2007. Technocratic and Independent? The Appointment of European Commissioners and its Policy Implications. *Journal of European Public Policy* 14(2), pp.169-89.
- Slapin, J.B. 2006. Who Is Powerful?: Examining Preferences and Testing Sources of Bargaining Strength at European Intergovernmental Conferences. *European Union Politics* 7 (1), pp.51–76.
- Hug, S, and König, T. 2002. In View of Ratification: Governmental Preferences and Domestic Constraints at the Amsterdam Intergovernmental Conference. *International Organization* 56 (02), pp.447–76.

## Week 5

### Legislative politics

#### Study questions

- Describe the different legislative procedures used in the EU. How do they differ from one another?
- Describe the internal structure of the Council of Ministers. How are legislative powers and influence distributed between 1) the member states in terms of voting power? and 2) between the different levels of negotiation within the Council?
- Describe the internal structure of the European Parliament. What are the main dimensions of political conflict in the EP? How stable are coalitions between the EP party groups?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. *European Union Politics*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 11 (part about Council of Ministers), Chapter 12, 16
- Hix, S. and Hoyland B. 2011. *The political system of the European Union*. Palgrave, Chapter 3.
- Hix, S., Noury, A. and Roland G. 2009. Voting Patterns and Alliance Formation in the European Parliament. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 364: 821-831.
- Cross, J.P. and Hermansson, H. 2017. Legislative amendments and informal politics in the European Union: A text reuse approach. *European Union Politics*, 18(4), pp.581-602.

#### Further reading

- Wratil, C. 2018. Modes of government responsiveness in the European Union: Evidence from Council negotiation positions. *European Union Politics*, 19(1), pp.52–74.
- Thomson, R. and Hosli, M. 2006. Who Has Power in the EU? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44(2), pp.391-417.
- Huhe, N., Naurin, D., and Thomson, R. 2018. The evolution of political networks: Evidence from the Council of the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 19(1), pp.25–51.
- Rasmussen, A. and Reh, C. 2013. The consequences of concluding codecision early: trilogues and intra-institutional bargaining success. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(7), pp.1006-1024.
- Rasmussen, A. 2011. Early conclusion in bicameral bargaining: Evidence from the co-decision legislative procedure of the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 12(1), pp.41-64.
- Rasmussen, A. 2008. The EU Conciliation Committee One or Several Principals?. *European Union Politics*, 9(1), pp.87-113.
- Rasmussen, A. 2012. Twenty Years of Co-decision Since Maastricht: Inter-and Intrainstitutional Implications. *Journal of European Integration*, 34(7), pp.735-751.
- Reh, C., Héritier, A., Bressanelli, E. and Koop, C. 2013. The informal politics of legislation explaining secluded decision making in the European Union. *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(9), pp.1112-1142.
- Mühlböck, M., & Rittberger, B. 2015. The Council, the European Parliament, and the paradox of inter-institutional cooperation. *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 19.
- Brandsma, G. J. 2015. Co-decision after Lisbon: The politics of informal trilogues in European Union lawmaking. *European Union Politics*, 16(2), pp.300-319
- Dinan, D. 2010. *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration* London: Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 9.
- Corbett, R., Jacobs, F. and Shackleton, M. 2005. *The European Parliament*. London: John Harper
- Costello, R. and Thomson, R. 2010. The Policy Impact of Leadership in Committees: Rapporteurs' Influence on the European Parliament's Opinions. *European Union Politics* 11(1), pp.1-26.
- Cross, J.P. 2013. Everyone's a winner (almost): Bargaining success in the Council of Ministers of the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 14(1), pp.70–94.
- Cross, J.P. 2012. Interventions and negotiation in the Council of Ministers of the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 13(1), pp.47–69.

- Hayes-Renshaw, F., Van Aken, W. and Wallace, H. 2006. When and Why the EU Council of Ministers Votes Explicitly. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44: 161-94.
- Hix, S., Noury, A. and Roland, G. 2007. *Democratic Politics in the European Parliament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1, 5, 6, 9.
- Judge, D. and Earnshaw, D. 2008. *The European Parliament*. London: Palgrave. (2nd ed.).
- König, T, Lindburg, B, Lechner, S. and Pohlmeier, W. 2007. Bicameral Conflict Resolution in the European Union: An Empirical Analysis of Conciliation Committee Bargains. *British Journal of Political Science* 37, pp.281-312.
- Kreppel, A. 2002. *The European Parliament and Supranational Party System: A Study in Institutional Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mattila, M. 2009. Roll Call Analysis of Voting in the EU Council of Ministers after the 2004 Enlargement. *European Journal of Political Research* 48, pp.840-57.
- McElroy, G. and Benoit, K. 2007. Party Groups and Policy Positions in the European Parliament. *Party Politics* 13, pp.5-28.
- McElroy, G. and Benoit, K. 2010. Party Policy and Group Affiliation in the European Parliament. *British Journal of Political Science* 40(2), pp.377-98.
- Naurin, D. and Lindahl, R. 2010. Out in the Cold? Flexible Integration and the Political Status of Euro Opt-Outs. *European Union Politics* 11(4), pp.485-509.
- Thomson, R. 2008. The Relative Power of Member States in the Council: Large and Small, Old and New. In Naurin, D. and Wallace, H. (eds.) *Unveiling the Council of the European Union: Games Governments Play in Brussels*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.238-60.
- Thomson, R. 2009. Actor Alignments in the European Union Before and After Enlargement. *European Journal of Political Research* 48, pp.756-81.
- Ringe, N. 2005. Policy Preference Formation in Legislative Politics: Structures, Actors, and Focal Points. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4), pp.731–746.

## **Week 6**

### **Judicial politics and compliance**

#### **Study questions**

- Describe the structure of the European Court of Justice and the different procedures the ECJ has at its disposal to enforce EU law?
- What role does the European Court of Justice play in the political system of the EU? What powers does it yield and what are the limits of these powers?

- What do we mean by the term ‘judicial activism’? Does the ECJ engage in judicial activism often? How have member states reacted to examples of judicial activism by the ECJ?
- What difficulties might arise when Member States transpose EU laws into national laws?
- We observe significant variation in the levels of compliance with EU law both between Member States and over time. What can explain this variation?
- Why might member states fail to comply with EU legislation? What incentives are involved in compliance and non-compliance?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. *European Union Politics*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 13.
- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. *The political system of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 4.
- Angelova, M., Dannwolf, T. and König, T. 2012. How Robust are Compliance Findings. *Journal of European Public Policy* 19(8), pp.1269-91.

#### Further reading

- Closa, C. 2018. The politics of guarding the Treaties: Commission scrutiny of rule of law compliance, *Journal of European Public Policy*
- Jaremba, U. and Mayoral, J.A. 2019. The Europeanization of national judiciaries: definitions, indicators and mechanisms, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(3), pp.386-406
- Peritz, L. 2018. Obstructing integration: Domestic politics and the European Court of Justice. *European Union Politics*, 19(3), pp.427–457.
- Hartlapp, M. 2018. Power Shifts via the Judicial Arena: How Annulments Cases between EU Institutions Shape Competence Allocation. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56: pp.1429–1445.
- Kleine, M. 2014. Informal Governance in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(2), pp.303-314.
- Zhelyazkova, A. and Yordanova, N. 2015. Signalling compliance: The link between notified EU directive implementation and infringement cases. *European Union Politics* 16(3), pp.408-428
- Carrubba, C.J., Gabel, M. and Hankla, C. 2008. Judicial behavior under political constraints: Evidence from the European Court of Justice. *American Political Science Review*, 102(04), pp.435-452.
- Sweet, A.S. and Brunell, T. 2012. The European Court of Justice, state noncompliance, and the politics of override. *American Political Science Review*, 106(01), pp.204-213.

- Alter, K.J. 2000. The European Union's legal system and domestic policy: spillover or backlash?. *International Organization*, 54(03), pp.489-518.
- Bache, I., George, S. and Bulmer, S. 2011. *Politics in the European Union* Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 23
- Chalmers, D., Davies, G. and Monti, G. 2010. *European Union Law*. Cambridge University Press, Chapter 4.
- Garrett, G. 1995. The Politics of Legal Integration in the European Union. *International Organization* 49(1), pp.171-81.
- Luetgert, B. and Dannwolf, T. 2009. Mixing Method: A Nested Analysis of EU Member State Transposition Patterns. *European Union Politics* 10/3, pp.307-34.
- Thomson, R. 2010. Opposition through the Back Door in the Transposition of EU Directives. *European Union Politics* 12, pp.337-57.
- Thomson, R., Torenvlied, R., and Arregui, J. 2007. The Paradox of Compliance: Infringements and Delays in Transposing European Union Directives. *British Journal of Political Science* 37, pp.685-709.
- König, T., and Mäder, L. 2013. Non-conformable, partial and conformable transposition: A competing risk analysis of the transposition process of directives in the EU15. *European Union Politics*, 14(1), pp.46-69.
- König, T. and Mäder, L. 2014. The Strategic Nature of Compliance: An Empirical Evaluation of Law Implementation in the Central Monitoring System of the European Union. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58, pp.246-263.
- Steunenberg, B. 2006. Turning Swift Policy-making into Deadlock and Delay National Policy Coordination and the Transposition of EU Directives. *European Union Politics*, 7(3), pp.293-319.

## Week 7

### Elections, referenda, and public opinion

#### Study questions

- How has public opinion towards the EU changed over time? What explains this variation?
- What different theories have attempted to explain public attitudes towards the EU? Which of these theories is most convincing and why?
- What do we mean when we describe the EP elections as second order in nature? Is this a fair description of EP elections at this point in the history of the EU?

#### Key reading

- Explore EUOPINIONS website: <http://eupinions.eu/de/home/>

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. *European Union Politics*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 15
- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. *The Political System of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan (3rd edition), Chapters 5-6.
- Boomgaarden, H.G., Schuck, A.R., Elenbaas, M. and De Vreese, C.H. 2011. Mapping EU attitudes: Conceptual and empirical dimensions of Euroscepticism and EU support. *European Union Politics*, 12(2), pp.241-266.
- Beach, D., Hansen, K., and Larsen, M. 2018. How Campaigns Enhance European Issues Voting During European Parliament Elections. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 6(4), pp.791-808.

#### Further reading

- Aldrich, A. S. 2018. National Political Parties and Career Paths to the European Parliament. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56: pp.1283–1304.
- Hix, S. and Marsh, M., 2007. Punishment or Protest? Understanding European Parliament Elections. *Journal of Politics* 69(2), pp.495-510.
- Vasilopoulou, S. and Talving, L. 2018. Opportunity or threat? Public attitudes towards EU freedom of movement. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-19.
- Rooduijn, M., 2015. The rise of the populist radical right in Western Europe. *European View*, 14(1), pp.3-11.
- Jeannet, A.M., 2018. Internal migration and public opinion about the European Union: a time series cross-sectional study. *Socio-Economic Review*.
- Kostadinova, P. and Giurcanu, M. 2018. Capturing the legislative priorities of transnational Europarties and the European Commission: A pledge approach, *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.363–379.
- Senninger, R. and Bischof, D. 2018. Working in unison: Political parties and policy issue transfer in the multilevel space, *European Union Politics*, 19(1), pp.140–162.
- Sorace, M. 2018. Legislative Participation in the EU: An analysis of questions, speeches, motions and declarations in the 7th European Parliament. *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.299–320.
- Frid-Nielsen, S. S. 2018. Human rights or security? Positions on asylum in European Parliament speeches. *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.344–362.
- Cavallaro, M., Flacher, D., and Zanetti, M. A. 2018. Radical right parties and European economic integration: Evidence from the seventh European Parliament. *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.321–343.
- Tuttnauer, O., 2018. If you can beat them, confront them: Party-level analysis of opposition behavior in European national parliaments. *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.278-298.

- Hernández, E. 2018. Democratic discontent and support for mainstream and challenger parties: Democratic protest voting. *European Union Politics*, 19(3) pp.458–480
- Schulte-Cloos, J. 2018. Do European Parliament elections foster challenger parties' success on the national level?. *European Union Politics*, p.1465116518773486.
- Anderson, C.J. and Hecht, J.D. 2018. The preference for Europe: Public opinion about European integration since 1952. *European Union Politics*, 19(4), pp.617-638.
- Beach, D., Hansen, K., and Larsen, M. 2018. How Campaigns Enhance European Issues Voting During European Parliament Elections. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 6(4), 791-808.
- Lefkofridi, Z. and Katsanidou, A. 2018. A Step Closer to a Transnational Party System? Competition and Coherence in the 2009 and 2014 European Parliament. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56: 1462–1482.
- Sorace, M. 2017. The European Union democratic deficit: Substantive representation in the European Parliament at the input stage. *European Union Politics*, p.1465116517741562.
- Nielsen, J.H. and Franklin, M.N. 2017. The 2014 European Parliament Elections: Still Second Order?. In *The Eurosceptic 2014 European Parliament Elections* (pp.1-16). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- McEvoy, C. 2016. The Role of Political Efficacy on Public Opinion in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(5), pp.1159-1174
- Hobolt, S.B. and de Vries, C.E. 2016. Public Support for European Integration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19, pp.413-432.
- Hobolt, S.B. 2016. The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), pp.1259-1277.
- Braun, D., Hutter, S. and Kersch, A. 2016. What type of Europe? The salience of polity and policy issues in European Parliament elections. *European Union Politics*, 17(4), pp.570-592.
- Baglioni, S. and Hurrelmann, A. 2016. The Eurozone crisis and citizen engagement in EU affairs. *West European Politics*, 39(1), pp.104-124.
- Oliver, T. 2016. European and international views of Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-8.
- Nielsen, J.H. 2016. Personality and Euroscepticism: The Impact of Personality on Attitudes Towards the EU. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. 54(5), pp.1175–1198.
- Smith, K.E. 2016. Left out in the cold: Brexit, the EU and the perils of Trump's world. LSE Brexit. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/68777/>.



- Hix, S., Hagemann, S. and Frantescu, D. 2016. Would Brexit matter? The UK's voting record in the Council and the European Parliament. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/66261/>.
- Chopin, T. and Lequesne, C. 2016. Differentiation as a double-edged sword: member states' practices and Brexit. *International Affairs*, 92(3), pp.531-545.
- Dagnis Jensen, M. and Snaith, H. 2016. When politics prevails: the political economy of a Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-9.
- Hobolt, S.B. and de Vries, C.E. 2016. Public Support for European Integration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19, pp.413-432.
- Hobolt, S. and Spoon, J. 2012. Motivating the European voter: parties, issues and campaigns in European Parliament elections. *European Journal of Political Research* 51(6), pp.701-727.
- Hobolt, Sara B. 2012. Citizen Satisfaction with Democracy in the European Union\*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50 (s1), pp.88-105.
- Armingeon, K, and B Ceka. 2014. The Loss of Trust in the European Union During the Great Recession Since 2007: the Role of Heuristics From the National Political System. *European Union Politics* 15 (1), pp.82-107.
- Ceka, B. 2013. The Perils of Political Competition: Explaining Participation and Trust in Political Parties in Eastern Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (12), pp.1610-35.
- Lefkofridi, Z. and Katsanidou, A. 2014. Multilevel representation in the European Parliament. *European Union Politics*, 15(1), pp.108-131.
- Kopecky, P. and Mudde, C. 2002. The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe. *European Union Politics*, 3(3), pp.297-326.
- Franklin, M. and Hobolt, S.B. 2011. The Legacy of Lethargy: How Elections for the European Parliament Depress Turnout. *Electoral Studies* 30, pp.67-76.
- Gabel, M. 1998. Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories. *Journal of Politics* 60(3), pp.333-354.
- Garry, J. and Tilley, J. 2009. The Macroeconomic Factors Conditioning the Impact of Identity on Attitudes towards the EU. *European Union Politics* 10(3), pp.361-379.
- Hellström, J. 2008. Who Leads, Who Follows? Re-examining the Party-Electorate Linkages on European Integration. *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(8), pp.1127-44.
- Hix, S. and Marsh, M. 2011. Second-order effects plus pan-European political swings: An analysis of European Parliament elections across time. *Electoral Studies* 30, pp.4-15.

- Hobolt, S.B. 2009. *Europe in Question: Referendums on European Integration*. Oxford University Press.
- Hobolt, S.B. 2012. Citizens satisfaction with democracy in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50 (1), pp.88-105.
- Hobolt, S.B., Spoon, J. and Tilley, J. 2009. A Vote Against Europe? Explaining Defection at the 1999 and 2004 European Parliament Elections. *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1), pp.93-115.
- Hobolt, S.B. and Wittrock, J. 2011. The second-order election model revisited: An experimental test of vote choices in European Parliament elections. *Electoral Studies* 30, pp.29–40.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. 2006. Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration. *European Union Politics* 6(4), pp.419–43.
- Steenbergen, M.R., Edwards, E.E. and de Vries, C.E. 2007. Who's Cueing Whom? Mass- Elite Linkages and the Future of European Integration. *European Union Politics* 8(1), pp.39-49.

## Week 8

### Brexit

#### Study questions

- What factors explain the outcome of the Brexit referendum vote?
- What factors explain the outcome of the Brexit negotiations between the UK and the EU?
- How has Ireland, a much smaller country than the UK, managed to have its views enshrined in the withdrawal agreement?
- How is Brexit (if it goes ahead) likely to affect EU decision-making?

#### Required Readings

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. *European Union Politics*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 27.
- Hobolt, S. B. 2016. The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), pp.1259-1277.
- Kirsch, W. 2016. Brexit and the Distribution of Power in the Council of the EU, *CEPS Commentaries*, pp.1-4.
- Springford, J. 2018. Theresa May's Irish trilemma. <https://www.cer.eu/insights/theresa-mays-irish-trilemma>.
- Jones, E. 2018. Four Things We Should Learn from Brexit, *Survival*, 60:6, pp.35-44.

#### Further reading

- Patel, O. & Reh, C. 2016. Brexit: The Consequences for the EU Political System, UCL Constitution Unit Briefing Paper, pp.1-5.
- Staal, K. 2016. Brexit Implications for Influence on EU Decision Making, The Stability of Regions, Culture, and Institutions VIVES Workshop, University of Leuven, Belgium, pp.1-6.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. 2016. Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash. HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-026. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2818659>.
- European Commission. 2019. Withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the EU. Available here: [https://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/uk\\_withdrawal\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/uk_withdrawal_en)
- Lavery, S., McDaniel, S. and Schmid, D., 2018. Finance fragmented? Frankfurt and Paris as European financial centres after Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-19.
- Jennings, W. and Lodge, M. 2018. Brexit, the tides and Canute: the fracturing politics of the British state, *Journal of European Public Policy*
- Qvortrup, M. 2016. Referendums on Membership and European Integration 1972–2015. *The Political Quarterly*, 87, pp.61-68.
- Henderson, A. , Jeffery, C. , Liñeira, R. , Scully, R. , Wincott, D. and Wyn Jones, R. 2016. England, Englishness and Brexit. *The Political Quarterly*, 87, pp.187-199.
- James, S. and Quaglia, L. 2018. The Brexit Negotiations and Financial Services: A Two-Level Game Analysis. *The Political Quarterly*, 89, pp.560-567.
- Renwick, A. , Allan, S. , Jennings, W. , McKee, R. , Russell, M. and Smith, G. 2018. What Kind of Brexit do Voters want? Lessons from the Citizens' Assembly on Brexit. *The Political Quarterly*, 89, pp.649-658.
- Laffan, B. 2018. Brexit: Re-opening Ireland's English Question. *The Political Quarterly*, 89, pp.568-575.
- Chen W, Los B, McCann P, Ortega-Argilés R, Thissen M, van Oort F. 2018. The continental divide? Economic exposure to Brexit in regions and countries on both sides of The Channel. *Papers in Regional Science*. 97, pp.25–54.
- Richardson, J. 2018. Brexit: The EU Policy-Making State Hits the Populist Buffers. *The Political Quarterly*, 89, pp.118-126.
- Richards, L. , Heath, A. and Carl, N. 2018. Red Lines and Compromises: Mapping Underlying Complexities of Brexit Preferences. *The Political Quarterly*, 89, pp.280-290.
- Hantzsche, A. , Kara, A. and Young, G. 2018. The Economic Effects of the UK Government's Proposed Brexit Deal. *The World Economy*, Accepted Author Manuscript.

- Gasiorrek, M. , Serwicka, I. and Smith, A. 2019. Which Manufacturing Industries and Sectors Are Most Vulnerable to Brexit?. *The World Economy*, Accepted Author Manuscript.
- Manners, I. 2018. Political Psychology of European Integration: The (Re)production of Identity and Difference in the Brexit Debate. *Political Psychology*, 39, pp.1213-1232.
- Warlouzet, L. 2018. Britain at the Centre of European Co-operation (1948–2016). *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.955–970.
- Dhingra, S., & Sampson, T. 2016. Life after BREXIT: What are the UK's options outside the European Union?. CEPBREXIT01. London School of Economics and Political Science, CEP, London, UK.
- Goodwin, M. J., & Heath, O. 2016. The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind: An Aggregate-level Analysis of the Result. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(3), pp.323-332.
- Grant, C. 2016. The Impact of Brexit on the EU, Centre for European Reform, blog post, 24 June 2016.
- Kierzenkowski, R., et al. 2016. The Economic Consequences of Brexit: A Taxing Decision, OECD Economic Policy Papers, No. 16, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jm01svdkf6k-en>.
- Kaufmann, E. 2016. It's NOT the economy, stupid: Brexit as a story of personal values. *British Politics and Policy at LSE*.
- Whitman, R. G. 2016. Brexit or Bremain: what future for the UK's European diplomatic strategy?. *International Affairs*, 92(3), pp.509-529.
- Ottaviano, G. I. P., Pessoa, J. P., Sampson, T., & Van Reenen, J. 2014. Brexit or Fixit? The trade and welfare effects of leaving the European Union.
- Oliver, T. 2016. European and international views of Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), pp.1321-1328.
- Menon, A., & Salter, J. P. 2016. Brexit: initial reflections. *International Affairs*, 92(6), pp.1297-1318.
- Jensen, M. D., & Snaith, H. 2016. When politics prevails: the political economy of a Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), pp.1302-1310.
- Oliver, T., & Williams, M. J. 2016. Special relationships in flux: Brexit and the future of the US—EU and US—UK relationships. *International Affairs*, 92(3), pp.547-567.

## Week 9

### Interest representation

#### Study questions

- What are interest groups and why do we study them in the EU context?
- Describe the different access point through which lobbyists attempt to influence EU policy making. Do the institutional structures of the Commission, EP, and Council aid or hinder lobbyists in their lobbying attempts?
- What different types of factors have been identified as influencing lobbying success in the EU?
- What attempts have been made to regulate EU lobbying? Have these attempts been successful?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. European Union Politics. Oxford University Press. Chapter 14.
- Hix, S. and Høyland, B. 2011. The political system of the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan. Chapter 7.
- Bouwen, P. 2004. Exchanging access goods for access: A comparative study of business lobbying in the European Union Institutions. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43: 337–369
- Dür, A., Bernhagen, P., and Marshall, D. 2015. Interest Group Success in the European Union When (and Why) Does Business Lose?. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(8), pp.951-983.

#### Further reading

- European Commission for Democracy Through Law (Venice Commission). 2013. Report on the Role of Extra-Institutional Actors in the Democratic System.
- Coen, D. 2007. Empirical and theoretical studies in EU lobbying. *Journal of European Public Policy* 14(3), pp.333-345.
- Marshall, D. 2010. Who to lobby and when: Institutional determinants of interest group strategies in European Parliament committees. *European Union Politics*, 11(4), pp.553-575.
- Bunea, A. 2018. Regulating European Union lobbying: in whose interest?. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-21.
- Flöthe, L. and Rasmussen, A., 2018. Public voices in the heavenly chorus? Group type bias and opinion representation. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-19.

- Judge, A. and Thomson, R., 2018. The responsiveness of legislative actors to stakeholders' demands in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-20.
- Wonka, A., De Bruycker, I., De Bièvre, D., Braun, C., and Beyers, J. 2018. Patterns of Conflict and Mobilization: Mapping Interest Group Activity in EU Legislative Policymaking. *Politics and Governance*, 6(3), 136-146.
- Hollman, M. and Murdoch, Z. 2018. Lobbying cycles in Brussels: Evidence from the rotating presidency of the Council of the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 19(4), pp.597-616.
- Røed, M., and Wøien Hansen, V. (2018) Explaining Participation Bias in the European Commission's Online Consultations: The Struggle for Policy Gain without too Much Pain. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56: 1446–1461.
- De Bruycker, I. 2016. Power and position: Which EU party groups do lobbyists prioritize and why? *Party Politics* 22(4), pp.552-562.
- van der Graaf, A., Otjes, S. and Rasmussen, A. 2016. Weapon of the weak? The social media landscape of interest groups. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(2), pp.120-135.
- De Bruycker, I. 2016. Pressure and Expertise: Explaining the Information Supply of Interest Groups in EU Legislative Lobbying. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 54(3), pp.599-616.
- Beyers, J., De Bruycker, I. and Baller, I. 2015. The alignment of parties and interest groups in EU legislative politics. A tale of two different worlds?. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4), pp.534-551.
- Klüver, H., Mahoney, C. and Opper, M. 2015. Framing in context: how interest groups employ framing to lobby the European Commission. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4), pp.481-498.
- Klüver, H. and Mahoney, C. 2015. Measuring interest group framing strategies in public policy debates. *Journal of Public Policy*, 35(02), pp.223-244.
- Eising, R., Rasch, D. and Rozbicka, P. 2015. Institutions, policies, and arguments: context and strategy in EU policy framing. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4), pp.516-533.
- Boräng, F. and Naurin, D. 2015. 'Try to see it my way!' Frame congruence between lobbyists and European Commission officials. *Journal of European Public Policy* 22(4), pp.499-515.
- Beyers, J., Bonafont, L. C., Dür, A., Eising, R., Fink-Hafner, D., Lowery, D., ... and Naurin, D. 2014. The INTEREURO project: Logic and structure. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 3(2), 126-140.
- Chari, R. Murphy, G. and Hogan, J. 2007. Regulating Lobbyists: A Comparative Analysis of the USA, Canada, Germany and the European Union, *The Political Quarterly*, 78(3), pp.422-438.

- Coen, D. 1998. The European business interest and the nation state: large-firm lobbying in the European Union and member states. *Journal of Public Policy*, 18(01), pp.75-100.
- Mahoney, C. and Baumgartner, F. 2008. Converging perspectives on interest group research in Europe and America. *West European Politics*, 31(6), pp.1253–1273.
- Beyers, J. 2008. Policy Issues, Organizational Format and the Political Strategies of Interest Organizations. *West European Politics* 31(6), pp.1188-1211.
- Beyers, J. and Kerremans, B. 2004. Bureaucrats, Politicians, and Societal Interests: How Is European Policy Making Politicized?" *Comparative Political Studies* 37(10), pp.1119-1150.
- Börzel, T. and Heard-Lauréote, K. 2009. Networks in EU Multi-level governance: Concepts and Contributions. *Journal of Public Policy* 29(2), pp.135-152.
- Coen, D and Richardson, J (eds) (2009) *Lobbying the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dür, A. 2008. Interest groups in the European Union: How Powerful are They?" *West European Politics* 31(6), pp.1212-1230.
- Eising, R. 2007. The access of business interests to EU institutions: towards elite pluralism? *Journal of European Public Policy* 14(3), pp.384-403.
- Eising, R. 2008. Interest Group in EU policymaking. *Living Reviews in European Governance* Vol. 3 (<http://europeangovernance.livingreviews.org/Articles/lreg-2008-4/>).
- Greenwood, J. 2007a. *Interest Representation in the European Union*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Greenwood, J. 2007b. Review Article: Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the EU. *British Journal of Political Science* 37: 333-35.
- Klüver, H. 2010. Measuring Interest Group Influence using Quantitative Text Analysis. *European Union Politics* 10(4), pp.535- 549.
- Mahoney, C. 2008. *Brussels versus the Beltway. Advocacy in the United States and the European Union*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Mahoney, C. 2007. Lobbying Success in the United State and the European Union. *Journal of Public Policy* 27(2), pp.35-56.
- Quittkat, C. 2011. The European Commission's Online Consultations: a Success Story? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49(3), pp.653-674.
- Skodvin, T., Gullberg, A.T., and Aakre, S. 2010. Target-group influence and political feasibility: the case of climate policy design in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(6), pp.854- 873.

## Week 10

### The Euro-Crisis and its aftermath

#### Study questions

- What are the origins of the Euro crisis?
- Do existing institutions have the capacity to solve the Euro problem?
- Is it possible to have a currency union without a fiscal union?
- What are the consequences of the Euro crisis for democracy in Europe?

#### Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. European Union Politics. Oxford University Press. Chapter 26.
- Copelovitch, M., Frieden, J. and Walter, S. 2016. The political economy of the euro crisis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(7), pp.811-840.
- Tarlea, S., Bailer, S. and Degner, H. 2019. Explaining Governmental Preferences on Economic and Monetary Union Reform. *European Union Politics* 20(1).
- Rodrik, D. 2018. How Democratic Is the Euro? Available here: <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/how-democratic-is-the-euro-by-dani-rodrik-2018-barrier=accesspaylog>.

#### Further readings

- Wren-Lewis, S. 2018. Should Eurozone central bankers keep quiet about fiscal policy? Available here: <https://mainlymacro.blogspot.com/2018/07/should-eurozone-central-bankers-keep-quiet-about-fiscal-policy.html?m=1>.
- Armingeon, K. and Cranmer, S. 2018. Position-taking in the Euro crisis. *Journal of European public policy*, 25(4), pp.546-566.
- Steinbach, A. 2018. EU economic governance after the crisis: revisiting the accountability shift in EU economic governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-19.
- Matthijs, M. and McNamara, K. 2015. The Europe crisis' theory effect: northern saints, southern sinners, and the demise of the Eurobond, *Journal of European Integration* 37(5), pp.229-45.
- Scharpf, F.W. 2011. Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy. pp.1-46.
- Kanthak, L. and Spies, D. C. 2018. Public support for European Union economic policies, *European Union Politics*, 19(1), pp.97-118.
- Degner, H. and Leuffen, D. 2018. Franco-German cooperation and the rescuing of the Eurozone. *European Union Politics*.



- Kanthak, L. and Spies, D. C. 2018. Public support for European Union economic policies. *European Union Politics*, 19(1), pp.97–118.
- Bauhr, M. and Charron, N. 2018. Why support International redistribution? Corruption and public support for aid in the eurozone. *European Union Politics*, 19(2), pp.233–254.
- Finke, D. and Bailer, S. 2018. Crisis bargaining in the European Union: Formal rules or market pressure? *European Union Politics*.
- Verdun, A. 2018. Institutional Architecture of the Euro Area. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, pp.74–84.
- Wasserfallen, F, Leuffen, D, and Kudrna, Z. 2019. Analysing European Union Decision-Making during the Eurozone Crisis with New Data. *European Union Politics* 20(1).
- Lehner, T. and Wasserfallen, F. 2019. Political Conflict in the Reform of the Eurozone. *European Union Politics* 20(1).
- Walter, S. 2016. Crisis politics in Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 49, pp.841–873.
- Camisã, I. 2015. Irrelevant player? The Commission’s role during the Eurozone crisis. *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 11.
- Bauer, MW. and Becker, S. 2014. The unexpected winner of the crisis: The European Commission’s strengthened role in economic governance. *Journal of European Integration* 36 pp.213–229.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2015. Liberal intergovernmentalism and the euro area crisis. *Journal of European Public Policy* 22 pp.177–195.
- Lundgren, M, Bailer, S, and Dellmuth, L.M. 2019. Bargaining Success in the Reform of the Eurozone. *European Union Politics* 20(1).
- Degner, H and Leuffen, D. 2019. Franco-German Cooperation and the Rescuing of the Eurozone. *European Union Politics* 20(1).
- Regan, A. 2015. The imbalance of capitalisms in the Eurozone: Can the north and south of Europe converge? *Comparative European Politics*.
- Kaiser, J. and Kleinen-von Königslöw, K. 2016. The Framing of the Euro Crisis in German and Spanish Online News Media between 2010 and 2014: Does a Common European Public Discourse Emerge?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*.
- Kaiser, J. and Kleinen-von Königslöw, K. 2016. Partisan journalism and the issue framing of the Euro crisis: Comparing political parallelism of German and Spanish online news. *Journalism*.
- Ioannou, D., Leblond, P. and Niemann, A. 2015. European integration and the crisis: practice and theory. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(2), pp.155-176.

- Braun, D. and Tausendpfund, M. 2014. The impact of the Euro Crisis on citizens' support for the European Union. *Journal of European Integration*, 36(3), pp.231-245.
- Schimmelfennig, F. 2014. European integration in the euro crisis: The limits of postfunctionalism. *Journal of European Integration*, 36(3), pp.321-337.
- Clements, B., Nanou, K. and Verney, S. 2014. 'We no longer love you, but we don't want to leave you': the Eurozone crisis and popular Euroscepticism in Greece. *Journal of European Integration*, 36(3), pp.247-265.
- Tosun, J., Wetzel, A. and Zapryanova, G. 2014. The EU in crisis: advancing the debate. *Journal of European Integration*, 36(3), pp.195-211.
- Buti, M. and Carnot, N. 2012. The EMU Debt Crisis: Early Lessons and Reforms\*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), pp.899-911.
- Vilpišauskas, R. 2013. Eurozone crisis and European integration: functional spillover, political spillback?. *Journal of European Integration*, 35(3), pp.361-373.
- De Grauwe, P. and Ji, Y. 2012. Mispricing of Sovereign Risk and Macroeconomic Stability in the Eurozone\*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), pp.866-880.
- Drudi, F., Durre, A. and Mongelli, F.P. 2012. The Interplay of Economic Reforms and Monetary Policy: The Case of the Eurozone. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), pp.881-898.
- Eijffinger, S.C.W. 2012. Rating Agencies: Role and Influence of Their Sovereign Credit Risk Assessment in the Eurozone\*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), pp.912-921.
- Verdun, A. 2012. Introduction to the Symposium: Economic and Monetary Union and the Crisis of the Eurozone. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), pp.863-865.
- Dawson, M. 2015. The Legal and Political Accountability Structure of 'Post-Crisis' EU Economic Governance. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(5), pp.976-993.

## **Week 11**

### **The EU's democratic deficit and EU transparency**

#### **Study questions**

- What is a democratic deficit? Does the EU suffer from a lack of democratic legitimacy? Should we hold the EU to the same ideals of democratic legitimacy as we do nation states?
- How transparent is the EU? How has this changed over time? Is increasing transparency a potential way in which to make the EU more democratic and legitimate?

## Key reading

- Cini, M. and Borragán, N.P.S. 2019. European Union Politics. Oxford University Press. Chapter 9.
- Follesdal, A. and Hix, S. 2006. Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44(3), pp.533-62.
- Moravcsik, A. 2008. The Myth of Europe's "Democratic Deficit". *Intereconomics: Journal of European Economic Policy* 43(6), pp.331-40.
- European Commission. 2019. A-Z Index of Euromyths 1992 to 2017. Read 2-3 examples from here: <https://blogs.ec.europa.eu/ECintheUK/euromyths-a-z-index/>
- Presidency of the Council of the European Union, 2001. Presidency Conclusions, European Council Meeting in Laeken (The Laeken Declaration). [https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/68827.pdf](https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/68827.pdf)
- Naurin, D. 2007. *Deliberation Behind Closed Doors. Transparency and Lobbying in the European Union*. Colchester: ECPR Press. Ch1-2.

## Further reading

- Brandsma, G.J. 2018. Transparency of EU informal trilogues through public feedback in the European Parliament: promise unfulfilled. *Journal of European Public Policy*, pp.1-20.
- Kreuder-Sonnen, C. 2018. Political secrecy in Europe: crisis management and crisis exploitation. *West European Politics*, 41(4), pp.958-980.
- Blatter, J., Schmid, S. D., and Blättler, A. C. (2017) Democratic Deficits in Europe: The Overlooked Exclusiveness of Nation-States and the Positive Role of the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55: 449–467.
- Karlsson, C., and Persson, T. 2018. The Alleged Opposition Deficit in European Union Politics: Myth or Reality?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56: 888–905.
- Bølstad, J. 2015. Dynamics of European integration: Public opinion in the core and periphery. *European Union Politics*, 16(1), pp.23-44.
- Crombez, C. 2003. The Democratic Deficit in the European Union: Much Ado about Nothing? *European Union Politics* 4, pp.101-20.
- Habermas, J. 2008. *Europe: The Faltering Project*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hix, S. 2013. *What's Wrong with the Europe Union and How to Fix it*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Majone, G. 2000. The Credibility Crisis of Community Regulation. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38(2), pp.273–302.

- Moravcsik, A. 2002. In Defence of the Democratic Deficit: Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(4), pp.603-24.
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Rittberger, B. 2007. *Debating the Democratic Legitimacy of the European Union*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Thomson, R. 2011. *Resolving Controversy in the EU*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 12. Free pre-publication version available at: <http://www.robertthomson.info/research/resolving-controversy-in-the-eu>
- Zweifel, T. D. 2002. Who is without sin cast the first stone: the EU's democratic deficit in comparison. *Journal of European Public Policy* 9(5), pp.812-840.
- Cross, J.P. 2013a. Striking a pose: transparency and position taking in the Council of the European Union. *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(3), pp.291–315.
- Cross, J.P. 2014. The seen and the unseen in legislative politics: Explaining censorship in the Council of Ministers of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(2), pp.268-285.
- de Fine Licht, J., Naurin, D., Esaiasson, P. and Gilljam, M. 2011. Does transparency generate legitimacy? An experimental study of procedure acceptance of open-and closed-door decision-making. *QoG Working Paper Series*, 2011(8), p.8.
- Levy, G. 2007. Decision making in committees: Transparency, reputation, and voting rules. *American Economic Review*, 97(1), pp.150–168.
- Lodge, J. 1994. Transparency and democratic legitimacy. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 32(3), pp.343–368.
- Settembri, P. 2005. Transparency and the EU Legislator: “Let He Who is Without Sin Cast the First Stone”. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(3), pp.637–654.
- Stasavage, D. 2006. Does transparency make a difference? The example of the European Council of Ministers. In *Proceedings-British Academy* 135, p.165. Oxford University Press Inc..
- Stasavage, D. 2004. Open-door or closed-door? Transparency in domestic and international bargaining. *International Organization*, 58(04), pp.667–703.

## Week 12

Revision and exam preparation