

UCM-course SSC 1009

European Integration

An Introduction

August-October 2017

Course coordinator:

Diane Fromage
Faculty of Law, Room C3.315
Phone: + 31 43 388 3188
Email : diane.fromage@Maastrichtuniversity.nl

Tutors:

Laura Dolmen
tba

Introduction

The aim of this course is to offer an introduction to European integration. Why was the European Union created and why does it still exist? How did it become what it is now? How does it function? And what are its prospects for the future?

Structure of the course and attendance

The course lasts 7 weeks. It consists of twelve tutorial meetings and six lectures. Attendance at the tutorial meetings is mandatory. In accordance with standard UCM-rules you will have to attend 85% of the meetings, which implies that you must attend at the least 10 of the 12 tutorial meetings. Students who do not meet attendance requirements will have to complete an additional assignment. Students who do not pass this additional assignment will not be able to pass the course.

The same does not hold true for the lectures, but students are strongly advised to attend, since the lectures contain additional information and guide the students through the course. The lectures offer a lot of information that is not included in either the reading materials or the tutorial meetings, yet could very well be in the final exam. Moreover, experience demonstrates that students who attend all lectures do far better in the exam than those who do not attend.

Educational aims

This interdisciplinary course seeks to provide students with a basic understanding of the notions of integration and dis-integration in the European context. It presents a political history of today's European Union. At the end the student should know the major (dis)continuities in the history of European integration during the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century, and be able to explain how the European Union functions.

Lectures

There are a total of six lectures. The lectures do not aim to explain what has already been discussed in the literature and/or the tutorial. Instead, they offer something additional. The first three lectures are devoted to what the European Union actually is, and how it functions. In the remaining three lectures, we dig deeper into some specific problems the European Union is facing, and its prospects for the future.

Tutorials

The tutorials and the assigned tasks follow a slightly different pattern. After briefly exploring the meaning of "Europe" (task 1), we explore the historical development of the European Union (tasks 2 – 8), before reflecting on its problems and prospects (tasks 9 – 11).

Literature

The literature for this course is compiled in a reader, containing various articles and chapters. So, for all purposes of clarity, there is not a single textbook that we use for this course. The reader will be made available in the form of an e-reader.

In addition, at the end of this manual students will also find a list of additional sources (books, articles, websites and multimedia) related in particular to the lectures, which can be of further use in tackling the different issues at best. Students are encouraged to find additional reading materials.

Examination

Written exam

The course will end with a written exam consisting of (probably) three essay questions, which may be subdivided in sub-questions. Everything we have covered in the course (lectures, tutorial meetings and literature) could be part of the written exam. The written exam constitutes 60% of your grade.

Paper

Somewhere in the second half of the course, students have to submit a paper of 2700 – 3500 words on a subject related to the content of the course. The exact date will be announced during the first lecture, and on EleUM. During the first week of the course a list of suggested topics will be posted on EleUM, from which students can choose. You may also come up with your own topic, but in that case you must check with your tutor whether it is a relevant and feasible topic. The list of suggested topics will also include a more detailed description of what is expected from you with regards to the paper, and there will be some advice too. The paper constitutes 40% of your grade.

Presentation

All students are expected to prepare and/or give a presentation in the 11th tutorial meeting. You will work in groups of 3-4 students, which will be assigned by the tutor in the first meeting. The content of the presentation can be found in this course book under Task 10. The form of the presentation (who presents, in what form) is more flexible, as long as the content is covered. When in doubt, please check with your tutor. Presentations should be around 10 minutes, after which there is time for questions from the rest of the group.

The presentation will not be graded. However, should the quality of the presentation be unacceptably low (e.g. obvious lack of effort), 0.5 points will be subtracted from your overall final grade (this applies to all members of the group). On the other hand, if your presentation is exceptionally good, all the members of the group will receive a bonus of 0.5 on their final grade.

Re-sit

In the unfortunate event of a failure to pass the course, students will be offered another opportunity in December or January. Students will have to retake the part of the evaluation they failed, i.e. either the paper or the exam or both.

Lectures

Lecture 1: Introduction to European integration

Lecture 2: The functioning of the EU

Lecture 3: The four freedoms

Lecture 4: The EU and the democratic disconnect

Lecture 5: Brexit

Lecture 6: The future of the EU

Tutorials

Task 1: The Idea of Europe

Traditionally, the European Union is presented as the product of the First and Second World Wars. Within only 30 years, Europe had been destroyed twice. Policy makers were confronted with the question of preventing a third war, and took the first steps towards European integration. This can be seen as a success story: Major wars have indeed been absent within the borders of an ever expanding and prosperous European Union.

However, while expanding in the East, Europe is losing territory in the West as a result of the British referendum. More importantly, it seems that Europe is losing the hearts and minds of the people living in Europe, as shown by the increasing appeal of anti-EU, “sovereignist” parties in many Member States.

This begs the question whether European unity and European democracy is really possible in the long run, if there is no such thing as a European people. While Europe was built on the idea of peace and prosperity, it seems that, in the words of German writer Günter Grass, “cultural identity has been neglected”.

But is there such a thing as a European identity? For centuries, this question has generated debate all across the continent (the limits of which are up for debate as well). While each country has its unique history, culture and identity, most historians agree that there is a “European experience” common to all the peoples of Europe. As always in history and politics, it is disputed, the experience depending on one’s viewpoint. For example, when the Constitutional Treaty for the European Union was drafted (2000 – 2004) many Member States of the EU (e.g. Italy, Poland) wished to include a reference to the Christian or Judeo-Christian heritage of Europe. From a French perspective, this was unacceptable, since it was contrary to the *laïcité*, that very European enlightened principle to separate religion and the state.

“I do not admit, that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America, or the black people of Australia, by the fact that a stronger race, a higher grade race has come in and taken its place”

Winston Churchill, 1937

“I’m sorry, Islam has no place in Slovakia. It is the duty of politicians to talk about these things very clearly and openly. I do not wish there were tens of thousands of Muslims”

Robert Fico, Prime-Minister of Slovakia, 2016

“We feel attached to the Christian concept of mankind, that is what defines us. Anyone who doesn't accept that is in the wrong place here.”

Angela Merkel, 2015

“Speaking of Turkey joining the European Union, let me tell you that Russia is way more European than Turkey”

Nicolas Sarkozy (former and perhaps future president of France), 2016

“We have made Italy. Now we must make Italians”
Massimo d'Azeglio, Italian Statesman, 1861

Literature

M. Heffernan (1998). *The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics*, UK: Routledge.
Introduction: geography and the meaning of Europe, **pp. 1-5**.

M. Heffernan (1998). *The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics*, UK: Routledge.
Europe: the historical geography of an idea, **pp. 9-48**.

M. Heffernan (1998). *The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics*, UK: Routledge.
Europe and its peoples: racial geopolitics, **pp. 81-94**.

N. Davies (2007). *Europe East and West*. UK: Pimlico. The Idea of Europe, **pp. 5 - 20**

Huffington Post (n.d.). *European identity: a crisis in the 21st century?*

Task 2: Keep the Germans Down, the Russians Out and Get the Americans In – The Birth of European Economic Community

After World War II, States in Western Europe faced formidable challenges. They had to rebuild the continent economically, develop some kind of protectionism *vis-à-vis* the Red Danger coming from the East and, last but not least, tackle the ‘German problem’. Prosperity and peace were the main objectives and to achieve these, integration rather than mere cooperation was necessary. While the political setting certainly was conducive to European integration, and some initial steps had already been taking prior to and during the Second World War, it appeared far from easy to create some kind of governmental system. As important as Marshall Aid, the WEU and NATO may have been, they did not provide the perfect response to the problems to be solved. A series of creative and determined thinkers developed ‘functionalist’ ideas for a new kind of supranational organizations, including the ECSC, the EDC and EEC, which set the train of European integration, at least for some countries, in motion.

Literature

M. Heffernan (1998). *The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics*, UK: Routledge. Europe reborn: the pan-Europa movement & Radical Regionalism, **pp. 125 - 131**

M. Heffernan (1998). *The Meaning of Europe: Geography and Geopolitics*, UK: Routledge. Resistance and the European idea, **pp. 175 - 178**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 5: Europe after the War, **pp. 81 – 91**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 6: The Schuman Plan for Coal and Steel, **pp. 91 – 103**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 7: The European Defence Community, the European Political Community, and the Road to the Rome Treaties, **pp. 104 – 115**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 8: The European Coal and Steel Community and Euratom, **pp. 116 – 123**

Winston Churchill (1946) Speech in Zürich, 19 September 1946
http://www.cvce.eu/obj/discours_de_winston_churchill_zurich_19_septembre_1946-fr-5da812de-3a20-4e2a-9cc1-7e0f90c8f97b.html

Robert Schuman (1950) The Schuman declaration, 9 May 1950

The Economist (2015). *Post-post-nationalist Germany: Strict order*. August 8th 2015, **pp. 1-3**

Task 3: De Gaulle and Euro-sclerosis

The adoption of a treaty establishing supranational structures is no guarantee for successful integration. The mere fact that supranational organizations are empowered to take decisions that are legally binding on Member States does not necessarily imply that Member States actually obey. De Gaulle had an entirely different vision on the European integration process than Monnet/Schuman and expressed his opposition to ‘Community Europe’ *inter alia* through his so-called ‘empty chair policy’. The subsequent Luxembourg Accords are often referred to as a “agreement to disagree”, but there is no denying that the Accords served above all De Gaulle’s interests and *de facto* reintroduced intergovernmental elements in the Community’s *de iure* supranational structure. Views on what impact the Accords have had on the integration progress differ.

Literature:

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 9: The European Economic Community: 1958 - 1967, **pp. 124 – 132**

J. Vanke (2014). Chapter 6: Charles de Gaulle’s Uncertain Idea of Europe. In: Desmond Dinan (ed.) *Origins and Evolution of the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, **pp. 136 – 155**

L. van Middelaar (2008). Spanning the River: The Constitutional Crisis of 1965 – 1966 as the Genesis of Europe’s Political Order. *European Constitutional Law Review*, vol. 4 **pp. 98 – 126**

A. Barker (2013). Bonuses, Osborne and the Luxembourg Compromise, *Financial Times*, 3 May 2013

L. Norman (2014). Britain, Juncker & the (Possibly) Phantom Luxembourg Compromise, *The Wall Street Journal*, 25 June 2014.

Task 4: Back to Supra-nationalism: the 1992 Project

The second part of the 1980s constitutes the heyday of the European integration process. Being pressured by influential entrepreneurs, the Commission, under the leadership of Delors, launched the 1992 project and took the initiative for the Single European Act. The Luxembourg Accords were abandoned, as a result of which the political Community institutions managed to adopt virtually all proposals in the 1985 White Paper. As a result, the integration process accelerated. The Internal Market and its four freedoms were realized and the Community moved on to monetary integration. Having met the convergence criteria, many Member States decided to participate in Stage 3 of the EMU, to adhere to the terms of the Stability and Growth pact and to introduce the Euro.

“My objective is that before the end of the millennium Europe should have a true federation. The Commission should become a political executive which can define essential common interests... responsible before the European Parliament and before the nation-states represented how you will, by the European Council or by a second chamber of national parliaments.”

Commission President Jacques Delors, 1990

“The President of the Commission, M. Delors, said at a press conference the other day that he wanted the European Parliament to be the democratic body of the Community, he wanted the Commission to be the Executive and he wanted the Council of Ministers to be the Senate. No! No! No!”

UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, 1990

Federalism is a guideline, not a pornographic word, you can speak it out loud. We have been focusing too much on a country that has said no, no, no!

Commission President Jacques Delors, 1991

Literature

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 11: The European Community into the 1980s, **pp. 142 – 150**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 12: The Single European Act, **pp. 151 – 158**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 13: Maastricht: the Treaty on European Union, **pp. 159 – 168**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 27: The Single Market, **pp. 384 – 401**

J. Snell (2014). The Internal Market and EMU: From Common Market to Economic Union. *UACES 44th Annual Conference Paper*, **pp. 1 – 10**

The Guardian (15.5.2017). Macron and Merkel signal new move to strengthen Eurozone.

Task 5: East-European integration: 1945-1980

"From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent."

Winston Churchill, 1946

After World War II, Europe lay in shambles. Despite the surrender of Germany, European affairs were far from 'business as usual': Quite the contrary. In addition to many troublesome issues, the postwar years led to a division of Europe into an Eastern and a Western part. Like the Western half, the Eastern half was confronted with unprecedented challenges that called for new forms of governments, unity and integration. However, the response to these challenges were in some respects very different on each side of the iron curtain.

Under the tight control of the Soviet Union it was to be expected that Eastern Europe could reach a much higher level of order and integration than in the West. Comecon, Cominform and the Warsaw pact were the counterparts of OECD/EEC, Council of Europe and NATO/WEU.

Compared to the Interbellum period, the situation within and among the Eastern European states was indeed relatively tranquil. Although the functioning of the Eastern order and its organizations differed fundamentally from its Western counterparts, a sense of mutual respect and recognition grew between the two blocs in Europe. This even led to some brittle form of pan-European integration in 1975 with the Helsinki Final Act.

Literature:

T. Judt (2005). *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945*. London: Vintage Books. Chapter I: The legacy of war, **pp. 13 - 40**

T. Judt (2005). *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945*. London: Vintage Books. Chapter IV: The Impossible Settlement, **pp. 100 – 128**

T. Judt (2005). *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945*. London: Vintage Books. Chapter V: The Coming of the Cold War, **pp. 129 – 164**

T. Fry (1993). *The Helsinki Process: Negotiating Security and Cooperation in Europe*. Washington: National Defense University press. Chapter 1, Agreement at Helsinki, **pp. 3 – 21**

R. Bideleux (1996). *European Integration and Desintegration. East and West*. London: Routledge. Chapter 10: The Comecon experiment, **pp. 141-163**

Task 6: The dissolution of the Soviet-Union and Eastern Europe 1980 – 1991

“We welcome change and openness; for we believe that freedom and security go together, that the advance of human liberty can only strengthen the cause of world peace. There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace. General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization, come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!”

US President Ronald Reagan, West Berlin, 1987

At the end of the 1980s it became clear that the Eastern order was less durable than initially expected. The Soviet Union, the central superpower, could not match the challenges of the post-industrial world and was no longer able to control developments on its own territory and its own sphere of influence. *Perestroika* and *Glasnost*, as well as an unprecedented level of *détente* (and a matching drop in the expenditures for defense) among the two superpowers could not save the Soviet Union, but finally contributed to its own destruction. The Eastern bloc (and the Communist regimes in those countries) disintegrated at a dizzy speed, but remarkably peacefully. The Cold War was over. From a Western perspective, the East was ready to rejoin Europe. Decades of separation, however, meant that this would not be easy.

Literature:

A. Brown (2012). The Gorbachev Revolution and the end of the Cold War. In: M. P. Leffler & O. A. Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, Volume 3. UK: Cambridge University Press, **pp. 244 - 266**

J. Lévesque (2012). The East Europe revolutions of 1989. In: M. P. Leffler & O. A. Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, Volume 3. UK: Cambridge University Press, **pp. 311 - 332**

G. Schopflin (1990). The End of Communism in Eastern Europe. *International Affairs*, vol. 66, no. 1, **pp. 3-16** (Note that this article was written in 1990!)

Der Spiegel (2015). Gorbachev Interview: “I am truly and deeply concerned”. Spiegel Online, 16 January 2015, **pp. 1 – 7**

C. Bottici & B. Challand (2013) *Imagining Europe: Myth, Memory and Identity*. UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3: East and West, Divided Memories in a United Europe, **pp. 65 – 83**

Non mandatory reading:

F. Fukuyama (1989) “The end of History?”. The national interest.

Task 7: Renovation and Enlargement.

The downfall of Communism had a major impact on the integration process in the “old West”. Because of, on the one hand, the unstable setting in Eastern Europe in the 1990s and, on the other hand, the successful continuation of the integration process in the West, it was virtually inevitable that many of the former States in the East would apply for EU membership. The EU realized, however, that opening the doors for so many new cohabitants required a renovation of its own house, both in substantive and institutional terms. Thus, the EU did not only face the task of deepening the integration process but also to widen it.

Relying on the experiences of previous enlargements in the 1970s and 1980s, the Union developed an enlargement strategy, including principles such as accepting the *acquis communautaire* and the so-called Copenhagen criteria, aimed at ensuring the economic competitiveness of the candidate states and their commitment to democratic principles. While the EU has developed a common accession strategy, it is plain that each application is judged on its own merits.

“When it comes to enlargement, this has been a historic success. However, Europe now needs to digest the addition of 13 Member States in the past 10 years. Our citizens need a pause from enlargement so we can consolidate what has been achieved among the 28. This is why, under my Presidency of the Commission, ongoing negotiations will of course continue, and notably the Western Balkans will need to keep a European perspective, but no further enlargement will take place over the next five years. As regards Turkey, the country is clearly far away from EU membership. A government that blocks twitter is certainly not ready for accession.”

Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, 2014

Literature:

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 9: Maastricht and Amsterdam (the late 1980s to the late 1990s), **pp. 150 – 166**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 34: Enlargement, **pp. 529 - 550**

P. Hassner (1990). Europe beyond partition and Unity: Disintegration or Reconstitution? *International Affairs*, vol. 66, no. 3, **pp. 461 – 475**. Note that this text is from 1990!

European Commission (2014). 25 Years after the fall of the iron curtain: The State of integration of East and West in the European Union, **pp. 1 – 40**

Additionally: you are invited to browse through the Commission’s website “European neighbourhood policy and enlargement negotiation” to get a grip of the past and current accession procedures.

Task 8: A failed Constitution and a ‘new’ Lisbon Treaty.

The enlargement increased the need for a more efficient, democratic and legitimate Union. For this the institutional architecture needed to be altered, but this proved far from easy. The Treaties of Amsterdam and Nice did not bring about the desired institutional reform. Thus, in Laeken, Belgium, it was decided to establish a European Convention entrusted with the task of drafting a “Constitution for Europe” so as to bring Europe closer to its citizens. Under the leadership of Valérie Giscard d’Estaing the Convention produced a draft text, which was approved by the EU’s political leaders. Yet, as wise as they may be, politicians are not always in control. Dutch and French voters killed the constitutional treaty in a referendum.

The death of the European Constitution shocked Europe’s leaders. They faced a formidable problem. They all regarded the changes contained in the Constitution a must for moving on with the integration process in a Union of 27 or more Member States. Yet, what to do when the people say “No”? There was no “Plan B”. After a “Period of Reflection”, however, they, guided by Germany’s Merkel, found a plan B, which largely solved their problem. While Irish voters still caused some problems, Europe “welcomed” the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon on 1 November 2009. One of the main aims of the Lisbon Treaty was to ensure that the EU would finally be truly democratic.

Literature

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 10: From Amsterdam to Lisbon (2000 – 2009), **pp. 168 – 181**

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 12: The Institutional Architecture, **pp. 199 – 230**

C.H. Church & D. Phinnemore (2010). Understanding the Treaty of Lisbon. *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, vol. 10, no. 2, **pp. 5 - 29**

M. Telò (2016). The EU from a constitutional project to a process of constitutionalization. *European Politics and Society*, vol. 18, no. 3, **pp. 301-317.**

Assignment 9: Theories of European integration

Now that we have an insight into the history and workings of the European Union, it's time for the view of academics. Political scientists have for the past half century struggled to understand why countries choose to integrate.

The emergence and development of the European project over the years still represents a challenge for these theorists of integration. For decades, two theories have dominated the debate: *Neofunctionalism* and its concept of spillover, and (*Liberal*) *intergovernmentalism* and its idea that it is still national governments that are in charge. While both may explain certain aspects of European integration very well, they seem to be less successful explaining others. Since the 1990s, dissatisfaction with the main theories has prompted the development of a number of alternatives, each with their own strengths and weaknesses.

Literature

I Bache, S Bulmer, S George and O Parker (2015). *Politics in the European Union*, UK: Oxford University Press, 4th ed. Chapter 6: The Schuman Plan for Coal and Steel, **pp. 3 – 19**

D. Dinan (2014). *Origins and Evolution of the European Union*. UK: Oxford University Press. Chapter 15: The Historiography of European Integration, **pp. 345 – 375**

Please Note: This text contains information on many, many different authors writing on European integration. You don't need to know all these authors and what they had to say. Focus on the most important ones, and focus on the big trends in the study of European integration that the author identifies.

CIVITAS (2015). Factsheet on Theories of European Integration.

T. L. Moga (2009). The Contribution of the Neofunctionalist and Intergovernmentalist Theories to the Evolution of the European Integration Process, *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, Vol 1, No 3, **pp. 796 - 807**

Task 10: Crises in Europe

“Europe will be forged in crises, and will be the sum of the solutions adopted for those crises”

Jean Monnet, 1978

With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU and its member states had hoped to enter a period of stability. Yet, the opposite happened: in 2008 the financial crisis struck, followed by a sovereign debt crisis in Europe. In the Mediterranean and in the Balkans, a humanitarian crisis has unfolded, as refugees and asylum seekers travel to Europe to find a better future in the EU. And of course there is the looming Brexit, which some see as a big step towards the demise of the European Union.

Presentations:

For this task, three groups of 3-4 students are expected to prepare and give a presentation. The form of the presentation (who presents, in what form) is flexible, as long as the content is covered. When in doubt, please check with your tutor. Presentations should be around 10 minutes, after which there is time for questions from the rest of the group.

The presentation will not be graded. However, should the quality of the presentation be unacceptably low (e.g. obvious lack of effort), 0.5 points will be subtracted from your overall final grade (for all members of the group). On the other hand, if your presentation is exceptionally good, you will receive a bonus 0.5 on your final grade.

Group A: Eurocrisis

Group B: Refugee Crisis

Group C: Brexit

Each presentation should, at least, contain the following:

1. A brief introduction of the crisis
2. The effect of the crisis on European integration
3. How this crisis is / will / will not be solved

Of course you are allowed to add further (relevant) issues to your presentation.

Literature

Given the rapid developments in these three issues, the literature will be announced through EleUM a few weeks before the presentations. The assigned literature will not be extensive, and should be read by all students. In addition to that, you are expected to conduct further research on the specific topic of the presentation of your group.

Task 11: Quo vadis Europe?

As we have seen in task 10, multiple crises have hit (and continue to hit) Europe in the past decade. Some - most notably 52% of the British public - have concluded that the project is no longer beneficial to them.

“Napoleon, Hitler, various people tried this out, and it ends tragically. The EU is an attempt to [unify Europe] by different methods.”

Boris Johnson, 2016

Others argue that Europe should stick to its core business, namely the internal market, and should leave the rest to the Member States. Afterall, they reason, the trouble only started after the EU went beyond mere market integration.

“People feel that the EU is heading in a direction that they never signed up to. They resent the interference in our national life by what they see as unnecessary rules and regulation. And they wonder what the point of it all is. Put simply, many ask “why can’t we just have what we voted to join – a common market?””

David Cameron, 2013

Again others have proposed a new leap forwards for Europe, arguing that the crisis shows that the EU is in need of more rather than less cooperation, for example in economic or asylum policy. Among them, there are also those who feel that only a core group of countries would be ready to go ahead. The old idea of a multi-speed Europe or a Europe of concentric circles has resurfaced.

“Some would say that more sovereign powers should be returned to EU member states. I could not disagree more. This would only further weaken the project of integration that has safeguarded peace and prosperity in Europe for decades. Populism and Euroskepticism are the enemies of that project. The only way to beat them is to build a Europe that works for its citizens. Anything less works only for the demagogues who would follow the UK into the wilderness.”

Guy Verhofstadt, 2016

Discussion Topics for task 11

For this task, the **readings** can be found on the EleUM. Make sure to read them and to critically assess the problems identified and the solutions proposed. For the discussion, you can of course also refer to what you have learned during the rest of the course.

The discussion leader will have to make sure the debate stays on track and that everyone has a chance to participate. The discussion will center on the following questions:

1. What is – in your opinion - the biggest problem facing the European Union today?
2. How can the Union’s problems best be tackled?
 - 2a. Is more or less European integration the answer? Or perhaps a more ‘flexible’ Europe?
3. What will a future European Union look like?

ADDITIONAL USEFUL SOURCES

These suggestions are here to help you in case you need additional materials to deepen the knowledge you have acquired during the lectures or to prepare your papers and your presentations.

- D. Disnan (2014), *Origins and Evolution of the European Union*. Oxford: OUP.
- D. Hodson; J. Peterson (2017), *Institutions of the European Union*. Oxford: OUP.
- J. McCormick (2017), *Understanding the European Union. A short introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- European Parliament, *Fact sheets on the European Union*: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/displayFtu.html?ftuId=intro.html>
- Documents prepared by the European Parliament Research Service: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/20150201PVL00031/European-Parliamentary-Research-Service>
- CVCE (repository on the EU integration process): <https://www.cvce.eu/en>

And these are movie recommendations related to the topics discussed in this course

- *Sonnenallee*, movie directed by Leander Haußmann (1999)
- *Goodbye Lenin!*, movie directed by Wolfgang Becker (2003)