

**Sebastian Krapohl, MSc**

Seminar for the Chair of International Relations  
Summer Term 2007

## **European Integration**

The integration of 27 nation states within the European Union is probably the most ambitious policy project of the post-war era. From the debris of the Second World-War, a political entity developed during the past 50 years, which peacefully unifies the people of Europe, and which significantly influences policy-making within its member states. In order to study the process of European Integration and to analyse policy-making at EU-level, the seminar proceeds in three steps. Firstly, different theories of European Integration and EU policy-making will be discussed. Subsequently, the most important steps of European Integration will be studied within the second section of the seminar. And finally, a third section will deal with policy-making by the different intergovernmental and supranational actors at EU level.

**Date and Room:** Thursday, 12.15 a.m. -1.45 p.m. (12:00-14:00 Uhr c.t.) in F-380  
**ECTS:** 6  
**Lecturer:** Sebastian Krapohl, MSc (sebastian.krapohl@sowi.uni-bamberg.de)  
**Office Hours:** Friday, 10.00-12.00 a.m.

### **Conditions for participation and certificates:**

- The examination regulations for the new Bachelor programme require that students participate in foreign-language seminars. To provide such an opportunity, this seminar will be taught in English. Presentations and coursework will have to be given in English, too. A student tutor will correct your essays for language mistakes (without influencing the final mark). **A good knowledge of English is an essential requirement for participation in the seminar.**
- The previous or parallel participation in the introductory lecture and/ or seminar is required.
- Regular reading of the literature and regular attendance at the seminar will be expected and controlled by random checks.
- All participants have to give a presentation of 10-15 minutes.
- To obtain a certificate, participants have to write a mid-term paper of five pages up to the date of their presentation and a long essay ('Hausarbeit') of 10-15 pages after the end of the term.

**Please note:** The number of participants is limited. Students have to register in FlexNow! to participate in the seminar.

## Seminar Structure

19/4/07 Introduction

### **Theory Section:**

26/4/07 Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism

3/5/07 Rational Institutionalism

10/5/07 Historical and Sociological Institutionalism

17/5/07 *Ascension Day (Christi Himmefahrt)*

### **Steps of European Integration:**

24/5/07 The Beginnings: The European Coal and Steel Community, the Rome Treaties and the Luxembourg Compromise

31/05/07 The Golden Age: The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty

7/6/07 *Corpus Christi (Fronleichnam)*

14/6/07 Widening and Deepening: From the Amsterdam Treaty to the European Constitutional Project

### **EU Policy-Making:**

21/6/07 Legislative Politics: European Parliament, Legislative Procedures and the Democratic Deficit

28/6/07 Intergovernmental Politics: European Council, Council of Ministers and Bargaining Power

5/7/07 Executive Politics: Commission, Comitology and the Delegation Problem

**6/7/07 12:15 a.m- 1:45 p.m., F 301, Auxiliary Date!**

12/7/07 Judicial Politics: European Court of Justice, European Law and Legal Integration

19/7/07 Seminar Evaluation

## **19/4/07**

### **Introduction**

**Conditions for Participation:** All participants will have to attend the seminar regularly, and have to read the compulsory reading. Both will be controlled by random checks. Besides, every participant shall give a presentation of 15 minutes in English.

**Requirements for a Certificate:** To obtain a certificate, students will have to write a mid-term paper of five pages up to the date of their presentation and a long essay ('Hausarbeit') of 10 to 15 pages up to 1/4/07.

**Literature:** Two kinds of literature are provided for each session. Firstly, two articles or book chapters are given for every session as compulsory reading for every participant. You may be asked to summarise the compulsory literature at the beginning of each session. If you lack adequate knowledge of the literature, you will have to handle in a written summary at the next session. Secondly, another three articles or book chapters are given as additional literature. These shall be used to prepare the presentations and essays. All literature can be found in the virtual campus.

**Presentation:** Each participant shall give a presentation of 15 minutes in English during the seminar. Sample questions for presentations are given for each session. The presentation shall be based on at least five scientific sources. Besides, the presentation shall be supported by slides and a detailed handouts. You shall speak with the lecturer about your presentation two weeks in advance. Please do not read out the presentation from a script, but try to speak freely!

**Mid-Term Papers and Essays:** In order to obtain a certificate, you have to write a mid-term paper about the same topic like your presentation. Additionally, you have to write a long essay ('Hausarbeit') of 10 to 15 pages after the end of the term. The essay shall build up on the mid-term paper and the presentation. Both - the mid-term paper and the essay - shall focus on a scientific question, and shall not only describe the respective field. Sample questions are given for each session. The deadline for the essays is 1/4/2007, i.e. within the holidays after the end of the seminar. You shall speak with the lecturer about the question and the structure of your essay.

26/4/07

## Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism

### Questions for Essays and Presentations:

- Compare Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism: Which actors and mechanisms are the driving forces of European Integration? Who controls the integration process? How strong is the relative influence of supranational institutions on the one hand and member states on the other hand?
- Criticise Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism. What are the advantages or disadvantages of the two theories? What do they criticise on each other? Which one do you think is more convincing?
- Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism developed from different historical contexts. Describe these historical circumstances, and analyse, how they influenced the perception of European Integration.

### Compulsory Reading:

Rosamond, Ben (2000): 'Neofunctionalism', and 'Backlash, Critique and Contemplation', in: 'Theories of European Integration' (London: Macmillan), pp.50-97.

Rosamond, Ben (2000): 'Intergovernmental Europe' in: 'Theories of European Integration' (London: Macmillan), pp. 130-156.

### Additional Literature:

Haas, Ernst (1958): 'The Expansive Logic of Sector Integration', in: 'The Uniting of Europe' (Stanford: University Press), pp. 283-317.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999): 'Theorizing European Integration', in: 'The Choice for Europe' (London: UCL Press), pp. 18-85.

Stone Sweet, Alec and Wayne Sandholtz (1997): 'European Integration and Supranational Governance', in: *Journal of European Public Policy* 4, pp. 297-317.

**3/5/07**  
**Rational Institutionalism**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- How does Rational Institutionalism understand the role of actors and institutions? What is their relationship? What are the consequences for European Integration and EU policy-making?
- Compare Rational Institutionalism with Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism. Where do you see similarities between the theories? What are the most important differences? Is Rational Institutionalism a good 'compromise' between the two classic integration theories?
- Criticise the theory of Rational Institutionalism. What are its advantages and disadvantages? Is Rational Institutionalism a real integration theory? Where may it be applied more reasonably?

**Compulsory Reading:**

- Pollack, Mark A. (1997): 'Delegation, Agency and Agenda-Setting in the European Community', in: *International Organisations* 51, pp. 99-134.
- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1997): 'Games Real Actors Play: Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research' (Oxford: Westview), Chapter 2, 36-50.

**Additional Literature:**

- Pollack, Mark A. (1996): 'The New Institutionalism and EG Governance: The Promise and Limits of Institutional Analysis', in: *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 9, pp. 429-458.
- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1989): 'The Joint Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration', in: *Public Administration* 66, pp. 239-278.
- Tsebelis, George and Geoffrey Garrett (2001): 'The Institutional Foundation of Intergovernmentalism and Supranationalism in the European Union', in: *International Organization* 55, pp. 357-390.

**10/5/07**  
**Historical and Sociological Institutionalism**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- Compare Historical and Sociological Institutionalism. How do these theories understand the role of actors, institutions and history? Where do you see similarities between the theories? What are the most important differences?
- Compare Historical and Sociological Institutionalism with Rational Institutionalism. How do these theories understand the role of actors, institutions and history? What are the consequences for European Integration and EU policy-making?
- Compare Historical and Sociological Institutionalism with Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism. Are Historical and/or Sociological Institutionalism better 'compromises' between the two classic integration theories?

**Compulsory Reading:**

- Krapohl, Sebastian (2006): 'Thalidomide, BSE and the Single Market: A Historical-Institutionalist Approach to Regulatory Regimes in the European Union', in: *European Journal of Political Research*, 46:1, 25-46.
- Risse, Thomas (2004): 'Social Constructivism and European Integration', in: Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez (eds.): 'European Integration Theory' (Oxford: University Press), pp. 159-176.

**Additional Literature:**

- Aspinwall, Mark. D. and Gerald Schneider (2000): 'Same Menu, Separate Tables: The Institutional Turn in Political Science and the Study of European Integration', in: *European Journal of Political Research* 38, pp. 1-36.
- March, James G. and Johann P. Olson (1998): 'The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders', in: *International Organization* 52, pp. 943-969.
- Pierson, Paul (1996): 'The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutional Analysis', in: *Comparative Political Studies* 29, pp. 123-163.

**24/5/07**  
**The Beginnings:**  
**From the Three Communities to the Luxembourg Compromise**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- Which historical circumstances influenced the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Economic Community? What were the central policy-projects of the two communities?
- Why did the member states adopt the Luxembourg compromise? What were the consequences?
- What does the Luxembourg compromise tell you about the theories of European Integration?

**Compulsory Reading:**

- Dinan, Desmond (2005): 'Reconstruction, Reconciliation and Integration, 1945-1957', in: 'Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration' (London: Palgrave), Chapter 1.
- Dinan, Desmond (2005): 'Uncertain Terrain, 1958-1972', in: 'Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration' (London: Palgrave), Chapter 2.

**Additional Literature:**

- Armstrong, David, Lorna Lloyd and John Redmond (1996): 'The European Union 1945-1969: the Creation of the European Community and the Early Years', in: 'From Versailles to Maastricht: International Organisation in the Twentieth Century' (London: Macmillan), pp. 138-164.
- Haas, Ernst B. (1958): 'Integration: Ideology and Institutions', in: 'The Uniting of Europe' (Stanford: University Press), pp. 3-112.
- Moravcsik, Andrew (1999): 'Finding the Thread: The Treaties of Rome, 1955-1958', in: 'The Choice for Europe' (London: UCL Press), pp. 86-158.

**31/5/07**  
**The Golden Age:**  
**The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- After the ‘Eurosclerosis’ of the 1970s, both the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty were important milestones of European Integration. What were the main policy projects of these two intergovernmental conferences? Why became they possible at these points of time?
- Analyse the negotiations, which led to the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty? Which Integration theory is better able to explain the final outcomes?
- How do the Single Market and the European Monetary Union influence policy-making at national and supranational level? What are the consequences for the member states? Why did they nevertheless agree to these policy projects?

**Compulsory Reading:**

Moravcsik, Andrew (1991): ‘Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the European Community’, in: *International Organization* 45, pp. 19-46.

Sandholtz, Wayne (1993): ‘Choosing Union: Monetary Politics and Maastricht’, in: *International Organization* 47, pp. 1-39.

**Additional Literature:**

Fligstein, Neil and Mara-Drita, Iona (1996): ‘How to Make a Market: Reflections on the Attempt to Create a Single Market in the European Union’, in: *American Journal of Sociology* 102, pp. 1-33.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999): ‘Economic and Monetary Union: Negotiating the Maastricht Treaty, 1988 – 1991’, in: ‘The Choice for Europe’ (London: UCL Press), pp. 379-471.

Scharpf, Fritz W. (1996): ‘Politische Optionen im vollendeten Binnenmarkt’, in: M. Jachtenfuchs and B. Kohler-Koch (eds.): ‘Europäische Integration’ (Opladen: Leske + Budrich), 109-140.



14/6/07

## **Widening and Deepening: From the Amsterdam Treaty to the European Constitutional Project**

### **Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- Compare the historical circumstances and the policy-projects of the intergovernmental conferences of Amsterdam and Nice with that of the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty. Can we speak about a new ‘Eurosclerosis’? Which integration theory is better able to capture this development?
- Why was the EU enlarged to ten new member states of Middle and Eastern Europe? Which integration theory is better able to capture this development?
- The European Constitution was aimed to solve the ‘reform-blockade’ of the EU. Analyse the draft constitution. What were the major envisaged reforms? Would the constitution reduce the democratic deficit of the EU? Would it lead to more efficient policy-making? Why does it nevertheless meet so much resistance of the European peoples?

### **Compulsory Reading:**

Moravcsik, Andrew (2006): ‘What Can We Learn from the Collapse of the European Constitutional Project?’, in: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, 47:2, 219-241.

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2001): ‘The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union’, in: *International Organization* 55, pp. 47-80.

### **Additional Literature:**

Magnet, Paul and Kalypso Nicolaidis (2004): ‘The European Convention: Bargaining in the Shadow of Rhetoric’, in: *West European Politics* 27, pp. 381-404.

Moravcsik, Andrew and Kalypso Nikolaides (1999) ‘Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam: Interests, Influence, Institutions’, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37, pp. 57-85.

Wessels, Wolfgang (2001): ‘Nice results: The Millennium IGC in the EU’s Evolution’, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39, pp. 197-219.

**21/6/07**

**Legislative Politics: European Parliament, Legislative Procedures and the Democratic Deficit**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- How much influence has the European Parliament within the different legislative procedures? Which legislative actors of the EU gained or loosed influence during the last 50 years?
- Compare the European Parliament to national parliaments. What are the differences? Shall the EU become a more parliamentary political system? What are the reasons against such a development?
- Does the EU suffer from a 'democratic deficit'? If yes, what are the reasons for the deficit, and how could it be reduced? Which role does the European Parliament play to legitimate EU policy-making?

**Compulsory Reading:**

Hix, Simon (1999): 'Legislative Politics', in: 'The Political System of the European Union' (London: Macmillan), pp. 56-98.

Follesdal, Andreas and Hix, Simon (2006): 'Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik', in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44:3, 533-562.

**Additional Literature:**

Majone, Giandomenico (1998): 'Europe's 'Democratic Deficit': The Question of Standards', in: *European Law Journal*, 4:1, 5-28.

Moravcsik, Andrew (2002): 'In Defence of the 'Democratic Deficit': Assessing Legitimacy in the European Union', in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40, pp. 603-624.

Tsebelis, George and Geoffrey Garrett (2000): 'Legislative Politics in the European Union', in: *European Union Politics* 1, pp. 9-36.

**28/6/07**  
**Intergovernmental Politics:**  
**European Council, Council of Ministers and Bargaining Power**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- The European Council and the Council of Ministers are the intergovernmental centres of the EU political system. How far are they able to control EU policy-making?
- How does the Council of Ministers decide about EU policies? What are the powers of ministers vis-à-vis their own bureaucrats and other EU organs.
- The Council of Ministers consists of representatives from the national governments, which are themselves responsible to their parliaments. How legitimate is decision-making of the Council?

**Compulsory Reading:**

Schoutete, Philippe de (2002): 'The European Council', in: John Peterson and Michael Shackleton (eds.): 'The Institutions of the European Union' (Oxford: University Press), pp. 21-46.

Hayes-Renshaw, Fiona (2002): 'The Council of Ministers', in: John Peterson and Michael Shackleton (eds.): 'The Institutions of the European Union' (Oxford: University Press), pp. 47-70.

**Additional Literature:**

Hayes-Renshaw, Fiona and Helen Wallace (1995): 'Executive Power in the European Union: The Functions and Limits of the Council of Ministers', in: *Journal of European Public Policy* 2, pp. 559-582.

Hosli, Madeleine O. (1996): 'Coalitions and Power: Effects of Qualified Majority Voting in the Council of the European Union', in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34, pp. 255-273.

Van Schendelen, MPCM (1996): 'The Council Decides: Does the Council Decide?', in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34, pp. 531-548.

**5/7/07**  
**Executive Politics:**  
**Commission, Comitology and the Delegation Problem**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- The Commission is the body, which comes closest to a 'EU Government'. Why did the member states delegate so much power to the Commission? Why do they nevertheless control the Commission by various committees?
- How much influence have the various scientific and Comitology committees on EU policy-making? Where does this influence derive from? How far is policy-making within the EU committee system effective and legitimate?
- Compare the different Rational and Sociological Institutional approaches to the EU committee system. What are their differences and similarities? What are their strengths and weaknesses? Which theory is better able to capture policy-making within the EU committee system?

**Compulsory Reading:**

Hix, Simon (1999): 'Executive Politics', in: 'The Political System of the European Union' (London: Macmillan), pp. 21-55.

Krapohl, Sebastian and Karolina Zurek (2006): 'The Perils of Comitology Governance: Intergovernmental Bargaining during the BSE Scandal in the European Union', in: European Integration Online Papers, 10:2.

**Additional Literature:**

Franchino, Fabio (2000): 'Control of the Commission's Executive Functions: Uncertainty, Conflict and Decision Rules', in: European Union Politics 1, pp. 59-88.

Joerges, Christian and Jürgen Neyer (1997): 'Transforming Strategic Interaction into Deliberative Problem-Solving: European Comitology in the Foodstuffs Sector', in: Journal of European Public Policy 4, pp. 1350-1763.

Majone, Giandomenico (2002): 'The European Commission: The Limits of Centralization and the Perils of Parliamentarisation', in: Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions 15, pp. 375-392.

**12/7/07**  
**Judicial Politics:**  
**European Court of Justice, European Law and Legal Integration**

**Questions for Essays and Presentations:**

- On which way can the European Court of Justice influence the legal systems of the EU member states? How far can the European Court of Justice influence EU policy-making? Why did the member states establish such a strong court at supranational level?
- How independent is the European Court of Justice from political influence? Is the court merely an agent of the member states, or did it escape member states' control?
- How did the European Court of Justice influence European Integration? What do the different theories tell you about this influence of the court?

**Compulsory Reading:**

Hix, Simon (1999): 'Judicial Politics', in: 'The Political System of the European Union' (London: Macmillan), pp. 99-132.

Dehousse, Renaud (1998): 'The Court and the Dynamics of Integration', in: 'The European Court of Justice' (London: Macmillan), pp. 70-96.

**Additional Literature:**

Alter, Karen J. and Sophie Meunier-Aitsahalia (1994): 'Judicial Politics in the European Union: European Integration and the Path-breaking Cassis de Dijon Decision', in: *Comparative Political Studies* 26, pp. 535-561.

Garrett, Geoffrey, R. Daniel Kelemen and Heiner Schulz (1998) 'The European Court of Justice, National Governments, and Legal Integration in the European Union', in: *International Organization* 52, pp. 149-176.

Stone Sweet, Alec and James A. Caporaso (1998): 'From Free Trade to Supranational Polity: The European Court and Integration', in: Wayne Sandholtz and Alec Stone Sweet (eds.): 'European Integration and Supranational Governance' (Oxford: University Press), pp. 92-133.

**19/7/07**  
**Seminar Evaluation**

The lecturer will present the results of the written evaluation. This will provide additional opportunity for seminar participants to give comments on the seminar to the lecturer. The following points shall be discussed in detail:

- What were the strengths of the seminar, what the weaknesses?
- How were the workload and the challenges of the seminar?
- Was the project of an English-speaking seminar a success or failure?