



LUDWIG-
MAXIMILIANS-
UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNCHEN



Prof. Dr. Berthold Rittberger
Geschwister-Scholl-Institut für Politikwissenschaft
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
berthold.rittberger@gsi.uni-muenchen.de
<<http://berthold-rittberger.weebly.com/>>

Summer Term 2019

Master Seminar WP 2.1

Europäische Institutionen / European Institutions

- Contemporary Debates in the Study of the EU -

Time and location: in English: Monday, 12:15-13:45, Oettingenstr. 67, 169
auf Deutsch: Dienstag, 12:15-13:45, Oettingenstr. 67,
C007

Office hours: Every Monday during term time (14:30-15:30). Please
make an appointment with Ms. Nutzinger in advance
(sekretariat.rittberger@gsi.uni-muenchen.de)

Course description

The institutions of the European Union (EU) have been the subject of much debate and criticism in recent years. The EU's "multi crises" – the Euro crisis, the migration crisis, Brexit to name only a few – have challenged the EU's institutional status quo and highlighted its cracks and weaknesses. In this course, we analyse the EU's institutional architecture against the backdrop of different theoretical approaches, rooted in different literatures, such as integration theory, neo-institutionalism and theories of (democratic) legitimacy. We are particularly interested in exploring the factors leading to the transformation and decay of particular institutions, as well as the creation of new ones. We will also focus on the design properties of EU institutions as well as their consequences for political outcomes.

Structure of the seminar sessions

In this seminar, you will acquire in-depth knowledge of different theoretical perspectives to account for the formation, design, transformation, decay as well as the consequences of European institutions. Moreover, you will learn to apply these perspectives to empirical phenomena in your own little research projects. The overall objective of the module is to provide you with the knowledge and skills to conduct

theory-guided research on key issues of European institutions. To this end, you will be asked to read several texts in preparation of each session (texts marked with an asterisk * = compulsory reading, available in the Intranet course folder). In our seminar sessions we will first reconstruct and discuss the theory/ies based on the compulsory reading. In order to assess the analytical usefulness of the theory/ies we will then apply it/them to specific institutions and political problems.

Module requirements:

The module “WP 2” comprises two seminars: “WP 2.1 European Institutions” and “WP 2.2 International Institutions”. The module examination consists of a “Hausarbeit” and “Übungsaufgaben”. You will have to complete one of the two module requirements in WP 2.1, the other one is due in WP 2.2.

Requirements for “Übungsaufgaben”:

This requirement consists of **four reaction papers**. These are concise reviews of the current week’s required readings (marked with a *). Keep each paper to a maximum of two pages. The papers are due **in class**. Because they are meant to encourage you to think about the readings before you come to class, no late papers will be accepted. Also, I will not accept papers that are Emailed to me, my cat, my secretary, or anyone else. Do bring them to class, printed!

In your reaction paper, you should:

1. Summarize the main arguments of the readings for the week. What are the readings about? How do they relate to each other? (Keep this part short – half a page, maximum.)
2. Critique the readings – consider methodology, logic, biases, omissions, etc. Do the authors prove what they propose convincingly? Why or why not?
3. Identify at least 3 questions that you would like to discuss in class.

Deadlines: All four reaction papers are to be handed in during term in class. At least two of the four reaction papers have to be handed **by mid-term (17.6. or 18.6.)**

Requirements for “Hausarbeit”:

This requirement consists of **two discussion papers** of about 6 pages each, focusing on the readings assigned for the week (minimum of **four** readings from the reading list). The discussion papers should be literature reviews of the readings with a twist. That is, they present a sketch of the major theories (explanations) and the results of your own assessment, focused around a question of your choice (think about something to unite the readings to a common theme, something that could be asked in an exam, for example). Some of the best examples of this type of literature review appear in World Politics and The Annual Review of Political Science. You may want to look at some of these review essays in journals before you write your own. You should address the three following points.

1) What are the authors trying to demonstrate? Summarize the arguments using the following criteria:

- a. What are the main arguments and hypotheses defended by the authors?

- b. What are the main variables or explanatory factors/conditions? What is the theoretical argument that links these variables/factors/conditions?
- c. What level of analysis is used (micro, meso or macro)? Who performs the action: people, institutions, states, international organizations?
- d. What is the type of analysis used (deductive/inductive)?
- e. What kind of method is the author employing (case studies, comparison of many cases, qualitative, quantitative, a mix of methods)?

2) Evaluate the theory: Are these pieces of literature convincing? Below are some examples of evaluation criteria to help you make your point. You do not need to deal with all these items at once, just those you feel are relevant to your argument.

- a. Originality: new findings? New theory?
- b. Simplicity/parsimony: Do the authors use many or few variables to make a point?
- c. Coherent/internally consistent: Do the propositions contradict each other?
- d. Pertinent/useful: Can they theory/theories be applied to real world cases?
- e. Predictive: Can we make predictions using this theory?
- f. Is this generalizable to many cases/countries, or just applicable to a single/few cases? Are there obvious cases that do not fit the theory?
- g. Does the theory seem normative or objective? Do the authors speak about how things are in the real world, or how things should be?
- h. Are the variables adequately conceptualized and operationalized? Are the concepts clear? Were the measures chosen to evaluate concepts adequately?
- i. Was the choice of design acceptable, or could you recommend a better way to test the theory?

3) What links the articles together? Which of the theories proposed is most adequate and why, at least with respect to the question you have posed? Keep in mind that mature scholarship asks not so much whether someone is right or wrong but under what kinds of circumstances a theory is useful. What do we know about a particular topic, what do we still need to find out?

Papers are due in class. I cannot accept late papers because that would put those who complied with the deadline at a disadvantage (e.g. after the class discussion on the topic). If you think you will fail to meet the deadline, then you should plan to submit a later paper.

Deadlines: Both discussion papers are to be handed in during term time. At least one of the two discussion papers must be handed **by mid-term (17.6. or 18.6.)**.

Staying up to date

The most important discussions and debates that shape research on European institutions and politics take place in peer reviewed academic journals. You should make it a routine to regularly consult and screen the journals mentioned below, especially if you plan to write your seminar paper in this course:

Comparative European Politics
European Journal of Political Research
European Political Science Review
European Union Politics
Governance
Government & Opposition
Journal of Common Market Studies
Journal of European Integration
Journal of European Public Policy
Regulation & Governance
West European Politics

One of the best academic blogs on current affairs in the EU is the [EUROPP blog](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/), administered by colleagues at the LSE (<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/>)

[Politico Europe](http://www.politico.eu) (<http://www.politico.eu>) keeps you up to date on current affairs. Make sure you subscribe to their newsletter, bringing you fresh information every morning (esp. "Brussels Playbook" and "Morgen Europa").

Overview of the seminar sessions

1. Introductory session

Engl.: Mo, 29.4.; dt.: Die, 23.4.

2. Rationalist institutionalism and EU integration

Engl.: Mo, 6.5.; dt.: Die, 30.4.

Grieco, J. (1996). State Interests and International Rule Trajectories: A Neorealist Interpretation of the Maastricht Treaty and European Economic and Monetary Union, *Security Studies*, 5, 261-306.

*Kleine, M. & Pollack, M. (2018). Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Its Critics, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56 (7), 1493-1509.

*Pollack, M. A. (1997). Delegation, agency, and agenda setting in the European Community, *International Organization*, 51 (1), 99-134.

Pollack, M. A. (2012). "Realist, Intergovernmentalist and Institutional Approaches", in: Jones, E., Menon, A. & Weatherill, S. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-17.

Moravcsik, A. & Schimmelfennig, F. (2018). "Liberal Intergovernmentalism", in: Wiener, A., Börzel, T.A. & Risse, T. (eds.), *European Integration Theory*, 3rd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 64-84.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to distinguish rationalism from rationalist theories about EU politics.
- You should be able to describe different rationalist theories about EU politics.
- What are the commonalities and differences between PA-theory and Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI)?

3. Ideas, institutions and EU integration

Engl.: Mo, 13.5.; dt.: Die, 14.5. [Termin am 7.5. fällt aus.]

Béland, D. (2009). Ideas, institutions, and policy change, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16 (5), 701-718.

Béland, D. & Cox, R. H. (2011). "Introduction: ideas and politics", in: Béland, D. & Cox, R. H. (eds.), *Ideas and politics in social science research*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-20.

Carstensen, M. B. & Schmidt, V. A. (2016). Power through, over and in ideas: conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23 (3), 318-337.

*Carstensen, M. B. & Schmidt, V.A. (2018). Ideational power and pathways to legitimation in the Euro crisis, *Review of International Political Economy*, 25 (6), 753-778.

Matthijs, M. (2016). Powerful rules governing the Euro: The Perverse Logic of German Ideas, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23 (3), 375-391.

*Matthijs M. & McNamara, K. (2015). The Euro Crisis' Theory Effect: Northern Saints, Southern Sinners, and the Demise of the Eurobond, *Journal of European Integration*, 37 (2), 229-245.

Parsons, C. (2011). "Ideas, position, and supranationality", in: Béland, D. & Cox, R. H. (eds.), *Ideas and politics in social science research*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 127-142.

Schmidt, V. A. (2010). Taking ideas and discourse seriously: Explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth 'new institutionalism', *European Political Science Review*, 2 (1), 1-25.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to distinguish rationalist from ideational approaches.

- You should be able to explain how ideas matter for political behaviour.
- You should be able to explain how ideational approaches conceive of the relationship between interests and ideas (note: it's complicated!)
- What are the likely causes of the Euro crisis from an ideational perspective?

4. Historical institutionalism and EU integration

Engl.: Mo, 20.5.; dt.: Die, 21.5.

Capoccia, G. & Kelemen, R. D. (2007). The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism, *World Politics*, 59 (3), 341-369.

*Pierson, P. (1996). The Path to European Integration. A Historical Institutional Analysis, *Comparative Political Studies*, 29 (2), 123-163.

*Jones, E. et al (2016). Failing Forward? The Euro Crisis and the Incomplete Nature of European Integration. *Comparative Political Studies*, 49 (7), 1010-1034.

Verdun, A. (2015). A historical institutionalist explanation of the EU's responses to the euro area financial crisis, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22 (2), 219-237.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to distinguish HI from rationalist theories.
- You should be able to explain key HI concepts, such as path dependence and unintended consequences.
- What are the likely causes of the Euro-crisis from a HI perspective?

5. Beyond institutionalisms: alternative approaches to EU integration

Engl.: Mo, 27.5.; dt.: Die, 28.5.

*Adler-Nissen, R. (2016). Towards a Practice Turn in EU Studies: The Everyday of European Integration, *Journal of Common Market Studies* 54 (1), 87-103.

*Jabko, N. & Sheingate, A. (2018). Practices of Dynamic Disorder, *Perspectives on Politics*, 16 (2), 312-327.

Saurugger, S. (2016). Sociological Approaches to the European Union in Times of Turmoil, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54 (1), 70-86.

Zeitlin, J. (2016). EU experimentalist governance in times of crisis, *West European Politics*, 39 (5), 1073-1094.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to formulate the key criticisms the different papers voice regarding institutionalist approaches to explain EU integration.
- You should be able to formulate the analytical value added by these alternative approaches.

6. Which Europe? Differentiated integration

Engl.: Mo, 3.6.; dt.: Die, 4.6.

Kroll, D. & Leuffen, D. (2015). Enhanced cooperation in practice. An analysis of differentiated integration in EU secondary law, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22 (3), 353-373.

*Kölliker, A. (2001). Bringing together or driving apart the Union? Towards a theory of differentiated integration, *West European Politics*, 24 (4), 125-151.

Leuffen, D., Rittberger, B. & Schimmelfennig, F. (2013). Differentiated Integration. Explaining Variation in the European Union, Basingstoke: Palgrave, chapter 1 & Conclusions.

*Schimmelfennig, F., Leuffen, D., & Rittberger, B. (2015). The European Union as a system of differentiated integration: Interdependence, politicization and differentiation, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22 (6), 764-782.

Schimmelfennig, F., & Winzen, T. (2014). Instrumental and constitutional differentiation in the European Union, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52 (2), 354-370.

Schmidt, V. (2019) The future of differentiated integration: A 'soft-core', multi-clustered Europe of overlapping policy communities, *Comparative European Politics*, 17 (2), 294-315.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to identify and describe different conceptualizations of differentiated integration.
- You should be able to describe the drivers and obstacles behind differentiated integration.
- You should be able to discuss different policy areas with regard to their likelihood for differentiation.
- What can theories of DI contribute to better understand 'Brexit'?

No class on 10.6. & 11.6. (Pfingsten)

MID-TERM: At least 50% of your assessments are now due: 2 reaction papers OR 1 discussion paper.

7. Wither Europe? EU disintegration

Engl.: Mo, 17.6.; dt.: Die, 18.6.

Bartolini, S. (2006). A Comparative Political Approach to the EU Formation, ARENA Working Paper No. 04.

Bickerton, C. (2019). The limits of differentiation: capitalist diversity and labour mobility as drivers of Brexit, *Comparative European Politics*, 17 (2), 231-245.

Jones, E. (2018). Towards a theory of disintegration, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25 (3), 440-451.

Scharpf, F.W. (2015). Vom angedrohten Grexit zur differenzierten Integration, *Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften*, 13 (3), 325-335.

Vollaard, H. (2014). Explaining European Disintegration, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52 (5), 1142–1159.

*Schimmelfennig, F. (2018). Brexit: Differentiated disintegration in the European Union, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25 (8), 1154–1173.

Webber, D. (2014). How likely is it that the European Union will disintegrate? A critical analysis of competing theoretical perspectives. *European Journal of International Relations*, 20 (2), 341-365.

*Webber, D. (2019). Trends in European political (dis)integration. An analysis of postfunctionalist and other explanations, *Journal of European Public Policy*, early view, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1576760>

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to relate Brexit to processes of differentiated integration in the EU.
- You should be able to identify the main expectations about the EU disintegration, which can be derived from EU integration theories.
- How does Bartolini's theory of nation state formation processes help us to better understand the unfolding of the Euro crisis / refugee crisis / Brexit / democratic backsliding?

8. Constructing a supranational democracy: The expansion of the EP's prerogatives

Engl.: Mo, 24.6.; dt.: Die, 25.6.

Farrell, H. & Héritier, A. (2007). Introduction: contested competences in the European Union. *West European Politics*, 30 (2), 227-243.

Goetze, S. & Rittberger, B. (2010). A Matter of Habit? The Sociological Foundations of Empowering the European Parliament, *Comparative European Politics*, 8 (1), 37-54.

Harouche, P. (2018). The inter-parliamentary alliance: how national parliaments empowered the European Parliament, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25 (7), 1010-1028.

*Hix, S. (2002). Constitutional agenda-setting through discretion and rule-interpretation: Why the European Parliament won at Amsterdam, *British Journal of Political Science*, 32 (2), 259-280.

Hobolt, S.B. (2014). A vote for the President? The role of Spitzenkandidaten in the 2014 European Parliament elections, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21 (10), 1528-1540.

Moury, C. (2007). Explaining the European Parliament's right to appoint and invest the Commission, *West European Politics*, 30 (2), 367-391.

Rittberger, B. (2012). Institutionalizing representative democracy in the European Union: The case of the European Parliament, *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50.s1, 18-37.

*Roederer-Rynning, C., & Schimmelfennig, F. (2012). Bringing codecision to agriculture: A hard case of parliamentarization, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 19 (7), 951-968.

Rosén, G. (2015). EU Confidential: The European Parliament's Involvement in EU Security and Defence Policy, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53 (2), 383–398.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to identify different explanations for the EP's gradual empowerment.
- You should be able to categorize these explanations with regard to the different institutionalist theories we discussed at the beginning of term.
- How and why did the 'Spitzenkandidaten' process in the context of the EP elections come about? Is it likely to be repeated for 2019?

9. The regulatory state: Regulatory institutions in the EU

Engl.: Mo, 1.7.; dt.: Die, 2.7.

Bach, T., De Francesco, F., Maggetti, M & Ruffing, E (2016). Transnational Bureaucratic Politics: An Institutional Rivalry Perspective on EU Network Governance, *Public Administration*, 94 (1), 9-24.

Blauberger, M., & Rittberger, B. (2015). Conceptualizing and theorizing EU regulatory networks, *Regulation & Governance*, 9 (4), 367-376.

Tarrant, A. & Kelemen, R. D. (2017). Reconceptualizing European Union regulatory networks: A response to Blauberger and Rittberger, *Regulation & Governance*, doi: 10.1111/rego.12136.

Dehousse, R. (1997). Regulation by Networks in the European Community: The Role of European Agencies, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4 (2), 246-261.

*Kelemen, R. D. & Tarrant, A. D. (2011). The Political Foundations of the Eurocracy, *West European Politics*, 34 (5), 922-947.

Levi-Faur, D. (2011). Regulatory Networks and Regulatory Agencification: Towards a Single European Regulatory Space, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18 (6), 810-829.

Majone, G. (1997). From the positive to the regulatory state: causes and consequences of changes in the mode of governance, *Journal of Public Policy*, 17 (2), 139-167.

*Majone, G. (2016). European integration and its modes. Function vs. territory, TARN Working Paper 2/2016, <<https://tarn.maastrichtuniversity.nl/publications/tarn-working-papers/>>

Roederer-Rynning, C. & Daugbjerg, C. (2010). Power Learning or Path Dependency? Investigating the Roots of the European Food Safety Authority, *Public Administration*, 88 (2), 315-330.

Thatcher, M. (2011). The Creation of European Regulatory Agencies and its Limits: A Comparative Analysis of European Delegation, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18 (6), 790-809.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to explain the rise of the 'regulatory state' in Europe (and in the EU).

- You should be able to describe different kinds of regulatory institutions (e.g. agencies, networks).

- You should be able to distinguish between different explanations for the choice of regulatory institutions in the EU.

10. The politicization of the EU: A pathway towards a more legitimate order?

Engl.: Mo, 8.7.; dt.: Die, 9.7.

*De Wilde, P., & Zürn, M. (2012) Can the Politicization of European Integration be Reversed? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50.s1, 137-153.

De Wilde, P., Leupold, A. & Schmidtke H. (2016). Introduction: the differentiated politicisation of European Governance, *West European Politics*, 36 (1), 3-22.

Grande, E. & Hutter, S. (2016). Beyond authority transfer: Explaining the politicisation of Europe, *West European Politics*, 39 (1), 23-43.

*Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2009). A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus, *British Journal of Political Science*, 39 (1), 1-23.

Hutter, S. & Grande, E. (2014). Politicizing Europe in the National Electoral Arena: A Comparative Analysis of Five West European Countries, 1970–2010, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52 (5), 1002-1018.

Statham, P. & Trez H.-J. (2015). Understanding the mechanisms of EU politicization: Lessons from the Eurozone crisis, *Comparative European Politics*, 13 (3), 287-306.

Zürn, M. (2016). Opening up Europe: next steps in politicisation research, *West European Politics* 39, (1), 164-182.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to describe the concept of politicization.
- You should be able to identify and describe the drivers of politicization.
- You should be able to tell us how politicization affects the politics of EU integration.
- Is politicization a good or a bad thing, and by what standards?

11. The EU's democratic deficit: Crisis exceptionalism?

Engl.: Mo, 15.7.; dt.: Die, 16.7.

Kreuder-Sonnen, C. (2018). Political Secrecy in Europe: Crisis Management and Crisis Exploitation, *West European Politics* (online before print).

*Kreuder-Sonnen, C. & Zangl, B. (2015). Which post-Westphalia? International Organizations between Constitutionalism and Authoritarianism, *European Journal of International Relations*, 21 (3), 568-594.

Scharpf, F.W. (2014). After the Crash: A Perspective on Multilevel European Democracy, MPIfG Discussion Paper 14/21, <http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp14-21.pdf>.

Scicluna, N. (2014). Politicization without democratization: How the Eurozone crisis is transforming EU law and politics, *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 12 (3), 545-571.

Scicluna, N. (2017). Integration through the disintegration of law? The ECB and EU constitutionalism in the crisis, *Journal of European Public Policy* (online before print).

*White, J. (2013). Emergency Europe, *Political Studies*, 63 (2), 300-318.

Wilkinson, M.A. (2013). The Spectre of Authoritarian Liberalism: Reflections on the Constitutional Crisis of the European Union, *German Law Journal*, 14 (5), 527-560.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- You should be able to identify the causes of the EU's democratic legitimacy deficit.
- You should be able to describe how crisis politics affects the EU's democratic credentials.
- You should be able to discuss promises and pitfalls of politicization from the

purview of democratic legitimacy.
- Does crisis politics strengthen or weaken the Union?

12. The return of grand theory (?) and the clash of the titans

Engl.: Mo, 22.7.; dt.: Die, 23.7.

*Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2019). Grand theories of European integration in the twenty-first century, *Journal of European Public Policy*, early view, <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1569711>>

*Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2019). Is liberal intergovernmentalism regressive? A comment on Moravcsik (2018), *Journal of European Public Policy*, early view, <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1582684>>

*Moravcsik, A. (2018). Preferences, Power and Institutions in 21st-century Europe, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56 (7), 1648-1674.

Test yourself: What you should know after the readings

- What is the beef between Moravcsik and Hooghe/Marks all about?
- In your view, which theory holds most promise to answer the pressing questions about EU politics and integration today?