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EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

View of COMMITTED Europeans

● STATIC  EU system as it works today

● DYNAMIC  Momentum desirable, necessary; bicycle theory
  
  Direction: An ever closer Union

  Integration, especially eurozone, an end in itself

● IMPLICATION: Continuing growth of EU by spillover, treaties
EUROSCEPTICISM

View of UNWILLING Europeans dissatisfied with status quo

SOFT Euroscepticism:

Reform by reducing EU powers

Negotiate national opt outs from the acquis

HARD Euroscepticism: EU Unjustified, never consented to EU 2013

Veto new proposals

Attack, defy acquis, treaty commitments

Withdraw
PRAGMATISM

View of QUESTIONING Europeans

● NO a priori commitment to ever closer OR ever looser Union

● SATISFICING: If existing policies acceptable, leave as it is

● IF DISSATISFIED: Diagnose causes of problem

   Scrutinize alternatives within and outside EU for:
   Causes and effects. Claims on resources. Probability of success

● IMPLICATION: Cautious about integration; look before you leap
MEDIAN EUROPEAN FAVOURS LEAVING EU AS IT IS

*European Election Study, 27 country survey,*
Q 80. Some say European unification should be pushed further. Others say it has already gone too far. What is your opinion? Please indicate your views using a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means unification has already gone too far and 10 means it should be pushed further.

*Eurobarometer No. 77, Spring, 2012*
Q. A14. In general does the EU conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?

2009

- Less integration 30%
- More integration 40%
- As it is 30%

2012

- Negative EU 28%
- Positive EU 32%
- Neutral EU 40%
INTERDEPENDENCE CREATES INSTABILITY

● ABOUT POLICIES e.g. regulating multi-nationals, environment

● DYNAMIC CONSEQUENCES
  Produces spillovers
  Creates demand for collective action

● SMALL STATES welcome EU managing interdependent policies

● NO ASSUMPTION OF ZERO-SUM OUTCOMES
SPILOVERS VISIBLE, HIGH IMPACT & NEGATIVE

- Eurozone locks Germany and Greece together
- Social cohesion can't be achieved by fiscal transfers
- Schengen & enlargement stretch multi-culturalism
THE EU'S CAPACITY TO ACT

- In law, EU open to many members
- In practice, legal, economic and cultural capacity must have some limit
- Copenhagen criteria set standards for applicants for admission
- No equivalent criteria for EU's own absorption capacity.

  Committed integrationists dislike constraint
  Unwilling Europeans want to reduce capacity
PRAGMATIC LIMITS TO EU CAPACITY

● Constitutional: German Federal Court
  UK European Referendum Act 2011
  Incorporation of Stability *Vertrag as EU law*

● Weak enforcement powers on member states re democratic standards

● Conditionality doesn't get rid of corruption:

● Potential new members below 2004 enlargement states re:
  Democratic commitment. Corruption. GDP. Functioning economy.
### INTERDEPENDENCE STRETCHES EUROPE’S BOUNDARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>EU countries</th>
<th>Non -EU</th>
<th>% EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;EUROPEAN&quot; ORGANIZATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Central Bank</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29 + 12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Trade Organisation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpol</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to Challenges:

COMMITTED TO INTEGRATION

● Uniform policy for all member states

● Decide by consensus or Unanimity

● Limits to acting within stretched powers of existing treaties

● Not justified to Europe’s citizens
UNWILLING EUROPEANS: THE UK GOVERNMENT

Seek opt outs for new policies

Repatriate powers: Fresh Start MPs

Withdrawal--and join Norway in European Economic Area

--and leap in the dark
A PRAGMATIC RESPONSE

● CASE by CASE evaluation of policy options

● ENHANCED CO-OPERATION: COALITIONS OF THE WILLING
  Immediately satisfies both countries in and out

  IF experience good, laggards catch up with leaders

● LOOSER UNION IF BENEFITS NOT IN COMMON
  Monetary disunion: four groups

● INTEGRATION AS A BYPRODUCT