**European Studies Course**

**European Integration and Anti-Integration Sentiment**

*Hosted by the European University Centre at Peking University*

**COURSE SUMMARY**

European integration continues to deepen with as major milestone the latest Lisbon Treaty of 2009 establishingthe office of the presidency, the extension of powers of the European Parliament, the revision of voting procedures in the Council of Ministers, and the establishment of a High Representative office. At the same time, however, we see increased resistance to European integration in founding member states such as the Netherlands and France, where integration referendums delivered surprising “no” votes and anti-European political parties gather increased support in elections. In the recent elections in the United Kingdom, the Tories won the elections in part by promising a referendum on EU membership.

The Global Financial Crisis of 2008 further underlined the close integration of the European economic systems, but also resulted tough austerity policies within member states under pressure from European partners. The backlash from these policies further encourages anti-integration attitudes, with voters blaming the European Union for some of their woes. Furthermore, anti-integration attitudes among the countries less affected by the crisis, which saw significant funds go to support the weaker economies, were strengthened.

This more local and anti-globalization sentiment is perhaps also visible on a more local scale, where we see a momentum of separatist movements in for example Scotland and Catalonia. The consequences of those tendencies for the European Union are unclear and the membership status of a potential separated region in a member state is undefined as it stands.

To what extent do the anti-integration sentiments form a threat to deepening – or maintaining – European integration? How do separatist pressures in member states affect European integration? How does the recent Global Financial Crisis impact on popular support for European integration? These are the kind of questions that will be asked in this course, to be answered from a multidisciplinary perspective.

Students will be encouraged to link the topic with China’s own challenges. China is big country with very different cultures and ethnic identities, which has become more and more a political problem. Although there are certainly big differences between China and the EU in this regard, the nature of the problem could commonly be reduced to the concern of ‘how could different people live as one.’ The Chinese lessons may even be of help for European politicians and scholars in their thinking of their own challenges in this respect. The teaching and discussion under this theme would certainly be a great opportunity for both Chinese students/scholars and European professors to engage in a fruitful cross-cultural dialogue. A sequence of sub-themes would bring them to study and reflect on different aspects of this topic.

**Course Contents (Obligatory for students who sign up for the course)**

September 24 –Prof. Georg Grote

 *（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

October 15 – Prof. Andy Storey

 *（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

October 29-30 – Prof. Piotr Bogdanowicz

 *（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

November 19-20 –Prof. Mary Gallagher

*（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

December 3-4 – Prof. Gavin Barrett

*（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

December 19-20 – Prof. Stella Kostopoulou

 *（Lecture：15：10 ；Seminar：19：00）*

**Public Lectures (To students who sign up: very welcome to participate, but not obligatory)**

See a different document

**Examination: Final paper**

* As examination of the course, the students write an individual paper (in English or Chinese) on the topic of this course in relation to the readings.
* You will have to submit your paper to the course co-ordinator (段德敏）on 15 Janurary 2016 at the latest.

  The paper draft will be presented and discussed at a final seminar on 31 December 2015.

其他考核说明:

* 出席考勤：超过三次未上课不得优秀
* 鼓励大家用英文写作期末论文，这也是申请奖学金基本前提。

**Course Lectures**

# September 24 – Dr. Georg Grote

**Dr. Georg Grote, Historian, Head of School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, University College Dublin**

*Conflict Resolution and regional development in Europe – the South Tyrol Case*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

The South Tyrol issue in the 20th century bears all key aspects of European history in the 20th century, from nationalism to fascism, oppression and conflict, displacement and identity crisis, totalitarianism and democracy, Europeanism, regionalism, secessionism and a peaceful solution to the strive for minority self-determination in a framework of understanding, multilingualism and c*ampanilismo*.

Apart from its exemplary qualities for European developments in the 20th century, and the resolution of potentially explosive ethnic tensions in the Italian Province, (which itself turned it into a blueprint for the European approach towards conflict resolution), the issue of South Tyrol is a fascinating micro-history in itself, particularly for the historian of nationalist phenomena who is concerned with the manifestations and transformations of collective identities from the nationalist to the regionalist era in Europe.

In this lecture I will try to outline how the explosive qualities inherent in historical nationalism were defused within the European framework, while, at the same time, the needs for a distinct collective identity continue to survive and have created a state-like strong regional force in Northern Italy which bears many of the hallmarks of nation-building. At the same time, the Province is well integrated and firmly embedded in its host country Italy.

For many years I have researched and accompanied the political and societal developments in South Tyrol and am currently actively involved in creating an archive of social history, which is considered to become one of the seedbeds of regional identity, straddling the ethno-linguistic divides between the three populations in the Province, the German-speaking Tyrolean population, the Italian-speaking population, originating from the immigrants during the Fascist period (1922-1943) and the indigenous Ladin-speaking population which enjoys a special protection. I will report on the efforts of the South Tyroleans to draw on international expertise to build up a regional identity, the cultural and linguistic protection of all populations in the area, and how they are challenging the post-World War I borders between the states of Austria and Italy through their full use of the framework on regionalism provided by the European Union and how this geographically small Italian province contributes to the fast-changing relationship between the region, the nation-state and the European Union.

READING LIST

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR FURTHER READING

1. Alcock, Antony. A History of the Protection of Regional Cultural Minorities in Europe. Macmillan, London 2000.

2. Benedikter, Thomas. The World’s Working Regional Autonomies. Anthem, London 2007.

3. Brendon, Piers. The Dark Valley. A Panorama of the 1930s. Jonathan Cape, London 2000.

4. Gamper, Anna / Christoph Pan (eds.). Volksgruppen und regionale Selbstverwaltung in Europa. Nomos, Wien 2008.

5. Gehler, Michael / Andreas Pudlat (eds.). Grenzen in Europa. Olms, Hildesheim 2009.

6. Giudiceandrea, Lucio / Aldo Mazza. Stare insieme è un’arte. Vivere in Alto Adige / Südtirol. Alphabeta, Merano 2012.

7. Grote, Georg. “I bin a Südtiroler.” Kollektive Identität zwischen Nation und Region im 20. Jahrhundert, Athesia, Bozen 2009.

8. Grote, Georg / Barbara Siller (eds.). Südtirolismen. Wagner, Innsbruck 2011.

9. Grote, Georg. The South Tyrol issue 1866-2010. From National Rage to Regional State. Lang, Oxford 2012.

10. Grote, Georg / Hannes Obermair / Günther Rautz (eds.). “Un mondo senza stati è un mondo senza guerre.” Politisch motivierte Gewalt im regionalen Kontext. ERUAC, Bozen 2013.

11. Hroch, Miroslav. Das Europa der Nationen. Die moderne Nationenbildung im europäischen Vergleich. Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2005.

12. Judt, Tony. Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945. Vintage, London 2010.

13. Keating, Michael. The New Regionalism in Western Europe. Territorial Restructuring and Political Change. Elgar, Cheltenham 1998.

14. Pan, Christoph / Beate Sibylle Pfeil. National Minorities in Europe. Braumüller, Wien 2003.

15. Peterlini, Hans Karl. 100 Jahre Südtirol. Geschichte eines jungen Landes. Haymon, Innsbruck2012.

16. Schneckener, Ulrich / Stefan Wolff (eds.). Managing and Settling Ethnic Conflicts. Palgrave, New York, 2004.

17. Steininger, Rolf. South Tyrol. A Minority Conflict of the 20th Century. Transaction, New Brunswick 2003**.**

SUGGESTED READING

1. Alcock, Antony. A History of the Protection of Regional Cultural Minorities in Europe. Macmillan, London 2000.Chapters of particular interest: The Paris Peace Conference, p.39-57; Territorial Changes and Population Movements, p. 88-93; The Austro-Italian Agreement on South Tyrol, p.97-100.

2. Benedikter, Thomas. The World’s Working Regional Autonomies. Anthem, London 2007.Chapters of particular interest: The Concept of Political Autonomy, p.16-70; South Tyrol and Italy’s Autonomous Regions, p.87-108.

3. Brendon, Piers. The Dark Valley. A Panorama of the 1930s. Jonathan Cape, London 2000.Chapters of particular interest: The Roots of Fascism, p.21-42; The Triumph of Hitler, p.88-107; The Fascist Axis, p.469-491.

4. Judt, Tony. Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945. Vintage, London 2010.Chapters of particular interest: The Legacy of War, p. 13-40; The Rehabilitation of Europe, p.63-99; The Politics of Stability, p.241-277.

5. Keating, Michael. The New Regionalism in Western Europe. Territorial Restructuring and Political Change. Elgar, Cheltenham 1998.Chapters of particular interest: The Region – the elusive Space, p.9-15; Regions and State Building in Western Europe, p.16-35; The Politics of Regional Development, p. 47-52; TheMove to regional Government, p. 55-62.

6. Schneckener, Ulrich / Stefan Wolff (eds.). Managing and Settling Ethnic Conflicts. Palgrave, New York, 2004.Chapters of particular interest: Conceptualising Conflict Management And Settlement, p.1-39; Settling Ethnic Conflicts through Power-Sharing: South Tyrol, p.57-76.

7. Georg Grote: “South Tyrol in the 20th Century: Retaining Ethnicity between Nationalism and Regionalism.” In: Aileen Pearson-Evans, Angela Leahy (eds.), Intercultural Spaces: Language, Culture, Identity. New York, Peter Lang 2007, p. 149-160

8. Georg Grote: “Reclaiming Places in a Regionalist Context. Iconoclasm and Toponomasticism in South Tyrol.” In: Fergal Lenehan, Nadine Jänicke (eds.), The Moulding of Space - Negotiating Language and Spatiality in Literature and History. Leipzig: Meine Verlag 2010, p. 33-44.

9. Georg Grote: “Vielsprachigkeit in Südtirol – Modell für Europa oder Kapitulation vor der Geschichte?” In: Acta Germanica, Jahrbuch des Germanistenverbandes im südlichen Afrika. Vol. 33, 2005, p. 69-80.

# October 15 – Prof. Andy Storey

**Prof. Andy Storey, College Lecturer, School of Politics & International Relations, University College Dublin**

*How is the current financial crisis impacting on popular support for European integration?*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

- The differential impact of the crisis on EU member states, with specific reference to the division between Northern and Southern Europe;

- How attitudes towards European integration are, or are not, impacted by these differential impacts; are the 'winners' still supportive of integration and the 'losers' less supportive?

- Here opposition to integration has risen, what form has this opposition taken? Specifically, have left-wing or right-wing movements been the beneficiaries of growing anti-integration sentiment?

- What is the likely overall effect of these trends for the future of European integration?

**READING LIST**

1. Nikolai Huke, Mònica Clua-Losada & David J. Bailey (2015) Disrupting the European Crisis: A Critical Political Economy of Contestation, Subversion and Escape, New Political Economy, 20:5, 725-751, DOI: 10.1080/13563467.2014.999759

2. Storey, Andy, Chronicle of a European Crisis Foretold. Chapter 3: Building Neoliberalism from Above and Options for Resistance from Below. P. 33-47

3. Streeck, Wolfgang. Small-State Nostalgia? The Currency Union, Germany, and Europe: A Reply to Jurgen Habermas Constellations Volume 21, No 2, 2014. P.213-221

4. Sune Sandbeck & Etienne Schneider (2014) From the Sovereign Debt Crisis to Authoritarian Statism: Contradictions of the European State Project, New Political Economy, 19:6, 847-871, DOI: 10.1080/13563467.2013.861411

5. Watkins, Susan (Nov, Dec 2014) The Political State of the Union, New Left Review; p. 5-25

# October 29 – Prof. Piotr Bogdanowicz

**Piotr Bogdanowicz, Ph. D. Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Warsaw**

*Five years later and five years before – to what extent does Europe 2020 support European integration?*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

In 2010 the European Commission ("**Commission**") issued Communication "Europe 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth"1 ("**Europe 2020**"). This new political strategy was a follow-up to Lisbon Strategy, which was launched in 2000 to make the European Union ("**EU**") "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" but proved largely ineffective. Even the Commission in the Lisbon Strategy evaluation document remarked that "the Lisbon's Strategy's aim of promoting more policy integration across the macro-economic, employment and micro-economic (including environment) dimensions has only partially succeeded"2.

However, Europe 2020 was based on the same concept with five headline targets to be achieved by the end of 2020. These cover:

* Employment – 75 % of the population aged 20-64 should be employed;
* Research and development (R&D) – 3% of the EU's GDP should be invested in R&D;
* Climate and energy – the "20/20/20" climate/energy targets should be met, i.e. reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 20% compared to 1990 values, increasing the share of renewables on total energy consumption to 20%, and increasing energy efficiency by 20%;
* Education – the share of early school leavers should be under 10% and at least 40% of the younger generation should have a tertiary degree; and
* Combating poverty – 20 million less people should be at risk of poverty.

José Manuel Barroso, then the President of the EC, called these targets "ambitious, but attainable". First reactions were, however, skeptical: "For me this is like a broken record. I've heard it for 10 years. It's all words and no substance". After five years, we see that since 2010 progress has been made in the areas of climate and energy and education only (but even here targets are still not met), it has been more limited for R&D expenditure and the distance to the employment and poverty targets has increased4. One can bet that Europe 2020's targets will not be met by the end of 2020.

But the problem is not with numbers. The problem is much more general: whether Europe 2020 is a strategy setting the right agenda and focusing on right long-term objectives. Today the EU has to struggle with such issues as integration fatigue, migrant crisis, the risk of the United Kingdom opt-outs from EU social policy and financial regulation or the risk of Greece leaving the euro. Needless to say, it requires the strategy, which is able to address these issues.

This lecture will be divided into three parts. I will start by summarizing main points of Europe 2020. Then I will make a mid-term assessment thereof. The foregoing will lead to the main point of the analysis: answering the question set forth in the title: to what extent does Europe 2020 support European integration? I will conclude with some ideas for the second half of Europe 2020.

**READING LIST**

1. European Commission, *Communication from the Commission*. *Europe 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, COM(2010) 2020 final

2. European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Document: Lisbon Strategy Evaluation Document*, SEC (2010) 114 final

3. Armstrong K.A., *The Lisbon Agenda and Europe 2020: From the Governance of Governance of Coordination to the Coordination of Governance*, "Queen Mary University of London, School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper" 2011, no. 89

4. Natali, D., *The Lisbon strategy, Europe 2020 and the crisis in between*, E. Marlier E., Natali D., (eds.), *Europe 2020: Towards a More Social EU*, Brussels 2010

5. Renda A., *The Review of the Europe 2020 Strategy: From austerity to prosperity?*, "CEPS Policy Brief" 2014, no. 322

# November 19 – Prof. Mary Gallagher

**Professor Mary Gallagher, French and Francophone Studies, School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, University College Dublin**

*Europe: the Language of Diversity*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

There is an obvious disconnect between systems that promote the value either of (supposedly) distinct and homogeneous entities/identities (ethnic, cultural, linguistic, political) or *even* of mixed, plural, layered or heterogeneous entities/identities, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, systems that embrace the value of what is (implicitly antithetically) labeled as ‘*trans*identitarian’, ‘*trans*national’, ‘*trans*lingual’, ‘*trans*cultural’. Both value systems are at work in the educational and cultural institutions and discourses of Europe. It is striking that the second set of characterizations are rarely, if ever, conceptualized in today’s Europe in anthropological terms (as essentially or universally ‘human’, for example) but rather by the grotesquely overused and vacuously geomorphological term ‘global’. What is ‘global’ about the systems, process, relations and exchanges that are supposedly described and certainly valued as such, is, apparently, their emancipation from the constraints and coordinates of space and time. Thus what is promoted above all is the absolute mobility or *trans*-late-ability of the global, and also its facilitation of, and realization in, *trans*actional relations of exchange.

The European Union is the current form and name given to what started out baldly as a Common Market and then briefly became a Community before reaching the apparent homeostasis of a Union. What is, currently, the state of this Union? Does it register, and if so how, any value for linguistic, cultural or human diversity, discontinuity, dissonance or dissensus in the neo-global age? In this lecture/seminar module, we will confront the gap or disconnect between a flattening economic and marketing discourse of European union, commonality and administration, an increasingly quixotic political discourse of European democracy and a philosophical discourse on language and languages.

Three questions will guide our reflection and these will be explored further in the seminar: all three have particular resonance in the light of the current ‘migration’ crisis rocking Europe.

**Course Seminar**

Discussion of some of the central questions arising around Europe’s multi-lingual composition (especially in relation to its postcolonial ‘legacy issues’). These might include:

1. What are the implications of Europe’s multiply colonial and imperial **legacy** on the contemporary status of its (internal and external) borders and boundaries and how do these play out in relation to the place of language/languages in Europe?

2. What are the main differences between the globalization in which the colonialist/imperialist legacy, on the one hand, and the neo-globalization that is playing out today in approaches to language/languages or linguistic difference/diversity.

3. Who belongs, who is made welcome, in Europe? And in which language(s)?

**READING LIST**

The background to these talks/discussions is wide-ranging, but a certain familiarity with (rather than a painstaking, methodical reading of) the following material will be helpful.

Etienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, trans. James Swenson, Princeton University Press, 2003

Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham, New York : Monthly Review Press, 1972, 2000. (available as PDF on humanities.ucl website)

Michael Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, London : Routledge, 2003

Mary Gallagher (ed), *World Writing : Poetics, Ethics, Globalization*, University of Toronto Press, 2008 [Introduction]

Lázló Marácz & Mireille Rosello, *Multilingual Europe, Multilingual Europeans*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2012

Charles Stewart (ed.), *Creolization : History, Ethnography, Theory*, Walnut Creek CA, Left Coast Press, 2007

Robert Young, *Postcolonialism : a Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2003

# December 3 – Prof. Gavin Barrett

**Prof. Gavin Barrett, Sutherland UCD School of Law, University College Dublin**

*The Evolving Eurozone - Some Thoughts on the Eurozone as It Emerged from Maastricht, as It Looks Now and as It Will Evolve in the Future*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

In the years since the initial shape of its architecture was first determined at negotiations over the Treaty of Maastricht in 1991, the eurozone has seen a remarkable level of development, both institutional and otherwise, rapidly becoming the focal point of European level constitutional change, with the design of the eurozone altering considerably from its original format. This process can be viewed as one of evolution or of revolution: perhaps both. Changes in design have occurred as individual gradual reactions which in some way have facilitated the survival of the entity that is the eurozone, in a crisis – something one normally associated with evolutionary change. On the other hand change, (in part necessitated by the faulty structure and institutional design of the eurozone), if somewhat piecemeal has nonetheless also been very rapid– a feature one normally associates with revolution.

Hinarejos has identified the enforcement of fiscal discipline, the addressing of structural inequalities, and the countering of asymmetric shocks in a more efficient manner as being challenges that *all* federal common multilevel fiscally decentralised systems need to address. The eurozone’s efforts to confront these challenges and others are in some measure, leading it to *become* the new European Union, in that this nineteen-member sub-group of EU member seems to be beginnin to occupy a role formerly occupied by the European Union as the centre of European economic and political integration for the foreseeable future. This lecture seeks to make some observations about eurozone structure and governance as this looked originally, as it has now evolved and how it seems likely to evolve in the near to medium-term future.

**READING LIST**

A. Hinarejos, *“Fiscal Federalism in the European Union: Evolution and Future Choices for EMU”* (2013) 50 CMLRev 1621 at 1621 and 1641.

A. Hinarejos, *The Euro Area Crisis in Constitutional Perspective* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015), Chapter 9.

M. Matthijs and M. Blyth, *"Conclusion: The Future of the Euro: Possible Futures, Risks, and Uncertainties",* Chapter 12 of M. Matthijs and M. Blyth, *The Future of the Euro* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015).

# December 18 – Prof. Stella Kostopoulou

**Prof. Stella Kostopoulou, Associate Professor in Regional Economics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Department of Economics**

*European Spatial Policy and Regional Inequalities: The Geography of Anti-Integration?*

**SUMMARY OF LECTURE**

* The development of spatial planning in the European Union.
* Different planning processes and systems.
* Key concepts and policy goals for spatial and territorial development.
* Planning tools aiming at promoting integration.
* The nature of regional disparities in European Union.
* The origins, evolution and current operation of European Regional Policy.
* The economic, institutional and political significance of regions in Europe today.
* Regions as a geography basis of anti-integration sentiment.

Students attending the Lecture and Seminar are expected to be able to better understand and explain spatial planning systems in Europe and the role of European Union support. Students are also expected to be able to analyse and discuss the nature of regional inequalities, as well as the economic and political significance of regions in the geography of anti-integration sentiment in European Union.