

## Report

### LISBOAN Working Group Workpackage II (WP leader: Simon Bulmer)

#### “Integration Theory and Governance Research after Lisbon”

June 16th 2011, 13.30 - 15.00 h

The working group of workpackage II chaired by *Simon Bulmer* (University of Sheffield) was dedicated to the impact of ‘leadership’ on negotiation processes within the European Union and beyond after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon. At the beginning, the chair elaborated on two guiding questions for the working group: i) Has the LT already impacted on the leadership question?, and ii) is a leadership of the Franco-German tandem or the Council a possibility or even a reality?

The first speaker, *Joachim Schild* (University of Trier), dedicated his presentation to the introduction of a systematic framework for investigating the Franco-German leadership under the LT. He started from an analytical framework of leadership, presenting different types of leadership, such as the engine function, agenda setting, compromise building and multilateral coalitions, and the resources used by a potential leader, such as institutional power resources. Against this background, he argued that the informal changes brought about by the LT were essential as well, for example the increasing importance of the ‘precooking’ by Germany and France with the new permanent President of the European Council. Secondly, the speaker applied the aforementioned types of leadership to a number of recent (or even on-going) test cases. He described the Eurozone crisis as an example of a partial Franco-German leadership, whereas with regard to the events in Libya, no such Franco-German leadership could be verified. From a more general perspective, Joachim Schild identified an asymmetrical leadership insofar as Germany takes a leading role in economic and monetary affairs, and France in diplomacy issues. With a view to the consequences of the LT, the speaker concluded that a Franco-German leadership was still possible, but that it had become more demanding than before Lisbon. During the subsequent discussion, some participants opined that only Germany had the institutional capacity to assume leadership within the EU.

The second speaker, *Wolfgang Wessels* (University of Cologne) stressed that there was a factual demand for leadership (above all in huge and heterogenic groups such as the EU). He therefore saw the need for academics to pay more attention to this issue, given that integration theory so far had neglected leadership. Turning to the role of the European Council, the speaker gave a quick overview over the creation of the European Council. Quoting the former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt who asked ‘Who is the Commission?’, he judged that the real decision-maker was the European Council. Wolfgang Wessels argued that the European Council was not a clearly intergovernmental institution – in contrast, that its decisions were sometimes surprisingly supranational. This perspective would better explain some areas in which the Council assumed an important role, like enlargement. Moreover, he suggested that there is a “joint management” since the European Council was also depended on other institutions, such as the Commission. On the other hand, the President of the Commission needed the Heads of State and Government as the case of Jacques Delors demonstrated. Delors had always been seen as a strong President, but he only could make such an appearance as was in agreement with the then leaders of Germany and France. As a last point, the speaker dealt with the role of the permanent President within the Council, remarking that he or she is elected for 30 months only and therefore depended on the support of the member states in order to get re-elected. Wolfgang Wessels concluded that the European Council remained the principal decision-maker for policy- and system-making.

In the following general discussion, *Ian Mannes* (Roskilde University) confirmed the need of broader theoretical approaches. A number of participants agreed that values and the role of a norm-setter are of considerable importance. As for the role of the permanent President, it was argued that a communicator/mediator could be more effective and useful than a real leader.