

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union

Project no. 177316-LLP-1-2010-DE-ERASMUS-ENWA

## **LISBOAN**

### **Linking Interdisciplinary Integration Studies by Broadening the European Academic Network**

## **Report on the workshop “Theorising integration and governance after the Lisbon Treaty and during ‘Crisis’”**

University of Sheffield (Partner no. 58)

Workshop Venue: The Ridge, University of Sheffield, UK

Deliverable No. 21

**9 July 2013, Project month 34**

Dissemination level: Public

Funding Disclaimer: This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## **Workshop: Theorising integration and governance after the Lisbon Treaty and during 'Crisis', 9th July 2013, University of Sheffield**

### **Aims**

The objective of the workshop was to review the 'state of the art' of the theoretical/analytical literature on the EU in the aftermath of the Lisbon Treaty and in the midst of the 'euro-zone crisis'. In particular, participants gave their views on the central question: Do existing approaches capture the changed circumstances or are new ones needed? The workshop brought together a range of EU studies scholars from institutions throughout the EU to consider this pressing question (see participant list and schedule below).

### **Keynote: Professor Ben Rosamond (BR)**

The keynote explored the central question of whether and how crises/major changes provoke shifts in the way we produce scholarly knowledge about the EU. BR posed a number of sub-questions: To what extent do external/ real world drivers in general drive academic/theoretical change? What would constitute substantive change in this context: Methodological change? A shift from positivism to reflectivism? Or, less radically, a move from one theory to another within a particular methodology? Such questions animated much of the discussion throughout the day.

BR argued that the story of EU integration is often told in terms of external drivers – in much mainstream research and teaching changes are closely associated with changes within EU politics (particular moments of discontinuity/ crisis etc.). But he argued internal (disciplinary) drivers are also important in explaining change as well as (in some cases unexpected) continuities. Scholars are socialised into particular fields and what is empirically significant is a choice made based on some a priori guide. A disciplinary politics is at play which determines the admissibility (or not) of particular work. EU studies is a case in point, where particular disciplinary approaches (from IR, political science) have been brought to bear on EU as object of study.

BR illustrated this central argument with reference to three crises: 1 the empty chair crisis; 2 the crisis of Maastricht ratification; 3 the ongoing 'euro' crisis. In each case it was emphasised that a standard story based on 'external drivers' could be told also in terms of 'internal drivers'. This led to the conclusion that we shouldn't necessarily expect the major external driver of euro-crisis to transform the theoretical terrain of EU studies. If such changes are considered desirable (which BR suggested they are) internal changes will also be important/ required. These might include the following: better historicisation of EU; greater engagement with a sociological turn and political economy; keep open the possibility for interdisciplinary work and seriously consider what this

might entail; consider the relationship between theory and practice (how they may constitute each other).

Q&A: The keynote prompted a wide ranging discussion on, inter alia: the relative impact of internal and external drivers to EU scholarship; the proximity of EU scholars to their object of study; the nature of crisis and whether the current crisis is/may be distinct as an external driver as compared with previous crises; the pressures and implications of disciplinarity, academic conformity, research funding etc.; whether neo-classical economics has been an (implicit) master-discipline for EU studies and whether there may be alternatives in this respect; the nature of the so-called 'permissive consensus' and the importance of normative reflection/engagement with political theory; whether EU studies can learn lessons from an increasingly heterodox post-Cold war IR.

**PANEL 1: Douglas Webber (DW), Antje Wiener (AW), Wolfgang Wessels (WW), Tamara Hervey (TH), Joachim Schild (JS) (Discussant)**

The first panel considered questions of integration and integration theory from a variety of perspectives.

DW spoke to a piece he has published in the European Journal of International Relations: 'How likely is it that the European Union will disintegrate? A critical analysis of competing theoretical perspectives' 2013. DW has attempted in this piece to extrapolate from the major approaches their prognoses on the implications of the crisis for integration/disintegration. He argues first that some theoretical approaches are more optimistic than others in terms of the long term prospects of the EU in light of the crisis and second that all such theory fails to pay sufficient attention to domestic politics which has become extremely significant in the current crisis. He discussed this issue with particular reference to the importance of German domestic politics and its consequent difficulties in assuming the role of hegemon within EU.

AW offered some reflections on the potential of the EU to be a constructive force globally. She presented three approaches – the normative power approach; the norm diffusion approach; and the critical norms research approach – arguing in favour of the third of these. While the first two are understood as top-down promotion of EU constitutional norms in global contexts, the third approach emphasises the importance of an interactive process, emphasising local ownership and local choice of norm adoption ('blue-printing'). Such an approach, she concludes, is more respectful of local contingency than the other two discussed.

WW (director of the Lisbon network) began by discussing the ways in which the initial intentions of the network – to consider the import of the Lisbon treaty for EU scholarship and teaching – had been to some extent overrun by 'real world' events, namely, the crisis. He went on

to discuss the crisis in terms of his 'fusion' thesis, emphasising, inter alia, the importance of the European Council in this context, including as a potential constraint on hegemonic power.

TH reflected on the importance of law in the current context and, in particular, on the argument that law has been 'decentred' in the EU context given, inter alia, shifts away from the Community Method; decreasingly activist/ 'heroic' ECJ; variable integration; and the nature of ongoing crisis management. TH argued that this argument is at least overstated: notions of a 'single legal order' have long been exaggerated and pluralism has long been a framework in EU legal studies. Law continues to have effect even if it is politicised in certain ways during the crisis (see also KA intervention below).

Discussion/ Q&A: The above interventions prompted an interesting discussion. JS, acting as discussant, concurred with DW on the importance of domestic politics, but wondered whether more attention should be given to other cases, particularly France. He prompted AW to consider how, methodologically, one might ascertain the relative importance of EU as a 'blueprint' (influence) beyond itself. And he asked TH to consider the causal factors explaining the position of law within the EU. Other participants drew attention to, inter alia: the importance of interdependence and its relationship with domestic politics in the crisis context; the similarities and differences between the Council and other executive actors; the continued import of the Franco-German relationship; whether questions of normative influence apply within EU (Europeanisation) as well as in the context of external relations; whether Germany accepts a hegemonic role in the EU.

**PANEL 2: Laura Cram (LC), Brigid Laffan (BL), Kenneth Armstrong (KA), Ian Bache (IB) (Discussant)**

The second panel considered questions of governance theory from a variety of perspectives.

LC considered different narratives of crisis and how such narratives frame the possibility for future action. Such narratives include: crisis as threat to the EU; crisis as opportunity for action (the notion of 'never waste a good crisis'); unity in adversity which sees the crisis as an opportunity for greater unity; and a survivalist narrative, which considers the EU as ultimately too big/important to fail. These various narratives frame governance in different ways.

BL made the case that since the crisis economic governance is firmly back on the agenda with the reforms that it has prompted. She highlighted, inter alia, the ways in which the crisis has prompted calls for greater union of various kinds (economic, fiscal, political etc.); the way in which it has revived questions of distributive politics and questions of output legitimacy. In short, she noted the ways in which the crisis should lead scholars back to some of the 'big' governance questions.

KA discussed a range of issues at the interface of governance and law, particularly in terms of so-called 'new' (soft) governance modes and the implications for law. These are long term questions (related to the decentring of law, demise of Community Method etc. – see TH intervention) but also particularly pertinent in the context of crisis where legislative responses include hard and soft forms of legal measures. The EU responses to crisis – changes in economic governance (see BL above) – also have implications for various legal issues at national level given the constraints that the EU imposes. There are a range of issues with which legal scholars need to get to grips.

Discussion/ Q&A: IB, acting as discussant, raised the question of how plausible the survivalist strategy – the notion that the EU is too big to fail – is in the context of the crisis (this point connects with DW's presentation above). In particular he noted growing legitimacy concerns. In response to all papers, in particular KA, IB wondered whether the crisis has prompted a need to consider broader 'meta-governance' questions – drawing particularly on political economy and critical governance literatures (see also BR and MR) – than it had pre-crisis. KA agreed that the crisis has in a sense 'dramatised' a range of issues that had existed but perhaps been given attention previously.

**PANEL 3: Simon Bulmer (SB) & Jonathan Joseph (JJ), Owen Parker (OP), Magnus Ryner (MR)**

SB and JJ outlined preliminary thoughts on an approach to EU studies which deploys the concept of hegemony in a variety of contexts: in economic and political domains; within the EU and among member states and including their domestic politics. The approach takes into account debates on structure and agency and multi-level politics. They argue that European integration is the product of a number of separate hegemonic projects. Such an approach accounts for the unintended structural consequences of agency across multiple levels.

OP addressed teaching theories of the EU. Given the breadth and complexity of the subject teaching modules/courses is a particularly difficult endeavour which has been compounded by the crisis. The crisis could be used as an opportunity to bring to the fore questions that were previously less salient, particularly critical and normative questions that may have previously been given insufficient attention. It was argued that being clear about the range of questions thrown up by EU as object of study at the outset of teaching (and also the disciplinary politics at play, see BR keynote) might be the most pedagogically appropriate way of introducing these questions into teaching.

MR offered some critical reflections on the state of EU studies and sought to draw together the themes discussed during the workshop. Much of what he said drew on his recent article in *Millennium*: 'Financial Crisis, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in the Production of Knowledge about the EU' (2012). He argues that much mainstream EU studies scholarship has been framed (and

constrained) by the assumptions of neo-classical economics and this has delimited discussion in ways which made it difficult for mainstream EU studies to predict/deal with the crisis. This intervention built in certain respects on the keynote (BR) in elucidating a particular perspective on the way in which a disciplinary politics has played out in EU studies.

Discussion and Q&A focused on the nature of hegemony, questions of orthodoxy and heterodoxy in EU studies and the challenges and difficulties of teaching the EU.

### **Conclusions**

The workshop sessions generated debate on a range of issues pertinent to theorising the EU post Lisbon and in the midst of the 'euro' crisis. Scholars working in the mainstream of EU studies suggested ways in which the existing 'tool-kit' of theoretical approaches might begin to consider and engage with these events. Others suggested that such events – and particularly the 'crisis' – signal the limitations of this 'tool-kit' and the need to engage with scholarly approaches from outside this mainstream, in particular, political economy approaches.

*Owen Parker and Simon Bulmer*  
University of Sheffield

**Workshop Schedule:**

09.00-09.20 Arrival

09.20-09.30 Welcome by Simon Bulmer

09.30-10.30 Keynote lecture:  
Ben Rosamond (Copenhagen) Theorising European crisis after Lisbon and the crisis

10.30-11.00 Morning tea

11.00-12.45 PANEL 1: Integration theory post-Lisbon/post-crisis

Chair: Simon Bulmer

Douglas Webber (INSEAD) How likely is it that the European Union will disintegrate? A critical analysis of competing theoretical perspectives

Antje Wiener (University of Hamburg) Blueprinting' Normative Order: The Social Construction of Europe and Its Political Value-Added

Wolfgang Wessels (University of Cologne) Fusion thesis & beyond: the validity of our theoretical acquis post-Lisbon and post-crisis.

Tamara Hervey (University of Sheffield) Law, integration and the post-Lisbon EU

Discussant: Joachim Schild (Universitat Trier)

12.45-13.45 Lunch

13.45-15.15 PANEL 2: Theorising Governance post-Lisbon/post-crisis

Chair: Christian Lequesne (CERI/Sciences Po, Paris)

Laura Cram (University of Edinburgh) Governance and the Survivalist Narrative: The EU's Emerging Mythistorema

Brigid Laffan (University College Dublin) Governance and legitimacy

Kenneth Armstrong (Queen Mary University London) Differentiated Governance, Pluralistic Normativity: Challenges for European Law and Governance

Discussant: Ian Bache (University of Sheffield)

15.15-15.30 Afternoon tea

15.30-16.45 PANEL 3: New directions in tackling the nature of the beast

Chair: Ian Bache (University of Sheffield)

Simon Bulmer and Jonathan Joseph (University of Sheffield) The Rise and Fall of a 'hegemonic project'? Supranational integration and domestic politics

Owen Parker (University of Sheffield) Teaching theories of EU politics post crisis

Magnus Ryner (King's College London) Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy and the Production of Knowledge about the EU

**Workshop Participants**

Surname	First Name	Organisation
Armstrong	Kenneth	Queen Mary University London
Bache	Ian	University of Sheffield
Bulmer	Simon	University of Sheffield
Cram	Laura	University of Edinburgh
George	Stephen	University of Sheffield
Hervey	Tamara	University of Sheffield
Hofmann	Andreas	University of Cologne
Iusmen	Ingi	University of Sheffield
Joseph	Jonathan	University of Sheffield
Kyriakidis	Alexandros	University of Sheffield
Laffan	Brigid	University College Dublin
Lequesne	Christian	Science Po
Nugent	Neill	College of Europe
Parker	Owen	University of Sheffield
Paterson	William	Aston University
Pye	Robbie	University of Sheffield
Rosamond	Ben	University of Copenhagen
Ryner	Magnus	King's College London
Schild	Joachim	University of Trier
Siles-Brugge	Gabriel	University of Manchester
Snaith	Holly	University of Sheffield
Vasallo	Mario	University of Sheffield
Webber	Douglas	INSEAD
Wessels	Wolfgang	University of Cologne
Wiener	Antje	University of Hamburg