This seminar looks at the EU through the lens of normative political theory. There are various schools of integration theory that seek to explain, understand or interpret the integration process, be it in terms of underlying social and economic processes, the internal dynamics of institutions, the beliefs and agency of individuals or some mixture of these. By contrast, this seminar looks at how far the integration process as described by these empirical theories might (or might not) be justified in terms of norms of justice, such as rights and equality, and legitimacy, such as consent and democracy. Particular emphasis is given to three broad schools of contemporary normative political theory that have figured prominently in discussions of global justice and legitimacy: cosmopolitanism, statism, and the distinctive role that a ‘republican’ approach might make to both these views.

The seminar runs over two terms. In Term 1, we shall look at the debates in the Political Theory literature regarding cosmopolitanism, statism, the contribution of republicanism, and the desirability and feasibility of global democracy. In Term 2 we apply these debates to the assessment of the EU and its legitimacy.

Requirements

The course does not assume any prior knowledge of either political theory or the workings of the EU, although if you are completely new to one or other or both you might benefit from reading a brief introductory text beforehand. There are two relevant books in the OUP A Very Short Introduction series that I can highly recommend:

D Miller, *Political Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*, especially ch. 7, although I suggest you read it all if you are new to the topic


Students will be expected to read at least two of the recommended readings for each week and to do at least one presentation, possibly two, during the course of the seminar.
Students who choose to take this seminar for credit are also required to meet Departmental attendance.

Up to three students have the option of writing a term paper for this seminar as part of their general term paper requirements. However, they must first clear the topic with Professor Bellamy. The term paper must then be submitted via email to Professor Bellamy with the organizing assistant in copy (Jennifer.Dari@eui.eu).

This seminar is worth 20 credits.

**Schedule**

The seminar takes place on **Thursdays at 9.00-11.00** in Seminar Room 2 at the Badia Fiesolana, with the exception of the session on the 27th of October and of the session on the 19th of January, which will be held in Seminar room 3 at the Badia.

The full list of seminar sessions is the following:

**Term 1**
- Thursday 6th October: Seminar Room 2
- Thursday 27th October: Seminar Room 3
- Thursday 10th November: Seminar Room 2
- Thursday 24th November: Seminar Room 2
- Thursday 15th December: Seminar Room 2

**Term 2**
- Thursday 12th January: Seminar Room 3
- Thursday 19th January: Seminar Room 3
- Thursday 9th February: Seminar Room 2
- Thursday 23rd February: Seminar Room 2
- Thursday 23rd March: Seminar Room 2

**Term 1: Cosmopolitanism, Statism and Global Democracy**

**Week 1 – Cosmopolitanism**

Cosmopolitan theorists hold that the egalitarian principles of justice liberal philosophers advocate in the domestic context should extend to the world at large.

- Is the ‘equivalence thesis’ between domestic and global justice tenable?
- Does equal respect for persons demand global distributive equality?
- Is global equality of opportunity an ideal worth pursuing?
- Is it plausible to claim that, with the advance of globalization, the intense social relations characterizing fellow citizens are now reproduced on a global scale?
- Should the demands of justice be applied universally for intrinsic reasons?
- What should be the subject of moral concern: the individual or the state?
Either:

Or:

Either:

Or:

**Further readings:**

**Week 2 Statism**

Statists argue that demanding duties of egalitarian justice only apply to individuals who stand in particular kinds of political relations vis à vis one another, such as the relations existing between fellow citizens. Since such relations do not exist at the global level, statists contend that egalitarian justice does not apply to the world at large. Is this a tenable position or are statists implausibly biased in favour of the *status quo*?

- According to Rawls, what are the demands of international morality?
- What are the moral objections to Rawls’ views? Are these persuasive?
- Are Rawls’ views on global justice out dated?
- What is Nagel’s main argument against global justice, and is it convincing?
- What, if anything, is morally special about the relations in which fellow citizens stand vis-à-vis one another?
- How far can statism accommodate cosmopolitanism and vice versa?
Either:


Or:


Either:


Or:


Further readings:


**Week 3 Justice, Legitimacy and Republicanism**

Some theorists have recently argued that we can view the debate between cosmopolitans and statists as being motivated by a difference over the respective spheres of justice and legitimacy. Republicans in particular have argued that we need a theory of global political justice, that has the latter as its focus, rather than a theory of global distributive justice. They put forward the republican notion of non-domination as a candidate for this role. How far can the concerns of cosmopolitans be assimilated to a concern with non-domination, and does doing so favour statists?

- Can a valid distinction be drawn between justice and legitimacy?
- Is democracy necessary for legitimacy? And if so, is it sufficient?
- What do republicans mean by non-domination?
- How does securing non-domination relate to justice and legitimacy?
- How far (if at all) does Pettit’s republican ‘law of peoples’ differ from Rawls’ Law of Peoples?
Does the republican view that a ‘free person’ implies a ‘free state’ favour statism?

Either:

Or:

Either:

Or:

Further readings:
  Also available here: http://philosophyfaculty.ucsd.edu/faculty/rarneson/democracyandjustice1.pdf
- Bohman, J. ‘Republican Cosmopolitanism’, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 12 (3) 2004

**Week 4 Nationalism and Migration: Cosmopolitanism, Statism and Republicanism**

Perhaps no issue better illustrates differences between Cosmopolitanist and Statist views than their respective attitudes to immigration, with the one more inclined to favour freedom of movement and open borders than the other. Not all statists are nationalists, but those that are tend stress the pre-political obligations of national
belonging above the political obligations of membership of the state, making them even more inclined to restrict immigration. Meantime, the position of republicans has been regarded as ambiguous at best on this issue.

- What, if anything, is morally special about fellow nationality (as distinct from fellow citizenship)?
- If both a fellow national and a stranger are drowning, and we can only save one, which one ought we to save?
- If there is a right to freedom of movement, must there also be a right to open borders?
- Can one distinguish economic migrants from refugees?
- Is a concern with culture-preservation weighty enough to justify immigration restrictions?
- Are closed borders a source of domination?
- Is subjection to coercion a plausible way of identifying the boundaries of the demos? And is Miller correct in claiming that border controls are not coercive?

Either:

Or:

Either:

Or:

Or:

**Further readings:**
- Miller, David *Strangers in Our Midst*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), especially chs. 2 and 5

Week 5 Cosmopolitan Democracy

In an increasingly globalized world, exercises of power which extend beyond the domestic context need to be tamed and regulated. Some political philosophers believe that their regulation should occur via democratic procedures. On their views, it would be highly desirable for the global arena to be democratically organized. Is this claim about the normative desirability of global democracy tenable? Or is the value of democracy dependent upon the existence of particular circumstances which are only instantiated at the domestic level? And even if global democracy was desirable, would it be feasible?

- Is the all-affected-interests principle a plausible basis for identifying the demos?
- If the all-affected-interests principle were true, would it follow that democracy should go global?
- What are the main obstacles to the realization of global democracy?
- Does global democracy require a global state? If so, should this be a reason against the pursuit of global democracy?

Either:


Or:

Either:


Or:


**Further readings:**


**Term 2: Normative Theory Applied to the EU**

This term will look at such issues as Legitimacy and the EU, Sovereignty, the Democratic Deficit, Postnationalism and Union Citizenship, Solidarity and the Migration and Euro Crises from the perspective of the normative theories explored in Term 1. Those unfamiliar with theories of EU integration are encouraged to read A Weiner and T Diez (eds), *European Integration Theory*, 2nd ed, Part 1 – especially Chs 2, 3, 4 and 11

**Week 6 The ‘Normative Turn’ in EU Studies and EU Theories of Integration**

Do you think normative issues are unavoidable within EU studies? If so, which ones and why? To what extent, and in what ways, if at all, can the EU be described as ‘contested’? Does the EU take us into new normative territory, lying midway between statist and cosmopolitan theories? Or is one or other of these adequate, depending on the issue (or one’s normative preferences)?

What are the key aspects of each of the main theories of European integration? How do they differ from each other? Can they be combined? What does each theory predict about the role and influence of member states, interest groups and supranational
actors? How would you go about testing the relative explanatory power of each theory? Do different accounts of EU integration point to different sources and forms of democratic accountability?

On the Normative Turn:

Either:


Or


Or


Either


Or


On Theories of Integration:

You can find outlines of the main theories in A Weiner and T Diez (eds), European Integration Theory, 2nd ed, Part 1 – especially Chs 2, 3, 4.

Classic statements are:


Week 7: Legitimacy, Democracy and Constitutionalism
What is the connection between legitimacy and democracy? Is legitimacy provided by constitutions and rights or by democracy or both?

On legitimacy:

Either:


Or:


Or:


On Constitutionalism and the EU

Either:


Or:


Either:

Week 8: The Democratic Deficit and the Demoi-cratic Disconnect

What does a democratic deficit consist in? Does the EU suffer a worse deficit than the member states? Is delegated power inherently anti-democratic or democracy promoting? Must democracy rely on a demos? And if so, what defines a demos? To what extent does demoi-cracy offer a ‘third way’ between intergovernmentalism and federalism?

Is the problem the democratic deficit or the demoi-cratic disconnect?

On the democratic deficit:

Either:


Or:


Or:


Either:

Or:


Or


On a European demos-cracy:


On a European demoi-cracy:

Either:


Or


Or:


Either:


Or:

Week 9: European Citizenship: Inter-national, Post-national or Supra-national?

What is citizenship? Does European citizenship meet the criteria standardly set for such a status? Is it cosmopolitan or statist in character, or does it have aspects of both? Is it vitiated through being orientated towards the market rather than politics? Should there be limits to freedom of movement? Has the migration crisis undermined EU citizenship?

Either:


Or:


Or:


Or:


Either:

Y Soysal, 'Citizenship, immigration, and the European social project: rights and obligations of individuality', British Journal of Sociology 63/1 2012

Or:


Or:

Either:

Or:

Or:

Or:
D Miller, “Bounded Citizenship”, *Citizenship and National Identity*, Ch 5 [also in K. Hutchings and R. Dannreuther (eds), *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*]

Week 10 Sovereignty, Solidarity and Justice; The Eurocrisis
What is sovereignty? Where does sovereignty lie in the EU – has it remained with the member states, passed to the EU, or is it shared between them? Can sovereignty be shared or mixed? Or is the EU a post-sovereign state? Is sovereignty compatible with solidarity within the EU? Does sovereignty generate a justice deficit in the EU? Or is sovereignty vital for justice? Does the eurocrisis involve overcoming sovereignty? Does it suggest we need a federal EU? Or must the Euro be abandoned to establish a liberal or republican intergovernmental EU?

On line early

And

One of the following:


W Wallace, ´Rescue or Retreat? The Nation-State in Western Europe’, *Political Studies*, 42 (1994) 52-76


On Solidarity and Justice and the Crisis:

Either:


Or:


Or:

Dimitry Kochenov, Gráinne de Búrca, Andrew Williams (ed) *Europe’s Justice Deficit*

Either:


Or


Or