

**Max Weber Programme and James Madison University**

**Third Graduate Symposium**

# **The Future of Europeanization: European Policies in the Making**

**San Domenico di Fiesole, Villa La Fonte, 7 June 2010**

**Co-organized by**

**James Madison University in Florence and Max Weber Programme, EUI**

The Max Weber Programme and James Madison University's Master in European Union Policy Studies present their Third Joint Graduate Symposium on European Policies.

The aim of the symposium is to establish a platform for JMU's master's students to present their work and ideas about the EU in the professional setting of an academic conference. The papers discuss the various policies adopted by the European Union, appreciate their effectiveness and analyze their impact, in order to better understand the European Union as a system of governance.

As two institutions promoting academic excellence, the EUI and JMU will grant an award for the best paper.

This year, the symposium is honored by the presence of Prof. Simon Hix, from the London School of Economics and Political Science, who will deliver the keynote speech.

This is just one of the events created by the collaboration between the EUI and JMU, which comprises several other events and opportunities throughout the year.

If you wish to be informed about joint projects, propose collaborations or join existing ones, please contact Caterina Paolucci ([paoluccx@jmu.edu](mailto:paoluccx@jmu.edu)), the Academic Coordinator of JMU.

### **Conference Organizers:**

Ayse Idil Aybars, Max Weber Fellow, EUI

Igor Guardanich, MWP, EUI

Caterina Paolucci, Academic Coordinator, JMU

**9:00 – Registration of the participants**

**9:15 – Welcome and opening by** Karin Tilmans (MWP) and Caterina Paolucci (JMU)

**9:30 – 11:00 – Session 1 (Parallel Panels)**

Panel 1: Social inclusion in EU countries (*SALA CONFERENZA*)

**Chair: Georgia Mavrodi**

***Nathaniel Doleman, 'Integration of Non-Western Immigrants: The Shift from Multiculturalism to Assimilationism in the Netherlands'***

**Discussant: Raya Muttarak/Idil Aybars**

Abstract: Over several decades, the discussion surrounding integration of immigrants, specifically non-western immigrants, as well as the different modes of integration have exploded in Western Europe. By examining the historical background and current socio-economic policies in the Netherlands, this paper evaluates the relationship between several explanatory factors and the policy shift from multiculturalism to assimilationism and its consequences for Dutch society. Existing literature on the facets of immigrant segregation, discrimination and welfare state dependence are explored to lend better understanding to both the unique case of the Netherlands and the European Union. The establishment of a relationship between these factors and integration policy shift is explained and this analysis argues that while the three factors do have an effect on immigrant integration, the third factor of a generous welfare state is the most pivotal in understanding the renewed push for assimilationist policies in the Netherlands. The study concludes by outlining the negative consequences of such relationships for non-western immigrants in Dutch society and by explaining the importance of further research on the matter for successful and efficient policymaking in both the Netherlands as well as the rest of Europe.

***Krisztina Jankura, 'Do immigrants Face Labor Market Discrimination in the Social-Democratic Welfare Model?'***

**Discussant: Furio Stamati**

Abstract: Throughout recent years, member states of the European Union have experienced an influx of migrants from all over the world. The EU has the policy of free movement of persons; however the difficulty lies with this free movement. Once someone is within the EU internal borders, due to the Schengen Agreement, there are limited border controls between member states. This allows migration to be done with a fair amount of ease. Migrants may either be seeking refuge, asylum or looking for work; and the EU is the answer. However, how does a migrant choose which member state to call their new home? The average citizens views them as illegal immigrants, who seem to cause more trouble than not. This is not always correct, as many immigrants comply with the national legislation. Thus, this raises the question of discrimination,

particularly in the labor market. Within the EU various welfare regimes exist, all influencing different impact on the level of discrimination that these migrants may face. The focus of this paper is an examination of the social-democratic welfare state and immigrants. The social-democratic state has been characterized as a typology successful with migrant integration. Its universal characteristics have acted as a pull factor for migrants. Therefore, the question this paper will seek to answer is to what degree do migrants face discrimination according to the welfare regime in which they reside, particularly the social-democratic typology. Through case study analysis, it will be determined whether or not there is discrimination and what type. The paper places emphasis on the two case studies of Sweden and Denmark. A review of their anti-discrimination policies, immigration statistics, and specific examples will be conducted. Discussion will reveal that immigrants do face various forms of discrimination in this equality promoting welfare typology.

***Jessica Raines, 'Social Inclusion of Refugees in the European Union after the Lisbon Treaty'***

***Discussant: Roxana Barbulescu/ Idil Aybars***

Abstract: Based on the international framework established by the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, the treatment of asylum-seekers is a global human rights issue of pressing importance. States are obligated by these agreements to accept asylum-seekers and socially include them into society by providing housing, education, employment assistance and health care. So far, the different member states of the European Union have not satisfactorily provided for the social inclusion of refugees within the Union. With the recent passing of the Lisbon Treaty, which includes the EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights, the EU has full competency to legislate in the area of asylum policy and to create the long-awaited common asylum system. This paper provides an assessment of three different policy areas that are important to social inclusion (education, employment and health care) and seeks to determine if the EU is justified for action in each specific area. The conclusion of the paper is that the EU is justified for action in all three policy areas and specific policy recommendations are made.

Panel 2: European Monetary Union (SALA A)

***Chair: Caterina Paolucci***

***Caitlin Briska, 'The Determinants of Single Currency Adoption in the European Union: An Economic Perspective: A Case Study of Germany and the United Kingdom'***

***Discussant: Antonio Miralles***

Abstract: At present, there are 27 Member States of the European Union, 16 of which are members of the Economic and Monetary Union. Following the enlargements of 2004 and 2007 of many Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, eight of these states have yet to meet the Maastricht Convergence Criteria to adopt the euro as their currency. Additionally,

Denmark and the United Kingdom have opted out of euro adoption, and Sweden has found a “loop hole” in the process by not joining the final stage of single currency adoption (European Commission 2009). The purpose of this research paper is to discover why countries like Denmark, the United Kingdom, and Sweden have decided not to adopt the euro, while other Member States have joined EMU. Three of the dominant factors that other scholars see as the determinants of Economic and Monetary Union accession are: loss of monetary policy sovereignty, cyclical convergence, and trade. I will test these variables with two case studies, Germany and the United Kingdom, that help to determine if my hypotheses on the determinants affecting Economic and Monetary Union accession are correct. All three of the hypotheses regarding single currency adoption in the European Union prove to be inconclusive. Since these hypotheses proved inconclusive in my study, politics must have a strong influence on the decision whether or not to adopt the euro. Additionally, this proves that while there are various aspects of both the German and British economies that would caution them away from euro adoption, there are also other characteristics that make euro adoption beneficial. Therefore, it is my final conclusion that a combination of economic and political factors influences euro adoption.

*Steven Sahr, 'Fiscal and Monetary Policy Separation in the EMU: Unsustainable in the Long Run?'*

Discussant: Fang Xu

Abstract: The structure of this paper will be as follows: first, a historical background will be presented which will outline how the European Monetary Union and the Stability and Growth Pact came to be the main structures governing the monetary and fiscal policies of the Eurozone member states. Following, an overview of the current financial crisis and ensuing recession that has occurred in Europe over the past several years will be discussed. The case study of Greece will then be presented to demonstrate how the placing of monetary policy competency at the supranational level and keeping fiscal competencies at the member state level can lead to instability, not only for the countries in question but the Eurozone as a whole.

The fact that Greece was allowed to break the rules of the system for nearly a decade before its collapse shows that further measures are needed to curtail fiscal policies that can directly lead to collapse and failure of the system. It is unlikely that a common fiscal policy will develop in Europe anytime soon, due to the strong desire among states to retain some measures of sovereignty but, this is the direction that the system needs to go in order to achieve long term stability. The cycle of boom and bust in the markets is not a new phenomenon and will not go away if it is ignored; therefore the European Monetary Union needs further fiscal coordination to be a sustainable policy in the long run.

**11:00 – 11:30 Coffee break**

## 11: 30 – 13:00 Session 2 (Parallel Panels)

Panel 3: Social inclusion in EU countries II (SALA A)

Chair: Caterina Paolucci

*Kate Bosi, 'Albanian Immigration to Italy: Motives for Emigration and Personal Identity: The Politics of European Culture and Identity'*

Discussant: Igor Guardiancich

Abstract: Immigration is an international concern that affects each country in a very different way. In this paper, I would like to concentrate specifically on Albanian immigrants in Italy. There are many reasons why an individual chooses to leave their home country and journey into a foreign land. In the following pages I would like to discuss the main concerns and reasons why Albanians emigrate to Italy. Some of these factors include economic difficulties at home, unemployment, disease, abuse (verbal, physical, mental), food shortage, family etcetera. This paper provides an assessment of why Albanians leave Albania, why they choose to move to Italy and how they feel about the transition. I have personally interviewed five Albanian immigrants here in Italy and conclude with the geographical location of Italy playing a large part in Albanian immigrants' decision to leave and move to Italy. Money in the form of remittances is sent back to their country and the majority of immigrants aim to stay only for a short time and eventually return home.

*Lauren Catalano, 'Public Opinion in the UK: The British National Party and Immigration. What is the Connection?'*

Discussant: Alexi Gugushvili

Abstract: Public opinion has acted as a forum for understanding and growth in the European Union since its beginnings. The opinions of the public are often ruled by the social and the cultural issues that they confront in everyday life, rather than overarching political issues that tend to formulate the policies that help to fuel these opinions. Immigration has become a divisive topic in European societies with a significant rise of radical right wing parties coinciding with the growth anti-immigrant sentiment. What is the fuel for this growing public dis-ease with immigration? Is it socially or politically constructed; based on personal experiences or political propaganda? In this paper a study of the interaction between public opinion, the growing numbers and presence of immigrants and a specific right wing party (the British National Party) in the United Kingdom using statistical evidence is analyzed. The paper concludes with a discussion of history, current trends, possible connections between the focuses of the study and suggestions of pathways for change.

*Katherine Cestare, 'European Muslims and Radical Islam: The Case of 2nd and 3rd Generation Muslims from Immigrant Descent'*

Discussant: *Georges Fahdi /Georgia Mavrodi*

Abstract: Radical Islamists are among a minority group of Muslims living in Europe. Although there are many different variations of radical Muslims in the different member states of the European Union, there is one sub-category that I will be focusing on in order to assess the possible motivations for serious forms of radicalization: young Muslims from immigrant descent. My analysis will focus on a narrow group of post-colonial immigrants, seen in both Great Britain, with a small comparison to those in France because these groups have demonstrated the most violent reactions to the unrest among Muslim Europeans as of late.

On this topic I would like to propose two hypotheses that are often brought up when reviewing the subject at hand. If younger generations are faced with a conflicting dual identity, this will make them more likely to prove their religious faith to Islam by going to war against the "evil west." In other words, are younger generations more likely to go to war against the modern, western world? The second hypothesis this paper will address is, if the national freedom in terms of radical expression is more relaxed in a particular member states, this would account for a higher level of radical Islamic terrorism. In dealing with this question there will be a focus on how individual member states deal with multiculturalism to determine whether their national immigration and integration approaches have had an effect on the level of radicalization among their Muslim population.

This paper will first test the idea of a conflicting identity by looking into the different reasons that account for this feeling of alienation. It will aim to show that young generations of Muslims in Europe experience higher levels of humiliation and or alienation than their parents did, which in turn makes them more likely to seek revenge against their perceived enemy. In order to do so, I will analyze research done on the causes of embarrassment and isolation amongst Muslims in different countries, with an emphasis on Great Britain, as well as the affect their nation state's foreign policy (in terms of the "war on terror") has had on the level of radicalization.

In order to test my second hypothesis I will first look at how each country integrates Muslims minorities. I would like to establish the level and interpretation of Multiculturalism in Great Britain, in opposition to that in France, and analyze the affect this has had on the assimilation into a cultural identity. Next, I will review research done on the affects of the "logic of appropriateness." From this rule, I would like to draw a conclusion from the degree in which national freedom of expression laws correlate to the radical expression that is available to younger generations in that country. Again in order to do my analysis I will be looking at young Muslims in Great Britain, as well as in France to compare their national legislature against the degree of radical movements seen in the corresponding country.

I will use case studies that focus on the British South Asian Muslims, with a small comparison to the French Maghrebian Muslims, in order to show the difference between a more liberal relationship between member state and minority group and a more conservative one, in order to determine which one has seen more radical uprising. Then conclude with a few suggestions as for what can be done to render the problematic situation.

Panel 4: Policy challenges to old and future member states (*SALA CONFERENZA*)

Chair: *Manuele Citi*

*Cooper Reveley, 'Transport Policy: Considerations and Recommendations'*

Discussant: *Laura Hering*

Abstract: Over the last fifty years Europe has set out on a project of reconciliation from a history of violent upheaval through a process designed to ensure economic prosperity for its citizens. One overarching goal of this push toward stability through economic health was the creation of a common market and the elimination of barriers to trade in four key areas. The Four Freedoms, the pillars of European Union economic policy, outline the goals of freedom of movement of goods, capital, labor and services. While significant progress has been made in three of these key areas, the push for freedom of movement of services has encountered some resistance, mostly from national governments seeking to protect sectors of the services market rooted in a long history of nationalist pride. One of the key industries which has suffered from the reluctance of Member States to acquiesce to the pressures of privatization is the transport sector. Here I will focus on key elements of this crucial component of the European Economy, address the reasoning behind the lack of concessions made to efforts toward privatization and make recommendations regarding the future of the transport sector within the European Union.

*Jerry Wohlgemuth, 'Hryvnia, Food and Gas: An Analysis of Ukraine's Prospects to Accede to the European Union'*

Discussant: *Alex Wilson*

Abstract: Enlargement is largely seen as the European Union's (EU) most successful foreign policy tool. The "big bang" enlargement of 2004 and 2007 saw the entry of twelve countries, ten being from post-Communist Central and Eastern Europe, creating a bloc that now spans from the Atlantic to the Black Sea. The Maastricht Treaty states that the EU is open to all European countries. The definition of a European country is becoming increasingly contentious as Turkey and the former Yugoslav states undergo accession negotiations. The 2004 and 2007 enlargements have seen a shift in Western Member States' attitudes toward enlargement, creating the so-called enlargement fatigue. This has brought the issue of widening to the forefront of debate and also raises the issue of a fixed absorption capacity for the Union. Three sectors were drastically affected by the past two enlargements: Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), agriculture and energy. This paper will look at the impact of the "big bang" enlargement on these three sectors. This analysis will then be applied to Ukraine, not an official candidate country, but clearly within Europe. Like many of the states that acceded in 2004 and 2007, the Ukraine will have a significant impact on all three of these sectors. It is not close to meeting economic criteria outlined in the Stability and Growth pact and will require a substantial amount of CAP expenditure. Ukraine's energy

sector is far from being liberalized, but this is also a problem through the EU. The energy sector shows an area where the EU should foster closer ties with the Ukraine and use a closer relationship to promote democracy. A stable and democratic Ukraine is a vital step toward EU wide energy security. This is all the more critical given recent political developments within Ukraine, which is at a critical juncture, where the EU cannot afford to play a passive role.

### **13:00-14:15 Lunch Break (SALA B)**

### **14:30 – 15:45 Keynote lecture**

*Simon Hix, London School of Economics and Political Science*

*“Democracy in the European Union post Lisbon”*

The lecture

The issue of the democratic legitimacy of the European Union has been prominent in national debates across Europe in recent years. The Lisbon Treaty contains many apparent remedies to the EU’s “democratic deficit”, including a strengthened European Parliament, a bigger role for national parliaments in legislative scrutiny and a new citizens’ initiative. Professor Hix will analyse the relevance and efficacy of these measures in addressing the democratic deficit and also address the broader issue of what can be done to make the EU a truly democratic political space.

The speaker

Professor Simon Hix is Director of the Political Science and Political Economy Group at the LSE and the co-editor of the journal *European Union Politics*. He has written several books on EU and comparative politics, including most recently *What's Wrong With the EU and How to Fix It* (2008) and *Democratic Politics in the European Parliament* (2007).

A leading expert on European Union politics and policy, Professor Hix has held visiting appointments at several top universities, including Stanford, Berkeley, UC San Diego, Sciences-Po in Paris, the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin, the College of Europe in Bruges, and the Korean Institute for International Economic Policy in Seoul. He has extensive consultancy experience, including for the UK Cabinet Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the European Parliament, the European Commission, the European Policy Centre, and the Asian Development Bank.

### **16:00 – 17:30 Session 3 (Parallel Panels)**

Panel 5: The EU’s role in the integration of socially excluded groups (*SALA CONFERENZA*)

*Chair: Idil Aybars*

*Courtney Cornwell, ‘What should the EU Asylum Policy look like?’*

*Discussant: Georgia Mavrodi*

Abstract: Asylum is a form of protection given by a State on its territory based on the principle of non-refoulement and internationally or nationally recognized refugee rights. Asylum is granted to a person if they are unable to seek protection in his or her country of citizenship and residence. The European Union has a duty to protect asylum seekers fleeing persecution or serious harm. This duty was made all the more clear with the Charter of Fundamental Rights being included in the Lisbon treaty. This paper examines the current problems that the EU faces in implementing a common asylum policy in the EU. Furthermore, the asylum policy of three Member States, Greece, Denmark and Germany are explored in order to demonstrate why a common asylum policy is needed. In a Europe without borders it makes sense to establish common standards for asylum seekers, so that one country would not seem more attractive a destination than another. An EU asylum policy is important because it would ensure that wherever an asylum applicant made his or her application in Europe, there was a certainty that he or she would have a fair hearing and be able to access support and ultimately not be disadvantaged by a given country's interpretation of who is a refugee. Once the problems are highlighted three policy solutions are presented, in the end concluding that the EU should continue to work towards a Common Asylum System while at the same time maintaining some national sovereignty to account for the variation in the way asylum-seekers impact the different Member States.

*Natasha Lueth, 'The European Court of Justice, European Integration, and Same-Sex Partnership Recognition'*

**Discussant: Igor Guardiancich**

Abstract: The status of same-sex partnerships vary within the European Union (EU). While twelve member states (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia) grant no national same-sex partnership rights, four member states (Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden) recognize same-sex. I began this paper questioning what theoretical framework of European integration the European Court of Justice (ECJ) conducts when ruling on a case concerning same-sex partnership recognition? With the examination of four ECJ cases, *P v S*, *Grant v SWT*, *D v Council*, and *Maruko v VdB*, I created three hypotheses. First, if the ECJ is neofunctionalist, the Court will increase EU competencies in same-sex partnership recognition legislation due to spillover effects. Second, seeing that in intergovernmentalist models reallocating policies to the supranational level stems from state preferences and inter-state bargaining, if the ECJ follows this model, then the Court will not rule in a way that shifts competency in same-sex partnership legislation to the EU. Finally, if the ECJ follows certain rational-choice institutional theory, then the Court will shift competency in same-sex partnership legislation to the EU by breaking from the principal-agent theory and actively seeking to control the agenda. After my analysis, I found that from these cases, no concrete conclusion on the theoretical framework of the ECJ can be drawn and I can not confirm or deny my hypotheses. Additionally, I found that the ECJ may adhere to a rational-choice principal-agent theory and actively seek to grant rights to same-sex couples.

*Michelle Melton, 'A Policy Assessment: Adopting a Comprehensive Framework for Combating Human Trafficking at the European Level'*

*Discussant: Višnja Vukov*

Abstract: There is enormous concern among governmental, non-governmental, and inter-governmental actors to address and combat trafficking in human beings at the global level. Europe is a unique but crucial environment in which to address the issue, as it is a region that has countries of origin, transit, and destination, and within the European Union, some Member States have two or all three of these qualities. Since the mid-1990s, the European Union has attempted to develop a comprehensive framework for combating human trafficking, but this has been hindered by a dissonance between the European institutions as to the best approach. At a supranational level, the European Commission has declared its support for a balanced approach combining the prosecution of traffickers, prevention measures, and the protection of victims, but this has been limited in practice and the EU has been criticized for not doing enough to emphasize human rights or produce concrete results. In order to change this situation and produce a more comprehensive policy framework, this paper is developed upon the perspective that the Community should further enhance and support certain policy instruments, such as those that support vulnerable groups and the European neighborhood, support legal migration patterns, adopt an economic orientation to the issue, and effectively use the expertise of non-governmental actors. By enhancing these tools, the EU will be able to increase institutional cooperation, meet the expectations of the global community, and produce concrete results in the fight against human trafficking.

*Stephanie Suitt, 'Analyzing European Trends in Nationality and Naturalization Laws: What is the EU's role?'*

*Discussant: Shushanik Makaryan*

Abstract: Harmonization of nationality and naturalization laws is a particularly charged climate for EU policy-making to work in, since these areas remain the exclusive competency of Member States (MS). However, with increasing immigration and permanent immigrant communities developing, it is essential MS begin coordination on EU policies to ensure that immigrants are receiving proper access to rights and to coordinate efforts based on the reality that the nationality and naturalization laws of each MS determines who becomes an EU citizen with subsequent rights in all other MS. Due to the immediate effects that nationality and naturalization laws have on MS, this is gradually becoming a common concern for MS and the EU. Different MS regulations on acquisition of naturalization cannot be maintained at the status quo.

This policy paper will evaluate the trends in convergence and divergence of nationality and naturalization laws across MS as a result of increased immigration. The modes of acquisition and naturalization processes TCNs (third-country nationals) are subjected to will be explained, followed by a description of different statuses that immigrants may be subjected to at the national level and EU level. The focus of evaluation will be on MS, TCNs, and the EU. This policy paper seeks to determine the role and extent to which the EU can be involved in regulating nationality and naturalization laws and offers

policy recommendations. The two policy alternatives will suggest more EU coordination, more uniform legislation, and finally a hybrid policy recommendation is presented to address tensions between national and EU levels.

Panel 6: Protectionism in the EU (SALA A)

**Chair: Alex Wilson**

***Kevin Herzik, 'Protectionism in the EU: Is Trade Protectionism Against China Legal?'***

***Discussant: Manuele Citi***

Abstract: The European Union and China have an increasingly complex trading relationship, one that has been intensified since China joined the World Trade Organization. Due to concerns over a loss of jobs as well as unfair trading practices, the EU has invoked numerous trade protectionist measures towards products coming from China. This has caused concern for those in both the EU and China because there is fear that trade wars may ensue, jobs may be lost, and consumers may pay higher prices for goods. This paper will look at whether these protectionist measures are legal, and if they are advisable, under WTO rules. I will answer these two questions utilizing economic theory, as well as two case studies.

***Craig Randolph, 'Agricultural Protectionism in the European Union: Justifiable Intervention or Trade-Distorting Policies?'***

***Discussant: Manuele Citi***

Abstract: Free trade is argued to encourage economic growth and development, benefiting both developed and developing nations through specialization in production and product diversity and availability. This research seeks to understand the potential benefits of liberalized trade in agricultural goods for international markets, as well as to discover and evaluate policy measures such as the Common Agricultural Policy, which are criticized as being overly protectionist. The cases to be analyzed in this research are the 1993 banana dispute between the EU and Latin American producers, and the 2002 dispute involving export subsidies on sugar between the EU and Brazil (and other third party countries). These cases represent traditional barriers to trade such as tariffs and export subsidies and provide answers to questions concerning the European Union and its use of protectionist policies in the trade of agricultural goods. This research concludes that while the protectionist measures used by the EU in the two cases exceeded acceptable use, the interventions were justified. The agricultural market is unique, and while the goal of the current Doha Round WTO talks should be to approach as closely as possible free trade, appropriate levels of stabilizing intervention by the EU and other national governments will continue to be necessary for the functioning of agricultural markets.

**17:45 - Proclamation of the winner (best paper)**

**18:00 - Cocktail**