



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/09/16
Ark nr. : 1 av 11

1. a) Multiple Choice

1. A) +

2. B) +

3. B) +

8110

4. A) +

5. A) +

6. C) +

7. D) +

8. B) -

9. C) +

10. D) -

b) Identifications

1) The term "Europeanization" covers the impact of 'Europe' - which might be the European Union or other actors above the national level such as the Council of Europe - on policy, polity and politics of nation states in general and among European Union Member States in particular. In the scholarly debate, this term is often closely linked to European integration, even though it is not the same. 'Europeanization' explains for example the adaption of European-level standards, practices, 'ways of doing things' etc. on the domestic level. Europeanization can be conceptualized both as 'outcome' or as 'process' leading to change within EU Member States or countries even countries beyond the EU.

2) The 'Dublin System' states that asylum seekers entering the EU have to make their asylum application in that member country of their first arrival within the EU. The last years have been witnessing a massive influx of refugees entering the EU by sea, which is why Mediterranean countries in Southern Europe (e.g. Italy and Greece) ~~are disproportionately~~ face a disproportionate pressure to process asylum applications in comparison to other EU Member States.



Emnekode : ST-420

Kandidatnr. : 4021

Dato : 05/09/16

Ark nr. : 2 av 11

Moreover, there is no supranational authority on the EU level able to introduce for example a fair distribution key to share the burden among Member States. In addition to that, the 'Dublin system' is de facto (not de jure) dissolved, because some countries have intergovernmentally agreed on taking in refugees that then make their claim in a country different than their point of entry to the EU.

3) External Governance describes the ~~action of the EU~~ the

4) An optimum currency area is a theoretical description of a optimal monetary union developed by R. Mundell in the 1960s. It describes a currency area in which member states do not face asymmetric shocks on e.g. their economy, financial system etc. or if countries are affected by these asymmetric shocks they should be able to possess options to react to these shocks. These adaptation options might for example be budgetary reactions (cut taxes, increase spendings etc.) or market mobility (free movement of labor etc.) or other alternative reactions to stabilize the economy (decrease wages etc.).

5) The SSM is a supervisory mechanism for credit institutions in the European Union. It enables EU bodies to supervise banks of Member States and was created in the context of the economic and Euro crisis in Europe to keep banks on track and monitor their compliance with EU regulations. The SSM is also called 'Banking Union'.

3) External governance describes the fact of being governed by a political body that is outside the scope of someone's ability to constitute this political body. An example would be that Germany takes a decision that affects another country and its population, even though it did not constitute it.



II. Short answers

1) The most urgent challenge to the EU and its Member States (MSs) is the lack of democratic legitimacy in the current ~~part~~ decision-making process. This is a challenge to both the EU and its MSs, because the decision-making is heavily intertwined, hence a mixture of intergovernmental and supranational decision-making. The economic and euro crisis within the EU has revealed new dimensions of this problem that have ^{already} been present before though. Following Peter Mair's argumentation for example, politics ~~take~~ ^{take} mainly take place at the domestic level (expressed by party competition, political debates etc. in which the people can actively participate), while policy shifted heavily ^{to} on the European level. This is problematic because technocratic bodies, such as the European Commission, can be regarded as not having enough democratic legitimacy because they are not (directly) elected by the people but nevertheless have tremendous decision-making power. Especially as a reaction to the crises, the national parliaments and the European parliament have been sidestepped to path the way for a faster decision-making. This is also linked to the seemingly impotent role of parliaments that are meant to represent the people. Joining the EU comes along both with benefits and obligations, the latter often forced member states (such as Greece) to comply with rules imposed by the EU with no real alternative. The voter therefore might ask the question how much his/her vote actually counts if their elected politicians in the parliaments do not have the ^{sufficient} power to affect decision-making processes. Politics, hence, is perceived very skeptically and therefore face a fundamental threat. Best expressed by the recent Brexit decision of the British people. This lack of ~~deci~~ democratic legitimation has to be tackled



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 4 av 11

2) As a republican theorist, James Bohman proposes a new notion of democracy that he calls 'transnational democracy'. This notion acknowledges the interconnectivity of nation states in an increasingly globalized and hence politically and economically intertwined world. This notion is in stark contrast to the current (old?, probably naïve) notion of democracy that very much emphasizes the self-determination and self-governance of people ('demos') by voting for politicians that decide over their people's destiny. Bohman however argues that a new notion understanding of democracy has to take into account the effects each political entity produces on others. According to him, there cannot be a democracy if it does not consider other 'demos' affected by their role in their decision-making process. This new notion has to admit that not only own decisions can influence others in a interconnected world, but should also acknowledge that people are not only governed by the office-holders they elect. It is impossible to have a democracy if ~~not~~ the focus is solely on one demos; all people have to be included that ~~or~~ will face the externalities a decision produces.

3) Securitization can be understood as a sort of framing of political issues. If ~~for example~~ something is perceived as a threat, it can be made a subject of security. This is usually linked to external factors that are perceived as dangerous and therefore categorized as something that has to be taken care of in ~~terms of~~ order to ensure security. A prominent example would be the on-going refugee crisis. The mere fact of refugees coming into a country can be framed in different ways. One might argue that there is a humanitarian obligation to help people fleeing their countries because of war and political persecution. On the other hand



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 5 av 11

it can be stated that a massive surge of asylum seekers pouring into a country threatens the national security, for example because there is not enough documentation and one can not assure that these people have a criminal background or criminal intentions. Thus, the issue would be securitized through an argumentation process. This involves (political) actors arguing that an issue is of particular importance due to security concerns.

5) The new intergovernmentalism approach tries to explain the post-Maastricht development (since 1992) of the European Union which it describes as 'paradox'. This is because the EU has gained significant new competences to strengthen European integration while at the same time the (decision-making) power was not shifted to traditional EU bodies such as the European Commission. This paradox is addressed by several hypotheses within this theoretical approach. A core hypothesis assumes that deliberation and consensus seeking characterize the work of the European Council that in the post-Maastricht period has gained tremendous decision-making power. The authors argue that especially in times of crisis the center of power lies in the Council that ultimately comes up with solutions while circumventing other ~~EU bodies~~ such supranational EU bodies such as the Parliament*. Moreover it argues that if it however delegates power to ~~the~~ the supranational/EU level, it does so by creating new bodies, so called 'de novo bodies'. This implies that power is not delegated to the

* This is expressed by the massive increase of Council meetings in the post-Maastricht period.



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 6 av 11

traditional drivers of European integration (such as the Commission)
Also in this hypothesis, the authors see evidence in the creation of dozens of de novo bodies since 1992 that possess certain competences. Another hypothesis is focused on the European Commission itself. It says that the Commission, and more generally, all supranational bodies of the EU are no longer hardwired for an ever closer Union, hence they do not push for further integration any more ~~they used to before 1992~~ the way they used to before. They make the case, for example, that Commission Presidents since Delors were all alumni of the (intergovernmental) European Council, i.e. former heads-of-states ~~to~~ that do not and did not champion further supranational ideas and visions the way former Presidents did.



3) Crisis in EU-Russia Relations

The relationship between the European Union and Russia is extremely strained. However, this has not always been the case. The non-linearity of the relation in the last two ~~dec~~ and a half decades poses significant challenges to a theoretical ~~disc~~ explanation.

But before discussing the theoretical explanations and possibilities to overcome the current stalemate, a brief overview over the development of the relationship and their importance to both actors should be given to understand the status quo.

EU-Russia relations have not been negative right from the start. They rather represent a sequence of ups and downs. While the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the evolution from the European Community to the European Union happened always simultaneously, the relationship started very promisingly. With Boris Yeltsin, an anti-communist with seemingly clear ambitions to improve relations to the 'west', got elected president of Russia in the early 1990s. Especially under his Foreign Minister, Russia developed closer connections to the European Union in particular and the West in general by signing for example a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement ^(PCA) with the EU. Moreover, Russia became member of the Council of Europe, thus sending a clear signal of its willingness to cooperate on virtually all spheres, including delicate matters such as human rights. This demonstrated a radical break with the Soviet Union and Cold war legacy. However, already during his second term, first disappointments emerged (from a European perspective). The wars in Chechnya were echoed by different reactions from EU MSs, most of them (especially Germany and France) criticizing the asymmetrical and aggressive type of warfare the Russians used in the Caucasus, even considering sanctions against Russia.



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 8 av 11

This eventually led to a suspension of the PCA for several years, marking the first disappointments and downs in the relationship. New hope came with new president Putin at the change of the millennium. Putin, at first sight, seemed a rather 'European'-minded leader during his first term. After a severe recession of Russia's economy, Putin pushed for more economic cooperation with Europe. Under his leadership the "Four Spases" agreement was launched which promised further cooperation and collaboration on different policy areas (such as economy and environment, security, research etc). Furthermore he gave a very pro-European commitment during his speech in the German Bundestag in 2001 (in German!). As further evidence, he stood with European leaders such as Schröder and Chirac against the US-led war in Iraq in 2003.

Nevertheless, relations cooled down in Putin's second term that can probably be attributed to the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, when the EU's and Russia's interests clearly diverged. In addition to that the Eastern enlargement of the EU, including former states of the Soviet Union might have had an impact as well. Progress in the collaboration slowed down and experienced a ~~partial~~ moderate revival under Putin's successor Medvedev. Even though Russia invaded Georgia shortly after his start of the presidency, criticism from the EU remained mostly moderate and did not disturb the relations as much as pragmatical collaboration ~~including some~~ went on. With the third term of Putin, that is still going on, the EU-Russia relations came to a severe crisis that we are witnessing right now. This is mainly due to extremely divergent interests with regard to Ukraine. Mutual sanctions have been imposed since the annexation of the Crimea in 2014. In addition to that, Russia almost unconditionally backs the Al-Assad-government in Syria - in contrast to the EU. Over the years, the EU and Russia have developed especially tight relationships in trade. For Russia, the EU is the single



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/2016
Ark nr. : 9 av 11

biggest partner in trade: almost 50% of Russian exports go to EU countries, while at the same time less than 10% of Europe the EU's exports go to Russia, which makes it a trade deficit for the EU. Additionally the EU is number one of all countries with the most foreign direct investments in Russia. Even though trade ~~and economic relations~~ massively decreased after the Crimea Crisis, there have been flourishing economic relations. Without going too much into detail, progress has also been made in terms of culture and education cooperation (e.g. student mobility) and police cooperation against terrorism. Hence, especially from an economic perspective, there is a lot at stake for both parties. In science, different narratives have been used to give sense to the outcome and current status of this relation. To name only a few, the most prominent version in the West explains the downfall with Russia's increasing authoritarianism and expansive intentions, for example by invading Georgia ~~and~~ parts of Georgia and annexing the Crimea plus destabilizing Eastern Ukraine. On the other hand, a rather Russian narrative in the literature sees the EU as an expansive empire that, for example, incorporated parts of the former Soviet Union, actively acting against Russian interests. An example might be the EU's reaction to the Euro Maidan protests in 2014, when it actively supported the social outrage because of the non-signing of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU by ~~them~~ the democratically legitimized then-Ukrainian government that eventually had to resign. Other scholars attribute a decisive role to the US that would heavily influence EU's interests, for example by forcing them to impose sanctions against Russia, even though it hurt ~~to~~ many EU MSs. Additionally together with the EU approaching traditional Russian spheres by new Eastern Nato members.



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 10 av 11

A main objective of a theory is to simplify ~~phenomena~~ real-world phenomena. For this reason, theoretical attempts to explain the EU-Russia relations struggle. A merely power-based explanation to explain international relations (such as in realism) has the same problem as more liberal approaches that emphasize interests of states. Both interest and power-based approaches use very ambiguous terms (interest, power) to explain the outcome. In hindsight, it is not so difficult to assess several events and actions as power or interest-driven. The problem with these explanations is that it is very difficult to explain ~~any~~ improvements in the complex relationship that occurred in-between. While these approaches might explain confrontation, how do they explain cooperation that happened at the same time? This confronts the 'classic approaches' in International Relations research with a serious puzzle. Constructivist theories, based on social interaction between relevant parties might be rather suited to capture ~~the complexity of~~ and explain the complexity of this relationship. Similarly, psychological approaches stressing also unintentional actions, misperceptions could be useful for an in-depth analysis. However, only interests cannot explain why the EU and power in a narrower sense cannot explain why the EU would impose sanctions against Russia and its own economic interests. - to give an example.

Overcoming the stalemate is another, more practically relevant, issue for the future of the relationship. Both the EU and Russia have an a severe interest in overcoming the tension because especially from an economic perspective a lot is at stake. The EU is still very much dependent on energy supply from Russia. This varies among member states, but especially eastern European countries have painfully experienced when Russia stops its supply of gas to Europe. A reduction of the energy dependency through closer cooperation with other oil and gas-exporting country as well as



Emnekode : ST-420
Kandidatnr. : 4021
Dato : 05/08/16
Ark nr. : 11 av ~~11~~ 11

investments in alternative energy could lessen the dependency and strengthen the EU's position vis-à-vis Russia. However, this is only a long-term solution. Alternatively, the EU could conduct an appeasement policy, accepting for example the annexation of the Crimea and start trading again. ~~This of course~~ at full scope without sanctions. This of course would be a very radical change and would therefore be very unlikely, since the EU does not only represent economic interests but also certain values and norms. However, this could lead to an end of the stalemate while this could also be interpreted as a victory for Russia since it could then dictate the conditions of their relationship in a much more powerful position. In contrast to that a confrontational way, hence strengthening sanctions, providing Ukraine with more help, including weapons (brinkmanship) might contain Russian ambitions. On the other hand, this might lead to a total escalation of the crisis, even war. A pivotal issue for the European Union in their foreign policy in general is that it rarely speaks with one voice. Russia strongly benefits from that because it favors bilateral agreements with ~~weaker~~ weaker member states than with a (potentially) strong European Union. Member States have several bilateral agreements with Russia which partly explains their different stance on Russia. Even though sanctions against Russia were univocally imposed, a rather pragmatic approach by several member states toward Russia is likely - especially in times of a legitimacy crisis of the EU. This may overcome the stalemate, but nevertheless weakens the EU's position. Without a solution in Ukraine, ~~a improving relations~~ though, a significant improvement of the EU-Russia relations seems fairly unlikely. The development in Ukraine will probably tell us more about the future of this relationship. However, it remains tense until this issue is solved.