Complexity of european integration essay

CFSP: Northern and Eastern Dimension of the European Union Complexity of European Integration Paper, written by Emil Dimitrov Immatriculation Number 44999 I. Introduction The following written paper seeks to examine why the studying of the European Integration is both relevant and a complex task at the same time and to apply appropriate argumentation to the thesis by means of secondary data research methods.

European integration is the product of the selective pooling of national sovereignty, or ultimate jurisdiction over a body politic, by postwar European nation-states. Unquestionably nowadays the European Integration respectively the European Union is the most advanced model of living in a harmonised framework of countries which follows common objectives. The European Union was built on the basic principles of democracy, peace, stability and equality.

As a matter of fact its long-lasting success is based on the assumption that all members are equal, recognize each other diversities and all respect the free will of each and every person which are the main values, the world is intensively endeavouring to spread, ever since the end of the World War 2. Although it might look the opposite, the integration process has overcome numerous of obstacles through the years and still goes through a lot of them on a daily basis. Rises and falls has always been an integral part of the integration process history.

The idea of exploring the complexity of the European Integration derives its main impetus from the significant success and progress which have been achieved in the variety of perception fields such as flexibility and

consideration of many factors of diverse nature; understanding of the dynamism of the processes; respect for different points of view, originating from different national backgrounds; significant progress in overcoming prejudices and stereotypes; possesses an enormous experience in terms of preventing and resolving different types of conflicts.

In my personal opinion the most crucial precondition which must be fulfilled in order to the integration to be implemented and to be successfully accepted by the majority of people is that the citizens should be well orientated in the labyrinth of values, missions, objectives, organizations, commissions, parliaments, councils, agencies, lobbies etc, simply because most people are less interested in matters and issues which they are not good enough aware of. Yet Europeans are still some way from understanding how and why regional integration happens, or even deciding whether or not it is a good idea. '[1] To achieve the research goal of my paper, I have studied the monograph of R. Cooper entitled The Post-modern State and World Order, J. McCormick's book Understanding the European Union, several chapters from a textbook about the European Union by E. Bomberg and A. Stubb, a part of a book on the European Union enlargement by N.

Nugent, speeches, declarations and articles by prominent European politicians, published in B. Nelson and A. Stubbs' Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration. Furthermore, the detailed and well structured information in the official site of the EU has also been of great help, as far as the historical development of the European integration is concerned. II. WHY IS EUROPEAN INTEGRATION DEFINED AS A COMPLEX PROCESS? II. 1. Perceptions, Boundaries and National Identity

European past has always been full of numerous unclarities and controversions especially on terms of various economic, cultural, political and social matters, boundaries and ethnic or religious appurtenance. Analysing the idea of Europe, J. McCormick emphasizes the following facts:' Even as Europeans move along the path of economic, social and political integration, the definition of Europe remains ambiguous, for several reasons. First, few of the EU's member states are culturally homogeneous, and there is no such thing as a European race.

The constant reordering of the territorial lines over the centuries has created a situation in which every European state has national minorities, and several of those minorities – notably the Basques and the Irish – are divided by national frontiers. Many states have also seen large influxes of immigrants in the last forty years, including Algerians to France, Turks to Germany and Indians to Britain. Not only is there nothing like a dominant culture, but most Europeans rightly shudder at the thought of their separate identities being subordinated to some kind of homogenized Euroculture. [2] A very powerful tool as far as the national identity is concerned are the languages and particularly the attitude towards the wide spread of a few of them and their usage as an intergration mean. Discussing the idea of Europe, J. McCormick points out the following statements: ' Second, residents of the EU speak at least 36 languages (Keegan and Keetle, 1993, p. 92), which are vigorously defended as symbols of national identities and act as a constant reminder of the differences among Europeans; one of the factors that eased the development of the United States was the existence of a common language.

Multilingualism also means that all officials EU documents are translated into the 11 official languages of the member states, although the work of EU institutions is increasingly carried out in English and French. Supported by its rapid spread as the language of global commerce and dimplomacy, the dominance of English grows, and it is slowly becoming the language of Europe. This worries the French in particular and other Europeans to some extent, but it is probably irresistible and will at least give Europeans a way of talking to each other, and perhaps help reduce the cultural differences that divide them. [3] The last citation could also be reviewed in terms of the constant will of the bigger states in Europe such as UK, France and Germany to defend their vast fields of interests and to play a key role by dictating the pace of the European processes as a sum. In the idea of Europe, J. McCormick also observes another rather curious fact concerning the exact territorial lines of the continent: ' Finally, and most fundamentally, the confusion over the definition of Europe arises out of uncertainty about its political and geographical boundaries.

Every other continent is defined by its coastline, but while the western, northern and southern boundaries of Europe are marked by the Atlantic, the Arctic and the Mediterranean, respectively, it has no clear eastern boundary. Strictly speaking it is not even a continent (usually defined as a large, unbroken land mass), but is part of the Asian continent. However it has been seen as distinct from Asia for the last 2000 years or more, even if no-one can really agree on where Europe ends and Asia begins. [4] An interesting controversion to the above mentioned common language as an integration method theory is to be observed in the Slavic part of Europe where despite

of the common language base the so called ' lands between' have emerged: ' In central Europe, changes in the balance of power long meant that the Poles, the Czechs and the Slovaks were caught in the crossfire of great-power competition, which is why this region was known as the ' lands between'.

The Slavs in particular became divided between those who accepted Catholicism, Greek Orthodoxy or Islam, which resulted in cultural heterogeneity in spite of western Europe (Delanty, 1995 p. 54). The west looked on this area as a buffer zone against Russia, a perception that was helped by the failure of its people to from lasting states identified with dominant ethnic groups.

During the Cold War the distinctiveness of eastern Europe was emphasized by the ideological divisions between east and west, despite the historical ties that meant Poland was closer to western Europe than to Russia. ' [5] II. 2. Legacy of wars and dividing lines in Europe (The Cold War) Discussing the idea of Europe, J. McCormick emphasizes the following facts: ' Europeans have much that unites them, but much more that divides them.

They lack a common history, they speak many different languages, they have different social values, their views of their place in the world often differ, they have gone to war with each other with tragic regularity, they have often redefined their allegiances and their identities, and they have frequently redrawn their common frontiers in response to changes in political affiliations. '[6] Since ancient times the international order has been based

either on hegemony (implemented by the strength of powerful empires) or on balance by means of the small states.

It was in Europe where the new model of balance-of-power has firstly appeared. Although it was not perfectly precise model the coalitions were pushing back bigger states ambitions for hegemony in Europe: ' The system also had a certain legitimacy; statesmen were conscious of the desirability of balance. Over the years, a consensus grew that the pluralism of European states should be maintained. Some at least saw this as a condition of liberty in Europe. Nevertheless, the balance-of-power system had an inherent instability. It was the system in which a war was always waiting to happen. [7] The Cold war is another unique phase of the European integration were 2 concepts, 2 totally different political blocs lead a combat with ideological propaganda instead of military actions, fighting mostly for new spheres of interference and hiding behind nuclear weapons threats: ' Since the Cold War was a battle of ideas as much as one between armies, those changes have not been imposed by occupying forces but introduced to willing, if bemused, governments by hordes of MIT-trained economists, management consultants, seminars and programmes of technical assistance.

The unique character of the Cold War is also shown by the fact that instead of extracting reparations – a practice which lasted from Middle Ages to the twentieth century – we gave instead given aid to help convert the defeated side. Thus are wars of ideas different from wars of territory. '[8] II. 3. European Integration – stops and starts European integration has been subject to frequent stops and starts.

Charles de Gaulle was responsible to a great extent for the stagnation of European integration in the late 1960's and 1970's: ' De Gaulle's arrival had a negative as well as a positive effect on the consolidation of the nascent EC. De Gaulle openly opposed supranationalism. He and his supporters (Gaulists) had resisted the ECSC and the EDC; they tolerated the EC, but primarily because of its economic potential for France. In de Gaulle's view, the nation state was supreme States could and should from alliances and collaborate closely, but only on the basis of intergovernmentalism, shared sovereignity.

Yet the Gaulle thought that the Community could be useful politically as the basis of an intergovernmental organization of European states. ' [9] As a result of the collision between supranationalism and intergovernmentalism the 1 Crisis in EU history has arisen: ' Majority voting is a key instrument of supranationalism because member states on the losing side agree to abide by the majority`s decision. De Gaulle rejected this principle, seeing QMV as an unacceptable abrogation of national sovereignty.

The looming confrontation erupted in June 1965, when de Gaulle triggered the so-called ' Empty Chair Crisis' by the withdrawing French representation the Council ostensibly in protest against Commission proposals to strengthen the EC's budgetary powers, but really in an effort to force other member states to agree not to extend the use of QMV. De Gaulle had a compelling practical reason to resist qualified majority voting: he wanted to protect CAP against a voting coalition of liberal member states. [10] Naturally after the 1 crisis has occurred it has been followed by the 1 Compromise in the EU history: ' The crisis ended in January 1966 with the so-called Luxembourg Compromise. The Treaty's provisions on QMV would stand, but the Council

would not take a vote if a member state insisted that very important interests were at stake. The Luxembourg Compromise tipped the balance toward intergovernmentalism in thh Community's decision-making process, with unanimity becoming the norm. This had a detrimental effect on decision-making until the Single European Act took effect in 1987. [11] The EU has always been shaken of tensions between distinct national interests and shared economic interdependence which have become a daily routine in the domestic agenda. However, a series of revisions to the EU's Treaties four in 15 years after the mid-1980s had the general effect of more closely binding together the Union's member states, strengthening its common institutions and adding to its policy remit. II. 4. Multiculturalism The concept of multiculturalism seems to be failing all around Europe.

European leaders are one by one denouncing the policy of multiculturalism. The latest statement came from French President Nicolas Sarkozy, who said he does not want people to pray in an ' ostentatious way' in the street. The one who started the trend was German Chancellor Angela Merkel. ' This multicultural approach, saying that we simply live side by side and live happily with each other has failed. Utterly failed,'[12] Merkel said. Then British Prime Minister David Cameron weighed in, saying, ' We have failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong.

We have even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run counter to our values. '[13] France's President Nicolas Sarkozy has given the most clear answer, ' My answer is, clearly, yes, it's a failure. '[14] ' Multiculturalism will only function if people coming to the country will have a job, have their own money and feel responsible for the community,' says

immigration officer Arnold Mengelkoch from Copenhagen. ' Otherwise, they are jobless people who lead a passive life with social welfare. [15] Obviously the main issue is in the definition of integration and multiculturalism that both locals and immigrants seem to have. Gassan Khorani, a Danish immigrant and civil engineer, says immigrants and natives just perceive the idea of integration differently. ' The Danes think that integration means becoming fully Danish. Immigrants have to eat, drink and live just like the Danes. But those who come here think integration means earning some money, having their kids speak Danish and going to Danish schools. That's why there's a discord,'[16] he says.

Member of the European Parliament and the EU parliament's vice-chair of foreign affairs, Fiorello Provera, says Italy faces the same multicultural problem, because most of the immigrants do not want to live by the country's rules. Multicultural tolerance, he says, means that all people have to live following the same rules and laws. ' Immigrants (in Italy) are tolerated if they follow rules, laws and traditions. It is very easy to tolerate, to accept immigrants following the rules. If they want to live their own rules on our territory, it will be very difficult to accept for the Italian people. Perhaps until this difference in expectations is resolved, the cultural tensions in Europe will persist but admitting that the problem exists may be the first step on the way to finding a solution, since it looks like the heads of state have only now realized what many observers have been predicting. Nowadays the problem is more urgent than ever, as popular unrest stirs up Northern Africa and new fresh inevitable waves of immigrants flocking to the EU and the Old World is not waiting for them with open arms. II. 5.

European Integration – unfinished, constantly developing process and the new challenges The process of integration in Europe is always led by means of the economic components. Integration may be expected to have positive effect on prosperity: this is clearly documented in economic theory but we can also expect that common economic interests will make conflicts less likely. European integration walked its way from the European Coal and Steel Community in the early fifties and proceeded step by step to the Single Market and now to the implementation of the euro across Europe.

The euro can be seen as the final piece in the Single Market. Failure to introduce the euro could put the whole integration process and its achievements so far at stake. However, the process of integration will not be completed with the introduction of the euro. Nevertheless the process of European Integration will continue, because many countries are still willing to join the EU. The introduction of the euro is the last stage of the integration process, which should not be rushed.

First, these countries must integrate their economies successfully into the EU environment afterwards the participation in the new exchange rate mechanism is inevitable: ' The new members will all join EMU at some point, but it could be several years after accession before they become part of the eurozone. They have not been given the option of an opt-out from the euro like those negotiated by the UK and Denmark. However this is not a problem as most of the new member states want to join the eurozone as quickly as possible after accession, and they nearly all have some form of peg to the euro in place.

They see the eurozone as removing exchange rate risk and further boosting their trade with the other eurozone members. It would also result in lower interest rates, in turn encouraging investment and growth. '[17] III. Conclusion The written paper begins by emphasizing the European Integration relevance and continues with 5 systematically arranged arguments supporting the main thesis based on the question why the integration process is a complexity matter.

The first argument concerns the exact territorial lines of Europe which are still subject of dispute and Europe's unhomogenity by origin and goes further with evaluation of the integration process success and on the other hand with national identity issues, which are thought to be a result of the homogenized Euroculture model, a key role in which is played by the English language domination. The second argument is focused on the legacy of wars in Europe and the leading role of the small states model and also analyses some of the real impetuses hidden behind the Cold War.

The third point observes the rises and the falls of the European Integration through the years and closely examines both the first crisis in the Community, representing Charles de Gaulle motives to " sabotage" the Integration and the followed solution provided by The Luxembourg Compromise as well. The fourth argument is based on recent statements of different European states leaders who are unanimously agreeing that the implementation of the multiculturalism model has failed across Europe and new alternatives should be sought.

The fifth argument emphasizes the unfinished character of the integration process and points out the future challenges in front of the Europe one of which is the introduction of the euro as a common currency. As a sum, it appears that EU is still seen to some extent as a threat to the national identities but on the other hand it is perceived far more in terms of the economic and security benefits it can provide to both individuals and to the countries as well, which in the end of the day are the factors that prevail over any other considerations. IV. References: Bomberg, E. Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? , Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 114-115 Bomberg, E. , Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? , Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 115 Bomberg, E. , Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? , Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 115 Cooper, R. (2000) The Post-modern State and World Order. Demos, p. 11 Cooper, R. (2000) The Post-modern State and World Order. Demos, p. 14 Grabbe, H. What the new member states bring into the European Union, Chapter 5, p. 8 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 28 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 29 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 38 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 39 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 39 McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 40 http://www. japantoday. com/category/world/view/merkel-german-multiculturalism-has-utterly-failed http://www. bbc. co. uk/news/uk-politics-12371994 http://news. yahoo. om/s/afp/20110210/wl_afp/francepoliticsimmigrationsociety_20110210231042 http://wn. com/multikulti_failblog_europe_leaders_trash_multiculturalism

http://wn. com/multikulti_failblog_europe_leaders_trash_multiculturalism

——————– [1] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 28 [2] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 38 [3] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 39 [4] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 39 [5] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 0 [6] McCormick J. (2002) Understanding the European Union, p. 29 [7] Cooper, R. (2000) The Post-modern State and World Order. Demos, p. 11 [8] Cooper, R. (2000) The Post-modern State and World Order. Demos, p. 14 [9] Bomberg, E. , Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? , Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 114-115 [10] Bomberg, E. , Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? , Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 115 [11] Bomberg, E. , Stubb, A. (2003) The European Union: How does it work? Dinan, D. , How Did We Get Here? Chapter 2, p. 115 [12] http://www. japantoday. com/category/world/view/merkel-german-multiculturalism-has-utterly-failed [13] http://www. bbc. co. uk/news/uk-politics-12371994 [14] http://news. yahoo. com/s/afp/20110210/wl_afp/francepoliticsimmigrationsociety_20110210231042 [15] http://wn. com/multikulti_failblog_europe_leaders_trash_multiculturalism [16] http://wn. com/multikulti_failblog_europe_leaders_trash_multiculturalism [17] Grabbe, H. What the new member states bring into the European Union, Chapter 5, p. 98