



# EVROPAEVM

## 2011 SUMMER SCHOOL

### *The Futures of Europe: Which Way Towards 2030*

17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011

Report for *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 The six-day Conference and Summer School set out to explore the complexities of current relations between European nations and the European Union, and in particular how the EU is likely to fare in the coming two decades. Participants met against a background of uncertainty, with a growing mood of gloom over whether the Greek economic crisis would explode again, as many predicted, and how the leaders of the Eurozone could display the right kind of leadership and 'get ahead' of the looming catastrophe.
- 1.2 Speakers – young graduates, in particular – set out, therefore, to examine the future of the Euro; problems arising from current political and economic integration; questions to do with European governance, distribution of resources, migration, alienation, future enlargement, security, Russia and ways for Europe to maintain its global influence in the face of all these challenges, especially in the wake of the rise a so-called G2: the US/China nexus.
- 1.3 One key impetus behind the conference was the report by the Reflection Group on the Future of the EU, entitled *Project Europe 2030, challenges and opportunities* which appeared in 2010, but which was barely discussed in the media or among Eurocrat circles, despite having a raft of thoughtful and insightful suggestions. The group was led by former Spanish Prime Minister, Felipe Gonzalez, and one of the two vice-chairs was invited to our event. It was decided to use the report as a back-cloth, and to discuss its findings in a way that had not been done before, in Spain especially, given that the group had been led by a Spaniard and had many of its meetings in Spain.

#### 2. Modus Operandi

- 2.1 The event was organised jointly by the Europaevm association of leading European universities and the *Fundación Ortega-Marañón* (FOM), which is linked to *Complutense*, and became an associate member in late 2010, with some input and support from the hosts, the *Menendez Pelayo International University (UIMP)*, which runs regular summer events and provided the infrastructure.

- 2.2 The event took place in the Magdalena Palace, in Santander, Spain, run by the UIMP and encompassed the *Europaeum's annual Summer School* and its annual *International Conference*, and served as an additional external summer event for the FOM.
- 2.2 The event followed the pattern laid down for UIMP events – two lectures in the mornings given by experts, followed by a panel discussion in the afternoon, and additional sessions for the younger scholars for role-playing, debates and graduate presentations. The focus of the event however was put on discussion and debate, to allow greater interaction and to allow participants to question the experts – and in this, with some judicious chairing, the event certainly succeeded, as speakers, organisers and participants acknowledged.
- 2.3 Each day was broadly themed so that lectures and the panel discussion drew on particular areas of expertise including the spheres of politics, economics, the media and academia – around questions to do with the Eurozone crisis, or international relations and China, and so forth.
- 2.4. The additional sessions reserved for Summer School activities involved young graduate scholars giving a range of papers on themes such as Energy policy in Europe, or, as well as some country studies - the survival of Ireland's economy, Croatia's view of the EU; why the Czechs have fallen out of love with the EU ? (see **annexe 5** for a collection of abstracts of these presentations). Each was followed by heated discussion – led by two designated discussants and then often leading to half a dozen further questioners. We also had five Working Groups each made up of four or five young scholars, asked to answer a series of questions to do with the future challenges of the EU as relating to economic issues, political issues, cultural and value based issues, security and international relations, and social/societal issues. There was a role-playing exercise where students were designated to put the merits of potential new EU candidate countries forward to a panel representing the EC, EU, the European Court, and an Economics advisor, and with an opposition team, following each all participants voted for their preferred new member from the five candidates considered. Finally, there was a lively Oxford Union style debate and a role-playing game, on the motion: *This House believes the challenges faced by Europe are too great for it to survive through to 2030 ?* where two teams of four had to propose and oppose the motion, but everyone had to make contributions.

### 3. Participants

- 3.1 In all there were some 50 participants, including leading figures from **politics** - such as Lord Tristan Garel-Jones, the Conservative peer, and Vaira Vīķe-Freiberga, a former President of Latvia; **academia** - Dr Hartmut Mayer of Oxford University, and Professor Christian Hacke of Bonn University; **think-tank policy-makers** - Richard Youngs, Director-General of FRIDE, and Emilio Lamo de Espinosa, the Director of Elcano Royal Institute for Strategic and International Studies (and Professor of Sociology at Madrid Complutense); **law** - Antonio Garrigues Walker, Chairman of the well known Garrigues law firm, and José Maria de Arieza, Dean of IE Law School and Jean Monnet-IE University Chair and a legal practitioner; and **economics** - Federico Steinberg, the Economics Senior Analyst at Real Instituto Elcano for International Relations, and Professor Fernando Fernández, of the IE Business School in Madrid. (for a full list of speakers, see **Biographical Notes annexe 1.**)
- 3.2 Some 28 graduates were registered but in the end three dropped out and three were indisposed at the start, two were ill, so 22 young graduate scholars came from Europaeum partner universities – variously from the University of Oxford, Leiden University, University of Bologna, Geneva Graduate Institute, University of Paris 1 Sorbonne, Charles University,

Prague, University of Helsinki, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Fundacion Ortega Maranon. - and all were active participants throughout the week. As indicated, after the formal lectures and panels on each day, they would come together to debate and discuss issues further in their own working groups and graduate sessions in the early evenings – and it was good to see these discussions continue over meal times and even in bars during the evenings

- 3.3 In addition there were some 20-25 UIMP participants who had signed on for the conference programme, and it was pleasing to find that many of them were ready to join in the discussions after each speaker and during the panel, and attendance throughout the week remained very high. This helped widen the range of the debates.

#### 4. Programme

- 4.1 The Summer School elements were started off on the Sunday afternoon, immediately after arrival and registration with lively introductory talks by Dr Paul Flather from the Europaem and Julio c. MacLennan from FOM, setting the tone for the event and outlining some of the key debates. This was followed by a first Graduate Session with two papers given and discussed. Over dinner students were introduced to Ms Viķe-Freiberga who joined us. They also started the process to get to know each other, but a very noisy dining room, with staff refusing to close the kitchen doors, prevented us from inviting each person to introduce themselves a little, which is the norm for us, and also for Ms Viķe-Freiberga to add some background words and anecdotes about her life and work. Many of the students went onto local bars where they did their introductions !
- 4.2 Anyway, the inaugural lecture to the full international conference was given on *The EU and the Challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century* by Vaira Viķe-Freiberga the next morning. Here she outlined her vision of the founding of the EU some 60 years ago, its purposes, its initial successes, leading up to a raft of challenges in the past decade, over the Euro, over Enlargement, and over politics, and the *raison d'être* behind the Reflection Group report – which she deeply regretted had not been more discussed, perhaps because the chairman and the group had not seen eye-to-eye on how best to stimulate public discussion. As time had overrun in the various introductions, there was limited discussion.
- 4.3 The **first** full day of the conference focussed on *The Economy* – and the second lecture was on *Is there a crisis in the European Project ?*, given by Antonio Garrigues Walker, a lawyer and member of the Trilateral Commission with some lively questions, was followed by a panel Discussion on *Monetary Stability in Europe* with three speakers asked to speak for no more than 25 minutes, leaving plenty of time for discussion and follow-up. After a one hour break, the evening was devoted to the first meeting of the working groups and a second round of graduate presentations.
- 4.4 The **second** day focussed on *Politics and Government in the EU*, with first an excellent lecture by Richard Youngs on *the International Challenges facing Europe* (rather than the billed theme of *Identity and Culture*), about which he has recently produced a widely read book. The lecture provoked a wide ranging discussion particular on the rise and role of China and the possible demise of the US. A second talk on *Nations and states since the Lisbon Treaty* was given by Iñigo Méndez de Vigo y Montojo. After lunch there was a panel discussion on *EU Institutions, Governments and Citizens after the Crisis*. After an additional break, there were further graduate presentations, and another round of working group sessions. The UIMP also provides a cultural programme, and there was a first class classical concert attended by a number of participants – some of whom could then be spotted at the weekly Tuesday campus disco !

- 4.5 The **third** day considered the questions surrounding *Europe's Social Model*, with lectures by Professor Emilio Lamo de Espinoza (Madrid University) on *Europe in a post-European World*, which was well received, and by Dr Hartmut Mayer (Oxford University) on *The Future of the Welfare State in the EU* which provoked many thoughtful observations and began a long-running thread about the role and perception of Germany and German people in Europe today, aided by having at least two very insightful German scholars among our speakers. The panel discussion continued around the themes of the *Future of the Welfare State, Competitiveness and the Race for Knowledge-based Economy in Europe*, with papers covering welfare and education, and led to lively discussion particularly about the role and value of universities, informed by the academic experiences of most of the participants. The Summer School activities that followed comprised a highly successful and enjoyable role-playing game, in which teams of two had to argue for - and against - putative applications to join the EU of the following candidate countries before a critical panel of assessors drawn from legal, economic, EU and EC circles. These were Ukraine, Russia, Morocco, Canada and Turkey, very much appreciated by the graduates. The final vote-off between Turkey and Ukraine, resulted in Ukraine being voted in to the EU in 2013 ! Another two lively graduate papers were then given and discussed before all the graduates headed down to dinner or outside to nearby restaurants.
- 4.6 The **fourth** day of the conference, entitled *Europe in the World*, started off with Professor Christian Hacke's lecture on *The New EU Foreign Policy and Security Policy* which again stimulated much discussion about the current foreign policy of Germany under Angela Merkel and its sense of responsibility within – and to – Europe today. This was followed by a Summer School session in the morning which took the form of an Oxford Union style debate, chaired by Dr Paul Flather of the Europaeum, with students presenting fierce arguments as to whether Europe today was strong enough and committed enough to weather the many challenges it faces. There were many lively contributions, with some students taking the format, some intervening almost too often with irritating points of order, and others with telling comments which swayed participants. At the final vote the surprising but clear result emerged – based on the debate solely – but a 3-2 majority that the EU would not manage to survive ! This was testimony to the team which argued that side as that was not the majority view at the start of the debate. When a further vote was taken as what students thought would actually happen, it emerged by a 4-1 majority that they thought that the EU would indeed survive. There followed a lecture by Julio C. MacLennan on European perspectives, and a very good panel discussion on *EU's Enlargement, Neighbourhood policy and Foreign Affairs* which again looked at the role of Germany, the rise of China and the seeming demise of Europe's global influence. There was still time for two final graduate presentations – to which all the summer school participants turned up, confirming their commitment to support and critique each other's work. After dinner the summer school participants met in the main town square and had a final evening together to mark the almost culmination of the programme.
- 4.7 The focus for the **fifth** and final day was billed as *the Environment* – the subject of two excellent graduate presentations – though not enjoyed by all participants. In fact Lord (Tristan) Garel-Jones decided to speak on themes he knew well, especially from his time as a former UK Europe Minister, and continued to explore some of the themes of *The EU, the position of Spain within the EU and the EU's international policies*.
- 4.8. The last Summer School session was devoted to the final reports from the five individual working groups, which were tabulated and explored by Paul Flather for their connectivity

and insight with comments from Julio C. MacLennan and Hartmut Mayer, which proved very enlightening.

- 4.9 There was then a final wrap-up with three students invited to submit views and comments – mostly very positive, though there were notices about the poor and quite repetitious food supplied in the UIMP canteens, and the fact that many speakers, especially the Spanish, were not that prepared and had strayed off the themes, which, apparently they had agreed in advance.
- 4.8 For a full programme, see **annexe 2**.

## 5. Feedback

- 5.1 As usual, the Europaeum asked its graduates to send in feedback reports, with their thoughts on both the academic of the event, as well as its organisation. It was gratifying, given additional constraints in organising this in a new and unknown venue with new partners and many organisational constraints, to find comments were, probably, even more enthusiastic and positive than usual.
- 5.2 The graduates agreed that the underlying themes of the event were “interesting and highly relevant”. They singled out the additional graduate sessions as, on the whole, most intellectually stimulating part of the experience, more than some of the lectures. In this, I think they were hinting that some of those invited had, perhaps, not prepared their remarks sufficiently, and many had strayed off their themes with some impunity. One or two had spoken well over time, despite perhaps too-polite interjectures by the Chairs. On other occasions tight North European chairing had produced far more productive discussions.
- 5.3 They appreciated some of the lectures (in particular it seems those by Dr Richard Youngs, Lord Garel-Jones, Hartmut Mayer and Christian Hacke :

*“Some of the speakers at the Conference were very inspiring. This applies especially to Lord Tristan Garel-Jones, the former British minister for Europe, Professor Christian Hacke and Mr Richard Youngs, who focused their presentations to the point and shared their interesting life experiences. We were lucky to have Professor Hartmut Mayer as one of the speakers and as a participant of the summer school.” - Zuzana Pickova, Charles University, Prague*

- 5.4 Overall, as indicated, they found the additional Summer School graduate sessions really interesting and enjoyable. Here they could exchange ideas more openly and more fully immerse themselves in discussions and deeper thoughts about the future of Europe. They highlighted the “rather incendiary” Oxford Union Debate and the role-playing game as thrilling opportunities to learn how to accommodate opposing views.
- 5.5 The graduates agreed that the summer school was an overall success, from both a personal and intellectual perspective:

*“Overall, I thought the summer school was a resounding success. I found it intellectually stimulating and socially rewarding; antagonists in the role-playing game and the debate transformed into the greatest dinner companions and dance partners at night. I consider this blending of the serious and the social to be the conference’s greatest achievement.”- Martijn Mos, University of Oxford*

- 5.6 As is customary, The Europaeum will also be publishing an additional report based entirely upon student feedback. But we should bear in mind the views of one student in terms of our findings:

*"I do not believe that since we were all intellectuals or would-be-so, and, for the most part, staunch Europeanists, our perspective was different from that of 'the man on the street'. Reality and reason are both debatable and constructed – by everyone. We were simply trying to understand it better because that is our inclination."* - **Shannon C. Little, University of Bologna**

- 5.7 Finally, all participants commented on how much they had enjoyed the event, and how much they had gained and learnt from the discussions, and exchanging views with students from other countries. One of them pointed out that he "did leave Santander with a more optimistic outlook on the EU", which must in the end be a very positive outcome. Indeed, one of the problems identified by the Reflection Group was that the EU has "failed to mobilise the support and participation of citizens which is essential to the legitimacy of the project." If the summer school contributed to rectifying this problem amongst young European scholars, then this might be counted as one of its greatest successes.
- 5.8 To sum up, through their reports, it is clear that the students found the event a great intellectual stimulation – and even though their days were long, there was enough time for fun, and one or two excursions ! (Please see **annexe 3** for a list of graduate participants.)

## 6. Funding

- 6.1 The event was sponsored jointly by five organisations; *Fundación Ortega-Marañón*, the Spanish Foreign Ministry, *Menéndez Pelayo International University* and *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*, as well as the Europaeum.
- 6.2 The overall cost is put at around €40,000 (with the distribution being approximately divided into the following proportions: €9,000 from the Europaeum, €10,000 from the FES, €7,000 from the Spanish Foreign Ministry, €5,000 from the FOM and some €8,000 as a UIMP subsidy – offset against fees they earn from their registered participants.
- 6.3 It was pleasing to note that representatives from all the partner organisations were able to attend at least part of the events that were organised.

## 7. Follow-up Activities

- 7.1 The Europaeum is maintaining its event website and is posting the various graduate paper abstracts (**also in annexe 5 here**)
- 7.2 We have also asked participants to send us full papers when they can and also other references and articles that relate to the themes, so that we can keep discussions continuing.
- 7.3 We had hoped that most of the speakers would be able to give us texts of their talks, especially given they were paid for their talks. But this does not appear very likely, and we do not have a tape of the proceedings.
- 7.4 The graduates have set up their own facebook link to stay in touch.

## 8. Conclusions

- 8.1 It is clear the event can be considered very much a success – both on intellectual grounds, collectively and individually, and it is understood that feedback to the UIMP, also expressed in the meeting hall, revealed that this was thought to be ‘one of the best summer programmes organised at Santander’ and it seems our local partners are likely to be invited to set up future events – whether the Europaeum was involved or not.
- 8.2 The conference was hinged on the Reflections Group crisis report and one hope was that we would end with some deeper insight into whether or not there were ideas there that should have been – and could still – be explored with benefit. We did conclude that the report should be revisited and that it was unfortunately, internal politics as much as external politics, that led to the report being largely bypassed, even in Spain; but also that many of the conclusions were too general to force themselves onto EU agendas.
- 8.3 We could though arrive at four general conclusions:
- (i) The future of Europe, now hinges, for better or worse, very much of the attitudes of the German leadership and on the German people, these being two distinct and to some extent independent variables. It was clear from our discussions that German leadership may be weaker than for some considerable time at the very point when Europe was in need of able and strong leaders, and that the automatic commitment of Germany to the European Project is being increasingly put to test;
  - (ii) The problem of the Euro and Eurozone crisis – which in fact draws in also those countries inside the EU who are not in the Eurozone – can only be solved if Europe’s leaders and managers get ahead of market expectations, and develop new economic structures and regulatory arrangements both to increase fiscal coordination, to create early warnings about future crises, and to ensure greater burden sharing;
  - (iii) Many discussions led to analysis of the current and future role of China, and what lessons could be drawn about their increasing influence of global economic markets, their emergent role in Africa, their huge creditor status vis-à-vis the United States. It was generally agreed that China currently did not have the will, experience or structures to play a global role, but this was bound to change over the coming decades. It is also becoming apparent that China has already demonstrated its interest in Europe’s growing crisis, though it seems that this is currently to ensure the continued survival of the EU and Eurozone, but probably at a price ;
  - (iv) The final conclusion was recognition of the continuing decline of Europe as a global power, partly due to the complex nature of its internal regional organisation, partly because of internal diversions over the past decade, and partly because of the impact of the economic crisis. A new triumvirate now heads the EU, but participants were not convinced or encouraged that this would necessarily lead Europe forward. A very gradual decline in the influence of US was also noted, and there were concern about what new world order would emerge over the coming decade,
- 8.4 The books were balanced and all partners are reporting their own satisfaction with their input in to the event. And, even if fleshing out detailed proposals that would work as a

panacea for the EU did not extend far beyond “in the end it will be Germany who has to pay...” all participants will have returned to their countries better informed about what the EU’s future might look like.

- 8.5 Final thanks must go, once again, therefore to our five supporting and sponsoring bodies – and an honourable mention to the two main organisers Dr Paul Flather from the Europaeum and Dr Julio McLennan from the FOM.



## Annexe 1

# EVROPAEVM

## 2011 SUMMER SCHOOL

### *The Futures of Europe: Which Way Towards 2030*

17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011 Santander

#### Biographical notes

##### **Jóse Maria de AREILZA**

Dean of IE Law School and Jean Monnet-IE University Chair. He received his Masters and Doctorate degrees from Harvard Law School, and Law degree with the Special University Prize from Universidad Complutense. He has worked at the Spanish Prime Minister's Office as advisor on European and North American Affairs, and as advisor to the Representative of the Spanish Government in the European Convention on the Future of Europe. He is the founding editor of the weblog *BlogEuropa.eu* and President of the Center for European Studies at IE University.

##### **Fernando BANDRÉS**

General Director of the Tejerina Foundation, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, University Complutense de Madrid. Mr. Fernando Bandrés Moya is Director of the Advanced Study Lecture Room at the Tejerina Foundation and Permanent Professor at the Faculty of Medicine of the Complutense University of Madrid, at which he occupied the positions of Associate Dean and Head of the Toxicology and Health Legislation Department. He also occupied the position of Dean at the Health Science Faculty of the European University of Madrid, at which he obtained the Biomedicine Chair.

##### **Carlos CARNERO**

Ambassador on a special mission for European Integration projects. He was a Member of the European Parliament (Spanish Socialist Workers' Party) from 1994 to 2006. He was a member of the Constitutional Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the delegation for relations with the Maghreb countries and the delegation for the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee. He is also a member of the Steering Committee of the European Movement.

##### **Emilio Lamo de ESPINOSA**

Professor of Sociology at Madrid Complutense University and Director of the Elcano Royal Institute for Strategic and International Studies and a regular columnist of El País and ABC. He was Director General of Universities at the Ministry of Education and Science and Secretary General of the Council of Universities during the period of development and implementation of reforms. From 1992 to 2002 he was a Director of the Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset.

##### **Fernando FERNÁNDEZ**

An economist and professor of The IE Business School in Madrid. He holds a Ph.D. in Economics

from The Autonomous University of Madrid. His professional development, which reflects his personal interests, has led him to explore all the different Economics' fields. Professor Fernando Fernández started as a scholar fully dedicated to teaching and research; afterwards he worked in international economic policy at the IMF, in the banking arena at Santander Group, in international consulting and as Rector of private universities. His current professional interests focus on international economic developments, financial sector reform, including international regulation and supervision, the quality of economic regulation and liberalization policies. Professor Fernando Fernández has received several awards for his work in educating public opinion in economics, i.e. the Gloria Batista Award in 2008 and the Mercurio Award in 2006 for best article in written media I support of free trade.

#### **Paul FLATHER**

Secretary-General of the Europaeum, an association of leading European Universities and Fellow of Mansfield College, Oxford. He was the founding Secretary-General of the Central European University (1990-1994) originally set up in Budapest, Prague and Warsaw, by George Soros (now based in Budapest), and director of international and external affairs for Oxford University (1994-1999). Formally, he worked at the BBC, *Times* Newspapers, and served as Deputy Editor of the *New Statesman*. He is directing the Europaeum's research project on the future of European universities. His research work is on Indian political development since Independence. He worked with dissident movements in Central Europe in the 1980s, and with race equality groups in the UK. He was an elected member of the London Council in the 1980s (chairing its committee on post-school education 1986-1990).

#### **Lord Tristan GAREL-JONES**

A British politician and business executive. He was a Member of Parliament from 1979 to 1997 and was made a life peer in 1997. He was minister for Europe from 1990 to 1993. He is vice-chair of the All Party Humanist Group. He has been managing director of UBS and and Chairman of the Euroamerican Foundation promoting a stronger relationship between Europe and Latin America.

#### **Christian HACKE**

Professor Christian Hacke received a Ph.D. from Free University Berlin 1974 and was professor for Political Science at the University of the Army Forces in Hamburg from 1980 to 2000. From 2000 to 2008 he held the chair of Political Science and Contemporary History at Bonn University where he taught International Relations with a special focus on American and German foreign policy and the history and theory of International Relations. Prof. Hacke has published several books, mostly on American and German Foreign Policy, and contributes frequently to German newspapers and magazines such as *DIE ZEIT* and *FAZ*.

#### **Bernardino LEÓN**

Bernardino León is a Spanish diplomat of more than 20 years' experience. In June 2011 Mr. León has been appointed as the EU Special Representative for the Southern Mediterranean Region. He has devoted most of his career to the Arab world. Since 2008, he has been Secretary-General at the Spanish Prime Minister's Office, acting as main foreign policy adviser to the Prime Minister. In 2009, he also became Sherpa for the G20.

#### **Julio C. MACLENNAN**

A Historian and Writer, Santander Fellow in Iberian and European Studies at St. Anthony's College, Oxford, visiting professor at Tufts University, lecturer in Contemporary European History and International Relations at Ortega y Gasset University Institute, and IE Business School in

Madrid. He read history at University College, Oxford and holds a D. Phil from St. Antony's College, Oxford. He was briefly involved in Spanish diplomacy (Turkey and Ireland).

He is the author of several books on Spanish and European history and politics. He currently works on a book under the title of *Fortune-seekers and imperialists: the rise and fall of Europe in the world, 1492-2000*. He writes for the Spanish daily ABC and occasionally for the international press. He is a frequent lecturer in several universities and forums around the world.

### **Hartmut MAYER**

A Fellow and Lecturer in Politics at St. Peter's College, Oxford. A Region Head Western Europe at Oxford Analytica since 1999. Currently a long-term visiting professor at Hamburg University and the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA). Previously, he was Visiting Professor at Hitotsubashi University in Tokio, Japan. He holds a D.Phil. from St. Antony's College, Oxford, an M.Phil. from Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, an M.A.L.D from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and the equivalent of B.A. from the Free University of Berlin. He worked as a journalist in Germany, among others with DIE ZEIT and Sueddeutsche Zeitung.

### **Federico STEINBERG**

Economics Senior Analyst at Real Instituto Elcano for International Relations and a Professor at the Universitat Autonoma de Madrid. Has done his undergraduate studies at the Autonomous University of Madrid and at Georgetown University. He earned MSc in Politics of the World Economy from the London School of Economics and Political Science and MA in International Affairs from Columbia University, School of International and Public Affairs in New York. He has taught at Georgetown University, George Washington University, Suffolk University and the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. He has worked as a consultant to the World Bank. Author of *Cooperation and Conflict. International trade in the era of globalization* (2007).

### **José VARELA ORTEGA**

President of the Foundation José Ortega y Gasset-Gregorio Marañón, Professor of the Contemporary History at Juan Carlos University. He holds a D. Phil. from St. Antony's College, Oxford, and worked at the Iberian Studies Centre led by Sir Raymond Carr at St. Antony's College in the 1970s. He is the author of major works on contemporary Spanish history. Between 2002 and 2005 he was director of Colegio de España in Paris. He founded the Spanish internet daily newspaper *El Imparcial* in 2007.

### **Antonio López VEGA**

Professor of Contemporary History at Madrid Complutense University de Madrid, Director of the journal Social Science Circumstance. He has been a Director of the Fundación [Fundación Gregorio Marañón](#) until it was merged with Ortega y Gasset Foundation where he currently plays positions. Won a special degree and doctorate from the University Complutense of Madrid with a thesis on *Gregorio Marañón: Intellectual Biography*. He also taught at the University Carlos III of Madrid. Among other academic and editorial assignments, he is director of publications, coordinator of projects and research groups, chair of the Gregorio Marañón Studies Centre. His publications are mainly devoted to the life and work of Dr. Marañón: *Correspondence unprecedented: Cashew-Ortega, Unamuno* (2008), *Marañón, Academics: The landscape of knowledge* (2005), *Gregorio Marañón. Radiograph of a liberal* (forthcoming).

### **Veira VIKKE-FREIBERGA**

Former President of Latvia (1999-2007). She has earned her Ph.d. in experimental psychology. In 2006, the three Baltic States officially announced her candidacy for the post of UN Secretary-

General. She is a founding member of the Club of Madrid, a member of the European Council of Foreign Relations. She received the 2005 Hannah Arendt Prize for political thought, the 2007 Emperor Otto Prize for contributions in defining European identity and future, she has been awarded 37 Orders of Merit and 16 Honorary Doctorates. She has been appointed on the Advisory Board of EUROCLIO.

### **Iñigo Méndez de VIGO Y MONTOJO**

Spanish Politician, Member of European Parliament (People's Party, Committee of Constitutional Affairs) and Former Member of the *Presídium* in charge of writing the European Constitution. President of the Board of Directors of the College of Europe. EPP coordinator and spokesman in the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (since 1996). Member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. Earned BA in Law from Complutense University of Madrid. He was a Chairman of the EP Delegation to the Convention drafting the Charter of Fundamental Rights and to the Delegation to the European Convention. He received Salvador de Madariaga Prize for Journalism and Gold Medal of the Foundation of European Merit.

### **Richard YOUNGS**

Director General of the Madrid-based think tank FRIDE and since 2004 Assistant Professor at Political and International Studies Department at Warwick University. He obtained his BA (Hons) at Cambridge University, and his MA and PhD from Warwick University. He has held positions as analyst at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office; research fellow to an EU project on democracy promotion; and EU Marie Curie Fellow, based at the Norwegian Institute for International Relations in Oslo. He has written several books on democratisation and European foreign policy- the latest one is *Europe's Decline and Fall: the struggle against global irrelevance* (2010).

### **Antonio GARRIGUES WALKER**

A lawyer and member of the Trilateral Commission. He has been Chairman of the Garrigues Law Firm since 1961. He also presides over the Fundación Garrigues and the Spanish-Latin American alliance of lawyers 'Affinitas'. Garrigues is widely-renowned as a legal expert in foreign investment in Spain. He has consulted for large multinationals and the Spanish government in the area of economic legislation, especially in the field of foreign investment. He holds numerous posts in the legal and academic world. In 2009 he was appointed President of the ESADE International Advisory Board. He is also Life Trustee of the Fundación José Ortega y Gasset-Gregorio Marañón. Connected to his work on globalisation and the globalised world, he holds many senior positions in national and international organisations such as Honorary President for Spain of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

### **Lothar WITTE**

Director of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Madrid. Before assuming this post, he was Representative of the FES in Tunisia. He has worked as a political analyst for the FES in Bonn and as a freelance consultant in development policy. Lothar Witte holds a Master in Sociology (University of Berlin) and an M.A. in Economics (Vanderbilt University, Nashville/Tn.).

[www.fes-madrid.org](http://www.fes-madrid.org)



Annexe 2

EVROPAEVM

2011 SUMMER SCHOOL

*The Futures of Europe: Which Way Towards*

2030

17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011

**Santander**

*Programme of events*

Sunday 17<sup>th</sup> July

AM Arrival of participants

**From 17.30 Registration** (Magdalena Palace, Riancho Room)

**18.15 Welcome** (venue TBC)

- **Paul Flather**, Europaeum's Secretary-General, Mansfield College, Oxford
- **Julio C. MacLennan**, Lecturer in History and International Relations at IE Business School and the Ortega-Marañón Foundation

**19.00 Introduction**

- **Paul Flather:** *Some Dilemmas for Europe*  
**Discussant:** Manfredi Mangano (Bologna)
- **Julio C. MacLennan:** *Introduction to the Reflexions Group Report*  
**Discussant:** Marleen Maat (Leiden)

**20.00 Graduate presentations**

**Chair:** Paul Flather

- **Shannon C. Little (Bologna):** *Irish banking and sovereign crisis*  
**Discussants:** Jana Kosová (Prague) and Bo Chen (Leiden)
- **Eva Indruchová (Prague):** *Czech Republic on its way to the Euro*  
**Discussants:** Agata Młodawska (Krakow) and Emmanuel Dalle Mulle (Geneva)

**21.00 Welcome Dinner** (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace )

## Monday 18<sup>th</sup> July: *The Economy*

8.30-9.45 Breakfast (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace)

10.00 Welcome

- José Varela Ortega, President of the Foundation José Ortega y Gasset-Gregorio Marañón
- Julio C. MacLennan

Inaugural lecture: *The EU and the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century*

- Vaira Vīķe-Freiberga, Former President of Latvia and leading member of Reflexions Group 2009

11.30 Welcome

- Paul Flather

Lecture: *Is there crisis in the European project*

- Antonio Garrigues Walker, president of Garrigues Law firm and member of the Trilateral Commission

13.30 Lunch (Magdalena Palace)

15.30 Panel discussion: *The Future of the Euro and monetary stability in Europe*

- Frederico Steinberg, Economics Senior Analyst at Real Instituto Elcano for International Relations, Madrid
- Fernando Fernández, Economist, Professor of Economics and IE Business School, Madrid
- Hartmut Mayer, Lecturer in Politics, St Peter's College Oxford

18.00 Summer School Graduate Session I

Working Groups - Meeting A - Coordinated by Paul Flather

- Economic Futures for Europe 2030
- Political Futures for Europe 2030
- Cultural Futures for Europe 2030
- Security Futures for Europe 2030
- (Health, Education and Welfare)

19.00 Graduate presentations

Chair: Hartmut Mayer

- **Pablo Sanz Peña (Oxford):** *The European Commission and the 2030 Challenge of Energy Security and Climate Change*  
Discussants: Zuzana Picková (Prague), and Victor van Kleef (Leiden)
- **Claudia Rommel (Bonn):** *European Economic Government*  
Discussants: Julia Höffmann (Oxford), and Stefano Golinelli (Bologna)

20.30 Dinner (Magdalena Palace)

## Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> July: *Politics and Government in the EU*

8.30-9.20 Breakfast (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace)

9.30 Lecture: *European identity, culture and its internal challenges*

- **Richard Youngs**, Director General of FRIDE, Assistant Professor at Warwick University

11.30 Lecture: *The EU before its citizens and states since the Lisbon Treaty*

- **Iñigo Méndez de Vigo y Montojo**, MEP and Former Member of the *Presidium* in charge of writing the European Constitution

13.30 Lunch (Magdalena Palace)

15.30 Panel Discussion: *EU institutions, governments and citizens after the crisis*

- **Iñigo Méndez de Vigo y Montojo**
- **Jóse Maria de Areilza**, Dean of Law School, IE Business School
- **Richard Youngs**

18.00 Summer School Graduate Session II

Working Groups - Meeting B - Coordinated by Paul Flather

19.00 Graduate Presentations

Chair: Julio C. MacLennan

- **Mario Kortman (Leiden)**: *Euroethics, a critical perspective on euro-pragmatism*  
Discussants: Magdalena Czech (Krakow), and Paola D'Antuono (Bologna)
- **Stefano Golinelli (Bologna)**: *From "Big Science" to "Post-Normal Science"*  
Discussants: Ioana Alexandra Tuta (Geneva), and Martijn Mos (Oxford)

20.30 Dinner (Magdalena Palace)

## Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> July: *Europe's Social Model*

8.30-9.20 Breakfast (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace)

9.30 Lecture: *Europe in post-European world*

- Emilio Lamo de Espinosa, Professor of Sociology at Madrid Complutense University

11.30 Lecture: *The future of the welfare state in the EU*

- Hartmut Mayer

13.30 Lunch (Magdalena Palace)

15.30 Panel Discussion: *The Future of the Welfare State, Competitiveness and the Race for Knowledge-based Economy in Europe*

- Emilio Lamo de Espinosa
- Fernando Bandrés, General Director of the Tejerina Foundation
- Antonio López Vega, Professor of Contemporary History at Madrid Complutense University
- Paul Flather

18.00 Summer School Graduate Session III

Role-Playing game - Coordinated by Paul Flather

19.00 Graduate Presentations

Chair: Hartmut Mayer

- **Marleen Maat (Leiden):** *Left Perspective on the EU: Past and Present*  
Discussants: Marek Doseděl (Prague), and Claudia Rommel (Bonn)
- **Timo Miettinen (Helsinki):** *European universalisms - values, scope and limits*  
Discussants: Marianna Wiedenbeck (Geneva), and Eva Indruchová (Prague)

20.30 Dinner (Magdalena Palace)

## Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July: Europe in the World

8.30-9.20 Breakfast (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace)

9.30 Lecture: *The new EU foreign and security policy. Will there ever be a genuine EU foreign policy*

- Christian Hacke, Professor of Politics, Bonn University

11.30 Summer School Graduate Session IV

Graduate Presentations

Chair: Julio C. MacLennan

- **Manfredi Mangano (Bologna):** *The European Energy Security Dimension*  
Discussants: Velibor Jakovleski (Geneva), and Pablo Sanz Peña (Oxford)
- **Martijn Mos (Oxford):** *Conflicted Normative Power Europe: The European Union and Sexual Minority Rights*  
Discussants: Shannon C. Little (Bologna), and Mario Kortman (Leiden)

12.30 **Oxford Union Style Debate** – “*The European Union simply faces too many challenges ahead to survive through 2030*”

Chair: Paul Flather

13.40 Lunch (Magdalena Palace)

15.30 Lecture: *Spain and the European Union. Achievements and Challenges*

- **Bernardino León**, General-Secretary of the Presidency of the Spanish Government

16.30 Panel Discussion: *EU's enlargement, neighbourhood policy and foreign affairs*

- **Christian Hacke**, Professor of Politics, Bonn University
- **Carlos Carnero**, Spanish Ambassador in the EU
- **Tristan Garel-Jones**, Former UK Minister of Europe and Latin America and Former President of Euroamerican Foundation

20.30 Dinner (Magdalena Palace)

## **Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July: Energy and Environmental Challenges for the EU**

8.30-9.20      **Breakfast** (Main dining hall, Magdalena Palace)

9.30      **Lecture:**      *The Legacy of Europe and its Relevance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century World*

- Julio C. MacLennan

10.30      **Lecture:**      *The EU and the Emerging Powers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

- Tristan Garel-Jones

11.30      **Graduate Closing Session V**

**Reports from Individual Working Groups followed by General Discussion**

12.45      *What have we all learned?*

- Paul Flather
- Antonio López Vega
- Julio C. MacLennan
- Christian Hacke
- Hartmut Mayer

13.30      **Lunch** (Magdalena Palace or at a local restaurant)

**Optional Excursion** (details to be confirmed)

*In case of emergency please contact: Julio MacLennan [crispomacclennan@hotmail.com](mailto:crispomacclennan@hotmail.com)*



### Annexe 3

## EVROPAEVM

### 2011 SUMMER SCHOOL

### *The Futures of Europe: Which Way Towards 2030*

17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011

Santander

#### List of Participants

Paola D'ANTUONO	Bologna		International and Diplomatic Science
Bo CHEN	Leiden	PhD	Public Administration
Magdalena CZECH	Krakow	PhD	Sociology
Emmanuel DALLE MULLE	Geneva	PhD	International History and Politics
Marek DOSEDĚL	Prague		Law and law sciences
Paul FLATHER	Oxford	Fellow	Mansfield College; Europaeum
Stefano GOLINELLI	Bologna		European Studies
Christian HACKE	Bonn	Professor	Political Science
Julia HÖFFMANN	Oxford		Interdisciplinary Area Studies
Eva INDRUCHOVÁ	Prague	PhD	Law
Velibor JAKOVLESKI	Geneva	PhD	Political Science
Victor van KLEEF	Leiden	MA	European History and Civilization
Mario KORTMAN	Leiden		Politics
Jana KOSOVÁ	Prague		International studies
Shannon C. LITTLE	Bologna		Diplomatic Science
Marleen MAAT	Leiden	MA	European Studies
Julio MACLENNAN	FOM	Lecturer	European History and IR
Manfredi MANGANO	Bologna		International and Diplomatic Science
Hartmut MAYER	Oxford	Lecturer	Politics, St. Peter's College
Paula MENDEZ KEIL	Geneva		International Relations
Martijn MOS	Oxford		European Politics and Society
Timo MIETTINEN	Helsinki	PhD	European Studies
Agata MLODAWSKA	Krakow		Sociology
Zuzana PICKOVÁ	Prague		Social Sciences
Claudia ROMMEL	Bonn		European Studies
Pablo SANZ PEÑA	Oxford		Politics and IR
Ioana Alexandra TUTA	Geneva		International Affairs
Marianna WIEDENBACK	Geneva		International Affairs
Lothar WITTE	FES	Director	Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung




---

## Annex 4

# EVROPAEVM

2011 SUMMER SCHOOL

## *The Futures of Europe: Which Way Towards 2030*

17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011 Santander

### Graduate papers' abstracts

---

Stefano GOLINELLI, University of Bologna,  
*From "Big Science" to "Post-normal Science"*

In contemporary knowledge societies, the role of science is becoming more prominent than ever. Technological progress is at the heart of economic growth and competition, and scientific justification has emerged as the only neutral criterion to assess the consistency of national and regional regulations with free-trade dictates. Almost every feature of social and political life is heavily affected by the way knowledge is produced, shared and used, and this in turn has required political scientists to rethink the relationship between science and democracy. As science exerts a great influence on everyday life, it must be subject to some kind of popular control. The realisation of this control, however, has proved difficult to fulfill due to its contentious nature, especially in the area of new technologies, where facts are uncertain, values in dispute and stakes high.

This paper focuses on these problems of scientific governance, taking as its reference the evolution of EU green biotech regulations. This case provides an illuminating example of both the complexity of this debate and the relevance of its implications. Rather than stressing the trade facets of the GM dispute, this essay explores some institutional explications that better account for both the European opposition toward GMOs, and the adoption by EU authorities of a "social rationality" perspective, an approach that is often contrasted with North American "scientific rationality", which is primarily oriented towards aiding technological progress.

Since the mid-1980s, the increasing privatisation of science and the creation of the EU have transformed the processes of scientific governance, often in ways that casted doubts upon their legitimacy. On the one hand, the paradigm shift in science towards the private model has distorted public perception of this discipline and put into question its objectivity, security, and social desirability. On the other hand, the deepening integration between European states has led to extremely politicized and contested decision-making, and the EC has suffered from a loss of credibility and a perceived democratic deficit. These trends carried profound implications for biotech governance in Europe. Sound science has not been able to appease public unrest and civil society demanded to be included in the cost-benefit analysis, as "post-normal science" paradigm suggests. As a result, regulations have proven to be restrictive, unstable and controversial.

In the future, the emphasis on social rationality will not be limited to GM foods and crops but will similarly affect the governance of new technologies. In order to establish an optimal trade-off between democracy and progress, the EU not only needs to undergo a procedural and institutional reform, but also to restore a positive public view of science. The creation of a favourable environment for technological progress in

Europe won't be possible if the public perceives the risks and costs of new techniques to be greater than the benefits. If this re-legitimation of scientific complex is to occur, corporate agents should renounce their monopoly on research, so that the state (or the IGOs) can reorient it in the direction of civil society's needs.

---

**Eva INDRUCHOVÁ, Charles University in Prague,**  
**Czech Republic on its (slow) way to the euro**

I will explain the special circumstances now pertaining to the Czech Republic which have led its citizens to turn against the Euro, and the Eurozone mechanism, a mood encouraged by Czech politicians on all sides, most notably by our President, Vaclav Klaus.

My main conclusion is that the current reservations of the Czech Republic towards adoption of the euro, voiced especially by the leading politicians, but shared by the general public, stem from a combination of economic and political reasons within the country and external developments in the euro area - the Greek problems have caused even the supporters of quick Czech accession to the euro to diminish their enthusiasm.

Moreover, according to the current Prime Minister Petr Nečas, the euro area is now different compared to its state in 2003 when the Czech Republic decided to join the European Union. However, arguments based on the doctrine of *clausula rebus sic stantibus* are mostly being rejected as not applicable in the case of the European Union and the euro area. The Prime Minister also emphasized that his government would not set a date for adoption of the euro before its four-year mandate terminates in 2014 and that the Czech Republic will consider joining the euro area at the moment when the costs of maintaining the Czech crown outweigh the costs for adoption of the euro. Recently, the Czech Republic distanced itself even further from the single currency when the government decided not to participate in the Euro-Plus Pact. It is thus mainly the community of the largest Czech exporters who support the adoption of the euro in the long run, since the strong Czech crown lowers their income from abroad.

---

**Jana KOSOVA, Charles University in Prague,**  
**The Croatian attitude towards the EU**  
**in the context of the recent sentence handed out to Ante Gotovina in Haag**

I will discuss the relation of Ante Gotovina's case and its influence of Croatian attitude towards the EU, following some interviews I made during the short visit to Croatia. I can give a short biographical note on as follows:

*Ante Gotovina (born October 12, 1955) is a former Senior Corporal (Caporal Chef) of the French Foreign Legion and former Lieutenant General (general pukovnik) of the Croatian Army who served in the Croatian War for Independence. He was indicted in 2001 by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, accusing him of a "joint criminal enterprise" in an effort to expel Krajina Serbs from Croatia in 1995 during Operation Storm. After spending four years in hiding, he was captured in the Canary Islands on December 7, 2005. On April 15, 2011, Gotovina was found guilty on seven of the eight counts of the indictment and sentenced to 24 years of imprisonment*

---

**Shannon C. LITTLE, University of Bologna,**  
**Irish Banking and Sovereign Crisis**

This paper seeks to present the reader with a brief exposition of the Irish banking crisis of 2008 and the sovereign crisis which ensued after the decision of the Irish government to backstop all senior debt of the six main domestic financial institutions. It purports to outline the policies adopted to deal with the crisis and to critically assess and evaluate these in the light of alternatives put forth by commentators. The decision to save all the major banks is judged as reckless and counterproductive in light of the serious consequences it has imposed and will impose on the Irish economy and public finances for many years to come, albeit it is arguably an unavoidable outcome of a decade of lax supervision of lending on the part of financial regulators

and bank managers. An orderly restructuring of bank debt would be the least-worst solution if we adopt a strict Irish perspective and do not consider the spillovers to partners in the Euro Area. Despite both the IMF and the EC reports of last May being very favourable in terms of compliance by the Irish authorities, the economic outlook is still very fragile. Although most of the adjustment in terms of labour costs has already been accomplished and exports are on the rise, there are multiple threats to this recovery: sluggish growth in the UK and EA, more distress on sovereign debts of the peripheral countries, terms of trade deterioration in relation to commodities prices, to name a few. The combined effect of these problems could well push the programme off the cliff and the outcome is all but impossible to discern. Whether the Emerald Island can pull itself together and overcome this dismal situation ultimately depends on the resolve of its people and the well-judgment of its leaders. I am quite doubtful over the latter, but I do not believe the enormous gains the country has achieved in the last twenty years will be reversed.

---

**Manfredi MANGANO**, University of Bologna ,  
*The Energy Security Dimension of the European Energy Policy*

Energy has been in every time and place the vital backbone to progress and economic growth. It's then unsurprising that the European Community first and the European Union later moved to assert their competencies on this field: the paper details how this process unfolded, focusing on the Energy Security dimension of the European energy policies. Analysis starts with the Fifties and Sixties, when Energy Security policies, after the relative weakening of ECSC became again a province of Member States' initiative, and takes into consideration both the vital energy relationship with the Soviet Union and American responses. Attention then passes on the 70s, when the two multiple energy crises of 1973 and 1979 led to the birth of the International Energy Agency, amid violent discussions between Member States and the USA, and to the first coordinated Community policies. The path was followed in the Eighties and Nineties by the drive towards realisation of the Single Market, and by Union attempts to spread its neo-liberal approach outside its borders, by convincing energy partners to adapt to the most important notions of the *acquis communautaire* in energy matters. The Union's reaction to the various Ukraine and Belarus energy crises is considered, along with the developing geopolitical consciousness of the European Union, its relations with Russia and Turkey, efforts for integration of the Balkan energy markets, and the turbulent life of the Nabucco project. The paper concludes by addressing the need, for European policymakers, to properly assess Europe's needs and interests, moving away from a confrontational relationship with Russia and Iran towards a more competitive energy mix.

---

**Timo MIETTINEN**, University of Helsinki,  
*European universalisms - values, scope and limits*

Universalism is an idea that seems to stand between two opposite poles. On the one hand, it is affirmed ever more firmly as the fundamental principle of the contemporary democratic order – both national as well as global. A welfare state, we hold, cannot exist without universal healthcare and social security; a global democratic order cannot establish itself without the support of universal human rights. In the discussions concerning the status of minorities, principles of universalism are often promulgated as the best way to enhance the voices of the less heard: a revealing example of the indisputability of universalism can be found the UN's Vienna declaration of 1993, which firmly states that “the *universal nature* of these rights and freedoms is *beyond question*.” On the other hand, during the last few decades universalism has also been disparaged to the point that, at least in the academic discourse, no one really dares to support it unconditionally. In the works of Theodore Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Michel Foucault, Edward Said – to name a few – universalism has been associated with colonialism, imperialism and even totalitarianism; and further, it has become common to see universalism as a product of the dubious, Euro-centric or “instrumental” rationality of the Enlightenment period.

It seems to me that in order to resolve the tension between these two strains of universalism – what might be called its positive and negative senses – we need to rethink this concept; above all, re-read its history, re-discover its philosophical genealogy. For even though we would see the modern colonialism and imperialism as the thorniest leaves in the tree of universalism, I believe that we still have not touched upon its *roots*. It is

namely these roots that I want to consider here: I claim that in order to reframe the debate on universalism within the European tradition we should indeed go beyond the Enlightenment, and trace the descent of this notion beginning from Ancient Greek philosophy and what I would like to call its *universalistic heritage*. This pursuit, as I would like to see it, should not be ventured for the sake of nostalgic yearning, but because I believe that the Greek inception contains within itself a critical potential, which has been either dismissed or unthought by our tradition – a potential, which might help us to *articulate the very notion of universalism in a novel fashion*.

This article will present a very general argument, but its point is rather simple: in contrast to the universalism of the Enlightenment which grew out of the natural law theories of the early modern period, what I discuss here under the title of Greek universalism was a more *formal* idea that was after – not so much of concrete, *substantial* principles – but what could be designated as a shared attitude: a space of encounter for particular historical and context-bound situations. Following the late texts of Edmund Husserl, this motive could be captured – not in terms of shared propositions, conceptions or values – but as a *task* (*Aufgabe*) that constitutes the one of the fundamental strains of our European humanity, leaving its trace most central accomplishments: science, philosophy, politics and religion. By showing how this idea of universalism is intimately bound with the ideas of *rebirth* and *rational renewal*, I hope to broaden our scope of this concept as well as to insist on its new relevance for contemporary debate.

---

**Martijn MOS**, University of Oxford,

**Conflicted Normative Power Europe: The European Union and Sexual Minority Rights**

This paper will evaluate the extent to which the European Union (EU) manifests the ability to act as, and possesses the potential to develop into, a norm-setting bureaucracy in its external relations when it comes to the protection and promotion of sexual minority rights. In order to examine this, an overview of the theoretical notion of Normative Power Europe, as developed by Ian Manners, is offered. This is followed by an evaluation of the EU's international identity regarding LGBT rights. Ultimately it is concluded that the ability of the EU to shape international norms and values concerning this policy issue is severely undercut by a set of internal, institutional and conceptual inconsistencies. Only by overcoming this confliction and inconsonance can the EU develop into a full-fledged, credible and effective normative power in the case of sexual minority rights. It is concluded that the recently launched LGBT toolkit could constitute an important step in this direction.

---

**Claudia ROMMEL**, University of Bonn,

**European Economic Government – the way forward?**

The current crisis that hit the European Union on its Southern periphery in Greece led to a revival of the idea of creating a European Economic Government to prevent future turbulences of the eurozone and its common currency. In order to understand how a European Economic Government (EEG) is supposed to be the solution to the current problems, one needs to understand first how Europe got itself into the crisis.

A combination of factors caused Greece to find itself close to insolvency at the beginning of 2010: a high public debt, lower public income from taxes, faulty statistics that, once corrected, showed the complete effects of years of mismanagement plus the financial crisis and a loss of competitiveness. The Greek case is not that of Portugal, Spain or Ireland. Spain has had no deficits year after year and has still one of the lowest total public debts. However, the burst of the real estate bubble hit the economy hard and caused unemployment mainly among the youth. Spain's main issue is therefore its lack of competitiveness in the global economy. While there is reason to see the current European situation in a negative light, it might also be seen as a challenge to rectify the deficits of the Maastricht Treaty and come out with an even stronger currency.

So a European Economic Government / Governance are treated as possible solutions. But what is the difference between the two? Government implies a central, hierarchical decision-making and implementation system whereas Governance is a horizontal interaction where decisions are made through a negotiation process. The European Union already has a Governance system with the *acquis communautaire*, the Stability and Growth Pact, the open method of coordination and the European Macrodialogue. Furthermore, in terms

of monetary policy, the European Central Bank (ECB) is the Economic Government of the European Union. However, in fiscal policy (= use of government expenditure and revenue collection to influence economy) there are no competences on the European level so far.

A future European Economic Government would have the three main tasks:

- 1) Pursue flexible policy mix in monetary and fiscal policy in cooperation with the ECB
- 2) Implement countercyclical economic policy for the whole community
- 3) Make sure that debt is managed more responsibly.

Several proposals are given of who should be part of this Government and what it would look like. When analyzing these, it becomes apparent that almost all proposals are actually expanding the Governance system instead of “inventing” a European Economic Government. The reason for this is the fact that a Government would be accompanied with treaty amendments – very unlikely and undesirable after the cumbersome procedure to get the Lisbon Treaty passed. The most likely scenario for the future will be a European Economic Governance System in which the Eurogroup is expanded to include the President of the ECB and the Commissioner for Economics and Financial Affairs combined with increased coordination in the fiscal area. Clearly, more coordination is in the interest of the member states as this crisis can only be tackled by the sum of all member states’ efforts in order to come out of it with a strengthened currency.

**Pablo SANZ PENA, University of Oxford,**

***The European Commission and the 2030 Challenge of Energy Security and Climate Change***

Project Europe 2030 underlines the combined potential of energy security and climate change for social, economic and political destabilisation. Yet, to tackle these Herculean tasks, this vision admonishes that Europe cannot simply rely on market forces. Instead, wide ranging public interventions and support are needed to initiate a ‘new industrial revolution’ in the achievement of sustainability, a project in which the European Commission must take a leading role due to its capability to overcome the shortsightedness of national governments and truly engage in a patient, systematic and intelligent rebalancing between the political imperatives of both today and tomorrow. However, while the necessity to undertake wide reforms in seeking to mainstream economic, social and environmental sustainability at all levels of policy-making is ubiquitously recognised as a critical challenge for the future of Europe, is it necessary, if at all desirable, for the European Commission to take a leading role in such an environmental revolution?

Put bluntly, the analysis of the role of the European Commission in the promotion of renewable sources of energy (RES - E) suggests that this is not the case. Contrary to the idealised view of Project Europe 2030, this analysis portrays the European Commission as not only incapable to take on such a leading role due to its physical limitations in terms of budgetary and managerial concerns, but presents this idea as undesirable due to the manifest secondary position which environmental issues yield within the overall liberalising agenda of this institution. This study highlights how the Commission, under its typical normative focus on further liberalisation and in an alliance with the umbrella organisation of utility companies (EURELECTRIC), sought to pursue the creation of an ill-suited pan-European framework for the development of RES-E, an initiative against the preferences of the European Council, the European Parliament and environmental agencies, which resulted in the scrapping of such scheme from all Commission’s initiatives.

As a denouement, this academic endeavour puts the overall strategy highlighted in the Project Europe 2030 with regards to energy security and climate change into question. More specifically, this study highlights that the proposed role of the European Commission as a leading actor in the European revolution for sustainability must be reconsidered due to the apparent secondary role which this issue yields within the overall liberalising strategy of this institution. Therefore, this study opens the floor for further reflection on the future of the European Union, building upon the core ideas and objectives of Project Europe 2030, while at the same time juxtaposing this idealised vision against the reality of today’s Europe.

The following were not able to deliver their presentations due to illness and the pressure of work:

- **Mario KORTMAN**, Leiden University, on *Euroethics, a critical perspective on euro-pragmatism*
- **Emmanuel Dalle MULLE**, The Graduate Institute, Geneva, on the *Implications of the new Local Nationalism movements in the EU - initial thoughts*
- **Marleen MAAT**, Leiden University, on *Left Perspectives on the EU: Past and Present*