Deutsche Universität für Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer

O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs

USC Price Sol Price School of Public Policy

Summer Studies "On the Rhine"

"Public Policy and Administration in the European Union, Germany, and the United States"

18 May – 19 June 2020

Syllabus

1. Program overview

Speyer University is Germany's centre of competence for public administration. It offers postgraduate studies and executive training with an interdisciplinary approach, working closely with institutions in the public and private sector.

In cooperation with the Sol Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California, USA and the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, USA, Speyer University offers a joint summer program on comparative public policy and administration in Germany, the European Union and the United States. Five seminars deal with major topics in public management, European economic integration, US and EU constitutional law, policy-making in the EU and German federalism.

The program provides students with an opportunity to study issues of public policy and administration in an interdisciplinary and international context. The instructors have backgrounds in political science, economics and law. US and other international students, e.g. from Eastern Europe, learn side by side with German students. The courses are taught exclusively in English.

The program also features excursions to important German and European institutions, such as the German Federal Parliament and Chancellery (Berlin), the European Central Bank (Frankfurt), the European Court of Human Rights (Strasbourg) and the European Parliament, European Council and the Commission (Brussels). Through city tours in Speyer and Heidelberg, students also get to know the Rhein-Neckar region.

2. Faculty

Professor Michael W. Bauer is Jean Monnet Professor of the European Union and holds the Chair of Comparative Public Administration and Policy Analysis at the German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer. He is an expert on comparative public administration, EU policy-making and multi-level governance.

Professor Denvil Duncan is Associate Professor at the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. His research has explored the impact of tax evasion opportunities on income inequality, labor supply, risk taking behavior, and tax incidence.

Professor Andreas Knorr holds the Chair of Economics (Economic and Transport Policy) at the German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer. He is an expert on European economic integration.

Professor William G. Resh is Professor at the Sol Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California, USA. He is an expert on public management and executive politics.

Professor Constanze Janda holds the Chair of Social Law and Public Administration at the German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer. She is an expert on social security law and migration law.

Professor Rahel Schomaker is Professor of Economics and Public Administration at Carinthia University of Applied Sciences (CUAS), Kärnten, Austria and Senior Fellow at the German Research Institute for Public Administration (GRIP), Speyer.

3. Contact

Program director Speyer University
Professor Dr. Michael W. Bauer
Tel.: +49-6232 – 654 266
michael.bauer@uni-speyer.de

Professor Dr. Dr. h.c. Andreas Knorr
Tel.: +49-6232 – 654 157
knorr@uni-speyer.de

Professor Dr. Constanze Janda
Tel.: +49-6232 – 654 364
janda@uni-speyer.de

Program director PRICE
Dr. William G. Resh, Professor
Phone: +1-443-838-5220
wresh@price.usc.edu

Program Director O'Neill
Dr. Denvil Duncan, Associate Professor
Phone: +1-812-855-7493
duncande@indiana.edu

Prof. Dr. Rahel Schomaker
Tel: +49-177-213-1302
Rahel.Schomaker@online.de

4. Course structure, credits and requirements

4.1 Course structure

Overview seminars	EU institutions and multilevel policy-making	
	German federalism	
Core course	A comparative perspective on public administration	
Electives (choice of one)	European economic integration	Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice

This is how the OTR course structure works: Two overview seminars introduce you to EU policy-making and German federalism. Participation is obligatory, and you are expected to write a memo in both courses. The seminar "A comparative perspective on pub-

lic administration in the EU, Germany and the US" is the core course of the program. Participation is also obligatory. As a fourth course, you can choose between "European economic integration" and "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice". Both the core course and the elective course offer opportunities to deliver presentations and write papers or prepare a third memo. Which requirements you have to fulfil depends on your study program.

4.2 Requirements for O'Neill and Price students

Six credits/units (Graduate students)	Six credits/units (Undergrad students)
Active participation in four seminars (15 %)	Active participation in four seminars (15 %)
Two seminar papers (20% each = 40%)	One seminar paper (35%)
Two oral presentations (12.5% each = 25%)	One oral presentation (20%)
Two memos (10% each = 20%)	Three memos (10% each = 30%)
Participation in all excursions (mandatory)	Participation in all excursions (mandatory)

4.3 Requirements for Speyer students and international students

Speyer University students are welcome to participate in the whole program (four seminars out of five); they can also participate in single seminars as part of their regular curriculum. If you are interested in participating in single seminars, please register via the regular procedure. If you are interested in participating in the whole program, your requirements will be the same as for US undergraduate students (see above; excursions are not mandatory). Please visit our program website for detailed information and registration options for Speyer students.

Other **international students** should contact their home institutions to decide whether and to what extent they award credits for the OTR courses in the context of their academic programs. Depending on credit point requirements, they can follow either the graduate or the undergraduate track (see also above).

4.4 Choosing requirements

Against the background of different requirements for the student groups, choosing your individual requirements follows one of two main processes.

Undergraduate students, international students on the undergraduate track and Speyer students follow this process

You are:

O'Neill undergraduate	USC undergraduate	Speyer University student	International on undergraduate track

You choose an elective course:

"Economic integration"	"Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms"

You can choose to
a) deliver a presentation and write a paper in the core course and write a memo in the elective course or to
b) deliver a presentation and write a paper in the elective course and write a memo in the core course.

Paper in "Comparative public administration" + Memo in "Economic integration"	Memo in "Comparative public administration" + Paper in "Economic integration"	Paper in "Comparative public administration" + Memo in "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms"	Memo in "Comparative public administration" + Paper in "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms"

These are your requirements:

⇩	⇩	⇩	⇩
Paper and presentation in "Comparative public administration " + Memo in "Economic integration" + Memo in "EU policy-making" + Memo in "German federalism"	Memo in "Comparative public administration " + Paper and presentation in "Economic integration" + Memo in "EU policy-making" + Memo in "German federalism"	Paper and presentation in "Comparative public administration" + Memo in " Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" + Memo in "EU policy-making" + Memo in "German federalism"	Memo in "Comparative public administration" + Paper and presentation in " Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" + Memo in "EU policy-making" + Memo in "German federalism"

Graduate students, including internationals on the graduate track, follow this process:

You are:

O'Neill graduate student	USC graduate student	International student on graduate track

You choose an elective course:

„Economic integration"	„Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms"

⇩ **These are your requirements:** ⇩

Paper + Presentation in "Comparative public administration" Paper + Presentation in "Economic integration" Memo in "EU Policy" Memo in "German Federalism"	Paper + Presentation in "Comparative public administration" Paper + Presentation in "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" Memo in "EU Policy" Memo in "Federalism"

4.5 About papers, presentations and memos

- **Seminar papers** deal with a specific research question related to a topic from a given seminar (10-15 pages). It is recommended, but not obligatory, to write seminar papers on the presentation topics.
- **Oral presentations** give a general overview of a topic (15-20 min) and must be accompanied by a handout of 1-2 pages.
- **Memos** are brief reports on a scientific article or book chapter (1-2 pages). The respective instructor will provide you with appropriate selections. Each memo must be handed in one day before the respective scientific article or book chapter is discussed in class. Memos are accepted only in writing.

Full-program participants: Topics for presentations and literature for memos will be assigned to you once you have made your course choices.

A limited number of presentation topics and memo literature will be reserved for single seminar participants.

4.6 Deadlines and grading

US and other international students hand in their papers to the respective instructor(s) on **July 1, 2020**. In case the papers are turned in late, the grade will be reduced by 5 % for every two days it is late. Papers are no longer accepted after **July 5, 2020**.

The deadline for the Speyer professors to send their grades to the American professors is **July 10, 2020.**

4.7 Certificate of Participation

Upon request, Speyer University, O'Neill and USC also offer a special Certificate of Participation for US and international students who successfully complete the overall program.

5. Logistical information

5.1 Room and board

International students live on campus, generally sharing double-bedrooms with German students. Students have access to the library and all other university facilities. Breakfast and lunch are available at the university cafeteria on campus. The dorms offer cooking facilities. The kitchen has to be cleaned regularly – in alteration with the German students.

5.2 Support services

Professor Resh serves as the resident director on site for PRICE students; Professor Duncan serves in the same capacity for O'Neill students. Speyer University staff can help with logistics, academic concerns and emergency issues. Prior to departure, O'Neill and PRICE interview all IU and USC applicants and solicit information about relevant health issues; in addition, a list of contact numbers is maintained at O'Neill and PRICE.

Both PRICE and O'Neill cohorts will have a "student liaison" who will be the primary contact for most student questions and concerns. Students should feel free to contact the respective directors and staff in the case of an emergency. However, all questions regarding programmatic details, classroom assignments or details on the different excursions (for example) should be directed first and foremost to your respective student liaison. Details and contact information on the student liaisons will be distributed to each cohort before the program begins.

5.3 Visa procedure

All non-U.S. citizens are responsible for contacting **in time** the German Embassy or Consulate to determine the entry and visa requirements. **Please apply as early as possible for your visa, as the procedure usually takes a long time.**

For up-to-date information, please visit our website.

6. Overview of seminars

EU institutions and multilevel policy-making

Instructor: Professor Schomaker

Overview

This seminar is designed as a brief introduction to the political system of the European Union (EU). It focuses on the history and theory of European integration, the main institutions and procedures of the current EU, and the most important challenges it faces in the years to come. Each session starts with an introductory lecture on the crucial topics of the day. Afterwards, students gather in groups to discuss and research key documents, events and problems of European integration. Each session ends with a wrap-up that brings together the students' findings.

Basic Readings

Hix, S. & Hoyland, B. (2011): The Political System of the European Union, 3rd ed, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peterson, J. & Shackleton, M. (eds.) (2006): The Institutions of the European Union, 2nd ed, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, H., Pollack, M. & Young, A. (2010): Policy-Making in the European Union, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zimmermann, H., & Dürr, A. (eds). (2012): Key controversies in European integration, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Course Plan

Session 1 (18 May, 2.00-4.30 pm, HS 6)

Institutional development and theoretical interpretations of the EU integration process

Objectives:	Students will be able to identify the institutional milestones in European integration and to explain the development of the European Union using different theories.
Required reading:	Hix & Hoyland 2011
Recommended:	Rosamond 2000

Group work: Understanding key documents of European integration; guiding questions: what is the respective vision for a United Europe/the EU, what should it be for?

- Winston Churchill Speech in Zurich, 1946 (http://www.cfr.org/europe/churchills-united-states-europe-speech-zurich/p32536)
- Schuman Declaration 1950 (https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en)
- Luxembourg Compromise 1966 (http://www.internationaldemocracywatch.org/attachments/297_Luxembourg%20Compromise.pdf)
- Thatcher Speech in Bruges 1988 (http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332)
- Merkel Speech in Bruges 2010 (http://www.bruessel.diplo.de/contentblob/2959854/Daten/)

Session 2 (19 May, 10.00-12.30 am, HS 6)

The Main Actors and Their Role in EU Policy-Making

Objectives: Students will be able to describe the role of the European Commission, the Council of Ministers, the European Council and the European Parliament in EU policy-making.

Required reading: McCormick 2014 (Chapter 4), European Commission 2012

Recommended: Peterson 2006 (Commission); Hayes-Renshaw 2006 (Council of Ministers); Carammia, Princen & Timmermans 2016 (European Council); Shackleton 2006 (European Parliament)

Group work: Getting to know the EU institutions; guiding questions: how are they appointed/elected, what is their purpose?

- Fact Sheet: The European Commission: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.8.pdf
- Fact Sheet: The Council of the European Union: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.7.pdf
- Fact Sheet: The European Council: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.6.pdf
- Fact Sheet: The European Parliament – Powers: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.2.pdf
- Fact Sheet: The European Parliament – Organisation and Operation: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.3.3.pdf

Session 3 (19 May, 6.00-8.00 pm, HS 6)

The Main Decision-making Procedures

Objectives: Students will be able to understand the EU legislative procedures from the proposal to the adoption and implementation of legislation (legislative decision-making as well as executive law-making).

Required reading: Craig 2010, Chapter 2

Recommended: Pollak & Slominski 2004 (Treaty Revision); Costello & Thomson 2013 (Codecision procedure); Christiansen & Dobbels 2013 (Delegated law-making after Lisbon); Borrás & Jacobssen 2004 (Open Method of Coordination)

Group work: Understanding how decisions are made; guiding questions: which issues/policies are decided by supranational/intergovernmental procedures, what sets them apart?

- Supranational decision-making procedure http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.4.1.pdf
- Intergovernmental decision-making procedures http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.4.2.pdf
- Budget procedure http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_1.4.3.pdf

Session 4 (20 May, 10.00 am -12.30 pm, HS 6)

The Future of the EU – Crises and Challenges

Objectives: Students are aware of current developments and future challenges for the EU, especially regarding Eurosceptic movements, the process and implications of the Brexit as well as a common migration and asylum policy.

Required reading: European Commission 2015

Recommended: Falkner 2016 (EU's problem-solving capacities in times of crisis); Webber 2014 (Likelihood of EU disintegration)

Group work: Envisioning scenarios of future (dis)integration; guiding questions: what are likely trajectories of the EU, what will it look like in 2030, what are potential solutions for the refugee crisis, and the BREXIT?

- Gabriel-Macron: Europe cannot wait any longer, 2015 (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/03/europe-france-germany-eu-eurozone-future-integrate)
- Paul Morillas: The EU should abandon 'ever closer union' in favour of 'flexible differentiation' after Brexit, 2016 (http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2017/01/13/flexible-differentiation-after-brexit/)

Session 5 (20 May, 12.45-15.15 pm, HS 6)

Wrap up

Objectives: n.n.

Required reading: n.n.

Recommended: n.n.

Group work: n.n.

Bibliography

Borrás, S., & Jacobsson, K. (2004) The open method of co-ordination and new governance patterns in the EU. In Journal of European Public Policy. 11(2), pp. 185–208.
Carammia, M., Princen, S., & Timmermans, A. (2016). From Summitry to EU Government: An Agenda Formation Perspective on the European Council. In Journal of Common Market Studies 2016, pp. 1-17.
Christiansen, T., & Dobbels, M. (2013). Non-Legislative Rule Making after the Lisbon Treaty: Implementing the New System of Comitology and Delegated Acts. In European Law Journal, 19 (1), pp. 42–56.
Costello, R., & Thomson, R. (2013). The Distribution of Power among EU Institutions: Who Wins under Codecision and Why? In Journal of European Public Policy, 20 (7), pp. 1025-1039.
Craig, P. (2010). The Lisbon Treaty, Law, Politics and Treaty Reform. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
European Commission (2015). The EU explained: Ten priorities for Europe. Luxembourg.
European Commission (2012). The EU explained: How the European Union works. Luxembourg.
Falkner, G. (2016) The EU's current crisis and its policy effects: research design and comparative findings. In Journal of European Integration, 38(3), pp.219-235.
Gillingham, J. (2016) The end of the European dream. In: Zimmermann, H., & Dür, A. (Eds.): Key Controversies in European Integration. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 19-31.
Hayes-Renshaw, F. (2006). The Council of Ministers. In Peterson, J., & Shackleton, M. (eds.), The Institutions of the European Union, 2nd ed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 60-80.
Hix, S., & Hoyland, B. (2011). Chapter 1: Explaining the EU Political System. In Ibid, The Political System of the European Union, 3rd ed, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-19.
McCormick, J. (2014). Understanding the European Union. A Concise Introduction. 6th edition. London/New York: Palgrave.
Peterson, J. (2006). The College of Commissioners. In Peterson, J., & Shackleton, M. (eds.), The Institutions of the European Union, 2nd ed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 71-94.
Pollak, J., & Slominski, P. (2004) The Representative Quality of EU Treaty Reform: A Comparison between the IGC and the Convention. In Journal of European Integration, 26(3), pp. 201-226.
Rosamond, B. (2000). Chapter 5: Theorizing the New Europe. In Ibid, Theories of European Integration. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 89-128.
Shackleton, M. (2006): The European Parliament. In Peterson, J., & Shackleton, M. (eds.), The Institutions of the European Union, 2nd ed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 104-124.
Webber, D. (2014). How likely is it that the European Union will disintegrate? A critical analysis of competing theoretical perspectives.

A comparative perspective on public administration in the EU, Germany, and the US

Instructors: Professors Bauer, Resh and Duncan

Overview

The purpose of the seminar is to compare EU, German and US approaches to common problems of public administration, to present key characteristics of these administrative systems, and to hereby offer a better understanding of one's own system. After a discussion in session 1 of basic theoretical concepts underlying public administration in Europe and the US, there will be seven sessions focusing on administrative approaches in the following problem areas:

- Origins and phases of theorizing about public administration
- Parliaments and bureaucracy
- Case Study: The Internal Revenue Service
- Political approaches to public personnel administration
- The structure and accountability of regulatory agencies
- Administrative reforms
- Politics of budgeting in US, EU and Germany
- Politicized bureaucracy

Each session comprises two topics – we use letters for the sessions, and numbers for the topics for the ease of orientation! Each session thus contains two general introductions to the respective topics by the professors that are followed by the students' presentations of 15-20 min and discussion time of 20 min after each student presentation. The case study on the Internal Revenue Service is an exception.

Topics

Session A (19 May, 3.00 pm-5.30 pm, HS 6):

Origins and phases of theorizing about public administration

Objectives: Origins of public administration as a discipline: Are Weber's bureaucratic model and Wilson's distinction between politics and administration still relevant today? Weber's focus on legal rationality and Wilson's emphasis on administrative efficiency are generally considered to be starting points of legalistic and managerial approaches to public administration. Students will be able to describe the historical context and purposes of the two concepts and discuss their relevance for modern public administration.

1. Characteristics, purpose and today's relevance of Wilson's distinction between politics and administration

Required reading: Wilson 1887

Recommended reading: Kaufman 1956; Raadschelders 2000; Stillman 1999a, 1999b; Lynn 2001; Rosenbloom 2008

2. Characteristics, purpose and today's relevance of Weber's bureaucratic model

   Required reading: Fry & Raadschelders 2008, pp. 19-54

   Recommended reading: Sager & Rosser 2009; Weber 1978, vol. 1, chapter III ii (pp. 217-226), vol. 2, chapter XI (pp. 956-1005); Seibel 2010

Session B (25 May, 10.00 am-12.30 pm, HS 6):

Parliaments and (their) bureaucracies

Objectives: Parliaments are supposed to control the executive, i.e., the government and the administration. But how are they able to do this? What is their relationship to the administration? Moreover, what is the role of the Parliaments' own bureaucracies? Students will be able to identify the control mechanisms of parliaments in presidential and parliamentary systems and to understand the differences between bureaucrats in legislative and executive branches.

3. Legislative Oversight and Administrative Influence in the US

   Required reading: West 1995 (Ch. 6-7)

   Recommended reading: Arnold 1980; McCubbins & Schwartz 1984; Rosenbloom 2010

4. Bureaucrats in the European Parliament

   Required reading: Winzen 2011
   Recommended reading: Egeberg et al. 2012; Dobbels & Neuhold 2013; Pegan 2011

Session C (1 June, 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6 – Prof. Dr. Denvil Duncan)

Case Study: The Internal Revenue Service

Objectives: The section will look at the public administration challenges facing the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). We begin with a discussion of the IRS scandal and the resulting efforts to defund the IRS. This is followed by an overview of the impacts of the defunding effort on IRS operations. We contrast tax administration in the US (including the fate of the IRS) to tax administration in Germany. This includes a discussion of the interaction between the states and the federal governments in both countries. We also explore cultural differences that influence tax administration and tax compliance.

Readings: Martinez-Vazquez & Timofeev 2010

Duncan & McLure 1997

IRS 2011 – The tax gap map

The Tax Gap Project Group 2016 – About the concept of tax gaps

Reading on the IRS scandal:

The scandal: http://www.cnn.com/2014/07/18/politics/irs-scandal-fast-facts/

The defunding: http://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-tax/irs-funding-cuts-compromise-taxpayer-service-and-weaken-enforcement

Potential Impact on compliance: https://www.irs.gov/uac/irs-releases-new-tax-gap-estimates-compliance-rates-remain-statistically-unchanged-from-previous-study

Organizational Chart: https://www.irs.gov/PUP/newsroom/irs_organization_chart_october_2016.pdf

Other useful information on current changes and proposals: https://www.irs.gov/uac/strategic-plan-and-other-references

Fun video (may contain modestly offensive language): http://time.com/money/3819382/john-oliver-and-irs-tax-gap/

Session D (3 June, 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6)

Political approaches to public personnel administration

Objectives: Students will be able to describe, compare and evaluate how conflicts between professional integrity and political loyalty are resolved in the German and US governments.

5. Tensions between political appointees and careerists in the US federal government

   Required reading: Kettl & Fesler 2009b

   Recommended reading: Kettl & Fesler, 2009a; Heclo 1977; Peters 2004; Durant 1995; Cohen 1998; Resh 2015

6. The "political civil servant" in Germany – a contradiction in itself?

   Required reading: Veit & Scholz 2016

   Recommended reading: Derlien 2003; Jann & Veit 2010; Goetz 1999

Session E (8 June, 10.00 am -12.30 pm, HS 6):

The structure and accountability of regulatory agencies

Objectives: Students will be able to evaluate the conditions under which regulatory agencies can be effectively structured in the separation-of-powers systems of the United States and European Union. How do varying institutional and ideological perspectives conflict? How is this conflict manifest in administrative structure? To whom are these agencies accountable?

7. The structure and accountability of regulatory agencies in the US

   Required reading: Moe 1989

   Recommended reading: Wood & Bohte 2004; Balla & Wright 2001; Furlong & Kerwin 2005; Milakovich & Gordon 2009, pp. 530-535

8. The structure and accountability of regulatory agencies in the European Union

   Required reading: Gilardi 2008, pp. 55-72

   Recommended reading: Thatcher 2011; Döhler 2002; Thatcher 2007

Session F (10 June, 10.00 am-12.30 pm, HS 6):

Administrative reforms

Objectives: In the US, New Public Management (NPM) has been the prevailing administrative reform movement for the last two decades. In the EU, enlargement has triggered a debate on the reform of EU institutions, and led to the Lisbon Treaty. Students will be able to describe, compare and evaluate administrative reform concepts and measures.

9. New public management in Germany – an appraisal

   Required reading: Kuhlmann, Bogumil & Grohs 2008

   Recommended reading: Kuhlmann 2010; Pollitt & Bouckaert 2003; König 2001

10. New public management in the US – an appraisal

    Required reading: Breul & Kamensky 2008

    Recommended reading: Moynihan 2006; Thompson 2000; Thompson 2002; Kickert 1997; Spicer 2007; Gregory 2007; Eickenberry & Pautz 2008; Lynn 2008

Session G (11 June, 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6 – Prof. Dr. Denvil Duncan)

Politics of budgeting in US, EU and Germany

Objectives: The budget is an important policy document. It reflects the government's opinion about the current and future state of the world, and the policies the government hopes to implement in the coming year(s). Deciding how to divide scarce revenues among often competing departments in an effort to achieve multiple objectives requires a well-functioning political administration process. Students will be able to describe and compare the budgeting process in the US, EU and Germany and to identify some of the key challenges these governments face in developing and implementing their respective budgets.

11. US Public Budgeting: Laws, committees and budgetary agencies; process and timeline; effectiveness of budgetary rules and processes.

    Required reading: Mikesell 2011

    Recommended reading: Office of Management and Budget 2005

12. German Federal Budgeting and the EU: Laws, committees and budgetary agencies; process and timeline; effectiveness of budgetary rules and processes, and role of the EU.

    Required reading: Lübke 2006

    Recommended reading: Posen 2005; OECD 2014

Additional: Instruction for logroll simulation.

Session H (17 June, 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6):

Politicized Bureaucracy?

Objectives: The relationship between bureaucrats and politicians lies at the centre of this seminar. We started with analysing Weber and Wilson's concerns. In the final session we want to look at current state of affairs (and how students of public administration think about it) in the USA and in Europe. We will see that "politicization" is less a "status" but rather a relationship that is first, specific to the institutional configuration the administration is part of, never stops changing and that probably needs to be re-considered continuously.

13. US: The politicized bureaucracy in a separation of powers system

    Required reading: Miller & Whitford, 2016 (Chs. 1-2)

    Recommended reading: Lewis 2012; Furlong 1998; Moynihan & Roberts 2010; Gordon 2011; Lewis 2008; Resh 2014

14. EU: Multilevel Governance: Executive Dynamics and Politicization

Required reading: Hooghe & Marks 2008

Recommended reading: Hooghe & Marks 2001 (Chapter 1)

Bibliography

Arnold, R. D. 1978. Congress and the Bureaucracy: A Theory of Influence. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Balla, S. J. & Wright, J. R. 2001. Interest groups, advisory committees, and congressional control of the bureaucracy. American Journal of Political Science 45 (4), pp. 799-812.

Breul, J. D. & Kamensky, J. M. 2008. Federal Government Reform: Lessons from Clinton's 'Reinventing Government' and Bush's 'Management Agenda' Initiatives. Public Administration Review, 68 (6), pp. 1009-1026.

Cohen, D. M. 1998. Amateur Government. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 8 (4), pp. 450-497.

Corbett, R., Jacobs, F. & Shackleton, M. 2011. The European Parliament. 8th ed. London: John Harper.

Derlien, H.-U. 2003. Mandarins or managers? The bureaucratic elite in Bonn, 1970 to 1987 and beyond. Governance 16(3), pp. 401-428.

Dobbels, M. & Neuhold, C. 2013. 'The Roles Bureaucrats Play': The Input of European Parliament (EP) Administrators into the Ordinary Legislative Procedure: A Case Study Approach. Journal of European Integration 35 (4), pp. 375-390.

Döhler, M. 2002. Institutional Choice and Bureaucratic Autonomy in Germany. West European Politics, 25 (1), pp. 101-124.

Duncan, H.T. & McLure, C.E. 1997. Tax Administration in the United States of America: A Decentralized System. Bulletin for International Fiscal Documentation 51, pp. 74–85.

Durant, R.F. 1995. Public Policy, Overhead Democracy, and the Professional State Revisited. Administration and Society, 27 (2), pp. 165-202.

Eickenberry, A. M. & Pautz, M. C. 2008. Administrative Reform in the United States: Toward Government – Nonprofit Partnerships in Governance, in: Killian, Jerri and Eklund, Niklas (eds.), Handbook of Administrative Reform. An International Perspective, Boca Raton, FL.: CRC Press, pp. 197-213.

Egeberg, M., Gornitzka, Å., Trondal, J. & Johannessen, M. 2012. Parliament staff: unpacking the behaviour of officials in the European Parliament. Journal of European Public Policy 20 (4), pp. 495-514.

European Commission. 2002. A Project for the European Union. Communication of 22 May 2002, COM (2002) 247 final.

European Ombudsman. 2014. The European Ombudsman – Annual Report 2013. http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/en/activities/annualreports.faces.

Feinberg, L. E. 1986. Managing the Freedom of Information Act and Federal Information Policy. Public Administration Review, 46 (6), pp. 615-621.

Fry, B. R. & Radschelders, J. C. N. 2008. Max Weber: The Process of Rationalization, in: Mastering Public Administration. 2nd ed. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House, pp. 19-54.

Furlong, S. R. 1998. Political Influence on the Bureaucracy: The Bureaucracy Speaks. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 8(1), pp. 39-65.

Furlong, S. R. & Kerwin, C. M. 2005. Interest Group Participation in Rule Making: A Decade of Change. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 15 (3), pp. 353-370.

Gilardi, F. 2008. Delegation in the regulatory state. Independent regulatory agencies in Western Europe. Cheltenham, UK: Elgar.

Goetz, K. H. 1999. Senior Officials in the German Federal Administration: Institutional Change and Positional Differentiation, in: Page, E. C. and Wright, V. (eds.), Bureaucratic Elites in Western European States, Oxford University Press, pp. 147-177.

Gordon, S. C. 2011. Politicizing Agency Spending Authority: Lessons from a Bush-era Scandal. American Political Science Review, 105 (4), pp. 717-734.

Grande, E. & McCowan, M. 2014. The two logics of multilevel administration in the EU, in: Bauer, M. W. and Trondal, J. (eds.), The Palgrave Handbook of the European Administrative System. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gregory, R. 2007. New Public Management and the Ghost of Max Weber: Exorcized or Still Haunting?, in: Christensen, T. and Laegreid, P. (eds.), Transcending New Public Management. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 221-243.

Gregory, R. and Giddings, P. 2001. Citizenship, Rights and the EU Ombudsman, in: Bellamy, R. and Warleigh, A. (eds), Citizenship and Governance in the European Union. London/New York: Continuum, pp. 73-92.

Heclo, H. 1977. Political Executives and the Washington Bureaucracy. Political Science Quarterly, 92 (3), pp. 395-424.

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. W. 2001. Multi-level governance and European integration. Rowman & Littlefield.

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. 2008. A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus. British Journal of Political Science, 39(1), pp. 1–23.

Howlett, M. 2003. Administrative styles and the limits of administrative reform: A neo-institutional analysis of administrative culture. Canadian Public Administration 46 (4), pp. 471-494.

Jann, W., & Veit, S. 2010. Politicisation of Administration or Bureaucratisation of Politics? The case of Germany. Potsdamer Diskussionspapiere zur Verwaltungswissenschaft, Nr. 6.

Kaufman, H. 1956. Emerging Conflicts in the Doctrines of Public Administration. The American Political Science Review, 50, pp. 1057-1073.

Kettl, D. F., & Fesler, J. W. 2009a. The Civil Service, in: The Politics of the Administrative Process. 4th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press, pp. 207-241.

Kettl, D. F., & Fesler, J. W. 2009b. Managing Human Capital, The Politics of the Administrative Process. 4th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press, pp. 243-279.

Kickert, W. 1997. Public Management in the United States and Europe, in: Kickert, W. J.M. (ed.), Public Management and Administrative Reform in Western Europe, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 15-39.

König, K. 2001. Reinventing Government: The German Case, in: Greß, F.and Janes, J. (eds.) Reforming Governance. Lessons from the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, Frankfurt/New York: Campus/New York: Palgrave, pp. 33-54.

Kuhlmann, S. 2010. New Public Management for the "Classical continental European administration": Modernization at the local level in Germany, France and Italy. Public Administration 88 (4), pp. 1116-1130.

Kuhlmann, S., Bogumil, J., & Grohs, S. 2008. Evaluating administrative modernization in German local governments: success or failure of the "New Steering Model"? Public Administration Review 68 (5), pp. 851-863.

Lewis, D. E. 2008. The Politics of Presidential Appointments: Political Control and Bureaucratic Performance. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lewis, D. E. 2012. Presidential politicization of the Executive Branch in the United States, in: Lodge, M. and Wegrich, K. (eds), Executive Politics in Times of Crisis. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 41-62.

Lübke, A. 2006. Fiscal Dicipline between Level of Government in Germany. OECD Journal on Budgeting 5(2).

Lynn, L. E. 2001. The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For, Public Administration Review 61 (2), pp. 144-160.

Lynn, L. E. 2008. The Study of Public Management in the United States. Management in the New World and a Reflection on Europe, in: Kickert, W. (ed.), The Study of Public Management in Europe and the US. London: Routledge, pp. 233-262.

Magnette, P. 2003. Between parliamentary control and the rule of law: the political role of the Ombudsman in the European Union. Journal of European Public Policy 10 (5), pp. 677-694.

Martinez-Vazquez, J., & Timofeev, A. 2010. Choosing between Centralized and Decentralized Models of Tax Administration. International Journal of Public Administration, 33(12-13), pp. 601-619.

McCubbins, M. D., & Schwartz, T. 1984. Congressional oversight overlooked: Police patrols versus fire alarms. American Journal of Political Science, 28 (1), pp. 165-179.

Meier, K. J., & Bohte, J. 2007. Bureaucracy and the Public's Expectations, in: Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policymaking in the Fourth Branch of Government. 5th ed. Belmont, California: Thomson Wadsworth, pp. 135-178.

Mikesell, John L. 2011. Fiscal Administration: Analysis and Applications for the Public Sector, 9th ed., Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Milakovich, M. E. & Gordon, G. J. 2009. Public Administration in America.10th ed. Boston: Wadsworth.

Miller, Gary J., & Whitford, A. B. . *Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Moe, T. 1989. The Politics of Bureaucratic Structure, in: Chubb, J. E. and Peterson, P. E. (eds), Can the Government Govern?, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, pp. 267-329.

Moynihan, D. P. 2006. Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. Public Administration Review, 66 (1), pp. 77-89.

Moynihan, D. P., & Roberts, A. S. 2010. The Triumph of Loyalty Over Competence: The Bush Administration and the Exhaustion of the Politicized Presidency. Public Administration Review, 70(4), pp. 572-581.

Nassis, C. 2009. Good administration in the European Union: The role of the European Ombudsman and the European Network of Ombudsmen. London: Esperia Publ.

OECD. 2014. Budget Review: Germany. OECD Journal on Budgeting (2014)2.

Pegan, A. 2011. European Parliament and its Administration: What do we know and where do we go next? University of Luxembourg: Unpublished manuscript.

Peters, B. G. 2004. Politicization in the United States, in: Peters, B. G. and Pierre, J. (eds.), Politicization of the Civil Service in Comparative Perspective. London: Routledge, pp. 125-138.

Piotrowski, S. J., & Rosenbloom, D. H. 2002. Nonmission-Based Values in Results-Oriented Public Management: The Case of Freedom of Information. Public Administration Review, 62 (6), pp. 643-657.

Pollitt, G., & Bouckaert, G. 2003. Evaluating public management reforms: An international perspective, in: Wollmann, H (ed), Evaluation in public-sector reform: concepts and practice in international perspective. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 12-35.

Posen, A. 2005. German Experience with Fiscal Rules: Lessons for the US Budget Process Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process Committee on Rules, July 27, 2005.

Raadschelders, J. C.N. 2000. Administrative History of the United States: Development and State of the Art. Administration and Society 32 (5), pp. 499-528.

Resh, W. G. 2014. Appointee–Careerist Relations in the Presidential Transition of 2008-2009. Presidential Studies Quarterly 44 (4), pp. 697-723.

Resh, W. G. 2015. Rethinking the Administrative Presidency. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rosenbloom, D. H. 2008. The Politics-Administration Dichotomy in U.S. Historical Context. Public Administration Review 68 (1), pp. 57-60.

Rosenbloom, D. H. 2010. Reevaluating executive-centered public administrative Theory, in: Durant, R.F. (ed), The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 101-127.

Sager, F., & Rosser, C. 2009. Weber, Wilson, and Hegel: Theories of Modern Bureaucracy. Public Administration Review 69 (6), pp. 1136-1147.

Seibel, W. 2010. Beyond Bureaucracy – Public Administration as Political Integrator and Non-Weberian Thought in Germany. Public Administration Review 70 (5), pp. 719-730.

Spicer, M. 2007. Public Administration. The History of Ideas, and the Reinventing Government Movement, Public Administration Review, 64 (3), pp. 353-362.

Stillman, R. J. 1999a. Public Administration in the United States. In: Kickert, W. J. M. and Stillman, R. J. (eds.), The Modern State and its Study. New Administrative Sciences in a Changing Europe and United States. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 39-79.

Stillman, R J. 1999b. Modern Public Administration Theory as a Great State Debate: No State? Bold State? Pre-State? Pro-State?, in: Preface to Public Administration: A Search for Themes and Direction, 2nd ed., Burke, Virginia: Chatelaine Press.

Thatcher, M. 2011. The creation of European regulatory agencies and its limits: a comparative analysis of European delegation. Journal of European Public Policy 18 (6), pp. 790-809.

Thatcher, M. 2007. Regulatory agencies, the state and markets: a Franco-British comparison. Journal of European Public Policy 14 (7), pp. 1028-1047.

Thompson, F. J. 2002. Reinvention in the States: Ripple or Tide? Public Administration Review 62 (3), pp. 362-367.

Thompson, J. R. 2000. Reinventing as Reform: Assessing the National Performance Review, Public Administration Review 60 (6), pp. 508-521.

Veit, S., & Scholz, S., 2016. Linking administrative career patterns and politicisation: Signalling effects in the careers of top civil servants in Germany. In: International Review of Administrative Sciences, 82 (3), 516-535.

Weber, M. 1978 [1922]. Economy and Society, edited by Roth, G. and Wittich, C. 2 volumes. Berkeley: University of California Press.

West, W. F. 1995. Controlling the Bureaucracy: Institutional Constraints in Theory and Practice. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Wilson, W. 1887. The Study of Administration, reprinted in Political Science Quarterly, 2 (2), pp. 197-222.

Winzen, T. 2011. Technical or Political? An Exploration of the Work of Officials in the Committees of the European Parliament. The Journal of Legislative Studies 17 (1), pp. 27-44.

Wood, B. D., & Bohte, J. 2004. Political Transaction Costs and the Politics of Administrative Design. Journal of Politics 66 (1), pp. 176-202.

German federalism in the EU

Instructor: Professor Bauer

Course Plan

Session 1 (Mon, 25 May; 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6)

Introduction to the political system of the Federal Republic of Germany

Objectives:	Students will be able to understand the historical background and identify the major institutions of German federalism.
Readings:	Kramer 2005; Conradt & Langenbacher 2013
In-class material:	Excerpt (Schmidt 2016) on policy diversity in German federalism

Session 2 (Thu, 28 May 2019; 5.00-7.30 pm, Landesvertretung RLP, Brussels)

The German Länder in the EU Multilevel System – The Case of the Länder Representations in Brussels

External speakers:	Tanita Stamm, Landesvertretung Rheinland-Pfalz and Robert Möhrle
Objectives:	The students will learn about the horizontal cooperation among German states and their "competition" with respect to influencing EU affairs. The German federal system cannot be understood without analyzing the impact of the European integration process.
Readings:	Moore, Carolyn 2006; Marks, Haesly et al 2002

Session 3 (Mon, 8 June; 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6)

Party System and Party Politics (Special emphasis: Federal elections 2017)

Objectives:	Students will be familiar with the most prominent German parties and the processes of government formation following a general election.
Readings:	Lochocki 2016; Poguntke 2014
In-class-material:	Federal election 2017 results

- Government formation – Coalition governments from 1949-2017

Session 4 (Wed, 10 June; 3.00-5.30 pm)

Populism as a Challenge for the German Parliaments

Guest speaker: Dr. Christian Stecker, University of Mannheim

Objectives: Objectives: Students will be familiar with the recent populist rise of the right-wing alternative for Germany Party – and the impact of this party's success in German Parliaments will be analyzed.

Readings: n.n.

Session 5 (Tue, 16 June; 3.00-5.30 pm, HS 6)

German Federalism under Stress: Territorial Reform and the Alternative for Germany

Guest speaker: Dr. Steffen Zabler, German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer

Objectives: Students will understand the factors of social-economic and political pressure that coin current reform discussions regarding the German federal system. A case study of the failed territorial reforms out of fear of right-wing populists highlights the political dimension of any attempt to change the current German federal system.

2nd half of Session 5: **Wrap up Germany and the US in the Age of Trump**

Objectives: Students will analyze how the US sees Germany and how Germany sees the US in relevant policy areas under the Trump Administration – and what implication newest developments have for the German Federal System

Readings: Brugger 2019; Langenbacher & Wittlinger 2018

Readings: Scheller 2018; Stecker 2016; Kropp, Behnke 2016; Scharpf 2005

Session 6 (Wed, 17 June; 10.00 am -12.30 pm, HS 6)

Extra session: Summing up and evaluation of the seminar

Bibliography

Auel, K., & Neuhold, Ch. 2017. "Multi-arena players in the making? Conceptualizing the role of national parliaments since the Lisbon Treaty." Journal of European Public Policy 24(10): 1547-1561.

Brugger, Ph. 2019. "The Erosion of German Elite Trust in the United States of America". German Politics, DOI: 10.1080/09644008.2019.1594785.

Conradt, David P., & Langenbacher, E. 2013. "Policy-Making Institutions I." In The German Polity, edited by David P. Conradt and Eric Langenbacher, Tenth edition, 217–63. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Jäckle, S., & König, P. D. 2017. “The dark side of the German ‘welcome culture’: investigating the causes behind attacks on refugees in 2015.” West European Politics, 40 (2): 223-251.

Kramer, J. 2005. “Federal Republic of Germany.” In Constitutional Origins, Structure, and Change in Federal Countries, edited by John Kincaid, 144–78. A Global Dialogue on Federalism 1. Montréal: McGill-Queen’s Univ. Press.

Kropp, S. & Behnke, N. 2016. "Marble cake dreaming of layer cake: the merits and pitfalls of disentanglement in German federalism reform." Regional & Federal Studies 26 (5): 667-686.

Langenbacher, E., & Wittlinger, R. 2018. "The End of Memory? German-American Relations under Donald Trump." German Politics: 1-19.

Lehne, St., & Grabbe, H. 2018. “2019 European Parliament elections will change the EU’s political dynamics.” Carnegie Europe: 1-5.

Lochocki, T. 2016. “Will the German Center Hold?” Journal of Democracy 27 (4): 37-46.

Ondarza, Nicolai von, & Schnenuit, F. 2018. “Shadows over the European Elections” SWP Comment 50: 1-8 23

Marks, G., Haesly, R. & Mbaye, Heather AD. 2002. "What do subnational offices think they are doing in Brussels?." Regional & Federal Studies 12 (3): 1-23.

Moore, C. 2006. "‘Schloss Neuwahnstein’? Why the Länder continue to strengthen their representations in Brussels." German Politics 15 (2): 192-205.

Poguntke, Th. 2014. “Towards a new party system: The vanishing hold of the catch-all parties in Germany.” Party Politics 20 (6) 950 – 963.

Roberts, G. K. 2009. “Germany and Europe.” In German Politics Today: Second Edition, 183–97. Politics Today MUP. Manchester University Press.

Scharpf, F. W. 2005. "No exit from the joint decision trap? Can German federalism reform itself?."

Scheller, H. 2018. "Ten Years of Federalism Reform in Germany. Dynamics and Effects of Institutional Development." German Politics 27 (2): 293-294.

Schmidt, S. K. 2013. “A Sense of Déjà Vu? The FCC’s Preliminary European Stability Mechanism Verdict.” German Law Journal 14 (1): 1-20.

Schmidt, M. G. 2016. “Conclusion: Policy Diversity in Germany's Federalism.” German Politics 25 (2): 301-314.

Stecker, C. 2016. "The effects of federalism reform on the legislative process in Germany." Regional & Federal Studies 26 (5): 603-624.

Sturm, R. 2018. “Unitary Federalism – Germany ignores the original spirit of her Constitution”,

READ-JSG 28: 17-46

European economic integration

Instructor: Professor Knorr

Overview

The course of study is designed to familiarize students with the key theoretical and political concepts of European economic integration, its successes and its failures. In order to achieve its objectives, the course is divided into two main parts. Session 1, conceived as a brief introduction to the field, kicks off with a short history of the European economic integration process and an overview of the structural elements of alternative forms of regional economic integration. It concludes with a synopsis of the economic theory of regional economic integration. The focus of sessions 2-5 will be on selected areas of the European economic integration as it has evolved in practice: the EU's tax harmonization efforts and the supranational competition policy, the Common Agricultural Policy, the European Monetary Union (EMU), Euro crisis, immigration crisis and the likely economic implications of the proposed post-Brexit era.

The seminar will be taught by Professor Knorr. The first session is a lecture that introduces the overall topic. The following sessions are composed of students' presentations (of term papers and/or reading assignments) of around 20 min., followed by a plenary discussion of some 40 min. per topic.

Topics

Session 1: (Tue, June 2; 3.00 -5.30 pm, HS 6)

Introduction to European economic integration (Prof. Knorr)

Objectives: Students will be able to understand the historical background of European economic integration and its main challenges from the Treaty of Paris to the ongoing "EURO crisis", as well as the diversity of institutional designs of regional economic blocs. Moreover, students will be able to identify and to understand the causes and consequences of the - positive as well as negative - economic effects of regional economic integration on members and non-members.

1. A short history of European economic integration (Prof. Knorr)

Required reading: El-Agraa, A. 2011a

Recommended reading: Bulmer, S. 2007; Baldwin, R., & Wyplosz, C. 2012

http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm

http://europa.eu/pol/index_en.htm

https://agenda.weforum.org/2015/04/a-history-of-europes-economic-integration/

2. The economics of regional economic integration: free trade (basic freedoms), trade creation and trade diversion effects (Prof. Knorr)

Required reading: Pelkmans, J. 2006, pp. 2-17; Ardy, B., & El-Agraa, A. 2011a; El-Agraa, A. 2011b

Recommended reading: Haenggi, H. 2006; Baldwin, R., & Wyplosz, C. 2012; Hitiris, T. 2003; Venables, A.J. 2007; McDonald, F. 2005; Young, A.R. 2010; Ziltener, P. 2004
http://www.cfr.org/world/european-union-model-regional-integration/p22935

Session 2: (Thu, June 4; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, HS 6)

Selected EU policies I: competition policy and state aid control

Objectives: Students will be able to understand the main economic principles of competition policy and state aid control as well as their crucial role for the proper functioning of the Single Market.

3. The EU's supranational competition policy: objective, instruments, effectiveness
4. The EU's supranational control of state aids: objective, instruments, effectiveness

Required reading: Sauter, W. 2011

Recommended reading: Baldwin, R., & Wyployz, C. 2012; Blauberger, M. 2008; Martin, S. 2007
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/index_en.html
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/overview/index_en.html
http://europa.eu/pol/pdf/flipbook/en/competition_en.pdf

Session 3: (Thu, June 4; 3.00-5.30 pm, VS)

Selected EU policies II: the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the EU's tax harmonization approach

Objectives: Students will be able to evaluate the objectives and instruments of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), its basic principles and its economic impact within the EU and on third countries as well as the need for fundamental reform. Moreover, students will become familiar with the pros and cons of tax harmonization in the Single Market.

5. Agricultural policy and agricultural protectionism in the EU and USA: objectives, policy instruments, economic costs and benefits

Required reading: Koester, U., & El-Agraa, A. 2011

Recommended reading: Blandford, D., Josling, T., & Bureau, J.-C. 2011; Colman, D. 2007; Neal, L. 2007

https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy_en

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/policy-briefs/05_en.pdf

6. Tax harmonization in the Single Market?

Required reading: Ardy, B., & El-Agraa, A. 2011b

Recommended reading: Fourçans, A., & Warin, T. 2001; Hitiris, T. 2003; McCarthy, K. J., Van Doorn, F., & Unger, B. 2008

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/gen_info/tax_policy/index_en.htm

http://www.ifs.org.uk/comms/r63.pdf

https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/40350/1/MPRA_paper_40350.pdf

http://bruegel.org/2014/07/tax-harmonization-in-europe-moving-forward/

http://wcfia.harvard.edu/files/wcfia/files/fwasserfallen_political_and_economic_integration.pdf

Session 4: (Thu, June 4; 6.30-9.00 pm, VS)

European Economic Disintegration I: the "Euro crisis"

Objectives: Students will be able to understand the economics of and the key steps towards monetary integration in the EU as well as the causes of and the potential fallout from the ongoing so-called "EURO crisis".

7. Monetary Integration I – To join or not to join a monetary union? The theory of optimum currency areas versus the convergence criteria of Maastricht Treaty

Required reading: Alessi, C., & McBride, J. 2015; Baldwin, R., & Giavazzi, F. 2015

Recommended readings: Wyplosz, C. 2010

8. The "Euro Crisis", its economic causes and potential solutions: Exits versus deeper integration?

Required reading: Mayes, D., & El-Agraa, A. 2011

Recommended reading: Alesina, A., & Giavazzi, F. 2010; Baldwin, R., & Wyplosz, C. 2012; Wyplosz, C. 2010

http://www.cfr.org/eu/eurozone-crisis/p22055

Session 5: (Tue, June 9; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, HS 6)

European Economic Disintegration II: BREXIT and the EU's immigration crisis

Objectives: Student will learn about the potential short-term to long-term economic effects of BREXIT on Great Britain and the remaining EU-27. Moreover, students will become familiar with the economics of migration in the EU context.

9. The (potential) economic consequences of BREXIT

Required reading: Jackson, J. K., Akhtar, S.I., & Mix, D.E 2016

Recommended reading: OECD 2016; Sampson, T. 2017

10. The EU's ongoing immigration crisis and its impact on the integration process

Required reading: Borjas, G. 2014; Collier, P. 2014

Recommended readings: Frontex (ongoing; https://frontex.europa.eu/)

Bibliography

Alesina, A., & Giavazzi, F. 2010. Europe and the Euro, Chicago. [Speyer Library: B VII c 815].

Alessi, C., & McBride, J. 2015. The Eurozone in Crisis, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/eurozone-crisis , last accessed December 12th 2018.

Ardy, B., & El-Agraa, A. 2011a. The economics of the single market, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 102-113. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

Ardy, B., & El-Agraa, A. 2011b. Tax harmonization, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 229-243. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

Ardy, B., & El-Agraa, A. 2011c. The general budget, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 289-305. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

Artis, M., & Nixson, F. 2007. The Economics of the European Union. Policy and Analysis, 4th edition, Oxford et al. [Speyer Library: B VII c 761(4)].

Baldwin, R., & Wyplosz, C. 2012. The Economics of European Integration, 4th edition, New York. [Speyer Library: B VII c 722(4)].

Baldwin, R., & Giavazzi, F. 2015. The Eurozone Crisis, A Consensus View of the Causes and a Few Possible Solutions, London, CEPR Press. https://voxeu.org/sites/default/files/file/reboot_upload_0.pdf

Blandford, D., Josling, T., & Bureau, J.-C. 2011. Farm Policy in the US and the EU: The Status of Reform and the Choices Ahead, IPC Discussion Paper, Washington, DC.

Blauberger, M. 2008. From Negative to Positive Integration? European State Aid Control Through Soft and Hard Law, MPIfG Discussion Paper 08/4, Cologne.

Bénassy-Quéré, A., Trannoy, A., & Wolff, G.B. 2014. Tax harmonization in Europe: Moving forward, Les notes du conseil d'analyse économique, no 14, French Council of Economic Analysis, http://bruegel.org/2014/07/tax-harmonization-in-europe-moving-forward/, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Bond, S., Chennells, L., Devereux, L.P., Gummie, M., & Troup E. 2000. Corporate Tax Harmonisation in Europe: A Guide to the Debate, The Institute for Fiscal Studies, London, http://www.ifs.org.uk/comms/r63.pdf.

Borjas, G. 2014. Immigration Economics, Harvard University Press.

Bulmer, S. 2007. History and Institutions, in: Artis, M., & Nixson, F. 2007. The Economics of the European Union. Policy and Analysis, 4th edition, Oxford et al., pp. 5-34. [Speyer Library: B VII c 761(4)].

Cameron, F. 2010. The European Union as a Model for Regional Integration, http://www.cfr.org/world/european-union-model-regional-integration/p22935, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Collier, P. 2013. Exodus: Immigration and Multiculturalism in the 21st Century, Great Britain, Allen Lane, Penguin Books

Colman, D. 2007. The Common Agricultural Policy, in: Artis, M., & Nixson 2007, The Economics of the European Union. Policy and Analysis, 4th edition, Oxford et al., pp. 77-104. [Speyer Library: B VII c 761(4)].

Dankó, Z. 2012. Corporate tax harmonization in the European Union, Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA), Paper No. 40350, https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/40350/1/MPRA_paper_40350.pdf.

De Grauwe, P. 2012. Economics of Monetary Union, 9th edition, Oxford. [Speyer Library: B VII c 765(9)].

Dorrucci, E. 2015. The history of Europe´s economic integration, https://agenda.weforum.org/2015/04/a-history-of-europes-economic-integration/ , last accessed December 12th 2018.

El-Agraa, A. 2011a. A history of European integration and the evolution of the EU, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 19-37. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

El-Agraa, A. 2011b. The theory of economic integration, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 83-101. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

El-Agraa, A. 2011c. The theory of monetary integration, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011, The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 147-162. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

European Commission, Agriculture, fisheries and food, https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/agriculture-and-rural-development_en , last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Commission, Overview of CAP Reform 2014 – 2020, in: Agricultural Policy Perspectives Brief, N° 5, Brussels 2013, http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/policy-briefs/05_en.pdf.

European Commission, Budget, http://ec.europa.eu/budget/index_en.cfm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Commission, Competition, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/index_en.html, last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Commission 2014, The EU explained: Competition, Making markets work better, Brussels, https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9f857b2e-e25a-4fc3-9550-81a9de3b0429/language-en , last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Commission, State Aid Control, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/overview/index_en.html, last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Commission, EU Tax Policy Strategy, http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/gen_info/tax_policy/index_en.htm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Parliament News 2013, Reform of the EU's agricultural policy, CAP budget in figures, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=IM-PRESS&reference=20110526FCS20313&language=EN , last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Union, The history of the European Union, http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

European Union, Topics of the European Union, http://europa.eu/pol/index_en.htm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Fourçans, A., & Warin, T. 2001. Tax Harmonization versus Tax Competition in Europe: A Game Theoretical Approach, Montreal, CREFE Working Paper 132, Center for Research on Economic Fluctuations and Employment/ Université du Québec à Montréal.

Jackson, J. K., Akhtar, S.I., & Mix, D.E. 2016. Economic Implications of a United Kingdom Exit from the European Union, https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R44559.pdf

Haenggi, H. 2006. Interregionalism as a multifaceted phenomenon: In search of a typology, in: Hänggi, H., Roloff, R., & Rüland, J. 2006, Interregionalism and International Relations, London, S. 31-62.

Heinemann, F., Mohl, P., & Osterloh, S. 2010. Reforming the EU Budget: Reconciling Needs with Political-Economic Constraints, in: Journal of European Integration, 32, 1, pp. 59-76.

Hitiris, T. 2003. European Union Economics, 5th edition, Harlow et al. [Speyer Library: B VII c 768(5)].

Koester, U. & El-Agraa, A. M. 2011. The Common Agricultural Policy, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011. The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 306-334. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

Martin, S. 2007. Competition Policy, in: Artis, M. & Nixson, F. 2007. The Economics of the European Union. Policy and Analysis, 4th edition, Oxford et al., pp. 105-129. [Speyer Library: B VII c 761(4)].

Mayes, D., & El-Agraa, A. 2011. The development of EU economic and monetary integration, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011. The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 163-181. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

McCarthy, K. J., Van Doorn, F., & Unger, B. 2008. Globalisation, Tax Competition and the Harmonisation of Corporate Tax Rates in Europe: A Case of Killing the Patient to Cure the Disease?, Tjalling C. Koopmans Institute Discussion Paper Series nr: 08-13, Utrecht.

McDonald, F. 2005. Market Integration in the European Union, in: McDonald, F., & Dearden, S. 2005. European Economic Integration, 4th edition, Harlow, London et al., pp. 39-74. [Speyer Library: B VII c 123(4)].

Moghadam, R. 2014. Europe's Road to Integration, in: Finance & Development, March 2014, Vol. 51, No. 1, http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/03/moghadam.htm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Neal, L. 2007. The Economics of Europe and the European Union, Cambridge et al. [Speyer Library: B VII c 753].

OECD 2016. The economic consequences of BREXIT a taxing decision (April 2016), http://www.oecd.org/eco/the-economic-consequences-of-brexit-a-taxing-decision.htm, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Pelkmans, J. 2006. European Integration. Methods and Economic Analysis, 3rd edition, Harlow, Munich et al. [Speyer Library: B VII c 750(3)].

Sauter, W. 2011. Competition policy, in: El-Agraa, A. M. 2011. The European Union. Economics and Policies, Cambridge, pp. 197-213. [Speyer Library: B VII c 766(9)].

Sampson, T. 2017. Brexit: The Economics of International Disintegration, in: Journal of Economic Perspectives, JEP 2017, pp. 163-184

Trueman, C.N. 2015. What are the arguments for and against joining the Euro, The History Learning Site, http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/british-politics/what-are-the-arguments-for-and-against-joining-the-euro, last accessed December 12th 2018.

Venables, A.J. 2007. The Economics of Preferential Trading Areas and Regional Integration, in: Artis, M., & Nixson, F. 2007. The Economics of the European Union. Policy and Analysis, 4th edition, Oxford et al., pp. 55-76. [Speyer Library: B VII c 761(4)].

Wasserfallen, F. 2013. Political and Economic Integration in the EU: The Case of Failed Tax Harmonization, in: Journal of Common Market Studies, JCMS 2013 pp. 1-16, http://wcfia.harvard.edu/files/wcfia/files/fwasserfallen_political_and_economic_integration.pdf.

Wyplosz, C. 2010. The Eurozone in the Current Crisis, Tokyo, ADBI Working Paper 207, Asian Development Bank Institute.

Young, A.R. 2010. The Single Market, in: Wallace, H./Pollack, M.A./Young, A.R. (2010), Policy-Making in the European Union, 6th edition, Oxford, pp. 108-117. [Speyer Library: A IV b 1488(6)].

Ziltener, P. 2004. The Economic Effects of the European Single Market Project: Projections, Simulations – and the Reality, in: Review of International Political Economy, 11, 5, pp. 953-979.

Selected Journals:

- Current Politics and Economics of Europe
- Economic Policy
- European Economic Review
- Journal of Common Market Studies
- Journal of International Economics
- Journal of World Trade
- World Competition
- World Economy

Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice

Instructor: Professor Constanze Janda

Overview

The European Economic Community (EEC) has been founded in the 1950s in order to promote Europe-wide trade and the mobility of capital, goods, services and employees. Whereas the right to mobility has been extended to all EU citizens in 1992, it was not before 2000 that the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union has been proclaimed. The seminar "Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice" aims at analyzing the scope and content of the European Human Rights approach and at reflecting it in the context of migration law, social security law and labor law.

The sessions will cover:

- Introduction to European constitutional law
- The Right to Equality and Non-Discrimination
- The Right to Asylum
- Migration and the Right to Social Security
- The Right of Collective Bargaining and Action

In each session, at least two students will present their insights, followed by a plenary discussion. The focus will be on EU law, however students are invited to enrich their presentations with examples from their respective national law. By doing so, students will be able to identify differences in the legal cultures and traditions of the US as well as the EU and its member states.

Seminar papers

All papers must be submitted **at the latest by July 4.**

Students are invited to choose one of the cases or texts listed below as a starting point for their presentations and seminar papers. Case law annotations will have to explain clearly the facts of the case, the legal questions and the reasoning of the court. The students are expected to reflect on the judgement, e.g. by referring to similar case law or to fundamental legal principles. Migration, social security and labor law often are under vivid political debate. Hence, students are invited to discuss political, social and economic implications of the case and reflect on the arguments that have been put forward in scientific literature. Instead of presenting one specific case, students can also opt for a more general reflection of the basic principles of EU and/or national human rights law.

Session 1: (Tue, June 2; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, S 103)**: Introduction to European constitutional law**

1. Introduction to the seminar by the course Instructor

2. Basic principles and basic freedoms of the TFEU

3. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

Objectives:

Introduction to general principles of European Constitutionalism, the "Four Freedoms" of the European Single Market and the Fundamental Rights and their influence on European and national law. Discussion of different approaches to constitutionalism.

Required reading:

Bogdandy, A. von, Constitutional Principles for Europe, in: Riedel E., & Wolfrum R. (ed.), Recent trends in German and European Constitutional Law, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer, 2006, pp. 1-35.

Douglas-Scott, S., Fundamental Rights and the Union, in: Schütze, R. & Tridimas, T. (ed.), Oxford Principles of European Union Law, Volume II, Oxford 2018.

García, R.A., The General Provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in: European Law Journal 2002, Vol. 8 Issue 4, p. 492-514.

Lenaerts, K. & Gutierrez-Fons, J.A., The European Union: A Constitutional Perspective, in: Schütze, R. & Tridimas, T. (ed.), Oxford Principles of European Union Law, Volume I, Oxford 2018.

Recommended reading:

Brink, M., EU Citizenship and (Fundamental) Rights: Empirical, normative, and conceptual problems, in: European Law Journal 2019, Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 21–36.

Chalmers, D., Davies, G. & Monti, G. (ed.), European Union Law. Text and Materials, 4th Edition, Cambridge 2019.

de Búrca, G., After the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights: The Court of Justice as a Human Rights Adjudicator?, in: Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law 2013, Vol 20, Issue 2, pp. 168–184.

di Federico, G., The EU charter of fundamental rights: from declaration to binding instrument, Berlin and Heidelberg 2011.

Dougan, M., Judicial Review of Member State Action under the General Principles and the Charter: Defining the „Scope of Union Law", in: Common Market Law Review 2015, Vol. 52, Issue 5, pp. 1201-1245.

Grimm, D., The Basic Law at 60 – Identity and Change, in: German Law Journal 2010, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 33-46.

Kochenov, D., The Right to Have What Rights? EU Citizenship in Need of Clarification, in: European Law Journal 2013, Vol. 19, Issue 4, pp. 502-516.

Ludera-Ruszel, A., Free Movement of Workers as an Instrument of Creation of the European Common Market, in: European Integration Studies 2015, Issue 9, pp. 161-169.

Sarmiento, D., Who's Afraid of the Charter? The Court of Justice, National Courts and the New Framework of Fundamental Rights Protection in Europe, in: Common Market Law Review 2013, Vol. 50, Issue 6, pp. 1267-1304.

Session 2: (Wed, June 3; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, S 103): **The Right to Equality and Non-Discrimination**

1. European Perspectives on Anti-Discrimination Law

2. European Case Law on Discrimination

Objectives:

Examination of relevant case law both of the European Court of Human Rights and the European Court of Justice concerning the right to freedom from discrimination and discussion of related national law apporaches.

Required reading:

Council of Europe, European Court of Human Rights & European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (ed.), European Non-Discrimination Law 2018, https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/handbook-european-law-non-discrimination

Recommended reading:

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of July 1, 2014, S.A.S. v. France – Ban on wearing burqa or niqab in public places.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgment of December 5, 2017, Hamidović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina – Expulsion from court room for wearing a skullcap.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of March 18, 2011, Lautsi v. Italy – Classroom Crucifix;

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of January 15, 2013, Eweida and others v. The United Kingdom – Protection against employers prohibiting the wearing of religious symbols.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of April 6, 2017, A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France – Legal requirements for rectification of civil status for transgender persons.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of December 22, 2009, Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina – Prohibition imposed on a Rom and a Jew to run for Presidency and Parliament.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of April 17, 2018, Vera Egenberger vs. Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e. V., C-414/16 - Occupational activities within churches and other organisations the ethos of which is based on religion or belief — Religion or belief constituting a genuine, legitimate and justified occupational requirement, having regard to the organisation's ethos.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of July 10, 2008, Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding vs. Firma Feryn NV, C-54/07 - Discriminatory criteria for selecting staff - Burden of proof - Penalties.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of March 14, 2017, Asma Bougnaoui and Association de défense des droits de l'homme (ADDH) v Micropole SA, C-188/15 — Discrimination based on religion or belief — Genuine and determining occupational requirement — Meaning — Customer's wish not to have services provided by a worker wearing an Islamic headscarf.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of July 16, 2015, CHEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria AD vs. Komisia za zashtita ot diskriminatsia, C-83/14 - Urban districts lived in mainly by persons of Roma origin - Concepts of 'direct discrimination' and 'indirect discrimination' - Possible - Offensive and stigmatising effect of the measure.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of April 6, 2017, Jyske Finans A/S vs Ligebehandlingsnævnet, C-668/15 - Equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin - Credit institution requiring additional proof of identity from third country nationals.

Dewhurst, E., The Development of EU Case-Law on Age Discrimination in Employment: 'Will You Still Need Me? Will You Still Feed Me? When I'm Sixty-Four', in: European Law Journal 2013, Vol. 19, Issue 4, pp. 517-544.

Schwellnus, G., Reasons for Constitutionalization: Non-Discrimination, Minority Rights and Social Rights in the Convention on the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, in: Journal of European Public Policy 2006, Vol. 13 Issue 8, pp. 1265-1283.

Session 3: (Tue, June 9; 3.00-5.30 pm, S 103): **The Right to Asylum**

1. Basic Principles of the Common European Asylum System

2. Case Law on the Rights of Refugees

Objectives:

Examination of relevant case law concerning entry and treatment of refugees to protection procedures and to social services.

Required reading:

European Court of Human Rights & European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (ed.), The Handbook on European Law Relating to Asylum, Borders and Immigration

2013, https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/handbook-european-law-relating-asylum-borders-and-immigration

Recommended reading:

Boeles, den Heijer & Lodder, European Migration Law, 2014, Intersentia Publishers.

Drywood, E., Who's in and Who's out? The Court's Emerging Case Law on the Definition of a Refugee, in: Common Market Law Review 2014, Vol. 51, Issue 4, pp. 1093-1124.

Foblets & Carlier, Law and Migration in a Changing World, 2020, Springer Publishing.

Ippolito, F., Migration and asylum cases before the court of justice of the European Union: putting the EU charter of fundamental rights to test?, in: European Journal of Migration and Law 2015, Vol. 17, issue 1, pp. 1-38.

Küçük, E., The Principle of Solidarity and Fairness in Sharing Responsibility: More than Window Dressing?, in: European Law Journal 2016, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp.448-469.

Nicolosi, S.F.,Going Unnoticed? Diagnosing the Right to Asylum in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in: European Law Journal 2017, Vol. 23, Issue 1/2, pp. 94-117.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of November 7, 2013, X and Y and Z, C-199/12 to C-201/12 - Minimum standards relating to the conditions for granting refugee status or subsidiary protection status - Membership of a particular social group - Sexual orientation.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of December 2011, N.S., C-411/10 - Prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment - Common European Asylum System - Concept of 'safe countries' - Rebuttable presumption of compliance of the Member State in charge with fundamental rights.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 2012, Y and Z, C-71/11 and C-99/11 - Minimum standards for determining who qualifies for refugee status or for subsidiary protection status - Definition of 'acts of persecution' - Acts by authorities designed to prohibit the manifestation of a person's religion in public.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of September 27, 2012, Cimade and GISTI, C-179/11 - Obligation to guarantee asylum seekers minimum reception conditions during the procedure of taking charge or taking back by the responsible Member State.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of February 23, 2012, Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy – Push-backs of migrants on high see by the Italian coast-guard.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of December 11, 2018, M.A. and Others v. Lithuania – Chechen refugees prevented from filing asylum applications in Lithuania and pushed back at the border with Belarus.

Session 4: (Fri, June 12; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, S 103)**: Migration and The Right to Social Security**

1. Basic Principles of European Social Security Law

2. Migration and Access to Social Welfare

Objective:

Analysing the interrelation between migration law and social security law and the concept of "social citizenship" in the relevant case law.

Required Reading:

Pennings, F., Introduction to European Social Security Law, 7th edition 2020, Intersentia Publishing.

Pennings, F. & Vonk, G., Research Handbook on European Social Security Law, 2015 E.Elgar Publishing.

Recommended Reading:

Cappelen, C. & Peters, Y., Diversity and welfare state legitimacy in Europe. The challenge of intra-EU migration, in: Journal of European Public Policy 2018, Vol. 25, Issue 9, pp. 1336-1356.

Ferrera, M., The Contentious Politics of Hospitality: Intra-EU Mobility and Social Rights, in: European Law Journal 2016, Vol. 22, Issue 6, pp. 791-805.

Hoogenboom, A., In Search of a Rationale for the EU Citizenship Jurisprudence, in: Oxford Journal of Legal Studies 2015, Vol. 35, Issue 2, pp. 301-324.

Pennings, F., EU Citizenship: Access to Social Benefits in Other EU Member States, in: International Journal of Comparative Labour Law & Industrial Relations 2012, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 307-333.

Reich, N., Union Citizenship-Metaphor or Source of Rights?, in: European Law Journal 2001, Vol. 7 Issue 1, pp. 4-23.

Strumia, F., European Citizenship and EU Immigration: A Democratic Bridge between the Third Country Nationals' Right to Belong and the Member States' Power to Exclude, in: European Law Journal 2016, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp. 417-447.

Thym, D., 'Citizens' and 'Foreigners' in EU Law. Migration Law and its Cosmopolitan Outlook, in: European Law Journal 2016, Vol. 22, Issue 3, pp. 296-316.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of March 1, 2016, Alo and Osso, C-443/14 and C-444/14 - Subsidiary protection status - Social welfare - Freedom of movement within the host Member State - Obligation to reside in a particular place.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of Novemver 21, 2018, Ayubi, C-713/17 - Rules relating to the content of international protection - Refugees with temporary right of residence - Social protection - Different treatment.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of September 20, 2001, Rudy Grzelczyk vs. Centre public d'aide sociale d'Ottignies-Louvain-la-Neuve, C-184/99 - National legislation which guarantees a minimum subsistence allowance only for nationals.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of November 11, 2014, Elisabeta Dano and Florin Dano vs. Jobcenter Leipzig, C-333/13 - Free movement of - Economically inactive nationals of a Member State residing in the territory of another Member State - Condition requiring sufficient resources.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 15, 2015, Jobcenter Berlin Neukölln vs. Nazifa Alimanovic and Others, C-67/14 - Freedom of movement for persons - Member State nationals who are job-seekers and resident in a different Member State.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of September 16, 1996, Gaygusuz vs. Austria, Application no. 17371/90 - Right to Social Security - Equal Treatment - Right to exclude Non-Nationals from Social Security Benefits that are financed out of Contributions.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 30, 2003, Poirrez vs. France, Application no. 40892/98, Right to Social Security - Equal Treatment - Right to exclude Non-Nationals from Social Security Benefits that are financed out of taxes.

Session 5: (Tue, June 16; 10.00 am-12.30 pm, S 103): **The Right of Collective Bargaining and Action**

1. The Right to Collective Bargaining and Collective Action

2. Case Law on the interrelation of Collective Action and the Market Freedoms

Objective:

Analysing the interrelationship of workers' rights and employers' freedoms in the case law of the European Court of Justice.

Required Reading:

Ewing, K. D., Myth and Reality of the Right to Strike as a 'Fundamental Labour Right', in: International Journal of Comparative Labour Law & Industrial Relations 2013, Vol. 29, Issue 2, pp. 145-165.

Fornasier, M., The Impact of EU Fundamental Rights on Private Relationships: Direct or Indirect Effect?, in: European Review of Private Law 2015, Vol. 23, Issue 1, pp. 29-46.

Zimmer, R., Labour Market Politics through Jurisprudence: The Influence of the Judgements of the European Court of Justice (Viking, Laval, Rüffert, Luxembourg) on Labour Market Policies, in: German Policy Studies/Politikfeldanalyse. 2011, Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp. 211-234.

Recommended Reading:

Albin, E., Union Responsibility to Migrant Workers: A Global Justice Approach, in: Oxford Journal of Legal Studies 2014, Vol. 34, Issue 1, pp. 133-153.

Joerges, C. & Rödl, F., Informal Politics, Formalised Law and the 'Social Deficit' of European Integration: Reflections after the Judgments of the ECJ in Viking and Laval, in: European Law Journal 2009, Vol. 15, Issue 1, pp. 1-19.

Novitz, T., The Internationally Recognized Right to Strike: A Past, Present, and Future Basis upon Which to Evaluate Remedies for Unlawful Collective Action?, in: International Journal of Comparative Labour Law & Industrial Relations 2014, Vol. 30, Issue 3, pp. 357-379.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of December 18, 2007, Laval un Partneri Ltd vs Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundet, C-341/05 - Freedom to provide services - Possibility for trade unions to attempt, by way of collective action, to force undertakings established in other Member States to negotiate on a case-by-case basis in order to determine the rates of pay for workers and to sign the collective agreement for the building sector.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of December 11, 2007, International Transport Workers' Federation and Finnish Seamen's Union vs. Viking Line, C-438/05 - Right of establishment - Collective action taken by a trade union organisation against a private undertaking - Collective agreement liable to deter an undertaking from registering a vessel under the flag of another Member State.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of January 31, 2012, Sindicatul Pastorul cel Bun vs. Romania, Application no. 2330/09 - Right to Strike as a Human Right.

Bibliography

Boeles, den Heijer & Lodder, European Migration Law, 2014, Intersentia Publishers.

Bogdandy, A. von, Constitutional Principles for Europe, in: Riedel E., & Wolfrum R. (ed.), Recent trends in German and European Constitutional Law, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer, 2006, pp. 1-35.

Chalmers, D., Davies, G. & Monti, G. (ed.), European Union Law. Text and Materials, 4th Edition, Cambridge 2019.

Council of Europe, European Court of Human Rights & European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (ed.), European Non-Discrimination Law 2018, https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/handbook-european-law-non-discrimination

di Federico, G., The EU charter of fundamental rights: from declaration to binding instrument, Berlin and Heidelberg 2011.

Douglas-Scott, S., Fundamental Rights and the Union, in: Schütze, R. & Tridimas, T. (ed.), Oxford Principles of European Union Law, Volume II, Oxford 2018.

European Court of Human Rights & European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (ed.), The Handbook on European Law Relating to Asylum, Borders and Immigration 2013, https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/handbook-european-law-relating-asylum-borders-and-immigration

Foblets & Carlier, Law and Migration in a Changing World, 2020, Springer Publishing.

Pennings, F., Introduction to European Social Security Law, 7th edition 2020, Intersentia Publishing.

Pennings, F. & Vonk, G., Research Handbook on European Social Security Law, 2015 E.Elgar Publishing.

Relevant case-law

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of September 16, 1996, Gaygusuz vs. Austria, Application no. 17371/90.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 30, 2003, Poirrez vs. France.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of December 22, 2009, Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of March 18, 2011, Lautsi v. Italy.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of February 23, 2012, Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of January 31, 2012, Sindicatul Pastorul cel Bun vs. Romania, Application no. 2330/09.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of January 15, 2013, Eweida and others v. The United Kingdom.

European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber), Judgement of July 1, 2014, S.A.S. v. France.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of April 6, 2017, A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgment of December 5, 2017, Hamidović v. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

European Court of Human Rights, Judgement of December 11, 2018, M.A. and Others v. Lithuania.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of September 20, 2001, Rudy Grzelczyk vs. Centre public d'aide sociale d'Ottignies-Louvain-la-Neuve, C-184/99.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of December 11, 2007, International Transport Workers' Federation and Finnish Seamen's Union vs. Viking Line, C-438/05.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of December 18, 2007, Laval un Partneri Ltd vs Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundet, C-341/05.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of July 10, 2008, Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding vs. Firma Feryn NV, C-54/07.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of December 2011, N.S., C-411/10.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 2012, Y and Z, C-71/11 and C-99/11.

European Court of Justice, Judgment of September 27, 2012, Cimade and GISTI, C-179/11.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of November 7, 2013, X and Y and Z, C-199/12 to C-201/12.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of November 11, 2014, Elisabeta Dano and Florin Dano vs. Jobcenter Leipzig, C-333/13.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of July 16, 2015, CHEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria AD vs. Komisia za zashtita ot diskriminatsia, C-83/14.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of September 15, 2015, Jobcenter Berlin Neukölln vs. Nazifa Alimanovic and Others, C-67/14.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of March 1, 2016, Alo and Osso, C-443/14 and C-444/14.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of March 14, 2017, Asma Bougnaoui and Association de défense des droits de l'homme (ADDH) v Micropole SA, C-188/15.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of April 6, 2017, Jyske Finans A/S vs Ligebehandlingsnævnet, C-668/15.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of April 17, 2018, Vera Egenberger vs. Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e. V., C-414/16.

European Court of Justice, Judgement of Novemver 21, 2018, Ayubi, C-713/17.

Appendix A

University of Southern California Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct

Plagiarism – presenting someone else's ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Section 11, Behavior Violating University Standards https://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions/. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct/.

Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the Office of Equity and Diversity http://equity.usc.edu/ or to the Department of Public Safetyhttp://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us. This is important for the safety whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. The Center for Women and Men http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/ provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage sarc@usc.edu describes reporting options and other resources.

Support Systems

A number of USC's schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the American Language Institute http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. The Office of Disability Services and Programs http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home index.html provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations. If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, USC Emergency Information http://emergency.usc.edu/ will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology.

Appendix B

Indiana University Statement on Academic Conduct

Academic honesty

Students are expected to adhere to O'Neill's standards on cheating and other academic behavior. These standards are clearly outlined at https://spea.indiana.edu/doc/undergraduate/ugrd_student_honorcode.pdf.

O'Neill's policy dictates that "Academic dishonesty can result in a grade of F for the class (an F for academic dishonesty cannot be removed from the transcript). Significant violations of the Code can result in expulsion from the University." It is critical that you become familiar with these standards.

Appendix C

Guidelines on seminar papers

1. Seminar paper

- Cover sheet (full name, topic, student ID number, course ID, submission deadline)
- Contents
- List of abbreviations
- Text
- References
- Appendices (if applicable)
- Approx. 10-15 pages

2. Referencing and citing

- All widely used formats are acceptable, as long as they are used consistently.
- Use respectable sources only. *Wikipedia* is not one of them.
- Plagiarism will ***not*** be tolerated!

  Plagiarism consists of any act of borrowing the words, opinions, ideas, sequence of ideas, statistical data, or other findings of another author without proper attribution. This means that, for instance, the literal citation of a text must be put in quotation marks. Mere reference to the author in a footnote is not sufficient. Plagiarism will result in lower grades and might even lead to a grade of 0. If 10% or more of a paper represents plagiarism, the paper will not be graded, and the person will be removed from the seminar.