

1

Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory

Thomas Diez and Antje Wiener

The Relevance of Integration Theory

The Dual Purpose of this Book

There is surely no shortage of books on European integration. This is a booming field, and readers will know better than anyone else the difficulties in choosing the appropriate literature. It is all the more surprising then that very few of these books are dedicated to the theory of European integration, especially when it comes to introductions and overviews. Most of them deal with the history of the integration process and its main actors, with the European Union's formal institutions and particular policies, or with present and future member states' policies, and barely spare a chapter on theoretical perspectives. This is not to say that there is no work done on integration theory. Indeed, this is in many respects a vibrant field that has overcome the impasses of the past. Yet, except for a few notable exceptions that we will return to in the course of this introduction (above all, Rosamond 2000 and Jørgensen, Pollack, and Rosamond 2007, and in German, Bieling and Lerch 2005), concise overviews of the field of integration theory remain rare.

This is therefore what we set out to do in this book: first, to provide an introduction to integration theory, its various approaches and how they have developed, to those who have started to study European integration, and are interested (as, we argue below, anyone studying European integration should be) in the theories of their field; second, to provide an overview of the field and take stock of its achievements to date, but also its problems, for those who are involved in the development of European integration theory, and who want to make sense of the sometimes confusing array of approaches that have been proliferating since the 1960s.¹ In doing so, we suggest that as the European integration process has progressed, its analyses have moved away from being predominantly concerned with either providing a normative template for a future European polity or with explaining the integration process within a social scientific framework grounded in International Relations (IR) theory. Increasingly, scholars have turned to or incorporated a more critical or 'problematizing' approach, therefore reflecting both concerns with the integration process and developments in IR theory since the 1980s, while others have treated the European Union (EU) as a political system that faces general problems of governance and therefore should not solely be treated as the exception to international politics that needs explaining. Neither of these developments means that

IR as a discipline has become irrelevant to the analysis of European integration, and it in many ways continues to structure the major debates, but the field as a whole has certainly become a lot more varied.

To this end, we have invited eminent scholars who have contributed significantly to the development of a particular theoretical approach, to take part in this 'stocktaking'. We have asked them to reflect upon the development, achievements, and problems of 'their' approach according to a set pattern, which we will introduce below and which will allow for comparing and relating individual approaches to each other. In this introduction, we want first to make the case for the relevance of theory when studying European integration. We then proceed to give a broad overview of the phases of theorizing European integration, thereby surveying the theoretical approaches that we have included in this volume and providing our rationale for this particular selection. The following section introduces the comparative framework that provided the guide for the chapters. This will include a discussion of the nature of the relationships between theories, a theme that we return to in the conclusion of this book. Finally, building on this discussion, we introduce the pattern of each chapter and provide an overview of the book.

We should add that the process of stocktaking would make no sense if it did not lead to the further development of theory. To that extent, we would not want to see this book read purely to understand and replicate existing theories, but rather as the starting point for criticizing and reformulating existing approaches, bringing them together in novel ways, and to move beyond them. We would like to see both colleagues and students involved in this project—it is probably fair to say that without the critical engagement of their students, none of the authors of this book could have made the contribution they did to European integration theory.

What is Integration Theory?

In order to talk meaningfully about integration theory, its two constitutive terms 'integration' and 'theory' need to be defined. This is less straightforward than it may at first seem, since both terms are heavily contested.

Let us turn to *integration* first. Ernst Haas, one of the most influential neofunctionalist integration theorists (see also Niemann with Schmitter in Chapter 3), once defined integration as the process 'whereby political actors in several, distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities toward a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states' (Haas 1958: 16). This is a broad definition, which includes both a social process (the shifting of loyalties) and a political process (the construction of new political institutions with a direct say in at least a part of their member states' affairs). Not all theorists would include both aspects in their definition, and there are reasons why Haas, from his perspective, emphasized the social element of integration. As will become clear in Chapter 3, functionally defined actors are core promoters of integration in neofunctionalism.

A less demanding definition preferred by intergovernmentalists, coming from a different angle within the spectrum of integration theory, focuses instead more narrowly on the creation of political institutions to which member states subscribe. For an overview of integration theories as the present volume attempts to provide, insisting on coverage of both social and political integration would have been far too demanding and would have led to the exclusion of theoretical approaches otherwise seen as central to the debate. Therefore, while we have sympathies for Haas's definition, we have in the following included approaches that tackle at least the political integration process, while some of them go beyond this and deal with social integration as well.

While this may seem broad enough as a common denominator for most of traditional integration theory, it is nonetheless too restrictive to account for some of the later developments in what may broadly be seen as the field of integration theory. In both of the definitions above, integration is first and foremost a *process*: both neofunctionalists and intergovernmentalists are more concerned with the process of integration than with the political system to which that integration leads. However, since the 1980s various authors have focused specifically on the shape of what they call a new system of governance emerging in the EU. While they are more concerned with the *outcome* than the process of integration (see Marks, Hooghe, and Blank 1996; Marks, Scharpf, Schmitter, and Streeck 1996), their work is included in our understanding of integration theory, because it now undeniably forms an important part of that field, as the field has moved towards accepting the EU as a polity that needs to be understood better.

Secondly, what is *theory*? Again, understandings differ, and as above, we endorse a definition that allows us to include a broader range of approaches. Narrowly defined, theory is understood as a causal argument of universal, transhistorical validity and nomothetic quality, which can be tested through the falsification of a series of hypotheses (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994; Przeworski and Teune 1982). Some of the chapters discussed in this book will stick to this narrow definition, many however will not. Instead, they use theory in a rather loose sense of abstract reflection, which despite its abstract nature can nonetheless be context-specific, for instance by taking its point of departure in the consideration of a particular policy field of the EU. To make this point clearer, it helps to consider that theory serves different purposes. Some theoretical approaches explain policy outcomes or decision-making behaviour, others criticize or 'problematize' general trends on the basis of abstract considerations; some fit particular developments into a larger classificatory scheme, others seek to provide normative guidance (see for example Woods 1996). In each case, theory means something else: Different theoretical approaches to European integration are informed by different understandings of the meaning and purpose of theorizing.

To distinguish these different understandings from the narrow definition of theory outlined above, we will use the term 'integration theory' when we mean the *field* of theorizing the process and outcome of (European) integration, while we use the term 'theoretical approaches' when we refer to the *individual* ways of dealing with integration, some, but not all of which may be classified as theories in the narrow sense. What they all share, however, is that they are not solely concerned with the development of particular policies, but that they want to make a contribution to the reflection on European integration and governance.

European integration theory is thus the field of systematic reflection on the process of intensifying political cooperation in Europe and the development of common political institutions, as well as on its outcome. It also includes the theorization of changing constructions of identities and interests of social actors in the context of this process.

Why Study Integration Theory?

For many students, the main purpose of studying integration theory will be to gain a better understanding of how the EU works. To do so, students require first and foremost knowledge about how these institutions are set up and how they work so as to identify organizational competences, the role and function of a particular institution according to the Treaties, or access points for lobbying activities. From this perspective, the value added by theory is not immediately obvious—instead, empirical facts appear to provide sufficient information. Why then study integration theory? There are, at least, three reasons.

First, theories in the narrow sense of the term help us to explain processes and outcomes of integration, which not only leads to a better understanding of the current set of institutions, but may also help to formulate expectations about future developments and institutional behaviour.

Second, apart from the set-up, role, and function of formal institutions, many readers will, for example, be concerned with questions of democratic reform and legitimacy. On the one hand, these *do* require detailed knowledge about the EU's institutions. Yet, on the other hand, they also require a deeper understanding of the normative issues at stake, such as: what should legitimacy be based on? Or: what form of democracy is appropriate for a polity beyond the nation state? Many approaches that do not fit the narrow scientific definition of theory address such issues and assist and encourage further reflections upon them.

Third, and arguably more importantly, 'pure' empirical knowledge of how institutions work is impossible and would in any case not be very meaningful. It is *impossible* since the representation of empirical facts is always based on particular concerns, and assumptions about the nature of the EU and the finality of the integration process, which often remain unreflected. Integration theory helps to highlight and problematize these concerns and assumptions. 'Pure' empirical knowledge is *not very meaningful* in the sense that since any empirical representation is imbued with such assumptions, to concentrate only on the 'facts' provides a superficial understanding that disregards at least some of the political disputes 'underneath' the surface. To sum this point up, analysing integration is not only a technical matter, but involves particular understandings and conceptualizations of integration and the EU, for which we need integration theory.

Two examples illustrate this point. The first one concerns the nature of foreign policy decision-making within the EU. To observers who base their assessment on organizational design, the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is by and large identified as a matter of the Council and therefore intergovernmentally organized. Not quite so, argue others (see e.g. Jørgensen 1997; Glarbo 2001; Øhrgaard 1997). While it

is true that formally, CFSP is primarily a matter between governments and does not fall within the scope of the Commission, this characterization misses some of the informal, 'societal' developments that have created a dense web of consultation with integrative effects that are not captured by the intergovernmentalist picture. These take place on the social level through the creation of a diplomatic community within the EU (Glarbo 2001), or the projection of normative power in international politics on the basis of common values and norms (Manners 2002; Sjursen 2006a; Diez and Manners 2008), and they have political consequences, such as the so-called 'coordination reflex', the widespread tendency to coordinate foreign policy with other member states rather than going it alone. The extent to which this is true is a matter of empirical analysis, but the important point is that these studies employ a particular theoretical approach that allows them to bring to the fore the social dimension of the integration process, even in areas formally characterized by intergovernmentalism (see also Risse on social constructivism in Chapter 8).

The second example concerns the development of citizenship in the EU. Here, formal institutional approaches would find that Union citizenship was 'invented' at the intergovernmental conference that prepared the treaty revisions at Maastricht. As such, it is often seen as a 'thin' institution with little substantive importance. Yet some authors have pointed out that elements of (market-) citizenship, i.e. fundamental rights of working citizens, had been included in the treaties before, and that the way European citizenship emerged at Maastricht was in fact conditioned by previous legal cases, rulings, and provisions (O'Leary 1996; Kostakopoulou 2001; Kadelbach 2003). Others have pointed out that previous 'citizenship practice', i.e. the policies and political processes that forge the institutionalized terms of citizenship within a particular context, had constructed elements of citizenship rights, access, and belonging that shaped the formulation of Union citizenship later on (Wiener 1998; see also Meehan 1993; Shaw 2007). The citizenship case demonstrates that the assessment of an institution's meaning depends on the type of theoretical approach chosen to study the problem. Whether one regards the institutionalization of EU citizenship with the Maastricht Treaty as an important development will, for instance, depend on the theoretical assumptions about context, institutional role, and function, i.e. whether citizenship is approached from a normative, liberal or, indeed, dogmatic legal perspective. Furthermore, the process of integration raises questions about theoretical assumptions and contested concepts, for example, the question of whether such citizenship undermines the familiar concept of modern (national) citizenship. All of these are questions that are ultimately of a theoretical nature in the sense of this book, and the theoretical vantage point one takes is crucial to how one answers them.

Reviewing the history of European integration demonstrates that there have been a number of occasions that are hotly debated in the integration literature, mostly due to analysts approaching them from different theoretical angles. The following is just a brief selection of controversies, some of which we will get back to in more detail later on:

The role of state interests in the founding years: From a realist perspective² in the IR sense of the term, integration and especially the developments in the founding years are largely down to the interests and power of big member states, during that phase particularly France and Germany, with France wanting to control Germany and Germany having an interest in getting back onto the international stage (see for example Pedersen 1998).

Against this, neofunctionalists have emphasized the role of private and sector interests (see Chapter 3), whereas political economy approaches put the spotlight onto the setting of integration within a broader context of capitalist hegemony (see Chapter 12).

The lack of major institutional developments in the 1970s: The 1970s are often labelled the 'doldrum years' of integration (and, as it were, integration theory), because political integration seemed to stagnate, whereas others have argued that below the surface a lot of changes took place that would prepare for the reinvigoration of integration and integration theory in the latter half of the 1980s (Caporaso and Keeler 1995). Furthermore, outside political science, legal scholars have advanced the argument of 'integration through law', focusing on increasing legal interdependencies and corresponding shifts in the meaning of sovereignty (Capeletti *et al.* 1985).

The agreement on the Single European Act (SEA) (1986): The agreement on institutional change introduced with the SEA raised a number of new questions for integration theory. Having been forged at an intergovernmental conference, it led to a re-launch of the theoretical debate discussing the role and formation of state preferences in the negotiations towards the SEA (Moravcsik 1991, 1993; see also Chapter 4), on the one hand, and emphasizing the role of the Commission, informal processes within the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER), and the influence of private actors such as the European Round Table of Industrialists, on the other (Wincott 1995; Hayes-Renshaw, Lequesne, and Mayor Lopez 1992; Ross 1995; Bornschier 2000; see also Chapter 12).

All of these controversies need to be investigated empirically, but they cannot be reduced to a simple testing of alternative hypothesis, nor can they be addressed purely by 'thick description' (W. Wallace 1996). Instead, seemingly competing theories often shed a different light on the issue that is enabled by a particular theoretical perspective.

Integration Theory: A Broad Overview

Phases of European Integration Theory

Having established the relevance of integration theory, we will in the following provide a broad overview of its development. This places the theoretical approaches in their historical disciplinary context.

We suggest that the development of integration theory can be divided into three broad phases (see also Wiener 2006). These are preceded by a normative proto-integration theory period. We identify the three phases as explanatory, analytical, and constructive, respectively. A note of caution is in order, however. Since most approaches combine various dimensions of theory, the distinction among the respective phases is not as clear-cut as analytically suggested. The phases are therefore meant to identify the emergence, development, and, at times, dominance of particular theoretical tendencies, but we do not mean to suggest that these were the only (and sometimes not even the dominant) ones. In Table 1.1, we have left the endpoints of these phases open, since work in one tradition tends to continue after the emergence of new tendencies in theorizing. However, when

Table 1.1 Three phases of

Phase

Explaining integration

Analysing governance

Constructing the EU

we mention em
integration the
Similarly, alt
of our three ph
had already co
a myriad of m
multiple loyalt
be polity'. Bot
ing governance
yet they had
that our three
integration th
pline, althoug
particular.

The normativ
tegration in Eu
building. Func
early 'liberal' a
a war-prone w
Second World
lication, it had
tional organiza
war. This was a

Table 1.1 Three phases in integration theory

Phase	When?	Main themes	Main theoretical reference points
Explaining integration	1960s onwards	How can integration outcomes be explained?	Liberalism, realism, neoliberalism
		Why does European integration take place?	
Analysing governance	1980s onwards	What kind of political system is the EU?	Governance, comparative politics, policy analysis
		How can the political processes within the EU be described?	
		How does the EU's regulatory policy work?	
Constructing the EU	1990s onwards	How and with which social and political consequences does integration develop?	Social constructivism, post-structuralism, international political economy
		How are integration and governance conceptualized?	
		How should they be?	Gender approaches

we mention end dates in the following text, these are to signify a shift within European integration theory towards new approaches.

Similarly, although perhaps to a lesser extent, the dates provided for the beginnings of our three phases are also problematic. In 1970, Haas (E. B. 1970: 635), for instance, had already conceptualized the then European Community as an 'anarchoid image of a myriad of unity' with significant 'asymmetrical overlapping' and 'infinitely tiered multiple loyalties', and Lindberg and Scheingold (1970) analysed the EC as a 'would-be polity'. Both of these works address issues characteristic of the phase of 'analysing governance' in European integration theory, which we will further develop below, yet they had been published at least a decade before. We would nonetheless argue that our three phases identify the major tendencies in the development of European integration theory. They are also significant as the general self-image of the discipline, although not everyone would agree with our identification of a third phase in particular.

The normative proto-integration period predates the actual development of political integration in Europe. It is an important precursor of the three phases of integration theory building. Functionalism is typical of this normative period. As part of a broader set of early 'liberal' approaches to IR, it saw states and their sovereignty as the core problem of a war-prone world. Popular in the interwar years and in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, with David Mitrany's *A Working Peace System* (1943) as the core publication, it had a strong normative agenda, namely how, through a network of transnational organizations on a functional basis, one could constrain states and prevent future war. This was a global concern and had no direct relation to European integration—as a

matter of fact, Mitrany was an opponent of regional integration that he saw as undermining his global concerns and replicating rather than transcending a state-model (Mitrany 1966; see Rosamond 2000: 36–8). Early federalism, too, can be located in this period. As a political movement it was more directly related to particular developments in Europe, for example in the form of calls for a European federation made during the interwar years by actors as different as the German Social Democrats (see Schneider 1977; Hrbek 1972) and the conservative Hungarian Count Coudenhove-Kalergi (1971). Again, state sovereignty was a core problem for federalists only to be overcome by political organization at a higher level, although in contrast to Mitrany's functionalist model, this new political organization would bear many features of the state.

With the *first phase* roughly lasting from the signing of the Treaty of Rome until the early 1980s, we enter European integration theory proper. Despite the realist attempts to integrate them into their worldview, and conceptualize integration as an effect of the power play between states, the early successes of integration challenged the existence of the territorial state system, which is at the core of realist assumptions. It therefore also challenged the overwhelming predominance of realism in IR after the disillusionment with liberal theories after the Second World War and its aftermath. Accordingly, integration theory initially sought to explain the processes of institution-building above the state, which was not supposed to happen within a realist picture of the world. Two theoretical approaches came to dominate the debate. Both were based on rational actor assumptions, while locating the push and pull for the integration process on different levels and in different societal realms.

Neofunctionalists, in line with their broad definition of integration, took up functionalist ideas and explained the move away from the anarchic state system and towards supranational institution-building by focusing on societal and market patterns and how they pushed elites towards advocating supranational institutions within their policy areas. Because of the functional interconnectedness of policy areas, these shared policy initiatives in so-called 'low politics' areas were seen as having the potential for 'spilling over' into other policy areas, at first to those closely related to market policy, but ultimately beyond (*functional spillover*). This assumption the neofunctionalists shared with their predecessors. Yet they recognized that such spillovers were far from automatic, and so in addition to this, they expected actors, who had shifted their loyalties and redefined their identities, to actively demand further integration (*political spillover*). In particular, actors responsible for governance on the supranational level (in the EU case, above all the European Commission) were considered to push (or 'cultivate') integration because they had an interest in integration as such (*cultivated spillover*). While sticking to the normative agenda of functionalism, neofunctionalists therefore paid greater tribute to the necessity of central political institutions. Chiming with the development of IR at the time, and the social sciences generally speaking, they also had an explicit *social scientific* (in contrast to a predominantly normative) interest in creating a *general* theory of regional integration that was applicable beyond the singular case of Europe (see in particular Ernst Haas's as well as Philippe Schmitter's work; Haas 1961, 1967, 1970; Haas and Schmitter 1964; and Niemann with Schmitter in Chapter 3 of this book). In a different but not dissimilar way, Karl W. Deutsch (1957) saw integration coming about through the increased communication and interaction across borders, which gave his theoretical approach the name 'transactionalism'.

These arguments about institution-building in geopolitical and theoretical circles were not without realism while the debate began in this period (see also (1992), on the one hand, and the social science analytical approaches on the other). Institution-building work demonstrated that it had been on government and institutional levels that institutions are designed. However, in the 1980s, a 'liberal' focus on interests and institutional politics member state realist camp in institutional politics liberalism as a result. For a new generation in the hands of integration theorists, realists have demonstrated making the game theorists would have consequences for the European Act revival and neofunctionalism (Mitrany 1966; Zysman 1989). The focus in theoretical comparative politics set-up seemed to be a recognition of the need for integration in the form of (1992) aptly called 'institutionalism'. This second theoretical reflection on integration theory reflects the disciplinary nature of the field. It is a reflection of the integration theory's evolution.

These arguments were opposed by intergovernmentalists who explained supranational institution-building as the result of bargains struck between nation states with specific geopolitical interests that militated towards a 'pooling' of sovereignty in specific historical circumstances. In doing so, intergovernmentalists stuck to the core arguments of realism while still explaining aberrations from the realist worldview (Hoffmann 1966). The debate between supporters of integration as 'the rescue of the nation state' (Milward 1992), on the one hand, and as the overcoming of the nation state, on the other, which began in this first phase of integration theory, has remained a consistent factor in social science analysis to this day. While liberal intergovernmentalism, one of the core theoretical approaches since the late 1980s, does not deny the societal impact on supranational institution-building, as the theorization of societal preference formation in Moravcsik's work demonstrates (see Schimmelfennig and Moravcsik in Chapter 4), their focus has been on governmental actors whose capacity for decisions was enhanced by supranational institutions, but not constrained by them. Institutions, according to this view, are designed for particular purposes and under control of the actors who created them. However, in line with the emerging consensus between neorealists and neoliberals in IR in the 1980s, Moravcsik combines 'realist' state-centrism on the international level with a 'liberal' focus on state preference formation, rather than referring to given geopolitical interests, and sees institutions beyond the nation state as a standard feature of international politics, even though they are largely dependent on the continued support of their member states. To that extent, Moravcsik relates much more to the neoliberal than the realist camp in IR; after all, neoliberals, too, concede that the state is central to international politics and have therefore given up one of the core normative aims of classical liberalism as outlined above.

For a new generation of integration theorists, however, institutions were not mere tools in the hands of their creators, but had themselves an important impact on both the integration process and the development of European governance. As neoinstitutionalists have demonstrated, institutions can cause 'unintended consequences' (North 1990), making the process of institution-building less easily reversible than the intergovernmentalists would have it (Pierson 1996). A particularly dramatic example of unintended consequences was the largely underestimated push to further integration by the Single European Act (Weiler 1999). In terms of European integration theory, this led to the revival and revision of classic integration theories in the form of liberal intergovernmentalism (Moravcsik 1991) and neofunctionalism (Stone Sweet 2002; Sandholtz and Zysman 1989; Tranholm-Mikkelsen 1991). It also marks the starting point for a shift of focus in theoretical approaches to European integration away from IR Theory towards comparative politics, not least out of a recognition that the EU's complex institutional set-up seemed to be here to stay. Meanwhile, even within IR, there emerged a greater recognition of different forms of institutionalized cooperation in international politics, first in the form of 'regime theory', then in the theorization of what Czempiel and Rosenau (1992) aptly called 'governance without government'.

This *second phase* considerably broadened the scope of empirical research and theoretical reflection on European integration, and introduced a greater degree of interdisciplinarity. It brought comparative and institutionalist approaches to the foreground of integration theory, following questions of what kind of polity the EU really is and how it

operates—as Thomas Risse-Kappen (1996) famously put it, to ‘explore the nature of the beast’. Among the concepts developed during this phase to answer these questions are the EU as a system of ‘multilevel’ (Marks, Hooghe, and Blank 1996) or ‘network governance’ (Jachtenfuchs and Kohler-Koch 1996), or as a ‘multiperspectival polity’ (Ruggie 1993). Others focused on the way in which policies are made through the analysis of policy networks (Peterson 1995a; Peterson and Bomberg 1999). A key process analysed was the ‘Europeanization’ of governance rules, institutions, and practices across the EU (Cowles *et al.* 2001). Questions of institutional adaptation and misfit and of good governance including legitimacy, democracy, and transparency are other issues addressed by works in this second phase of integration theories. They clearly reflected the shifting agendas of both IR and comparative politics in an era in which governance structures, it seemed, could no longer be contained within the nation state and therefore called for an analysis that integrated both fields.

To some extent, the *third phase* of integration theory is marked by the return of IR theory, although of a different kind. During the 1980s and 1990s, IR theory was characterized by the rise of a variety of critical and constructivist approaches, which drew their inspiration from developments in other fields of social theory. Scholars questioned both the ontological and epistemological assumptions on which traditional approaches had been built. Social constructivists, for instance, demonstrated the relevance of ideas, norms, institutions, and identities for international politics and pointed to the interdependence of the structure of the state system, on the one hand, and the agency of those involved in international politics, on the other. Post-structuralists problematized core concepts of IR theory and drew attention to the discursive construction of our understanding of international politics. Critical theorists and feminists not only developed important critiques of the contemporary international system, but also often offered alternative paths towards what they saw as a more just world. In the field of political economy, too, scholars took on a more critical outlook and increasingly referred to the problems brought about by the hegemony of capitalism as a particular political-economic system.

These developments coincided with the move towards political union in the 1991 Maastricht and the 1996 Amsterdam Treaties. Under the pressure of massive enlargement and constitutional revision, integration theory faced the challenge of analysing and problematizing the interrelated processes of widening and deepening. Different from the first two phases, which sought to explain or analyse either institution-building on the supranational level, or institutional change on the meso- and substate levels, this third phase of integration theory thus faced the more encompassing task of theorizing the goal or finality of European integration, the competing ideas and discourses about European governance, and the normative implications of particular EU policies. Accordingly, apart from problem-oriented theorizing, works during this phase have been concerned with questions about our understanding of integration, how particular policy areas have been defined and developed in the way they did, and what political effects these definitions and historical processes have had.

This third phase therefore focuses on substantial questions about ‘constructing’ (and limiting) European integration. It is in answering these questions that the critical and

constructivist ap-
sights from the
Maastricht and
of European gov-
political theory
structivism, espe-
of governance ag-
EU’s formal and
as far as the latte
rather than insti-

Approaches

The theoretical a-
theory, including
three correspond-
ance, and constr-

Part One, Expl-
federalism is fir-
a comparative fi-
polity (Koslowski
csik (1998) have
intergovernment-
neofunctionalism
that are often, al-
ing with each of-
4 to intergovern-
an explanation of
policies and insti-

In Part Two, A-
first and foremos-
ter 5 reflects on
of European inte-
Focusing more on
political science
sis of European
decisions with th-
often produces v-
that it advances
outputs within a
various ‘new insti-
in particular the

constructivist approaches in IR theory were taken up,³ alongside or combined with insights from the 'constitutional turn' later in the second phase, which, sparked by the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties and the increased public debate about the legitimacy of European governance, brought normative questions about the EU's constitution from political theory to the heart of the analysis of governance (see Chapter 11). Social constructivism, especially, has in some respects drawn on, and in turn contributed to insights of governance approaches. In particular, it has addressed issues of the development of the EU's formal and informal institutions, as well as processes of Europeanization, although as far as the latter are concerned, its focus has been on the Europeanization of identities rather than institutions and policies (see Risse in Chapter 8).

Approaches Covered in this Book

The theoretical approaches discussed in this book cover the three phases of integration theory, including their normative precursor. We have therefore divided the book into three corresponding parts: explaining European integration, analysing European governance, and constructing the European Union.

Part One, *Explaining European Integration*, contains first a chapter on federalism. While federalism is first and foremost a normative theory, it has been used more recently in a comparative fashion to explain, analyse, or devise particular features of the European polity (Kosłowski 2001; Nicolaidis and Howse 2001). Furthermore, scholars such as Moravcsik (1998) have derived hypotheses about the particular institutional choices made in intergovernmental conferences for European governance from federalism. Together with neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism, federalism can be seen as a triad of theories that are often, although problematically so, as we will argue below, presented as competing with each other. Accordingly, Chapter 3 is devoted to neofunctionalism and Chapter 4 to intergovernmentalism, both of which take IR theories as a starting point to attempt an explanation of why integration takes place, and why policy-makers choose particular policies and institutional arrangements.

In Part Two, *Analysing European Governance*, we turn our focus to those approaches that first and foremost try to understand and analyse the EU as a type of political system. Chapter 5 reflects on the development of governance approaches. It explicitly links the study of European integration to broader debates and analytical frameworks in political science. Focusing more on the analysis of policy-making processes and drawing on a different set of political science literature, Chapter 6 discusses the policy network approach to the analysis of European governance, at the core of which is the explanation of particular policy decisions with the configuration of the respective policy field. While such an approach often produces very detailed empirical studies, it is nonetheless a *theoretical* approach in that it advances general arguments about the nature of the policy-making process and its outputs within a complex governance setting. Chapter 7 looks at the contribution that various 'new institutionalisms' have made to the study of European governance, analysing in particular the impact of institutions on policy-making and the overall development of

constructivist approaches in IR theory were taken up,³ alongside or combined with insights from the 'constitutional turn' later in the second phase, which, sparked by the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties and the increased public debate about the legitimacy of European governance, brought normative questions about the EU's constitution from political theory to the heart of the analysis of governance (see Chapter 11). Social constructivism, especially, has in some respects drawn on, and in turn contributed to insights of governance approaches. In particular, it has addressed issues of the development of the EU's formal and informal institutions, as well as processes of Europeanization, although as far as the latter are concerned, its focus has been on the Europeanization of identities rather than institutions and policies (see Risse in Chapter 8).

Approaches Covered in this Book

The theoretical approaches discussed in this book cover the three phases of integration theory, including their normative precursor. We have therefore divided the book into three corresponding parts: explaining European integration, analysing European governance, and constructing the European Union.

Part One, *Explaining European Integration*, contains first a chapter on federalism. While federalism is first and foremost a normative theory, it has been used more recently in a comparative fashion to explain, analyse, or devise particular features of the European polity (Koslowski 2001; Nicolaidis and Howse 2001). Furthermore, scholars such as Moravcsik (1998) have derived hypotheses about the particular institutional choices made in intergovernmental conferences for European governance from federalism. Together with neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism, federalism can be seen as a triad of theories that are often, although problematically so, as we will argue below, presented as competing with each other. Accordingly, Chapter 3 is devoted to neofunctionalism and Chapter 4 to intergovernmentalism, both of which take IR theories as a starting point to attempt an explanation of why integration takes place, and why policy-makers choose particular policies and institutional arrangements.

In Part Two, *Analysing European Governance*, we turn our focus to those approaches that first and foremost try to understand and analyse the EU as a type of political system. Chapter 5 reflects on the development of governance approaches. It explicitly links the study of European integration to broader debates and analytical frameworks in political science. Focusing more on the analysis of policy-making processes and drawing on a different set of political science literature, Chapter 6 discusses the policy network approach to the analysis of European governance, at the core of which is the explanation of particular policy decisions with the configuration of the respective policy field. While such an approach often produces very detailed empirical studies, it is nonetheless a *theoretical* approach in that it advances general arguments about the nature of the policy-making process and its outputs within a complex governance setting. Chapter 7 looks at the contribution that various 'new institutionalisms' have made to the study of European governance, analysing in particular the impact of institutions on policy-making and the overall development of

governance, as well as the shaping of those institutions by political actors. The focus in this chapter is on rationalist and historical institutionalism, whereas sociological institutionalism is discussed as part of social constructivism in Chapter 8. This chapter acts as a kind of bridge to Part One and Part Three. Social constructivists are interested in what kind of 'beast' the EU is (Risse-Kappen 1996) and how political processes and identities change within the integration process. They link to the approaches in Part Three in that they stress the constructed characteristic of European integration and governance and the interplay of structure and agency in this construction. Yet they also link to the approaches covered in Part One in that they try to explain this construction, highlighting the role of ideas and norms together with interests, rather than focusing predominantly on the latter, as neofunctionalists and intergovernmentalists tend to do. Social constructivists also share with most approaches in both Parts One and Three a strong affiliation with IR: while social constructivism by no means originated there, it found its way into the study of European integration via the work that developed in IR since the late 1980s.

Finally, Part Three, *Constructing the European Union*, deals with those more recent approaches that add a critical dimension to studying the European Union. This part includes, in Chapter 9, a discussion of discursive approaches to the analysis of European integration, some of which have used post-structuralist concepts taken mostly from IR theory to problematize conceptions of European integration and governance, while others have tried to use those concepts to develop an explanatory framework for the analysis of the European policies of member states, drawing on the constraints that predominant discourses set for the formulation of EU policy. Gender approaches, which are covered in Chapter 10, share the critical and problematizing line with discursive approaches, building in part on the advances of feminist approaches in other disciplines and focusing on how European integration and EU policies build on and (re)produce a particular image of 'women' and 'men', implicitly or even explicitly favouring one over the other. In their critical and problematizing mode, both Chapters 9 and 10 tackle some of the core normative problems of European integration and EU governance as it has developed over the decades, including above all the notion of a crisis of legitimacy of supranational governance. These issues relate to the broader questions posed by political theory as a subfield of political science, and so it is little surprise that political theorists have increasingly found interest in the EU. Chapter 11 covers the input from this field to European integration theory. As a final contribution before our conclusion, Chapter 12 provides an overview of political economy approaches to the study of European integration and governance. Again, these have increasingly focused on critical interrogations of the integration process and its consequences, but instead of tackling predominantly conceptual issues as discursive approaches do, their main arguments relate to the capitalist system as it is embedded in the current configuration of the Single Market and Economic and Monetary Union.

The list of approaches covered in this book is obviously not exhaustive of all the approaches available to the student of European integration. We have included what we believe are currently the most salient and influential approaches in European integration theory, and by including some of the more recent developments, we will have already

expanded the s
theless some o
particular justifi

First, we have
who would like
because it would
process, we can
lead of Karl De
and the transac
(but see Deuts
close to transac
on transnation
supranational
communication

A second om
respect, we do
egration as defin
that economic
cially the effect
tion as such (se
their way into
where predicti
made on the ba
the division of
within these co
rently playing
it should be.

Last but not
no means all)
Saxon scholar
a narrative of t
that may have
and exciting th
side the Anglo-
international
approaches be
becoming the
developments
academic style
from another
original. As an
we regarded as
ways the yards

expanded the scope of what is conventionally taught as the core of the discipline. Nonetheless some of the omissions may prove more controversial than others. Two require particular justification.

First, we have not included a chapter on transactionalism. While we agree with those who would like to see this approach given much more attention than it currently receives, because it would refocus our attention to the social, rather than the political integration process, we cannot ignore that, a few exceptions aside, hardly anyone has followed the lead of Karl Deutsch in this respect. In addition to this, Deutsch's focus was on NATO and the transatlantic 'security community', rather than on European integration per se (but see Deutsch *et al.* 1967). It is telling that one of the few recent pieces that comes close to transactionalism subsumes Deutsch's work under neofunctionalism, and focuses on transnational exchange as one of the independent variables influencing the form of supranational organization, rather than on different forms of community as a result of communication across borders (Stone Sweet and Sandholtz 1997).

A second omission in this book is that of 'pure' economic theories of integration. In this respect, we do not believe that there can be a purely economic theory of European integration as defined above, which is above all a political and social process. To the extent that economic theories exist in this field, they are looking at particular aspects and especially the effects of economic integration, and are thus not theories of European integration as such (see Balassa 1962; El-Agraa 1982). Economic theories have, however, found their way into some of the approaches covered, such as liberal intergovernmentalism, where predictions about the outcome of domestic bargains over national interests are made on the basis of economic theorems, or political economy, which however criticizes the division of economics from the other social sciences, and they are therefore discussed within these contexts. However, we do not think that an economic theory as such is currently playing a major part in the integration theory debates, nor are we convinced that it should be.

Last but not least, the approaches included in this book have in their majority (but by no means all) been formulated by scholars working in English, and within the Anglo-Saxon scholarly community. This is a problem to the extent that we are thereby imposing a narrative of the development of European integration theory on scientific communities that may have had a very different experience, and we may have overlooked important and exciting theoretical developments in that process—European integration theory outside the Anglo-Saxon boundaries may indeed be 'the best kept secret' (Jørgensen 2000 for international relations theory; see also Friedrichs 2004). Having said that, the success of approaches beyond national boundaries requires its formulation in what is increasingly becoming the lingua franca of academia. This is not to say that there are no interesting developments outside what is accessible in English. It is also true that there are particular academic styles that differ between national academic communities, and that translating from another language into English does not always properly convey the meaning of the original. As an overview and a stocktaking exercise, we had to base our selection on what we regarded as success across borders, and English-speaking publications remain in many ways the yardstick for such an exercise, even if this is problematic.

Studying Integration Theory

Contexts of Theoretical Development

The story of integration theory can be told from a chronological angle or with a focus on theoretical debates and the specific issues covered. Our account combines a chronological perspective with a perspective on debates because there are distinct themes and controversies to particular *phases* of European integration theory. Telling the story of integration theory in these terms is not uncommon (cf. the overviews by Caporaso and Keeler 1995; Bache and George 2001; Rosamond 2000; Eilstrup-Sangiovanni 2006). More contested is the question of how the theoretical approaches relate to each other. There are two aspects to this issue. The first relates to the emergence of theories and the movement from one dominant approach to another, and can therefore be seen as a contribution to the history and sociology of European integration studies. The second is concerned with the 'fit' of theories (above all whether they are compatible or competing with each other), and is therefore a contribution to theory-building in itself.

Starting with the historical-sociological approach, there are two factors that are often seen as influencing the development of theories, the academic and the sociopolitical context (Rosamond 2000: 9). The academic context consists of debates and problems that are pursued in the wider scientific context of a particular field as well as the legacies of previous debates in the field itself. Of particular importance in this context are 'paradigms' that provide researchers with guideposts about how to conduct and present their studies (see Kuhn 1964). The sociopolitical context, in contrast, consists of factors outside of academia, such as the development of the object under analysis, the influence of sponsors on research agendas, or the discursive restrictions set by a particular political climate. In addition, both of these contexts can be coloured by national differences.

Our account of the three phases of European integration theory above provides plenty of examples for how the study of European integration has followed the ups and downs of its subject. The rise, fall, and comeback of neofunctionalism in the 1950s, following the Empty Chair crisis and the Single European Act respectively, provide the most obvious case. The relation between the sociopolitical context and the development of theory is, however, not a one-way street. Thus, not only was neofunctionalism developed on the basis of what happened in Western Europe in the 1950s, neofunctionalism itself also became the quasi-official ideology in the Commission and other parts of the EC institutions. Ironically, as George and Bache (2006) point out, it is today often used by so-called Eurosceptics to increase fears of a technocratic, centralized, and undemocratic super-state, whereas governments supportive of further integration tend to resort to the intergovernmentalist rhetoric of sovereignty being only 'pooled' in order to alleviate these fears.

While the influence of the EU's development on integration theory may be obvious, the academic context has been no less forceful in shaping the way in which integration has been conceptualized and analysed. As Rosamond (1995: 394) argues, theoretical approaches to the analysis of European integration 'have arisen in the context of dominant perspectives in the broad arena of social scientific inquiry' and are 'bound up with intellectual fashion and debates between and within different theoretical paradigms'. Thus, if we had included a list of major works in other social sciences and neighbouring fields in

this introduction
tion studies are of
as political science
Neofunctionalist
earlier versions of
European inte
versies in that it
realist paradigm
litical science ma
debate became e
core, either on t
turn hindered th
and Williams 20
the acceptance o
development of
that could be in
and Williams 20
efited greatly fro
which provided
important influ
Interestingly,
rather than the s
a crucial part in
been developed
explained by the
tions (see Wæver
tion theory deve
historically or
of particular po
third phase of i
them advocating
model. Among
or regional line
analysis. To give
from a Scandim
1999; Wæver B
originated in G
would have to
to suggest that

Competing e

The importance
tion theory rais
to each other. I

this introduction, we would have seen that theoretical movements in European integration studies are often preceded by or run in parallel with developments in disciplines such as political science, legal studies, and IR in particular, as our overview has demonstrated. Neofunctionalism provides yet again a good example with its social-scientific turn against earlier versions of functionalism (see Caporaso and Keeler 1995: 32–4; Kelstrup 1998: 24).

European integration also became an instrument for the pursuit of academic controversies in that it served as ammunition for the critique of the dominant, state-centred realist paradigm (George and Bache 2006); and again this mirrors debates in IR and political science more widely. Thereby, the neofunctionalism versus intergovernmentalism debate became embedded in a discourse in which the model of the state remained at the core, either on the national or on the European level (see Rosamond 1995), which in turn hindered the development of a debate about legitimacy 'beyond the state' (Kelstrup and Williams 2000: 8). That such a debate eventually became possible is not only due to the acceptance of the EU as a polity discussed above (see Hix 1994: 10), but also to the development of normative, critical, and constructivist approaches in other social sciences that could be imported into the third phase of European integration theory (Kelstrup and Williams 2000: 1, 9). Similarly, the comparativist project of the second phase benefited greatly from the previous development of neo-institutionalist research in sociology, which provided comparativists with new concepts to analyse political institutions as an important influence on politics in their own right.

Interestingly, it is the academic context where national differences seem to matter most, rather than the sociopolitical context, and the problem of language discussed earlier plays a crucial part in this. It is perhaps ironic that most of the classic integration theories have been developed in the United States, rather than within Europe. This, however, can be explained by the dominance of theory-driven American social science in international relations (see Wæver 1998a), from which the approaches in the crucial first phase of integration theory developed. 'European' approaches have traditionally tended to be much more historically or normatively oriented, or have been engaged in detailed empirical studies of particular policies (Smith and Ray 1993). Only with the advent of the second and the third phase of integration theory are there more clearly audible European voices—most of them advocating a form of social inquiry that is different from the American social science model. Among these voices, there is also a certain degree of differentiation along national or regional lines, although whether this is more than coincidental would require further analysis. To give but two examples, discursive studies of the EU have by and large emerged from a Scandinavian context (e.g. Hansen and Wæver 2002; Larsen 1997a, b; Neumann 1999; Wæver 1998b), whereas two major studies on ideas and European governance have originated in Germany (Jachtenfuchs *et al.* 1998; Marcussen *et al.* 2001). Further research would have to be done to substantiate these initial findings, but they are striking enough to suggest that particular approaches often have a regional centre.

Competing or Complementary Approaches?

The importance of sociopolitical and academic contexts for the development of integration theory raises fundamental questions about the relationship of individual approaches to each other. Does the discussion in the last section imply that instead of moving to one

unified theory, these approaches offer different perspectives that are largely determined by the contexts in which they are developed? Are these perspectives mutually exclusive, and can the arguments they put forward be tested against each other? How, in short, is one to compare the different theoretical approaches?

At the extremes of this debate are, on the one hand, the notion of scientific progress, where through falsification our knowledge of integration advances, and, on the other hand, the notion of incommensurable paradigms, which, in effect, construct and talk about different realities, and between which a dialogue is hardly possible. If we take the different understandings of theory advanced above, the more scientifically minded will generally tend towards the former, those with a broader understanding of theory towards the latter pole. Consequently, Moravcsik (1998) for instance, in his major contribution to the development of European integration theory, tests different theories against each other in order to establish a (liberal-intergovernmentalist) ground on which future theory can build. His exchange with Diez as well as with Risse and Wiener on the value of this contribution, however, can serve as an example for talking past each other because of very different agendas, concepts, and definitions that emerge from very different contexts (see Diez 1999c; Moravcsik 1999c, 2001c; Risse and Wiener 2001).

While we agree that scientific progress is ultimately influenced by its academic and sociopolitical context, we nonetheless find the argument of incommensurability problematic. Most integration theories have been developed within the context of Western academia, and although their pedigree differs, and consequently their ontological and epistemological foundations, they share quite a lot of common ground, as will become more obvious when reading through the chapters of this book. To the extent that they are incompatible, this is a consequence not of their inherent incommensurability, but of the claims they make about their scope. In other words, many theorists make broader claims such as 'explaining integration', when what they really do is a much more limited enterprise, for instance explaining results of intergovernmental conferences, criticizing a particular conceptualization of integration, or seeking to understand the historical development of a particular aspect of integration. This problem, as well as the criticism of it, is not new. Puchala already remarked in 1972 that

different schools of researchers have exalted different parts of the integration 'elephant'. They have claimed either that their parts were in fact whole beasts, or that their parts were the most important ones, the others being of marginal interest.

Puchala (1972: 268)

Inappropriate scope claims take an ontological and an epistemological form. Ontologically, approaches often explicitly or implicitly claim to provide a theoretical approach to (European) integration as such, while they in fact focus on a particular process or outcome. If this claim is relaxed, it should be possible to combine different approaches depending on the subject of analysis. Epistemologically, approaches would only be incommensurable if they claimed to have the same purpose and if they were directly related to reality. If, however, we assume that approaches can have different purposes, and if, perhaps more controversially, we further assume that our understanding of reality is always mediated by particular discursive contexts, which seems particularly opportune in the face of the multiperspectival character of the European Union (Ruggie 1993), then it

is possible to see
into a single, gra

Even if two ap
might still be d
claim) are two d
and the role of
Sweet and Sand
part through w
(see also Branch
1995: 398). All
testable against
essarily make th
ing the scope of

The approach
on the subject
ject. They cann
one needs to ac
differ in this re
eventually put
tors either, alth
against each of
The picture of
have to revisi
raises about th

For now, it
which these a
tant. One is ab
areas that the

The Function

There are th
parallel to the

1. *Theory as e*
approache
in the met
purpose in
has come
to happen
(2000)). T
their argu
methodol
these som
variant. N

is possible to see different approaches adding to a larger picture without being combined into a single, grand theory.

Even if two approaches agree on the aim of explaining integration, for instance, they might still be difficult to compare if what they mean by integration (ontological scope claim) are two different things. Moravcsik, for instance, focuses on political integration and the role of intergovernmental bargains, whereas neofunctionalists such as Stone Sweet and Sandholtz (1997) see integration as a much more social process happening in part through what they call 'transnational exchange' between member states societies (see also Branch and Øhrgaard 1999; on liberal intergovernmentalism see also Rosamond 1995: 398). All of these are respectable accomplishments in their own rights, and hardly testable against each other (see also Hix 1994: 3). Yet, at the same time, this does not necessarily make them incommensurable once there is a certain modesty introduced regarding the scope of the argument made.

The approaches in this book therefore can be seen as providing different perspectives on the subject of integration, each contributing to our overall understanding of the subject. They cannot easily be lumped together to form a grand theory of integration because one needs to adopt one's own viewpoint in order to 'make them work', and we therefore differ in this respect from the project of developing an overarching framework as it was eventually pursued even by Puchala (1972). However, they are not always direct competitors either, although some of them will indeed formulate hypotheses that can be tested against each other. Instead, one might see them as stones in an always-incomplete *mosaic*. The picture of integration that emerges from them is a multifaceted one—a point we will have to revisit in the conclusion to this volume, together with some of the questions this raises about the advancement and value of theory.

For now, it is important to develop an understanding of the main dimensions along which these approaches differ. We consider two such dimensions as particularly important. One is about the functions of theory briefly referred to above; the other is about the areas that the approaches analyse.

The Functions of Theory

There are three main functions of theory (broadly understood), and these run roughly parallel to the three main phases of integration theory identified above.

1. *Theory as explanation or understanding.* Although explaining and understanding approaches differ widely in the epistemological claims they make, and consequently in the methodologies they apply (see Hollis and Smith 1990), they share a common purpose in the sense that they ask why (explaining) or how (understanding) an event has come about. To that extent, they ask for reasons and/or causes for something to happen (on reasons and causes, see the discussion in Wendt (1999) and S. Smith (2000)). They differ predominantly in relation to the degree to which they consider their arguments generalizable or dependent on specific contexts, warranting different methodologies. The approaches in the first phase of integration theory have asked these sorts of questions, and most of them have leaned towards the 'explanation' variant. More recent approaches such as social constructivism have sometimes asked

similar questions, and while most social constructivists would see themselves in the 'understanding business', at least some of them have leaned towards 'explaining'.

2. *Theory as description and analysis.* This might at first seem like a waste-bin category, but it is not. Approaches in this category focus on the development of definitions and concepts with which to grasp particular developments, practices, and institutions. They provide labels and classifications. In that sense, explaining and understanding approaches have to presuppose descriptive and analytical approaches because the latter provide the former with the concepts on the basis of which events can be explained or understood. Likewise, an 'underlying theory' is an important part of any classificatory exercise (Grigorevich Mirkin 1996: 23). In the second phase of integration theory, we would expect a focus on description and analysis because one of the aims of these approaches was to provide a vocabulary with which to capture 'the nature of the beast' (Risse-Kappen 1996), to 'classify' the EU as a polity and to understand its main features and processes.
3. *Theory as critique and normative intervention.* While approaches in the first two categories take the development of integration more or less as a given, other approaches question the route that the integration process, or a particular policy, has taken, or develop norms and principles for the future of integration. Approaches in this category therefore either problematize a given development, or they develop normative alternatives. Theory in this understanding is often much closer to what one might call philosophy, or perhaps only 'abstract reflection', but in the form of normative theory, it has always had its rightful place in the canon of political theory, and many critical theories have recently been added to this (Tully 2002, 2008). At least some of the approaches included in our third phase of integration theory fall into this category.

If theory has such different purposes, it would be unfair and not even valid to hold one approach accountable on the basis of criteria set by another one. Evaluating and weighing theoretical approaches against each other therefore always has to take account of the principal function or purpose that the approach assigns to itself, unless we want to impose one common purpose on all theoretical approaches.

The Areas of Theory

It is, however, not only the purpose of theory that varies, but also the area, or the 'object' of particular approaches. Analysing member states' integration policy is different from, although related to, reflecting on the best institutional set-up for the EU, and consequently may require a different methodology. These areas of theory are a second, independent dimension on which theoretical approaches can differ from each other. Again, we propose three different areas, which we have delineated along the triad of polity, policy, and politics.

1. *Theory dealing with polity.* 'Polity' refers to the political community and its institutions. Approaches falling into this category would be those analysing the 'nature of the beast', those explaining how the EU's institutional structure came

about, or the
consideration

2. *Theory dealing with concrete policy content, or the general standards set to our definitions for instance normative u*
3. *Theory dealing with daily struggles bargaining dominance with political participatory process, or political str*

As these definitions strictly to one frames in which as the implications are likely to equal measurement policy, and political (the explaining aim at explaining (here politics) approach.

The Mosaic

Combining theory. Keeping in the nine approach can picture is like the picture. Each approach can be mutually ex

about, or those trying to find constitutional alternatives on the basis of normative considerations, to give examples taken from all three functions of theory.

2. *Theory dealing with policy.* 'Policy' includes the actual measures taken to tackle concrete problems, and theoretical approaches in this area analyse and compare their content, or critically reflect upon them. This includes aspects such as 'policy style, the general problem-solving approach, the policy instruments used, and the policy standards set' (Börzel and Risse 2000: 3). However, to qualify as theory according to our definition above, such analyses need to be brought onto an abstract level, for instance by drawing out general patterns of policy content, or reflecting on the normative underpinnings within a policy field.
3. *Theory dealing with politics.* 'Politics' comprises the process of policy-making and the daily struggles and strategies of political actors dealing with each other. It is about the bargaining between governments, the influence of particular interest groups, or the dominance of a specific style of how decisions are reached. Approaches concerned with politics look at such issues as why technocratic governance prevails over participatory governance, how interest groups try to influence the policy-making process, or how particular groups are systematically disadvantaged by the dominant political style.

As these definitions have illustrated, it would be rather difficult empirically to stick strictly to one of these areas. Any discussion of polity is likely to involve constitutional frames in which policy-making takes place, or which restrict the content of policy, as well as the implication of constitutional arrangements for politics. Nonetheless, approaches are likely to emphasize one or the other, and not deal with all three poles of the triad in equal measure. Moreover, to the extent that they want to explain, they will use polity, policy, and politics either as the *explanandum* (what is to be explained) or the *explanans* (the explaining factor). However, a theoretical approach such as neofunctionalism might aim at explaining integration outcomes (here polity), while focusing on their explanation (here politics). Therefore, one has to specify how the areas of theory figure within each approach.

The Mosaic of Integration Theory

Combining these two dimensions, we arrive at what we call the mosaic of integration theory. Keeping the caveats raised above in mind, theoretical approaches can be located in the nine cells of Table 1.2. Its character as a 'mosaic' comes from the fact that each approach can be seen as a stone that adds to the picture that we gain of the EU. This picture is likely to remain unfinished, as new approaches will add new stones to change the picture. To reiterate, our point is that rather than directly competing with each other, each approach contributes to the emerging picture in its own limited way. The contributions can be ambiguous—as is the EU itself in many ways—but they are not necessarily mutually exclusive and incommensurable, as is often assumed. Placing an approach in

Table 1.2 The functions and areas of (integration) theory

	Polity	Policy	Politics
Explanatory/understanding			
Analytical/descriptive			
Critical/normative			

a particular part of the mosaic therefore clarifies with which approaches it actually competes in a rather narrow field.

Even if this is the case, however, any two approaches may still not be directly testable against each other. The example of liberal intergovernmentalism versus neofunctionalism illustrates this. In this case, while both approaches want to explain the political process of reaching a decision, and to some extent the outcome of that process in terms of its effects on the polity, they analyse different aspects of the decision-making process because they start from a different definition of integration. The distinction of various analytical areas is therefore a rather general one that always needs to be supplemented by a closer look at the basic concepts and definitions that approaches use within their area. This is not only true for the area- but also for the function-dimension. Because we have lumped together explaining and understanding, analytical and descriptive, critical and normative, approaches even within one cell are not necessarily directly comparable, as the epistemological claims they make differ widely, and thus the scope of their argument.

As we have pointed out above, approaches will usually find themselves in more than one category. The mosaic should not be seen as an exercise in compartmentalization. Quite the opposite: it is a heuristic device that allows us to move beyond fruitless debates in which approaches operating in different areas and pursuing different purposes talk past each other. Besides, even though approaches will cross the imaginary boundaries of the identified fields, they will tend to focus on one or the other—life is too short, and book space too restricted to deal with everything.

Reviewing Integration Theory

The Structure of the Chapters

Although the structure of individual chapters varies, they all address a set of questions that will help in the comparison between theoretical approaches and the assessment of their compatibility or incommensurability. Each author was asked to summarize the origins of the approach covered, its main arguments, and development over time. As the majority of the authors were substantially involved in the development of 'their' approach, these sections are to be seen not only as an introduction, but also as a reflection on the current state of the art of each approach in relation to earlier work. Chapters also include

an overview of
from the perspe
potential ways

However, in
we have asked
puzzle that the
has been a focu
integration the
in the area that
in which they
addressed, or w
contributions t
about enlargem

On the basis
approaches de
raised in this
when reading
tions on the p
European integ

Past, Present

'Past, present, a
First, each chap
main puzzles a
forward, addre
parts of this w
seen as an exp
that have been
a considerable
ars; present in t
of governance
in the sense th
unlikely to do
account, as the

We have alre
along which th
we see in the
tribute to an e
and its develop
ment of one s
approaches. Th
comes, and the
can thrive.

an overview of the main debates surrounding approaches, including the criticism raised from the perspective of other approaches, the main current questions facing authors, and potential ways forwards.

However, in order to come to a consistent and reflected comparison of the approaches, we have asked authors to include a section in which they provide an example of a specific puzzle that they think 'their' approach is particularly apt to address, and which in the past has been a focus of many works written in this tradition. If our argument about European integration theory as a mosaic holds, we expect approaches to differ in their 'best case', or in the area that they focus upon. We have furthermore asked authors to include a section in which they summarize, or speculate on, how works written from their approach have addressed, or would address the issue of enlargement as a test case. Again, we expect the contributions to focus on different areas of, but also to ask different types of questions about enlargement, illustrating the different functions of theory.

On the basis of these two sections where authors provide examples of how their approaches deal with concrete issues, we will return in the conclusion to the questions raised in this introduction, but we also invite readers to make their own comparisons when reading this book, and to use these sections as a starting point for critical reflections on the past or ongoing debates summarized in each chapter, and thereby pushing European integration theory forward.

Past, Present, and Future

'Past, present, and future' provides an organizing theme for this book in a double sense. First, each chapter, by reflecting on the origins and development of each approach, on the main puzzles addressed and the state of the art, and on the current challenges and ways forward, addresses the past, present, and future of each approach. Secondly, the three parts of this volume reflecting the three phases of European integration theory can be seen as an expression of past, present, and future: past in the sense of a set of approaches that have been with us since the early days of integration theory, have been developed to a considerable degree, and have influenced subsequent generations of integration scholars; present in the sense that a lot of theoretical work today has shifted towards questions of governance that combine international relations and comparative politics; and future in the sense that a set of novel approaches raises a number of issues which, although unlikely to dominate theoretical development in the future, will have to be taken into account, as they are now taken into account in other social sciences.

We have already made clear that we do not wish to reinforce some of the fault(y) lines along which the field of European integration theory was divided in the past. Instead, we see in the present a healthy trend towards a proliferation of approaches that contribute to an ever more faceted and nuanced picture of the European Union, its history and its development. What we would like to see in the future is neither the development of one single grand theory, nor the isolation and non-communication between approaches. The following chapters should help to clarify from where each approach comes, and the scope of its argument, so that a critical but constructive and open debate can thrive.