Introduction to the Paper

*Lectures:* There will be sixteen lectures given by Dr Brooke across Michaelmas and Lent Terms. They will take place on Thursdays, at 9 in both Michaelmas and Lent in Alison Richard Building Room 138. The bulk of this document outlines the kind of material that will be discussed in those sessions.

*Supervisions:* Students taking this paper can expect six supervisions, normally three in each of Michaelmas and Lent Terms, to be arranged with Dr Brooke.

*Assessment:* The Tripos examination paper in Easter Term will contain twelve questions, and candidates will answer three questions. The questions will cover a broad range of topics considered in the course, but will not necessarily narrowly track the weekly lecture topics, and may require candidates to put together material from the different parts of syllabus. Candidates are therefore advised to revise broadly. The Tripos papers from 2016 and 2017 are included at the end of this document, and give a decent idea of what the exam might look like (though this year’s iteration of the course has a little more historical and a little less recent theoretical material).

*Foreign Languages:* Although the bulk of the material on the reading lists that follow is in English, a number of items are in French, and there is a small amount in other languages. This reflects the subject-matter: there are important primary texts that have not been translated, and there is significant current non-Anglophone scholarship which does not have suitable equivalents in English. This material is listed, in order to make it available to students who can read these languages, and to indicate the kind of material that will be discussed in the lectures. But the course has not been designed with an assumption that students can read these languages, and care will be taken when constructing course assignments (and setting the exam paper) not to disadvantage those students who can only read the English-language texts and scholarship.
COURSE OUTLINE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Michaelmas Term:**

1. Introduction: the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
2. 1713-1756: Saint-Pierre and the French Enlightenment
3. 1756-1789: Rousseau and the Physiocrats
4. 1789-1814: the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars
5. 1814-1830: Saint-Simon, the Restoration, and Congress Europe
6. 1830-1849: nationalists, socialists, republicans, and the Polish Question
7. 1849-1871: the new Bonapartism, Proudhon, and the 1860s peace movements
8. 1871-1890: the age of Bismarck: Nietzsche and the new international law

**Lent Term:**

9. 1890-1914: the liberals, customs unions, and imperialism
10. 1883-1917: the Marxists: Austro-Marxism, the SPD, and the Bolsheviks
11. 1918-1939: between the Wars: from Pan-Europe to Federal Union
12. 1939-1957: the Second World War and the creation of the EEC
13. Hayek, neoliberalism, and interstate federalism
14. MacCormick, legal theory, and sovereignty in Europe
15. The nature and future of the European polity
16. Conclusion: contemporary crises of the European Union

What follows presents an outline of the material to be covered in the sixteen lectures to be given over the course of Michaelmas and Lent Terms, with some thoughts on suitable literature. (To some extent they function as lecture handouts.) Additional reading may be suggested along with essay assignments or in lectures. Students are encouraged to explore further, especially in the stacks of the University Library, which contains a large amount of relevant material.

**GENERAL OVERVIEWS**

The reading lists that follow will focus on the literature that speaks most closely to the particular periods or topics being considered in the various lectures. But we begin with some books that offer an overview of the general theme of the course, or something close to it, with which you will do well to familiarise yourselves over the course of the year.


Perry Anderson has written various pieces on European union in recent years, some of which are collected in *The Old New Europe* (London: Verso, 2009), especially ch. 9 on the ‘Antecedents’ of the European Union, and more recently there were three long essays for the *London Review of Books*: ‘The European coup’, vol. 42, no. 24 (17 December 2020), ‘Ever closer union?’, vol. 43, no. 1, (7 January 2021), and ‘The breakaway: goodbye Europe’, vol. 43, no. 2 (21 January 2021).

**MICHAELMAS TERM**

**Week One: Introduction: the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries**


*Suggested supervision essay question:*

In what senses, if any, did Europe exist before 1700?

What accounts for the major differences between the various seventeenth-century peace plans?
The abbé de Saint-Pierre wrote a lot. The easiest place to find his ideas is in Charles Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre, *A Project for Settling an Everlasting Peace in Europe…* (London: Ferdinand Burleigh, 1714), which is available through ECCO (and also in the UL Rare Books Room). There is also a volume of *Selections from the Second Edition of the Abrégé du projet de paix perpétuelle*, H. Hale Bellot, trans. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, Limited, 1927).


Suggested supervision essay questions:

Was the Abbé de Saint-Pierre as naïve as his critics charged?

What was at stake in the disagreements between Voltaire and the Abbé de Saint-Pierre?

Week Three: 1756-1789: Rousseau and the Physiocrats


If you’re interested in contemporary international political theory, you might usefully read


*Suggested supervision essay questions:*

Why is it so difficult to reconstruct Rousseau’s international political thought?

To what extent was the eighteenth-century debate about European confederation a debate about economics?

Is Rousseau better understood as a disciple or as a critic of the abbé de Saint-Pierre?

**Week Four: 1789-1814: the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars**


For Edmund Burke’s international thought at the time of the French Revolution, see Jennifer M. Welsh, Edmund Burke and International Relations: The Commonwealth of Europe and the Crusade against the French Revolution (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), and Welsh, ‘Edmund Burke and the commonwealth of Europe: the cultural bases of international order’ in Ian Clark and Iver Neumann, eds. Classical Theories of International Relations (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 173-92.


Suggested supervision essay questions:

How should the French Revolutionary context affect, if at all, the way we interpret Kant’s essay on perpetual peace?

Who had the better of the Gentz-Hauterive debate?

Is it plausible to view Napoleon’s ‘Continental System’ as the basis for a scheme of Perpetual Peace?

Week Five: 1814-1830: Saint-Simon, the Restoration, and Congress Europe


For this topic, and for Weeks Six, Seven, and Eight, a vast amount of relevant material is presented in W. H. van der Linden, *The International Peace Movement, 1815-1874* (Amsterdam: Tilleul, 1987).

**Suggested supervision essay questions:**

Is there anything distinctively ‘socialist’ about Saint-Simon’s scheme for the reorganisation of Europe?

Compare and contrast the ideas of Saint-Simon and Joseph de Maistre for recasting European politics.

How did the rise of Russian power transform the problem of European political organisation around the time of the Congress of Vienna?

**Week Six: 1830-1849: nationalists, socialists, republicans, and the Polish Question**

For transnational aspects of the Revolutions of 1830, see Sylvie Aprile and Jean-Claude Caron, eds. *La liberté guidant les peuples: les révolutions de 1830 en Europe* (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2013).


For the 1832 Hambach Festival, see Erich Schunk in Klaus Ries, ed. *Europa im Vormärz: Eine transnationale Spurensuche* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2016), pp. 87-97 (and see Manfred Hettling’s contribution for some caution about the transnational aspect of 1848).


Suggested supervision essay questions:

Did nineteenth-century republicans offer a plausible model for combining patriotism and cosmopolitanism?

To what extent did the problem of European unification look different between 1830 and 1848 from the perspective of each bank of the Rhine?

Week Seven: 1849-1871: the new Bonapartism, Proudhon, and the 1860s peace movements


Left internationalist organisations of the 1860s include the International Working Men’s Association, Mazzini’s Universal Republican Alliance, Frédéric Passy’s International and Permanent Peace League, and Charles Lemonnier’s International League for Peace and Freedom, which published a journal called *Les États-Unis d’Europe*. For a brief statement of Lemonnier’s general view, see ‘The problem of European peace and its progressive solution by means of tribunals of international jurisdiction based on federations of European states’ (London, 1887) [text to be circulated].


Also interesting from the 1860s is Michel Chevalier, ‘La guerre et la crise européenne’, *Revue des deux mondes*, vol. 36 (1866), pp. 758-85.

*Suggested supervision essay questions:*

Did the political fall-out from the 1848 Revolutions make a united Europe a more or less distant goal?

Why were the anarchists interested in the International League for Peace and Freedom?

When it comes to thinking about European co-operation, was Michel Chevalier’s passage from Saint-Simonianism to Bonapartism marked more by continuity or change?

*Week Eight: 1871-1890: the age of Bismarck: Nietzsche and the new international law*


In general, on international law, see Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: the rise and fall of international law 1870-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,


**Suggested supervision essay questions:**

Were the international lawyers presenting familiar arguments about European unification, but in a distinctive jargon, or was there really something new here?

Is it possible to present Nietzsche’s ideas about Europe in a way that is both coherent and attractive?

**LENT TERM**

**Week One: 1890-1914: the liberals, customs unions, and imperialism**


Turning to the liberals, for W. T. Stead, see *The United States of Europe on the Eve of the Parliament of Peace* (London: William Clowes, 1899); also *The Americanization of the World, or the Trend of the Twentieth Century* (New York, NY: Horace Markley, 1901); and *The Last Will and Testament of Cecil John Rhodes: with elucidatory notes to which are added some chapters describing the political and religious ideas of the testator* (London: Review of Reviews Office, 1902).


*Suggested supervision essay question:*

‘The United States of Europe…may be much nearer than even the most sanguine amongst us venture at present to hope’ [W. T. STEAD, 1899]. To what extent was this a reasonable view to hold at the turn of the twentieth century?
Week Two: 1883-1917: the Marxists: Austro-Marxism, the SPD, and the Bolsheviks


*Suggested supervision essay questions:*

What, if anything, was distinctively Marxist about Marxists’ arguments about European union in the period before 1917?

‘The solution of the European union within the capitalist social order can objectively, in the economic sense, mean only a tariff war with America, and in the political sense only a colonial race war’ [ROSA LUXEMBURG]. Discuss.
Week Three: 1918-1939: between the Wars: from Pan-Europe to Federal Union


Suggested supervision essay questions:

Was the project of European unification in the interwar period largely a project of the Left or of the Right?

How was debate about uniting Europe different after the First World War, compared with what had gone before?

Week Four: 1939-1957: the Second World War and the creation of the EEC


Since the War, there have been discussions of ‘the idea of Europe’, contributing to a kind of philosophical inquiry which has continued down to the present day. See, e.g., F. Chabod, ‘L’idea di Europa’, La Rassegna d’Italia (1947), pp. 3-17, 25-37; Stuart Woolf, ‘Reading Federico Chabod’s Storia dell’idea d’Europa half a century later’, Journal of Modern Italian


Suggested supervision essay questions:

What, if anything, is there to be learned from postwar debates about ‘the idea of Europe’?

Is the creation of the European Economic Community best understood as the rescue or the abolition of the democratic European nation-state?

What is the significance of the fact that the European Union was founded in the period of decolonization?

Week Five: Hayek, neoliberalism, and interstate federalism

The key text is Hayek’s 1939 essay, ‘The economic conditions of interstate federalism’, reprinted in his collection Individualism and Economic Order (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1949), pp. 255-72. It can usefully be read alongside The Road to Serfdom (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1944), which was written only a few years later. Hayek really didn’t like the Saint-Simonians: The Counter-

For a broader historical arguments about the origins of neoliberalism in interwar internationalist thought, see Quinn Slobodian, Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018).


Suggested supervision essay questions:

Is the European Union best understood as a departure from, or as one more step along, Hayek’s ‘road to serfdom’?

Does today’s European Union owe more to the ideas of Hayek or of Saint-Simon?

To what extent does Slobodian’s argument about the origins of neoliberalism apply to the origins of the unification of Europe?

Week Six: MacCormick, legal theory, and sovereignty in Europe


**Suggested supervision essay question:**

Is Neil MacCormick’s argument about sovereignty a persuasive one?

Has Neil MacCormick’s legal theory stood the test of time?

**Week Seven: The nature and future of the European polity**


**Suggested supervision essay questions:**

If the European Union is understood as a kind of empire, as what kind of empire is it best understood?

Can there be a European democracy in the absence of a European demos?

What, if anything, is there still to be said on behalf of a European super-state?
Week Eight: Conclusion: contemporary crises of the European Union


*Suggested supervision essay questions:*

Who won the Habermas/Streeck debate?

How might the history of the argument about European union inform today’s conversations about Britain and the EU after Brexit?

**APPENDIX: A SAMPLE EXAMINATION PAPER**

1. Were the pre-1800 schemes for ‘perpetual peace’ (and the like) utopian? Discuss with reference to AT LEAST THREE such peace plans.

2. ‘Ideas about commerce and money have produced a sort of political fanaticism, they cause the apparent interests of all Princes to change so suddenly that one cannot establish any stable maxim based on their true interests, because now everything depends on economic systems, most of them extremely bizarre, which run through the heads of ministers.’ [ROUSSEAU] Discuss with reference to arguments about European unity.

3. Was the ideal of the ‘universal republic’ a reasonable extrapolation from French Revolutionary politics?

4. What, if anything, was the enduring significance of contributions to the debate on European union at the close of the Napoleonic period? Discuss with reference to AT LEAST TWO of Saint-Simon, Maistre, Schmidt-Phiseldek, and the Holy Alliance.

5. Were the arguments about European union in the 1830s and the 1840s new ones?

6. In what ways were arguments about European union, 1848-1914, better understood as arguments about imperialism? Discuss with reference to AT LEAST TWO of the liberals, the republicans, the anarchists, the international lawyers, and the Marxists.

7. To what extent can the pre-twentieth century arguments about European union be extricated from their religious context?
8. Did Pan-Europa matter?

9. How much do arguments about ‘Eurafrica’ actually illuminate?

10. Is there a contradiction between a commitment to neoliberalism on the one hand and to building a strong European Union on the other?

11. Have proponents of European unification got good answers to objections from those who build their case on the terrain of national democratic sovereignty?

12. Why has the problem of British membership in a European union been so fraught for so long?

APPENDIX B: THE 2016 AND 2017 POL18 TRIPOS PAPERS

2016

1. ‘All the powers of Europe form a sort of system among themselves which unites them by one single religion, the same international law, morals, literature, commerce, and a sort of equilibrium that is the necessary effect of all this, and which, without anyone in fact thinking about preserving it, would not be as simple to break up as many people think.’ [ROUSSEAU] Discuss.

2. Which of the eighteenth-century criticisms of the Abbé de Saint-Pierre’s peace plan were good ones, and which were not?

3. Did the period of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars (1789-1815) transform the problem of European unification, and, if so, how?

4. Was the ‘United States of Europe’ in the nineteenth century ever really more than just a slogan?

5. What were the particular challenges facing EITHER anarchists OR socialists in developing their thinking about the unification of Europe?

6. What, if any, is the distinctive contribution that legal theorists have made to political arguments about European integration?

7. To what extent does the European Union represent the triumph of political Catholicism?

8. Why is it so hard to disentangle ideas of a European union over the last three hundred years from the ambition to dominate Muslims?

9. Is the European single market a Hayekian project?

10. Does thinking about today’s European Union in terms of ‘neo-mediævalism’ illuminate more than it misleads?
11. Why have quite so many of the various ideas of a European union been manufactured in France?

12. Does adequate political thinking about the future of the European Union require an engagement with arguments from the past?

2017

1. ‘One cannot deny that it is above all to Christianity that Europe still owes today the sort of society that has endured among its members.’ [ROUSSEAU] Discuss.

2. Why did the Abbé de Saint-Pierre think that it would be possible to combine monarchies and republics in the same European confederation?

3. EITHER [a] Why were writers of the Revolutionary period so interested in the idea that Europe had until recently formed a single commonwealth or republic? Discuss with respect to AT LEAST TWO of Burke, Gentz, and Hauterive.

   OR [b] Why did the question of ‘spiritual power’ feature so prominently in schemes for the reorganisation of Europe after the defeat of Napoleon?

4. ‘I recognise as my brothers all members of Young Europe and commit towards them all the duties of fraternity in whatever place and time they ask it of me.’ [The Oath of Allegiance to Young Europe.] Why was the idea of brotherhood so central to the politics of nineteenth-century transnational republicanism?

5. To what extent can the ideas of Bluntschli and Lorimer about European unification be disentangled from their ideas about race?

6. What have been the most powerful left-wing arguments against the political and economic unification of Europe?

7. To what extent does the European Union reflect the ideals of movements ‘from below’? Discuss with respect to AT LEAST TWO of the International League for Peace and Freedom, Pan-Europa, and the Resistance.

8. Has the debate over the ‘idea of Europe’ generated any interesting conclusions?

9. Is the European Union best understood as an imperial or as a post-imperial formation?

10. Is the Hayekian case for a single European currency stronger or weaker than the Hayekian case against?

11. EITHER [a] Should we think of the European Union in terms of sovereignty, non-sovereignty, or post-sovereignty?


12. To what extent have ideas of a European union been shaped by geopolitics? Answer with respect to AT LEAST TWO of the United States of America, Russia (including the Soviet Union), and Turkey (including the Ottoman Empire).
APPENDIX C: THE 2016 AND 2017 EXAMINERS’ REPORTS

2016

Nine candidates sat the paper. There were four answers on each of Qs 9 (Hayek) and 10 (neomedievalism), three on 4 (the United States of Europe), 5 (anarchists and socialists), and 7 (political Catholicism), two on 3 (1789-1815), 6 (legal theorists), 11 (France), and 12 (the future), and one on 1 (Rousseau) and 2 (Saint-Pierre), with no attempt at Q8 (Muslims). The general quality of the answers was good, and a handful of the essays were really very good indeed, offering sophisticated discussion of primary texts, secondary literature, and relevant political contexts. Of the nine scripts, two ended up with a first-class mark, with six upper seconds and one lower second.

The paper was a challenging one, insofar as the questions did not always neatly map onto individual topics from the syllabus, but rather often encouraged candidates to think across the breadth of the course, and put material together that had been encountered in its different parts. Given the fairly small number of answers to each of the questions, and the pleasing range of approaches that was taken when answering them, it is difficult to make generalisations about how candidates fared on the paper. Nevertheless, a few observations follow. Discussion of the ‘United States of Europe’ (Q4) had curiously little reference to the USA as an obvious political model and inspiration (and essays on this topic spent a bit too much time on Mazzini). Essays on political Catholicism (Q7) sometimes slipped too quickly into a bland and not entirely to-the-point rehearsal of standard positions in the secondary literature (e.g. Lipgens vs. Milward). Answers on Hayek (Q9) were sometimes a bit quick to run together the single market and the Eurozone. It is always worthwhile paying close attention to the wording of the questions—e.g., to the reference to ‘particular challenges’ in Q5. Finally, a number of essays would have been stronger if the candidates had had a bit more of a grip on historical narratives, than they were able to demonstrate—especially with respect to the history of France (Q3, Q11).

2017

Six candidates sat the paper. Although the exam paper itself gave equal attention to the syllabus material presented across Michaelmas and Lent Terms, it was striking that around two thirds of the questions attempted dealt with the earlier part of the course. The more popular questions concerned the Abbé de Saint-Pierre, the Revolutionary period, nineteenth-century republicanism, and Friedrich Hayek, each attracting three or four answers.

The scripts were all of upper second-class quality. Although markers are habitually exhorted to ‘use the full range of marks’ it just was not possible on this occasion, where all of the scripts were solid, but where no candidate was working at a consistently superior level. Individual essays sometimes attracted First- or Lower Second-class marks, but the overall marks for the scripts converged in the middle 60s. One marker marked the scripts overall in the range 63-69, the other in the range 63-67—and their disagreements never exceeded two marks.

If there was a general problem across the scripts, it was that they didn’t press as hard as they might have done on the questions, to tease out what was most interesting or challenging about the issues that they raised. A little too often, description was offered in place of explanation, or gentle survey in place of a focussed argument. Good knowledge of relevant texts was shown, but sometimes the texts could have been worked a bit harder than they were. Thinking about particular questions: the Abbé de Saint-Pierre was both tedious and repetitive, and it was refreshing to see candidates write about his arguments in ways that were neither; answers on republican brotherhood would have done well to consider the fraternity of revolutionary conspirators in addition to the ‘brotherhood of man’; there was some fine knowledge of Hayek’s various contexts on display.