Elaborated Tips, Instructions and Guidelines for Essay, POLS432

Due: April 28, class time (30% of final grade)

The purpose of this review essay is to do the following: explain to the reader the deeper roots of motivation that have given rise to the vision of the EU and what evidence there might be that this vision might be taking root, despite obvious failings and setbacks to the transformative direction of Europe through the supranational governance system of the EU.

You begin with Kershaw. Here, you want to identify for the reader what three or so points Kershaw makes to help a novice (a novice – NOT ROBERTSON OR OTHER EXPERTS) understand how the evolution of supranational governance in Europe (The EU) has emerged from the roots of recent history – from forces and changes and events growing from World War I that laid the foundations for the creation of the EU in 1952. You select those events and changes in Europe between 1914 and 1949 which you take from Kershaw to be the MOST important. You need NOT try to summarize EVERYTHING. That would not make for a review, and it would not be readable. So, after you have read over Kershaw, jot down what three events or changes were, in your mind, the most important forces constraining the creation of the EU in the 1950s – what helped create the birth of the EU.

However, that is half of the primary job. The other half is to explain to the same novice you imagined in your mind’s eye when reviewing Kershaw, why McNamara thinks the EU as a force in the everyday life of a European citizen is much greater than one might imagine, and how extensive this influence is in the lives of European citizens. You are to reflect on what implications this holds for the argument made by McNamara that in spite of what some might think, the vision of a broader Union smoothing some of the edges evident in the years prior to the EU (as reviewed by Kershaw) may actually be working slowing in allowing the European citizens to “image” a broader community than their immediate nation-state and national interest.

Then, having reviewed the two books, you tie them together. What implications and lessons can you offer your novice about (1) why the EU came about, and (2) is it worth it and (3) does it have a future.

FORMAT INSTRUCTIONS
To organize this PROPERLY, you must:

1. Have an introduction that clearly tells the reader the major points you will explore in your review and what your conclusions will be. In this introduction, begin by helping the reader understand why the history and contemporary process of the EU is linked and important. Think about that — do not just look for that in your books — think about that in the context of what you have learned from your class lectures and what you read elsewhere.

2. Then begin by developing the body of the paper: summarize the main argument of Kershaw, and expose 3 event/changes you believe to be important in giving rise to the EU afterward in the 1950s (as noted above), and tell the reader what evidence you have drawn from McNamara to make the case that despite setbacks and inadequacies, the EU has none the less managed to sink deeply into the imagination of European citizens an important and legitimate political authjouty beyond the nation-state with which citizens may identify with much more than some estimate (as discussed above), and once you have completed your review of Kershaw and McNamara, integrate the two books and your observations (as discussed above).

3. Then, provide a conclusion. This must clearly and coherently summarize for the reader what you have done in the body of the review, what your conclusions are and what implications these conclusions offer in terms of understanding the EU as a developing process.

Rubric for grading:

- Is the reader told clearly what the objective and purpose of this essay is?
• Does the paper clearly and coherently present a sample of evidence (at least three historical events/changes) from Kershaw to support the argument that history helped shape the birth of the EU?

• Does the paper explain clearly and coherently through logical reasoning why the historical evidence from Kershaw would help understand the forces shaping the birth of the EU?

• Does the paper clearly and coherently present a sample of evidence from McNamara to support the argument that a new, imagined community within the EU is laying the foundations for a supranational governance transformation in Europe?

• Does the paper explain clearly and coherently through logical reasoning why the evidence from McNamara would support the argument that a new, imagined community within the EU is laying the foundations for a supranational governance transformation in Europe?

• Does the paper clearly and coherently tie the points of Kershaw and McNamara together in such a way as to show the reader why history and contemporary processes might help the reader better understand the full context within which one must understand and evaluate the significance of the EU?

• Does the paper offer a clear and coherent conclusion that summarizes sufficiently the major points raised in the paper and adequately reminds the reader of the basic objective of the paper, and shows how the paper has address this objective and purpose?

• Has the paper followed explicitly the format guidelines? **If not, paper will be marked down one letter grade.**

Failure to provide component (introduction, Kershaw, McNamara, Integration, and Conclusion) will reduce the paper up to 20% per component. Lack of clarity and coherence, and linkages between evidence and arguments for how they play a role in understanding the arguments of the authors will reduce paper by up to 50%.