

**DIFFERENTIATION – A NEW ELEMENT IN THE  
EUROPEAN LEGAL ARCHITECTURE**

**A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE  
STANFORD PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL LEGAL STUDIES  
AT THE STANFORD LAW SCHOOL,  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
JURIDICAL SCIENCES MASTER**

**By**

**Tobias Bosch**

**May 1999**

## Abstract

This thesis analyzes a new legal structure used in European law known as differentiation. Differentiation in European law means any form of partial integration through law that takes place between only some European Union Member States. This legal structure has been used on a larger scale from 1986 on. The best-known examples are the European Social Charter, which was implemented by all Member States except the United Kingdom, which refused to take part because of political reasons, and the European Monetary Union (EMU). Within the EMU, four countries did not take part in the final stage of the EMU, two, Denmark and the United Kingdom, because of their political unwillingness and the other two, Greece and Sweden, because they did not fulfill the necessary economic criteria for participation.

Different concepts have been developed within the scientific and political discussion to explain differentiation. Among these concepts, the most important are the multi-speed concept, variable geometry and Europe à la carte. In different variations these concepts combined two reasons for the non-participation of certain countries (political unwillingness and economic ability) and the element that differentiation should take part inside or outside the European Union law, to construct their concept of differentiation.

The thesis argues that all these established concepts should be revised after the implementation of closer cooperation by the Amsterdam Treaty. Closer cooperation implements the general provisions for the use of differentiation in the European Union law and does not follow the structure of differentiation of the existing concepts. Moreover,

closer cooperation equalizes the two reasons for the non-participation in accepting them both as grounds for using differentiation and therefore refuses to use the distinction made by the established concepts of differentiation. Closer cooperation replaces this distinction by the idea that every form for differentiation can be used as long as it supports full integration as the final objective of differentiation. However, the thesis argues that the integration concept alone can not explain all the existing rules of differentiation and has therefore be amended by the subsidiarity concept, which represents the ideas behind the existing provisions not following the integration concept. The specific features of both concepts as they are represented in the European legal architecture are then analyzed and their opposites are compared. Finally, the thesis analyzes the cases of the European Social Charter and the EMU further to gain preliminary results and to show some initial problems of using differentiation according to the integration concept.

# Table of Contents

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. THE EXISTING DIFFERENTIATION WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
1) TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITION OF DIFFERENTIATION .....	11
2) OVERVIEW OVER THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIFFERENTIATION CONCEPTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION .....	14
a) <i>The speech of Brandt in 1974 and his concept of “abgestufte Integration”</i> .....	15
b) <i>The Tindemans report in 1975</i> .....	16
c) <i>The first intensive political and scientific discussion from 1976 to 1985</i> .....	17
3) THE DIFFERENT EXAMPLES AND RULES OF DIFFERENTIATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	21
a) <i>Transitional periods</i> .....	22
b) <i>The Single European Act</i> .....	22
c) <i>The Social Charter and the protocol on Social Policy</i> .....	28
d) <i>The Maastricht Treaty</i> .....	31
e) <i>The Amsterdam Treaty</i> .....	34
f) <i>The field of justice and home affairs and the Schengen Agreement</i> .....	38
g) <i>Examples of differentiation outside the treaties</i> .....	44
4) GENERAL AND TYPICAL ELEMENTS OF DIFFERENTIATION DERIVED FROM THESE RULES .....	45
a) <i>The reasons for the use of differentiation</i> .....	46
b) <i>The different measures used by differentiation</i> .....	48
c) <i>Institutional design of the measures</i> .....	49
5) CONCLUSIONS .....	53
<b>III. THE VARIOUS CONCEPTS OF DIFFERENTIATION AND THEIR CENTRAL ELEMENTS .....</b>	<b>55</b>
1) THE DIFFERENTIATION CONCEPTS DEVELOPED IN THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION IN PREPARATION OF THE AMSTERDAM TREATY .....	56
a) <i>The different concepts</i> .....	57
aa) <i>The multi-speed concept</i> .....	58
bb) <i>The concept of variable geometry</i> .....	60
cc) <i>The concept of Europe à la carte</i> .....	62
dd) <i>The concept of flexible integration</i> .....	64
ee) <i>The core Europe concept</i> .....	66
b) <i>The central elements of the different approaches</i> .....	66
2) THE POLITICAL DISCUSSION IN THE PREPARATION OF THE AMSTERDAM TREATY .....	68
3) DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO-CONCEPT SOLUTION: INTEGRATION AND SUBSIDIARITY.....	75
a) <i>Arguments against the existing categorization of differentiation</i> .....	76
b) <i>The two concept solution based on integration and subsidiarity</i> .....	81
c) <i>The main features of the integration concept</i> .....	87
d) <i>The main features of the subsidiarity concept</i> .....	94
e) <i>The categorization of the enumerated rules under the two concepts and the further use of these concepts</i> .....	98
4) SUMMARY .....	101

<b>IV. THE ANALYSIS OF THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS OF DIFFERENTIATION UNDER THE INTEGRATION CONCEPT.....</b>	<b>103</b>
1) THE EMU AND THE NON-PARTICIPATION OF SWEDEN AND GREECE .....	104
2) THE SOCIAL CHARTER AND THE ACCESS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM .....	114
3) COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION .....	121
<b>V. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>132</b>