The European Union: A Model for Economic Cooperation

Shafqatullah[1]

https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2026.15.3.10

Abstract

Since its origins in the aftermath of the Second World War, the European integration project has evolved from sectoral cooperation into an advanced system of economic, monetary, and increasingly participatory governance. The European Union (EU) represents a unique form of regional integration that transcends traditional trade arrangements, combining supranational authority with intergovernmental decision-making (Bickerton et al., 2015; De Grauwe, 2020). This paper critically examines the EU as both an economic and an emerging deliberative system. It explores the historical foundations of integration, the Union's institutional structure, and the public goods it generates, particularly through the single market and the euro. Furthermore, the study situates the EU within contemporary debates on democratic legitimacy by analysing recent participatory innovations, especially the Conference on the Future of Europe and its European Citizens' Panels. It argues that while the EU has achieved unparalleled success in economic integration, its long-term sustainability depends on strengthening democratic legitimacy through deliberative mechanisms and citizen participation. The paper focuses on the fact that the EU remains the most advanced model of regional integration globally, yet its future lies in reconciling economic governance with participatory democracy and policy responsiveness.

Keywords: European Union, Economic Cooperation, Regional Integration.

Introduction

European integration is one of the most ambitious and lasting political projects of the modern era. It emerged after a devastating war, as early initiatives such as the European Coal and Steel Community sought to bind former enemies through economic interdependence. This was meant to prevent future conflict (Milward 1992). Over time, this functionalist approach expanded into deeper integration. The process led to the creation of the European Union, a complex governance system with economic, legal, and political dimensions (De Grauwe, 2020).

The EU, however, defies conventional categorisation. As famously described by Jacques Delors, it is an "unidentified political object," combining features of a federation, a confederation, and an international organisation (Majone, 2005). This hybridity reflects both the ambition and the limitations of integration, as Member States seek to balance sovereignty with collective governance.

In recent decades, the EU has come under increasing scrutiny for its democratic deficit. Critics point to the gap between institutions and citizens and to technocratic decision-making (Schmidt, 2020). In response, the Union is experimenting with deliberative and participatory mechanisms to boost legitimacy. The Conference on the Future of Europe is a landmark initiative that brings

[1]*Assistant Professor English, Shah Walliullah Govt. Degree College Mansoorah,*
PhD Scholar, Area Study Center for European Studies, University of Karachi.

Compliance with ethical standards: There are no conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial). This study did not receive any funding.

transnational citizen deliberation through panels, consultations, and youth engagement platforms (European Commission, 2022).

This paper contends that the EU is moving beyond its origins as an economic integration project to become a hybrid governance model that combines economic and deliberative forms. The central thesis is that the EU's sustained legitimacy and future success depend on increasing citizen participation and embedding deliberative mechanisms alongside economic governance.

What is the European Union?

The European Union (EU) is a unique and evolving political and economic organisation. It resists conventional categorisation within international relations and comparative politics frameworks. It is neither a traditional international organisation nor a federal state. Instead, it is a sui generis system that combines supranational authority with intergovernmental cooperation (Weiler, 2001; Majone, 2005). This hybridity reflects both the history of European integration and the ongoing tension between national sovereignty and collective decision-making.

Historical and Normative Foundations

The origins of the EU lie in the post-World War II context. Integration was conceived as a mechanism to secure peace, economic recovery, and political stability. The European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1951, was the first step toward institutionalised cooperation. It was grounded in the functionalist logic that economic interdependence would prevent future conflict (Milward, 1992). Over time, this limited sectoral integration expanded into broader economic and political domains. Successive treaty reforms, particularly the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, culminated in the formation of the EU (De Grauwe, 2020).

The Treaty on European Union explicitly sets out the EU’s normative foundation. It emphasises not only economic integration but also values like democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and the aim of an “ever closer union among the peoples of Europe” (European Union, 2012). This normative dimension makes the EU stand out from other regional organisations by placing integration within a larger political and ethical project.

Institutional Architecture and Governance

Institutionally, the EU is characterised by multi-level governance. Authority is spread across supranational, national, and subnational levels (Marks et al., 1996). Its governance structure has legislative, executive, and judicial parts. These resemble those of states but exist within a unique transnational framework.

Legislative authority is shared between the European Parliament, which represents EU citizens, and the Council of the European Union, which represents Member States. The European Commission functions as the executive and serves as policy initiator and treaty guardian. The Court of Justice of the European Union ensures uniform interpretation and application of EU law, reinforcing the Union’s character as a community of law (Weiler, 2001).

In the economic domain, the European Central Bank plays a central role in managing monetary policy for the eurozone, underscoring the depth of economic governance integration (De Grauwe, 2020). This institutional configuration reflects a balance between supranational authority and intergovernmental control, often described as a form of “new intergovernmentalism” (Bickerton et al., 2015)

The EU as a Producer of Public Goods

A key feature of the EU is its ability to produce public goods that go beyond what individual Member States can provide. These include economic benefits like the single market and the euro. They also include regulatory standards, environmental protection, and regional cohesion (Majone, 1994). The EU's regulatory influence, often called the "regulatory state," enables it to shape markets and standards both within and beyond Europe.

The EU does not provide these public goods equally in all policies. Economic integration is highly developed. However, social and fiscal integration are much more limited. These gaps result from political barriers and different national preferences (Begg, 2009). This imbalance affects the effectiveness and legitimacy of EU governance.

Democratic Deficit and the Turn to Deliberation

Despite its achievements, the EU has long been criticised for its democratic deficit. This refers to the perceived lack of direct citizen influence, transparency, and accountability in decision-making (Schmidt, 2020). The complexity of EU institutions and the dominance of technocratic governance have created a gap between people and policymakers.

In response, the EU has increasingly turned to deliberative and participatory mechanisms to enhance democratic legitimacy. The Conference on the Future of Europe represents a significant innovation in this regard, incorporating European Citizens' Panels, national consultations, and youth engagement initiatives into the policymaking process (European Commission, 2022). These mechanisms reflect the influence of deliberative democratic theory, which emphasises reasoned discourse, inclusivity, and public justification as foundations of legitimate governance (Habermas, 1996; Lafont, 2019).

The EU as an Evolving Political System

The EU is a dynamic and evolving political system. It is shaped by changes within Europe and by external forces. The EU is both widening, as it adds new members, and deepening, as integration deepens (Wessels, 2016). These two trends have led to a complex polity that continues to adapt to new challenges. These include economic crises, changes in global politics, and more public demand for democratic accountability.

The EU's future will likely depend on its ability to balance economic achievements with the demand for participatory governance. As deliberative mechanisms become more institutionalised, the EU may shift toward a transnational deliberative democracy, where citizens play a more direct role in shaping policy.

Key Features of Economic Integration in the European Union

The economic architecture of the European Union (EU) is the most advanced regional integration model globally, combining deep market integration with increasingly complex supranational governance. Unlike conventional trade blocs, the EU has evolved from a customs union into a highly institutionalised single market and, for many of its members, a full economic and monetary union. This transformation reflects both functional economic imperatives and political choices aimed at creating collective public goods, while simultaneously reshaping the distribution of sovereignty between Member States and EU institutions (Bickerton et al., 2015; De Grauwe, 2020).

From Customs Union to Single Market

The origins of the EU's economic integration lie in the establishment of a customs union, which eliminated tariffs and quotas among Member States while introducing a common external tariff. However, it soon became evident that the removal of formal trade barriers was insufficient to ensure genuine market integration, as a wide range of non-tariff barriers, regulatory, administrative, and fiscal, continued to fragment the European economy (Egan, 2001).

The transition from customs union to single market was decisively advanced by the European Commission's 1985 White Paper. In this paper, nearly 300 legislative measures were proposed to address remaining barriers to the free movement of goods, services, capital, and labour (European Commission, 1985; Cockfield, 1994). The subsequent adoption of the Single European Act (1986) marked a critical institutional turning point by introducing qualified majority voting in the Council of the European Union, thereby reducing the capacity of individual Member States to veto integration measures (Egan, 2015).

This process entailed a significant transfer of regulatory sovereignty from national to supranational levels. As Egan (2001) argues, the creation of the single market required limiting the autonomy of Member States in key regulatory domains, thereby strengthening the role of EU institutions such as the European Commission and the Court of Justice. In this respect, economic integration cannot be understood as purely market-driven; rather, it is deeply embedded in institutional and legal transformations. Thus, the single market represents the cornerstone of EU economic integration, built on the four freedoms: movement of goods, services, capital, and labour. And this was surely aimed to eliminate both tariff and non-tariff barriers through regulatory harmonisation and mutual recognition (Egan, 2001).

The role of the European Court of Justice, particularly in the *Cassis de Dijon* ruling, was pivotal in advancing integration through the principle of mutual recognition (Armstrong & Bulmer, 1998). The single market thus exemplifies the EU's regulatory capacity, leading scholars to characterise it as a regulatory state (Majone, 1994).

However, integration remains uneven, particularly in services and digital markets, highlighting ongoing challenges in achieving full economic convergence (Pelkmans, 2016).

The Single Market and Regulatory Integration

The single market represents the core of EU economic integration, structured around the four fundamental freedoms: movement of goods, services, capital, and labour. Its realisation required addressing three broad categories of barriers: physical (border controls and customs procedures), technical (divergent national regulations and standards), and fiscal (differences in indirect taxation) (Egan, 2001; Pelkmans, 2016).

A defining feature of this process was the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) 's pivotal role. Landmark rulings such as *Cassis de Dijon* (1979) established the principle of mutual recognition, whereby goods lawfully marketed in one Member State could not be excluded from another due to differing national regulations (Armstrong & Bulmer, 1998). This jurisprudence significantly accelerated integration by reducing the need for full regulatory harmonisation and facilitating cross-border economic activity.

The principle of mutual recognition was subsequently extended to other sectors, notably financial services, through the "passporting" system, illustrating how legal innovation underpins market integration. At the same time, the EU developed a comprehensive competition policy framework covering state aid control, antitrust regulation, and merger oversight, with enforcement shared between the European Commission and national authorities. This system ensures a “level playing field” within the single market and constitutes a defining feature of EU economic governance (Majone, 1994).

Despite its achievements, the single market remains incomplete and unevenly implemented. Persistent barriers in services, energy, and the digital economy highlight ongoing tensions between integration and national regulatory preferences (Pelkmans, 2016). Moreover, sectors categorised as “services of general interest,” particularly in the public domain, remain partially insulated from full liberalisation, reflecting political sensitivities.

From a theoretical perspective, the EU’s economic system has been characterised as a “regulatory state,” where governance is primarily exercised through rule-making rather than fiscal redistribution (Majone, 1994). This distinguishes the EU from federal states, as its budget, typically around 1% of EU GDP, remains limited compared to national fiscal systems (Begg, 2009). Consequently, the EU’s primary contribution lies in providing regulatory public goods rather than macroeconomic stabilisation or large-scale redistribution.

Monetary Union and the Euro

The establishment of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and the introduction of the euro represent a profound deepening of European integration. While discussions on monetary cooperation date back to the 1960s, substantive progress was only achieved with the Maastricht Treaty, which laid the institutional and legal foundations for a single currency (De Grauwe, 2020).

Monetary integration posed significant political and economic challenges, requiring Member States to relinquish one of the core attributes of sovereignty: control over their national currencies. This was particularly contentious in countries such as Germany, where monetary stability was closely linked to national identity and economic credibility.

The institutional core of EMU is the European Central Bank (ECB), one of the most independent central banks in the world. Its primary mandate is to ensure price stability, with other economic objectives subordinated to this goal. This hierarchical mandate, combined with the absence of a centralised fiscal authority at the EU level, creates an asymmetrical policy framework in which monetary policy is centralised while fiscal policy remains largely national (De Grauwe, 2020).

The eurozone crisis exposed the limitations of this architecture, particularly the absence of adequate fiscal coordination mechanisms. In response, the EU developed new instruments such as the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) and the Fiscal Compact, often through intergovernmental arrangements outside the core EU treaties. These developments exemplify what Bickerton et al. (2015) describe as “new intergovernmentalism,” whereby integration deepens without corresponding increases in supranational authority.

At the same time, these crisis-driven innovations generated significant debates about democratic legitimacy. The imposition of fiscal constraints and conditionality measures raised concerns about the erosion of national sovereignty and the democratic accountability of EU decision-making. This tension underscores a central paradox of European integration: the expansion of economic governance without a commensurate strengthening of democratic structures. These developments illustrate both the resilience and the tensions inherent in EU integration, particularly regarding legitimacy and the balance between national sovereignty and supranational authority (Schmidt, 2020).

The creation of the euro marked a significant deepening of integration, transforming the EU into an economic and monetary union. Rooted in theories of optimal currency areas (Mundell, 1961), monetary integration required Member States to relinquish control over national currencies in favour of a shared system governed by the European Central Bank (De Grauwe, 2020).

Despite its achievements, the eurozone has faced significant challenges, particularly during the sovereign debt crisis. Institutional innovations such as the European Stability Mechanism and the Fiscal Compact reflect attempts to address these weaknesses, often through intergovernmental mechanisms (Bickerton et al., 2015).

The EU as a Model for Regional Integration

The EU has long been regarded as a model for regional integration, reflecting theoretical frameworks developed by scholars such as Balassa (1962) and Tinbergen (1954). These frameworks conceptualise integration as a progressive process, from free trade areas to full economic and monetary union.

However, the EU goes beyond these models by incorporating legal, political, and increasingly participatory dimensions. While other regional blocs, such as ASEAN and Mercosur, emphasise economic cooperation, they lack the depth of institutionalisation and supranational authority found in the EU.

Nevertheless, the EU model is not without limitations. Resistance from Member States and concerns about democratic legitimacy continue to constrain integration, reflecting what scholars describe as an “integration paradox” (Bickerton et al., 2015).

The EU’s objectives extend far beyond economic cooperation. The Treaty on European Union articulates ambitions including economic convergence, social progress, sustainable development, and the creation of an “ever closer union among the peoples of Europe” (European Union, 2012). These goals reflect the EU’s role as a provider of public goods, encompassing market integration, peace, stability, and regulatory governance (Majone, 1994).

Institutionally, the EU combines supranational and intergovernmental elements. Legislative authority is shared between the European Parliament and the Council, while the European Commission serves as both the executive and the agenda-setter. The European Central Bank governs monetary policy within the eurozone, highlighting the depth of integration achieved (De Grauwe, 2020).

This structure illustrates the EU’s distinctive nature as a community of law, where authority derives from treaties and is exercised through binding legal frameworks (Weiler, 2001). However, this legalistic and technocratic orientation has also contributed to concerns about democratic legitimacy, reinforcing the need for participatory innovations.

Economic Integration and the Turn to Deliberative Governance: CoFoE and Democratic Innovation

A defining feature of contemporary EU governance is the shift toward deliberative democracy. The Conference on the Future of Europe represents a major step in this direction, introducing European Citizens’ Panels composed of randomly selected participants reflecting the Union’s diversity. These panels, along with national consultations and youth engagement initiatives, aim to incorporate citizen perspectives into policymaking processes (European Commission, 2022).

The deepening of economic integration, particularly in areas such as monetary policy and fiscal surveillance, has intensified demands for greater democratic legitimacy and citizen involvement. In this context, the EU has increasingly explored deliberative and participatory mechanisms to address its democratic deficit. The Conference on the Future of Europe represents a significant institutional innovation, linking citizen deliberation with broader debates on the future of EU

governance. Through European Citizens' Panels, national consultations, and youth engagement initiatives, CoFoE sought to incorporate citizen perspectives into policy discussions, including those related to economic governance and integration (European Commission, 2022).
This development reflects a broader shift toward deliberative democracy, in which legitimacy is derived not only from institutional outputs but also from inclusive, reasoned public discourse. In the context of economic integration, this implies that policies such as the single market and monetary union must be accompanied by mechanisms that enhance transparency, participation, and policy responsiveness. This reflects broader theoretical developments emphasising the role of deliberation in enhancing legitimacy through reasoned discourse and inclusive participation (Habermas, 1996; Lafont, 2019). However, the effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on their policy impact. Without clear links between citizen input and decision-making, deliberative initiatives risk being perceived as symbolic rather than transformative (Petit, 2022).

Future Prospects and Policy Implications

The future of the EU lies in balancing economic integration with democratic legitimacy. Initiatives such as the institutionalisation of Citizens' Panels and the integration of participatory mechanisms into legislative processes represent important steps toward a more responsive governance model (Greubel, 2022).
At the same time, challenges such as geopolitical competition, digital transformation, and climate change require the EU to generate new public goods. The European Green Deal and digital strategy illustrate this evolving policy agenda.
For scholars and policymakers alike, the EU offers a unique laboratory for studying the interaction between economic integration and deliberative governance, with implications extending beyond Europe.

Conclusion

The European Union remains a sui generis model of integration, combining economic, legal, and political dimensions in ways unmatched by other regional organisations. Its success in creating public goods through the single market and the euro is undeniable.
However, the sustainability of the European project increasingly depends on addressing its democratic deficit. The emergence of deliberative initiatives such as the Conference on the Future of Europe signals a shift toward a more inclusive and participatory model of governance.
Ultimately, the EU's future will depend on its ability to integrate citizen participation, transparency, and policy responsiveness into its institutional framework, thereby reinforcing democratic legitimacy while maintaining the depth of economic integration.

References

- Armstrong, K., & Bulmer, S. (1998). *The governance of the single European market*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Bächtiger, A., Dryzek, J. S., Mansbridge, J., & Warren, M. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Balassa, B. (1962). *The theory of economic integration*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Bickerton, C. J., Hodson, D., & Puetter, U. (2015). *The new intergovernmentalism*. Oxford University Press.
- De Grauwe, P. (2020). *Economics of monetary union* (13th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Egan, M. (2001). *Constructing a European market*. Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. (2022). *Conference on the Future of Europe report*.

- European Union. (2012). *Treaty on European Union*.
- Greubel, J. (2022). *European Citizens' Panels and EU democracy*. European Policy Centre.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms*. MIT Press.
- Lafont, C. (2019). *Democracy without shortcuts*. Oxford University Press.
- Majone, G. (1994). The rise of the regulatory state in Europe. *West European Politics*.
- Majone, G. (2005). *Dilemmas of European integration*. Oxford University Press.
- Milward, A. (1992). *The European rescue of the nation-state*. Routledge.
- Mundell, R. (1961). A theory of optimum currency areas. *American Economic Review*.
- Pelkmans, J. (2016). *European integration: Methods and economic analysis*.
- Petit, K. (2022). EU Citizens' Panels critique. European Policy Centre.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2020). *Europe's crisis of legitimacy*. Oxford University Press.
- Tinbergen, J. (1954). *International economic integration*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Weiler, J. H. H. (2001). The constitutional structure of the EU.