



CIEE Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Course name:	Political and Economic Development of the Netherlands and the EU
Course number:	POLI 3002 AMNT
Programs offering course:	Social Sciences and Humanities + Business & Culture
Language of instruction:	English
U.S. Semester Credits:	3
Contact Hours:	45
Term:	Spring 2019

Course Description

This course is designed to provide students with a solid foundation of both the Dutch political system and the economic integration of the European Union – and the pivotal role the Netherlands has played (and continues to play) in this project.

In the political section of the course, students will become familiar with the fundamental outlines of Dutch politics and government, including the major institutions and organizations that effect political change both within and outside the political system. Students will also gain an in-depth understanding of the historical development of the Dutch party system and coalition government, the rise of anti-immigration and ethno-nationalist political ideologies, as well as the ebb and flow of Euroscepticism in the Netherlands vis-à-vis other European countries (e.g. the case of UK's Brexit and the broader phenomenon of EU-“exits”).

The economic section of the course will focus on the economic dimension and organization of the Netherlands and the European Union and will tease out ways in which the economic integration of the latter has restructured the national economy of the former (and which institutions were/are principally involved in these processes). Specifically, students will study in some detail the various phases of economic integration implemented by the European Union. These discussions will range from the adoption of a common currency and the role and reception of the Euro in (tying together the economies of) the Netherlands and other selected member states, to the crafting of national and supranational trade policies, and the status and position of the Netherlands as an (a)typical European economy.

Learning Objectives

By completing this course, students will be able to:

- Demonstrate a thorough understanding of the *functioning* and the *historical development* of the political and economic systems of the Netherlands and the European Union;



- Debate the pros and cons of European integration in general and from the perspective of the Netherlands;
- Engage critically with theories of comparative politics and European integration;
- Situate the Netherlands in the broader political-economic context of the European Union;
- Apply theoretical concepts to analyze and to delineate the causes and implications of recent events;
- Evaluate primary sources in order to develop informed arguments about the main political and economic challenges that the Netherlands and the European Union face today.

Course Prerequisites

There are no prerequisites for this class.

Method of Instruction

Political and Economic Development of the Netherlands and the EU will run for 22 classes of two hours. The last class will meet on April 26, i.e. a few weeks before the official end of the semester. The course is taught as a seminar, which requires students to be well prepared and actively engaged. Students are expected to have done the readings before class. They should be prepared to answer questions, to contribute in a meaningful manner to class discussions and to comment on their peers' presentations.

Assessment and Final Grade

Students' final grades will be based on the following:

- Class participation: 10%
- Presentation: 25%
- Op-ed and response paper: 25%
- Debate: 15%
- Research paper: 25%

Course Requirements

Class participation – 10%

Because this course is taught as a seminar-style class, your participation is essential to its success.

You will be expected to show up prepared and on time. This means that you are expected to have done all of a seminar's readings *before* class begins. You should take part in class activities in an informed and thoughtful manner.



In case you are unable to attend a seminar, you are expected to catch up by looking through the Powerpoint slides (which I will make available online) and borrowing your classmates' notes.

Presentation – 25%

This course is ambitious in its design: we will study the political and economic development of both the Netherlands and the European Union. At the same time, the reading requirements are relatively light. Student presentations therefore provide a way to explore some topics in more depth than the readings and lectures allow for. They are also a great opportunity for students to showcase their ability to do research, to summarize information, to relate it to previous course material, and to present it in an informative and engaging manner.

Starting from class 5 (February 20), each student is expected to give one presentation of 15 minutes on a set topic that relates to the theme of that class. The topics are listed under the weekly schedule. Note that some classes will see multiple students present, while others will not feature any presentations.

Students will be expected to:

- Give a well-structured presentation on the topic with the use of presentation materials (e.g. Powerpoint or handouts);
- Outline the main theoretical and/or practical debates on the topic, and indicate who are associated with the different positions;
- Incorporate at least three academic publications, which are not already on the syllabus, into the presentation and to cite them appropriately;
- Illustrate the topic with practical examples;
- Engage the audience;
- Put forward at least two questions for class discussion;
- Stay within the time limit.

Op-ed and response paper – 25%

This assignment is linked to the debate (see below). Students will write an op-ed and a response paper on the topic of 'Nexit,' i.e. a Dutch exit from the European Union. In particular, they will respond to the following motion: *The Netherlands should prepare to leave the European Union in due course*. The op-ed is intended for a general, non-academic audience. Students will be randomly assigned a position, with half of the students arguing in favor of the motion and half arguing against. Students will then be paired with someone who has the opposite view.

The op-ed should be between 1,200 and 1,600 words. The op-ed should:

- Stake out a clear position;
- Support this position with the use of at least three different arguments;
- Use examples that bring the argument to life and which the reader can relate to;
- Preempt potential counterarguments;



- Use an appropriate writing style (e.g. avoid jargon, lengthy sentences and paragraphs, passive voice).

In a second step, students will write a response paper of between 675 and 850 words in which they criticize the op-ed of the student whom they are paired with. This paper should rebut the arguments that the opponent makes in his or her op-ed.

It is important to note that the motion is not a black-and-white statement. For example, it is possible to leave some institutions of the European Union (e.g. the Eurozone) while remaining a part of others (e.g. the Single Market). Proponents of a Nexit might also disagree about what “due course” stands for. Students are therefore encouraged to add some nuance to their argument.

The word limit is a **hard** limit. Failure to comply with the word limit as well as ‘creative’ attempts to circumvent the word limit (e.g. writing out dates, unnecessary hyphenation) will be penalized.

Due date op-ed: Thursday, 15 March at 16:00 (class time).

Due date response paper: Thursday, 22 March at 16:00 (class time).

Debate – 15%

This assignment is linked to the op-ed (see above). On 22 March, we will hold an in-class debate on the motion that the Netherlands should leave the European Union in due course. Students will be expected to hold the opposite view from the one that they defended in the op-ed.

The debate will consist of two parts:

- In the first part, students will have two minutes each to state and defend their position. The opening statement can be prepared in advance. This stage is important, because the arguments made will form the basis for the remainder of the debate.
- In the second part, the floor is open for a general debate.

Students will be assessed on:

- The quality and clarity of their arguments (e.g. use of facts and rhetorical flourishes);
- Their rebuttal of opposing arguments;
- The ability to respond to criticisms of their own arguments;
- Their presentation style (e.g. tone of voice, respectfulness, ability to engage).

Research paper – 25%

Each student will submit a research paper of between 2,500 and 3,000 words, excluding the bibliography.

Each research paper should include:



- A title
- An abstract
- A clear argument or thesis statement
- A discussion of counterarguments
- A clear structure, including an introduction, a conclusion and the use of subheadings
- A bibliography

Students should submit an argumentative and academic piece of writing. The former should manifest itself in a clear research question and thesis statement; the latter should shine through in the application of theories and/or academic concepts to practical developments. You are expected to conduct an original literature review and to incorporate academic readings from outside of the syllabus.

Students can select their own topic, but it must relate clearly to one of the class themes. Students may write their research paper on the same topic as their presentation, but not on the op-ed and debate topic (i.e. Nexit). I advise all students to send me an email with a proposed abstract for their research paper at least two weeks in advance of the deadline to see whether their chosen topic is acceptable.

The word limit is a **hard** limit. Failure to comply with the word limit as well as 'creative' attempts to circumvent the word limit (e.g. writing out dates, unnecessary hyphenation) will be penalized.

The research paper must be formatted according to APA guidelines, and must include a bibliography. For more information on APA formatting, see <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>.

Due date: Sunday, 29 April, 24:00.

Attendance, class participation and classroom policies

Each student is expected to attend all sessions of the course and to participate actively in class discussions. Attendance will be taken every week by the course instructor. Participation will be assessed according to the CIEE Amsterdam attendance policy outlined below:

1 absence = allowed

2 absences = extra assignment (1 page in consultation with the instructor)

3 absences = 1 point off the student's final grade

4 absences = student fails the course

- If a student comes in 15-30 minutes late to class, this counts as a ½ absence.
- At all times, the student needs to inform the instructor – before the start of class – in case he or she will incur an absence. Failure to notify the teacher in advance will result in an extra assignment.



- Note about all assignments: Late assignments will be marked down with 1 point off. Assignments that are more than 3 days (72 hours) late will not be accepted.

Students who make active connections to the concepts from the reading materials in class discussions, students who actively ask questions, and students who actively reflect on out-of-class experiences in class will receive extra points for participation. Participation points will be deducted when students do not participate in class or have not read the assigned reading materials before coming to class.

Laptops are allowed, but only when they are used to take notes or to look up information directly related to the class discussion. The instructor reserves the right to prohibit laptop use in case this distracts other students or this privilege is abused.

Important: Please note that in case you are not present for a quiz -- or fail to hand in an assignment on time because of illness -- you are required to hand in a written doctor's note with your teacher. In case a student is absent from the debate, they will be expected to give an additional presentation.

Resits are not offered for CIEE courses.

CIEE Grade Conversion Scale and Rubric

Your performance in this course will be graded in accordance with the CIEE course grading scale and rubric adopted for all CIEE courses, both of which are accessible in Canvas under "Files."

Weekly Schedule

Class 1:

Introduction

Reading: None

Class 2:

The Dutch Political System

Readings:

- [pp. 6-11, 23-51] Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy. (2008). The Dutch Political System in a Nutshell. Retrieved from <https://nimd.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Dutch-Political-System.pdf>

No student presentations

Class 3:

Party Politics in the Netherlands

Readings:

- [Chapter 1] Lijphart, A. (1975). *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pennings, P., & Keman, H. (2008). The Changing Landscape of Dutch Politics Since the 1970s: A Comparative Exploration. *Acta Politica*, 43(2–3), 154–179.
- [Skim] Mair, P. (2008). Electoral Volatility and the Dutch Party System: A Comparative Perspective. *Acta Politica*, 43(2–3), 235–253.

No student presentations

Class 4:

The Political System of the European Union

Readings:

- [Chapter 1] Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). *The Political System of the European Union* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kreppel, A. (2006). Understanding the European Parliament from a Federalist Perspective: The Legislatures of the United States and European Union Compared. In A. Menon & M. A. Schain (Eds.), *Comparative Federalism: The European Union and the United States in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 245–271). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

No student presentations

Class 5:

A Brief History of European Integration

Readings:

- [TBD] Dinan, D. (2010). *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration* (4th ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Student presentation topics: (1) Empty chair crisis, (2) Judicial activism

Class 6:

Theories of European Integration

Readings:

- Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2006). Introduction: The 1992-Project, the Revival of Neofunctionalism and the Liberal Intergovernmentalist Challenge. In M. Eilstrup-Sangiovanni (Ed.), *Debates on European Integration: A Reader* (pp. 181–203). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Student presentation topics: (1) Historical institutionalism and European integration (2) Multilevel governance, (3) Differentiated integration

Class 7:

EU Enlargement

Readings:

- Schimmelfennig, F. (2003). Strategic Action In A Community Environment: The Decision to Enlarge the European Union to the East. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(1–2), 156–183.

Student presentation topics: (1) Copenhagen criteria, (2) The Polish Plumber, (3) The Dutch Ukraine Referendum (6 April 2016), (4) Enlargement fatigue

Class 8:

The EU: A Community of Values?

Readings:

- Smismans, S. (2010). The European Union's Fundamental Rights Myth. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(1), 45–66.
- Scheppele, K. L. (2013). Not Your Father's Authoritarianism: The Creation of the "Frankenstate." *Newsletter of the European Politics and Society Section of the American Political Science Association*, Winter, 5–9.
- Müller, J.-W. (2017, May 20). Hungary: The War on Education. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from <http://www.nybooks.com/daily/2017/05/20/hungary-the-war-on-education-ceu/>
- Kelemen, R. D. (2014, June 2). A Union of Values? Retrieved May 9, 2016, from http://www.policy-network.net/pno_detail.aspx?ID=4675&title=A+union+of+values%3f+

Student presentation topic: The EU Framework to Strengthen the Rule of Law

Class 9:

The Netherlands and LGBTI Rights

Readings:

- Kollman, K. (2017). Pioneering marriage for same-sex couples in the Netherlands. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 24(1), 100–118.

- Mepschen, P., Duyvendak, J. W., & Tonkens, E. H. (2010). Sexual Politics, Orientalism and Multicultural Citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 44(5), 962–979.

No student presentations

Class 10:

LGBTI Rights in the European Union

Readings:

- Ayoub, P. M. (2015). Contested norms in new-adopter states: International determinants of LGBT rights legislation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 21(2), 293–322.
- Mos, M. (2014). Of Gay Rights and Christmas Ornaments: The Political History of Sexual Orientation Non-discrimination in the Treaty of Amsterdam. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(3), 632–649.

Student presentation topic: The “Mum, Dad & Kids” European Citizens’ Initiative

Class 11:

Populist and Anti-Immigration Politics in the Netherlands

Readings:

- Akkerman, T. (2005). Anti-immigration parties and the defence of liberal values: The exceptional case of the List Pim Fortuyn. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 10(3), 337–354.
- Vossen, K. (2011). Classifying Wilders: The Ideological Development of Geert Wilders and His Party for Freedom. *Politics*, 31(3), 179–189.
- [Chapter 1] Wilders, G. (2012). *Marked for Death: Islam’s War Against the West and Me*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing.
- Beauchamp, Z. (2016, February 19). How a gay European sociology professor’s political career explains Donald Trump. Vox. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/2/19/11059604/donald-trump-pim-fortuyn>

In-class viewings:

- [Geert Wilders](#) explains immigration issues in the Netherlands, 23 April 2017.
- [Fitna](#) (Geert Wilders)

Student presentation topics: (1) The party cartel (“Partijkartel”), (2) Left-wing populism: The Socialist Party, (3) Wilders and hate speech

Class 12:

Euroskepticism

Readings:

- Aarts, K., & Van der Kolk, H. (2006). Understanding the Dutch “No”: The Euro, the East, and the Elite. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 39(2), 243–246.
- Usherwood, S., & Startin, N. (2013). Euroscepticism as a Persistent Phenomenon. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(1), 1–16.
- Serricchio, F., Tsakatika, M., & Quaglia, L. (2013). Euroscepticism and the Global Financial Crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(1), 51–64.

Student presentation topics: (1) Democratic deficit, (2) Permissive consensus, (3) Eurorealism

Class 13:

Brexit and Beyond: Bursting Brussels’ Bubble?

Readings:

- Dennison, J., & Carl, N. (2016, July 18). The ultimate causes of Brexit: history, culture, and geography. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/71492/1/blogs.lse.ac.uk-The%20ultimate%20causes%20of%20Brexit%20history%20culture%20and%20geography.pdf>
- Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), 1259–1277.
- Hopkin, J. (2017). When Polanyi met Farage: Market fundamentalism, economic nationalism, and Britain’s exit from the European Union. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(3), 465–478.

Student presentation topics: (1) Frexit, (2) Grexit

Class 14:

Nexit: A Classroom Debate

Suggested reading:

- Luining, M. (2017, March). Dutch political parties on the European Union. Clingendael. Retrieved from https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Dutch_political_parties_on_the_EU.pdf
- Otjes, S. (2016, June 28). Is a Nexit now on the cards? What the UK’s referendum means for the Netherlands.

No student presentations

Class 15:

The Dutch Economy and the Welfare State

Readings:

- [Chapter 1] Katzenstein, P. J. (1985). *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- [Skip section on Denmark] Green-Pedersen, C. (2003). Small states, big success: party politics and governing the economy in Denmark and The Netherlands from 1973 to 2000. *Socio-Economic Review*, 1(3), 411–437.
- De Koster, W., Achterberg, P., & Van der Waal, J. (2013). The new right and the welfare state: The electoral relevance of welfare chauvinism and welfare populism in the Netherlands. *International Political Science Review*, 34(1), 3–20.
- Shorto, R. (2009, April 29). Going Dutch. New York Times. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/03/magazine/03european-t.html?pagewanted=all>

Student presentation topics: (1) Dutch disease (2) Dutch miracle, (3) Polder model

Class 16:

The City of Amsterdam and Europe

Readings:

- Favell, A. (2010). European Identity and European Citizenship in Three “Eurocities”: A Sociological Approach to the European Union. *Politique Européenne*, 30(1), 187–224.
- Mayors of the Capital Cities of the European Union. (2016, April 21). Declaration by the Mayors of the EU Capital Cities on the EU Urban Agenda and the Refugee Crisis. Retrieved from https://www.amsterdam.nl/publish/pages/506699/declaration_eu_capital_mayors_21_april_2016_amsterdam.pdf
- [Browse online] Government of the Netherlands (2017). The Dutch Bid for EMA. <http://www.netherlandsforema.eu/>

No student presentations

Class 17:

The European Monetary System

Readings:

- [Chapter 6, pp. 122-158] McNamara, K. R. (1999). *The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in European Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Student presentation topics: (1) The Snake, (2) Black Wednesday

Class 18:

Economic and Monetary Union

Readings:

- Jabko, N. (1999). In the name of the Market: how the European Commission paved the way for monetary union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(3), 475–495.
- Maes, I., & Verdun, A. (2005). Small States and the Creation of EMU: Belgium and the Netherlands, Pace-setters and Gate-keepers. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 327–348.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9886.2005.00558.x>

Student presentation topics: (1) Convergence criteria, (2) Stability and Growth Pact, (3) Impossible trinity, (4) Optimum currency area

Class 19:

The Dutch Central Bank

Readings:

- De Nederlandsche Bank. (2004). What It's All About. Retrieved from https://www.dnb.nl/en/binaries/What%20it%20s%20all%20about_tcm47-146114.pdf
- McNamara, K. R. (2001). Where Do Rules Come from? The Creation of the European Central Bank. In A. Stone Sweet, W. Sandholtz, & N. Fligstein (Eds.), *The Institutionalization of Europe* (pp. 155–170). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

No student presentations

Class 20:

The Symbolism of the Euro

Readings:

- Hymans, J. E. C. (2006). Money for Mars? The Euro Banknotes and European Identity. In R. M. Fishman & A. M. Messina (Eds.), *The Year of the Euro: The Cultural, Social, and Political Import of Europe's Common Currency* (pp. 15–36). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Kaelberer, M. (2004). The euro and European identity: symbols, power and the politics of European monetary union. *Review of International Studies*, 30(2), 161–178.

No student presentations

Class 21:

The Netherlands: A European Tax Haven?

Readings:

- [pp. 12-31] Van Dijk, M., Weyzig, F., & Murphy, R. (2006, November). The Netherlands: A Tax Haven? SOMO: Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations. Retrieved from <https://www.somo.nl/nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2006/11/A-tax-haven.pdf>
- Weyzig, F., & van Dijk, M. (2009). Incoherence between Tax and Development Policies: the case of the Netherlands. *Third World Quarterly*, 30(7), 1259–1277.
- News articles:
 - Tani, C. (2017, December 14). EU countries are not “tax havens”, parliament says. EUObserver. Retrieved from <https://euobserver.com/economic/140279>
 - Maurice, E. (2017, December 18). Commission opens case into Ikea’s Dutch tax deals. EUObserver. Retrieved from <https://euobserver.com/economic/140336>

No student presentations

Class 22:

Research Paper Workshop

Today students will work on their research papers in class.

No readings and student presentations

Course Materials

Readings

Aarts, K., & Van der Kolk, H. (2006). Understanding the Dutch “No”: The Euro, the East, and the Elite. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 39(2), 243–246

Akkerman, T. (2005). Anti-immigration parties and the defence of liberal values: The exceptional case of the List Pim Fortuyn. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 10(3), 337–354

Ayoub, P. M. (2015). Contested norms in new-adopter states: International determinants of LGBT rights legislation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 21(2), 293–322.

De Koster, W., Achterberg, P., & Van der Waal, J. (2013). The new right and the welfare state: The electoral relevance of welfare chauvinism and welfare populism in the Netherlands. *International Political Science Review*, 34(1), 3–20.

Dinan, D. (2010). *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration* (4th ed.) (pp. 150-207). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan [Chapters 4 and 5, pp. 150-207].

Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2006). Introduction: The 1992-Project, the Revival of Neofunctionalism and the Liberal Intergovernmentalist Challenge. In M. Eilstrup-Sangiovanni (Ed.), *Debates on European Integration: A Reader* (pp. 181–203). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Favell, A. (2010). European Identity and European Citizenship in Three “Eurocities”: A Sociological Approach to the European Union. *Politique Européenne*, 30(1), 187–224

Green-Pedersen, C. (2003). Small states, big success: party politics and governing the economy in Denmark and The Netherlands from 1973 to 2000. *Socio-Economic Review*, 1(3), 411–437 [skip section on Denmark].

Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2011). *The Political System of the European Union* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. [Chapter 1]

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), 1259–1277.

Hopkin, J. (2017). When Polanyi met Farage: Market fundamentalism, economic nationalism, and Britain’s exit from the European Union. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(3), 465–478.

Hymans, J. E. C. (2006). Money for Mars? The Euro Banknotes and European Identity. In R. M. Fishman & A. M. Messina (Eds.), *The Year of the Euro: The Cultural, Social, and Political Import of Europe’s Common Currency* (pp. 15–36). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Jabko, N. (1999). In the name of the Market: how the European Commission paved the way for monetary union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(3), 475–495.

Kaelberer, M. (2004). The euro and European identity: symbols, power and the politics of European monetary union. *Review of International Studies*, 30(2), 161–178.

Katzenstein, P. J. (1985). *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press [Chapter 1].

Kollman, K. (2017). Pioneering marriage for same-sex couples in the Netherlands. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 24(1), 100–118.

- Kreppel, A. (2006). Understanding the European Parliament from a Federalist Perspective: The Legislatures of the United States and European Union Compared. In A. Menon & M. A. Schain (Eds.), *Comparative Federalism: The European Union and the United States in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 245–271). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (1975). *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press. [Chapter 1]
- Maes, I., & Verdun, A. (2005). Small States and the Creation of EMU: Belgium and the Netherlands, Pace-setters and Gate-keepers. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 327–348.
- Mair, P. (2008). Electoral Volatility and the Dutch Party System: A Comparative Perspective. *Acta Politica*, 43(2–3), 235–253 [Skim].
- McNamara, K. R. (1999). *The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in European Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [Chapter 6, pp. 122-158].
- McNamara, K. R. (2001). Where Do Rules Come from? The Creation of the European Central Bank. In A. Stone Sweet, W. Sandholtz, & N. Fligstein (Eds.), *The Institutionalization of Europe* (pp. 155–170). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mepschen, P., Duyvendak, J. W., & Tonkens, E. H. (2010). Sexual Politics, Orientalism and Multicultural Citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 44(5), 962–979.
- Mos, M. (2014). Of Gay Rights and Christmas Ornaments: The Political History of Sexual Orientation Non-discrimination in the Treaty of Amsterdam. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(3), 632–649.
- Pennings, P., & Keman, H. (2008). The Changing Landscape of Dutch Politics Since the 1970s: A Comparative Exploration. *Acta Politica*, 43(2–3), 154–179.
- Scheppele, K. L. (2013). Not Your Father's Authoritarianism: The Creation of the "Frankenstate." *Newsletter of the European Politics and Society Section of the American Political Science Association*, Winter, 5–9.
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2003). Strategic Action In A Community Environment: The Decision to Enlarge the European Union to the East. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(1–2), 156–183.
- Serricchio, F., Tsakatika, M., & Quaglia, L. (2013). Euroscepticism and the Global Financial Crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(1), 51–64.

Smismans, S. (2010). The European Union's Fundamental Rights Myth. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(1), 45–66.

Usherwood, S., & Startin, N. (2013). Euroscepticism as a Persistent Phenomenon. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(1), 1–16

Vossen, K. (2011). Classifying Wilders: The Ideological Development of Geert Wilders and His Party for Freedom. *Politics*, 31(3), 179–189.

Weyzig, F., & van Dijk, M. (2009). Incoherence between Tax and Development Policies: the case of the Netherlands. *Third World Quarterly*, 30(7), 1259–1277.

Wilders, G. (2012). *Marked for Death: Islam's War Against the West and Me*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing. [Chapter 1].

Online Resources

Beauchamp, Z. (2016, February 19). How a gay European sociology professor's political career explains Donald Trump. Vox. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/2/19/11059604/donald-trump-pim-fortuyn>

De Nederlandsche Bank. (2004). What It's All About. Retrieved from https://www.dnb.nl/en/binaries/What%20it%20s%20all%20about_tcm47-146114.pdf

Dennison, J., & Carl, N. (2016, July 18). The ultimate causes of Brexit: history, culture, and geography. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/71492/1/blogs.lse.ac.uk-The%20ultimate%20causes%20of%20Brexit%20history%20culture%20and%20geography.pdf>

Government of the Netherlands (2017). The Dutch Bid for EMA. <http://www.netherlandsforema.eu/>

Kelemen, R. D. (2014, June 2). A Union of Values? Retrieved May 9, 2016, from http://www.policy-network.net/pno_detail.aspx?ID=4675&title=A+union+of+values%3f+

Luining, M. (2017, March). Dutch political parties on the European Union. Clingendael. Retrieved from https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Dutch_political_parties_on_the_EU.pdf

Maurice, E. (2017, December 18). Commission opens case into Ikea's Dutch tax deals. EUObserver. Retrieved from <https://euobserver.com/economic/140336>

Mayors of the Capital Cities of the European Union. (2016, April 21). Declaration by the Mayors of the EU Capital Cities on the EU Urban Agenda and the Refugee Crisis. Retrieved from https://www.amsterdam.nl/publish/pages/506699/declaration_eu_capital_mayors_21_april_2016_amsterdam.pdf

Müller, J.-W. (2017, May 20). Hungary: The War on Education. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from <http://www.nybooks.com/daily/2017/05/20/hungary-the-war-on-education-ceu/>

Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy. (2008). The Dutch Political System in a Nutshell. Retrieved from <https://nimd.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Dutch-Political-System.pdf> [pp. 6-11, 23-51].

Otjes, S. (2016, June 28). Is a Nexit now on the cards? What the UK's referendum means for the Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/70432/1/blogs.lse.ac.uk-Is%20a%20Nexit%20now%20on%20the%20cards%20What%20the%20UKs%20referendum%20means%20for%20the%20Netherlands.pdf>

Shorto, R. (2009, April 29). Going Dutch. New York Times. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/03/magazine/03european-t.html?pagewanted=all>

Tani, C. (2017, December 14). EU countries are not "tax havens", parliament says. EUObserver. Retrieved from <https://euobserver.com/economic/140279>

Van Dijk, M., Weyzig, F., & Murphy, R. (2006, November). The Netherlands: A Tax Haven? SOMO: Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations. Retrieved from <https://www.somo.nl/nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2006/11/A-tax-haven.pdf>

Media Resources

- [Geert Wilders](#) explains immigration issues in the Netherlands, 23 April 2017.
- [Fitna](#) (Geert Wilders)