

Political Challenges to the European Integration – an on-line simulation game

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were forced to develop an on-line simulation game instead of the actual face-to-face negotiations. Since there will be no final written exam this assignment will account for 50% of your final grade. Below we describe in detail how the simulation game will be performed on-line. We tried to come as close as possible to the “real” simulation, but some things simply cannot be overcome. Here are some ground rules:

- The game is obligatory to all the students for the completion of the course
- The game will have a semi-synchronous character (this will be explained in the ‘Dynamics of the game’ section). Due to the ingrained dynamism of the face-to-face simulation and the fact that some students already function in different time zones, we decided that recreating a fully synchronous format on-line is impossible.
- The game will consist of 2 components: the writing of a Position Paper and the on-line negotiations in the form of exchange of arguments with the help of an online Forum on Pegaz.

You will all be divided into 4 Forums, that will serve as “negotiation rooms” (7 people in each “room”). Each student will have a certain role assigned. 6 students will assume roles of representatives of the respective political groups in the EP and 1 student will assume the role of the representative of the Polish/Hungarian government in a debate on the rule of law in Poland/Hungary. You will be able to choose the “room” as well as your roles within the “rooms” (on a first come-first served basis via Excel sheet published on Pegaz).

You will be debating a draft resolution (the last page of this document). Only the fragments highlighted in **green** are debatable and can be changed/amended.

Semi-synchronous dynamics of the game

Your first task would be to write the Position Paper towards the draft proposal of the EP Resolution according to the guidelines below:

Position Paper (1000 words maximum) should include:

1. **Introduction** - you should describe in a few words the topic of resolution, mentioning in brief the background context that helped you understanding it.
2. **Political Group’s Position/Polish position** – use your group’s policy in order to analyse and frame the debated problem. You can refer to specific resolutions brokered by your party, political programme, policy papers, statements of prominent politicians,

etc. Try to convince the reader that your group's position is the best one.

3. Country's Position – Can be mixed with the Group's position to strengthen the message. You can refer to your country's historical, political, cultural context/heritage. It is always good to use some examples of policies or political statements given by your Prime Minister, or representatives of the government.
4. Personal Position – It is all up to you. You can add some personal experience, made up experience, belief, story, that would make your position more relatable.
5. Please, make your Position Paper more about facts than emotions. Show that you did the research and you are familiarized with all the aspects of your position. Remember, all your arguments have to be in compliance with your Position Paper.

Rules and Procedures:

- At least **24 hours before** the beginning of the negotiations (i.e. 25th of May, 10:00 CEST), you are obliged to share your Position Paper with the rest of the members of your “forum/room”. Send it to them directly, (and to the tutors by uploading it on Pegaz), so that the students from other “rooms” are not “inspired” by your work
- The simulation game will last 72h in total, **starting on 26th of May at 10:00 CEST and concluding on 29th of May at 10:00 CEST.**
- Since the start of the negotiations, you will have **no more than 12h** to put your first replies to the Position Papers you received from your colleagues on-line, reviewing their political positions, asking for elaborations, clarifications, indicating whether you agree or disagree with them and in reference to what, pointing weak or strong points in their initial argumentation, etc. In this round you get to know who is your potential ally, who is your opponent, and whether you have any common ground with other MEPs.
- For the remaining 60 hours everyone is expected to engage in a discussion, in which you would refer to the arguments of those with whom you disagree/agree and try to justify your political group's positions. Ultimately, it would be best if at the very end most of “roommates” would agree on a common text of the resolution. Therefore, we encourage that you actually suggest changes to the wording of the draft proposal in your contributions (and react to the changes proposed by others). Also, in order to prevent chaos, each article of the draft proposal should be debated in a separate discussion thread (we will pre-arrange the PEGAZ forum tool for this). In this 60h period we expect you to be fully engaged in the discussion (obviously not all the time – eating and sleeping is important), but please monitor the discussion in your “room”

closely and contribute substantially! Please make your contributions to the discussion polite, yet do not be afraid to be firm and decisive in your interventions.

- There will be no voting on the final wording of the resolution. The most important thing are your arguments, activeness and creativity (e.g. in proposing amendments) in the discussion.
- **PLEASE BEAR IN MIND THAT THIS ACTIVITY NEEDS TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN THE ENVISAGED 72 HOURS. YOU WILL NOT BE ABLE TO POSTPONE YOUR PARTICIPATION IN IT AND MAKE UP FOR IT LATER!**

Baseline for evaluation of Position Papers and active participation in the simulation game:

1. Student shows proper understanding of the underlying economic, social, and political impact of the proposal (whether for or against), understands the main parts of the proposal, refers to the facts correctly in the debate and in the Position Paper.
2. Student successfully uses the group's and country's policy in order to argue for his/her position, is active during the debate, engages MEPs from other groups, has cultural intelligence, defends his/her group's and country's values but is willing to compromise, is active regarding the amendments. If deviates from the political group he/she is associated with, is able to explain/have good reasons.
3. Produces convincing arguments with a clear purpose, well structured, interesting to be remembered, coherent argumentation with examples and evidence, correct body language, appearance, audible and articulated oral delivery.
4. The absolute minimum required to complete this activity is the preparation of the Position Paper and posting at least 4 substantial contributions (containing at least 1500 characters with spaces) during the discussion. The more substantial and frequent contributions you make, the better the grade!

Roles:

1. **Representatives of the Polish/Hungarian government** – They lobby for their own country. They can call for extra powers, money, political statements. Basically, everything what they need in order to carry on with their national agenda.
2. **MEPs** – They discuss the final version of the proposal. MEPs represent their political group, country and themselves. Position Papers are prepared on the basis of political group, country, personal position.

European Parliament's draft resolution on the situation in Poland and Hungary and strengthening of the protection of rule of law in the European Union

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the EU Treaties and in particular to Articles 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU),
- having regard to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,
- having regard to the Constitution of the Republic of Poland,
- having regard to the Constitution of the Republic of Hungary, - having regard to the European Convention on Human Rights

- A. Whereas the EU is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities;
- B. Whereas these values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail;
- C. whereas adherence to these values was approved by the Polish and Hungarian people in the referendum held in 2003;
- D. whereas Polish and Hungarian governments have been persistently introducing policies that have gradually deteriorated the rule of law in their countries, having a negative impact on the image of the Union, as well as its effectiveness and credibility in the defence of fundamental rights, human rights and democracy globally
- E. whereas the Polish and Hungarian governments have been ignoring the European Commission's recommendations and resolutions of the European Parliament on that matter;
- F. whereas the situation in Poland and Hungary still deteriorates in regards to the functioning of the constitutional systems, independence of the judiciary, freedom of association and assembly, freedom of expression, the rights of persons belonging to minorities, including Roma and Jews, and protection against hateful statements against such minorities, the fundamental rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees.

1. Believes that the trends mentioned above and taken together represent a systemic threat to the values of Article 2 TEU and constitute a clear risk of a serious breach thereof;
2. Calls for rapid implementation of the proposed regulation on the protection of the Union's budget in case of generalised deficiencies as regards the rule of law in the Member States. This includes close monitoring of financial management of European funds in those Member States endangering the rule of law and values enshrined in Article 2 TEU; and possible suspension of transfers of the funds, reduction of pre-financing of structural programmes and a suspension of the approval of one or more programmes or an amendment thereof, in relation to the Member States;
3. Urges the European Commission to immediately introduce a special financial framework for NGO's and academic institutions affected by discriminatory policies of illiberal regimes of Poland and Hungary;
4. Calls for treating all the Member States that fall under the Article 7(2) TEU procedure as one case as to avoid the situation of a "friendly veto" during the European Council proceedings.