

**University of Cyprus**

---

**From the Selected Works of Kyriakos N. Demetriou**

---

Fall October 28, 2014

# EUROPE IN CRISIS, CALL FOR PAPERS

Kyriakos N. Demetriou, *University of Cyprus*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/kyriakos\\_demetriou/34/](https://works.bepress.com/kyriakos_demetriou/34/)

CALL FOR PAPERS

*The European Union in Crisis: Explorations in Representation and Democratic Legitimacy*

(Forthcoming, Springer Verlag)

Ed. Kyriakos Demetriou ([k.demetriou@ucy.ac.cy](mailto:k.demetriou@ucy.ac.cy))

Springer will publish a sequence to *Democracy in Transition: political Participation in the EU*, ed. Kyriakos Demetriou, Springer 2013.

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/political+science/book/978-3-642-30067-7>

**What is the volume about?**

The most important current issue for both the European Union and Member States is the economic crisis and its implications for the future of the EU. Citizens across Member States of the EU, whether affected or not by the debt crisis and austerity measures, are progressively losing trust in their national governments. The political impact is profound: untimely end of governments, restructuring of party landscapes, unpredicted and unpredictable electoral results, mass protests – are but a few examples. Overall, citizens across the EU are increasingly sceptical of the EU’s ability to work out efficient mechanisms to deal with the worst crisis since the Union’s inception.

The overarching theoretical question is to what extent representation is tied to the EU(-ro) crisis/failure. What types of representation/ democracy should the EU be focusing on? Closely linked to this lies the recurring question of the democratic legitimacy of the EU in light of the so-called “democratic deficit(s)”, the policymaking power of an unelected (technocratic) bureaucracy, its concomitant elitism and abstract detachment from regional concerns.

The volume will engage broadly in addressing the tensions created between national vs. EU level of government and the resulting issues, while not neglecting an EU perspective on the matter. The volume is not designed to address questions related to Eurozone countries only but the entire of the EU.

Thus, the essays in this collection intend to explore issues pertaining to democratic legitimization in European politics intrinsically woven together: the monetary union and the debt crisis/ economic growth, constitutionalism, European integration (and disintegration), European federalism vs regionalism, Euroscepticism and the British question, the limits of political participation and active citizenship, EU and Globalization.

It is important to emphasize that the volume is expected to address the various concerns/problems/pathologies threatening the future of the EU, not only on the basis of contemporary contingencies and temporary factors, but also those affecting its future development and growth.

Significantly, the project – despite its thematic and topical coverage – does not aim to convey a “pessimistic” perspective but to draw the anatomy of the ‘European crisis’, analyse the roots/causes and background of problematic or malfunctioning areas, and make an effort towards anticipating

future developments. It is not implied that everything ‘went wrong’ across the board; some policy fields did better than others. E.g. though fiscal policy (or lack of one) is an area where the EU/ Euro went wrong, environmental policy is not. Foreign policy, for some, can even be considered a mild case of EU success.

**Tentative List of Contents:**

1. Democracy: Discussion: democratic deficit, legitimization issues, political values) (there are multiple issues to be discussed here. EU set up, tensions between EU institutions, EU vs domestic level (PGs vs PPs, interest groups, institutions and so on). Alexander Katsaitis, School of Public Policy, UCL -- confirmed
2. Suspending democracy? The role of unelected bodies in the governance of the |EU economic crisis. Diego Gionnone, Diego Gionnone, Department of Political Sciences “Jean Monnet” of the Second University of Naples (Italy) – confirmed
3. Constitutionalism : Discussion: Constitutional and legal edifice/problems, malfunctions; federalism; Nation state loyalties and Sovereignty crisis (This chapter could take different directions, -- perhaps one way to go, and this ties more to a multilevel approach, is the incremental shift of legislation towards the EU.) Pushing the Union forward? The role of the European Parliament in the Union crisis by Fernanda Neutel- Department of Political Science and International Relations- University Lusófona- Lisbon -- confirmed
4. Economy and monetary union: Possible areas of discussion: tensions and conflicts/consequences/risks (possible discussion: monetary policy vs. lack of fiscal policy. The theoretical discussion here could involve the inherent problems in the set up of the EMU as well as the tensions created within euro countries but also the tension between the “core” euro countries and the non-euro countries and it’s impact. e.g. UK referendum discussion and issues of representation)
5. Public Opinion on European Integration: Possible areas of discussion: One could go with the occasional sharp contrast between public opinion and integration or even the contrast between public opinion of the same sample (national, educational background, etc.) and different areas of integration.)
6. Foreign Policy: Possible areas of discussion: shortcomings, feasibility; (From a legitimacy perspective by retaining a common policy to a minimum (a human rights & cosmopolitanism deal) the EU has managed avoid harsh criticism in this field even though the Commission has been active. On the other hand, foreign policy is formed with little direct public opinion input.)

Nicola Chelotti, UCL Dept of Political Science, [n.chelotti@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:n.chelotti@ucl.ac.uk) , confirmed

7. Europe à la carte - integration versus disintegration
8. The EU of 40! - Where are the limits of Europe? (one may discuss Turkey's road to accession here)
9. Britain and Europe (British Euroscepticism/threats/risks)  
**Simon Usherwood, University of Surrey, [s.usherwood@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:s.usherwood@surrey.ac.uk), confirmed**
10. Divided Europe? Euroscepticism in East Central and Southern Europe
11. German European Hegemony: Myth or Reality?
12. The Euro crisis as a process of Schumpeterian "creative destruction"?
13. The EU's position in the globalised world  
**Fritz Breuss, Jean Monnet Professor für wirtschaftliche Aspekte der Europäischen Integration, Wien (Vienna University of Economics and Business) -- confirmed**
14. Review essay of Habermas' *Zur Verfassung Europas: Ein Essay* (2011)
15. The EU in Crisis: Future of.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Suspending democracy? The role of unelected bodies in the governance of the European Union economic crisis Diego Giannone**

*Abstract:* The democratic deficit of the European Union is a long-standing contentious issue. Reasons were attributed to the hybrid nature of the EU, the opacity and complexity of its decision-making process, as well as the lack of "true" European political parties, a poorly developed system of representative accountability, and the absence of a genuine European public sphere. The European institutions tried to bridge the gap by developing an original model of governance involving new actors and procedures in decision-making process. The aim of the paper is to analyze how the economic crisis affected the democratic deficit of the EU and its model of governance. The hypothesis is that the governance instruments invented by the EU to solve the economic crisis produced a double suspension of democracy. On the one side, the European governance gave excessive power to private actors and unelected bodies, thus undermining the role of European representative institutions; on the other side, the power of supranational unelected bodies eroded the democratic accountability of national governments and parliaments. To verify such assumption, the work will focus on the role played by the European Central Bank in the Italian economic crisis. Grounding on official reports and positions by the ECB and media sources in the period 2010-12, the

paper will thoroughly describe and analyze how the Bank imposed its own solution to the crisis, and the consequences it produced for European and national democracy.

Diego Giannone is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the Department of Political Sciences “Jean Monnet” of the Second University of Naples (Italy), where he is also Adjunct Professor of “Geo-political Relations”. His main themes and research interests include: the measurement of democracy, European Union democracy and governance, neoliberalism and institutional changes. His publications include: “Political and Ideological Aspects in the Measurement of Democracy: the Freedom House Case”, *Democratization*, 17(1), 2010: 68-97; *La democrazia neoliberista. Concetto, Misure, Trasformazioni* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 2010) [*Neoliberal Democracy. Concept, Measurement, and Transformations*]; and ‘Measuring ICT: Political and Methodological Aspects’, in *Electronic Constitution: Social, Cultural and Political Implications*, ed. Francesco Amoretti (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2009), 189-206.

### **Chapter 3**

#### **Pushing the Union forward? The role of the European Parliament in the Union crisis**

**Fernanda Neutel**, Department of Political Science and International Relations- University Lusófona, Lisbon, Portugal

Since its inception in 1951, the European Union project has faced frequent crises but it has always found appropriate solutions. Institutions have played a pivotal role. The European Parliament has been a centripetal and centrifugal player, creating synergies to enhance its powers and pushing the Union forward. In fact, nowadays, the European Parliament is doubtless a co-legislator in most policy areas with the Council. It has legislative, budget and control powers, but it can also exert control using consultation procedures, own-initiative reports, and written declarations. Throughout times it has used these possibilities to intervene in most varied issues. During the present crisis, it has done so several times. This essay proposes to analyze the attempts or solutions the European Parliament put forward in the present crisis management. For that, most important documents will be under scrutiny like own initiative proposals, written or oral questions, budget proposals, voting decisions, Commission and Council speeches and eurogroup interventions. Questionnaires to MEPs will also be considered. The assumption is that the left-right dimension of party politics will be central for the clarification of this question, but, if so, the European Parliament is like any other Parliament. Underlying the arguments, there will be the suggestion that politics are the solution, not the anathema, for the present crisis solution. But the Union policies should be reassessed.

**Fernanda Neutel** holds a PhD from Leeds University – United Kingdom- in Political Science/ European Studies and a Master degree in Modern International Studies from the same University. She is a lecturer in the Department of Politics and International Relations- University Lusófona- Lisbon (Portugal) since 1998. From October 2011 to July 2012 she was deputy director for the BA degree in European Studies and International Relations with former Portuguese minister for foreign affairs Dr. Medeiros Ferreira and, from July 2012 to January 2013, she was course director. She has also

been responsible for several Master courses, PhD courses and first degree courses where she teaches modules related to European Integration, Politics and Policies of the European Union, The Political System of the European Union, European History, and International Organizations. In 2004 she published the book ''Portugal in the European Union- the integration of the Portuguese MEPs in the European Parliament''. She has also published articles on the integration of Portugal in the European Union, on European integration and on political parties both in Academic journals and newspapers. Since January 2013 she became involved in European projects.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Foreign and Defence Policy and Legitimacy**

**Nicola Chelotti, [n.chelotti@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:n.chelotti@ucl.ac.uk), and Volcan Gul**

*Abstract:* This chapter analyses the legitimacy of EU foreign and defence policy, by investigating the logics and practices of its decision-making process. EU foreign and defence policy is increasingly made by national diplomats in Brussels, in Council committees, with minor involvement of elected national politicians and with a certain leeway from the influence of the national capitals. In addition, some of these officials adopt supranational conceptions of their diplomatic role, and undergo (partial) processes of EU socialisation. The chapter uses an original database of 138 questionnaires with national diplomats participating in the decision-making process of EU foreign policy.

In this perspective, the legitimacy of EU foreign policy is evaluated, with respect to different aspects. This includes (but not limited to) the legitimacy of Council committees as decision-making sites, of their members, of their decisions, and of the act (and chain) of power delegation. We will also explore the relation between legitimacy and accountability in this context.

*Authors:* Nicola Chelotti is teaching fellow in EU politics at the School of Public Policy, UCL. He has published on foreign and defence policy and EU decision-making process and practices.

Volcan Gül is a Ph.D candidate in Political Theory at the School of Public Policy, UCL. His research interests include concepts of legitimacy, accountability, and participatory and deliberative processes.

*Please send me a summary of ca. 150 words together with a short bio (one full paragraph)*