

平成 30 年 5 月 31 日現在

機関番号：17501

研究種目：基盤研究(C) (一般)

研究期間：2014～2017

課題番号：26380174

研究課題名 (和文) Consolidating or Dismantling Representative Democracy at the EU-level: An analysis of the activities of the Europarties, European Parliamentary Groups before and after the 2014 European elections

研究課題名 (英文) Consolidating or Dismantling Representative Democracy at the EU-level: An analysis of the activities of the Europarties and European Parliamentary Groups before and after the 2014 European elections

研究代表者

Day Stephen (Day, Stephen)

大分大学・経済学部・教授

研究者番号：60404357

交付決定額 (研究期間全体) : (直接経費) 2,900,000 円

研究成果の概要 (和文) : EU代表民主主義の「潜在的な発展可能性」をとらえるために、欧州議会内会派とユーロ政党の役割に迫ることが、本科研プロジェクトの基本目的である。ただし、欧州議会内会派やユーロ政党をそれぞれ凝集性のある単一の政治行動主体とみなして相互の関係を追うといったアプローチ方法は取らない。そうではなく、それぞれの「組織内差異化構造」の認識を目指し、その認識をベースに、困難な挑戦にさらされているEU代表民主主義の「潜在的な発展可能性」の理解を試みようとした。そこでこの「組織内差異化構造」を認識するべく、現実主義、理想主義そして懐疑主義の3つの理念的志向を各欧州議会内会派および各ユーロ政党に探った。

研究成果の概要 (英文) : This project concerns the 'developmental potential' of representative democracy at the EU-level and the role of the European Parliament/European Parliamentary Groups (EPGs) and the Europarties. Rather than treating the Europarties and EPGs solely as cohesive entities, engaged in politicking at an inter-party level, this project argues that by also recognizing 'intra-party differentiation' within these entities we can garner a better understanding of the reasons why that 'developmental potential' is presently facing severe challenges. Such an approach led to the identification of three cross-cutting tendencies that I labelled: realists, idealists, and sceptics.

研究分野：比較政治

キーワード：Europarties European Parliament Representative democracy Transnational democracy Spitzenkandidaten Transnational lists European elections

1. 研究開始当初の背景

(1) The legal cornerstone of representative democracy, at the EU-level, is contained within the provisions of Article 10 of the Lisbon Treaty. According to Article 10.1: “The functioning of the Union shall be founded on representative democracy”. The two vehicles charged with fostering and consolidating that democratic order are the European Parliament (EP)/ European Parliamentary Groups (EPGs) (Article 10.2) and the extra-parliamentary European political parties (Europarties - which are generally composed of national party leaders; party officials, MEPs, auxiliary organizations and, in some cases, individual members). As Article 10.4 states: “Political parties at European level contribute to forming European political awareness and to expressing the will of the citizens.” Given the notion of intent that underpins Article 10, this project focuses upon the ‘developmental potential’ of representative democracy at the EU-level and the role of the two vehicles, in particular the Europarties. Is it conceivable that sometime in the future E.E. Schattschneider’s memorable 1942 quip that ‘political parties created democracy and modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of parties’ could be echoed at the EU-level? Except this time that claim would read: ‘Europarties created representative democracy at the EU-level and EU representative democracy is unthinkable save in terms of Europarties?’ Such questions, therefore, are not only of significance for EU-studies but also for scholars of democracy and party politics.

(2) In attempting to give momentum to the abovementioned Treaty goal, the European Commission (COM(2012) 499 final. 2012/0237 (COD). Brussels, 12.9.2012) argued that it is: ‘...in the interests of the citizens of the European Union that a European representative democracy can flourish. Truly transnational European political parties... are key to articulating the voices of the citizens at European level.’ As a call for ‘what ought to be’ rather than ‘what was’, was such a vision feasible? Or could that goal be accused of naiveté because representative democracy would always remain rooted at the national level? As Etzioni-Halevy pointed out, ‘Modern democracy has been fashioned to suit the governing institutions of the territorial state, and it still remains to be seen if it can be adopted to transnational political bodies’ (‘Linkage Deficits in Transnational Politics’, *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2002, pp.203-222. 204). Does such an observation amount to saying that representative democracy is a kind of monistic phenomenon unable to countenance an additional ‘transnational’ layer? This was an issue that I first grappled with in an earlier Kakenhi project entitled

‘Global Networks of Political Parties in an era of Globalisation: Party Internationals and Euro-parties’ (2007-2009 - Kiban C 19530112). At that time, I had sought to evaluate the normative significance of the Global Party Internationals and the newly emboldened Europarties in the wake of EU funding in 2004 (Regulation (EC) No 2004/2003 on the statute and financing of European political parties). That project advanced the argument that ‘political parties above the level of the nation-state’ had a contribution to make especially if a transnational (cosmopolitan) democracy was heralded as a necessary antidote to the democracy eroding tendencies of economic globalization. But it also recognized that there were significant deficiencies/challenges (some might say insurmountable) to orchestrate such an outcome especially if transnational political parties were ever to become household names.

(3) In the case of the European Union, its Parliament continues to suffer from many deficiencies even though ‘...it is the world’s most far-reaching experiment in transnational democracy’ (Corbet, Jacobs and Shackleton, *The European Parliament*, John Harper Publishers, 2005 p.2). Chief among them is the shadow of the oft-cited ‘second-order election thesis’ first formulated by Reif and Schmitt back in 1980 (*European Journal of Political Research*, Vol.8, No.1, pp.3-44). While it is fair to say that the EP has come a long way in its 39-years, *as an elected institution*, not least in terms of its role as a co-legislator, declining electoral turnout, lack of awareness amongst European citizens about what it does etc. cannot be ignored. For Giles Merrit, a strong pro-European, the profound weaknesses of the European Parliament mean that it ‘isn’t a real parliament: it can’t raise taxes, it can’t declare war, and it doesn’t provide the EU executive with any sort of democratic legitimacy...’ (*Slippery Slope: Europe’s Troubled Future*, OUP, 2016).

(4) *Such deficiencies have led to serious question marks about the ‘developmental potential’ of representative democracy at the EU-level ever advancing beyond its present incarnation.* Does that mean that the pessimism of writers such as Simon Hix, (‘Towards a partisan theory of EU politics’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.15, No. 8, 2008, pp.1254-1265) who quite rightly questions the capacity of the EPGs and Europarties to strengthen representative democracy at the EU-level, is hard-wired into the debate *ad infinitum*? Here, the channeling of ‘political will’ becomes crucial. What is the likelihood of it being directed towards facilitating the normative intent of the Treaty, or, in contrast, towards increasing indifference and/or overt hostility vis-à-vis those provisions?

(5) In order to account for the machinations surrounding the ‘developmental potential’ debate it was necessary to devise an appropriate analytical framework. Simply treating the Europarties/EPGs as cohesive entities, that engaged in politicking at an inter-party level was not enough. While this traditional approach could help us understand macro-level events such as the end of the ‘grand-coalition’ within the EP between the center-left and center-right in early 2017, it lacked the incisiveness necessary to capture what was happening with the sorts of meso/micro level events that this project was primarily concerned with. In a bid to address that deficiency, I believed that a recognition of ‘intra-party differentiation’ (what I termed ‘party streams’ – whose primary focus tends to be intra-party developments), alongside the existence of ‘differentiated cross-party tendencies’ (ideal-types) that intermittently coalesce, in various constellations, on the basis of certain attitudes/values towards the issue at hand (primarily issues with an inter-party focus) would facilitate a more nuanced understanding of events. On the assumption that these tendencies could be identified by virtue of their general attitude towards the developmental potential of democracy at the EU-level, I would go on to label them: *realist, idealist and sceptic*.

## 2 . 研究の目的

(1) This research project sought to evaluate the nature and sustainability of the EU’s attempt to construct a transnational representative democracy. In order to make a judgment about the nature, stability and extent of that desire it is necessary to relay, capture and assess the impact of the changing legal environment and political dynamics within which the Europarties and EPGs exist. Thus, the backdrop of the project included: a) the on-going evolution of the extra-parliamentary Europarties. This included the influence of ‘Regulation No. 1141/2014 on the statute and funding of European political parties and European political foundations’ which came into force in 2017. Its enactment would result in a tightening of the funding rules and the establishment of ‘The Authority’ whose purpose was to ‘register, control and sanction’; b) events tied to the 2014 European parliamentary elections, which continued to replicate the familiar tropes of its predecessors, while simultaneously giving a significant boost to Eurosceptic and far-right political forces; c) national elections in the wake of 2014; and d) the dramatic impact of the UK’s Brexit referendum.

(2) It was then hypothesized that the process of democracy building/developmental potential at the EU-level was dependent on the role and influence of the three identified *crosscutting tendencies: realists;*

*idealists and sceptics* and their views, on the appropriateness of pursuing such a path. As each tendency seeks to influence, take advantage of, and react to legal and political developments, it becomes important to ascertain their gravitational pull on each other and their subsequent alignment.

<i>Ideal-types</i>	General Position on EU-level democracy
<i>Realists</i>	Not dismissive but actions tempered by the belief that national realities will always trump transnational aspirations
<i>Idealists</i>	Constantly seeking ways to strengthen transnational measures
<i>Sceptics</i>	Hostility to the notion of representative democracy at the EU-level

## 3 . 研究の方法

(1) After undertaking a review of the academic literature and trawling through the output of think-tanks and political foundations, I adopted a qualitative approach in the belief that such an approach, as Fiona Devine put it, ‘...capture(s) meaning, process and context’ (‘Qualitative Methods’, in David Marsh & Gerry Stoker (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Macmillan, 1995, pp. 137-153. 138). I was driven by the belief that the collation and analysis of primary source material would be the most effective way to successfully produce a comprehensive descriptive and analytical picture of events. I concluded that elite interviews, non-participant observation and content analysis of newspaper, party related documentation and material generated by new media such as the Twitter# constituted a legitimate research toolkit. Implicitly embedded within the project design, in order to help channel and frame the discussion, was a SWOT approach – an approach recognized for the emphasis that it puts on identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

(2) The value and significance of non-participant observation at numerous Europarty Congresses (European People’s Party (EPP) 2014; Party of European Socialists (PES) 2016; Alliance of Liberals and Democrats in Europe Party (ALDE-P) 2016) cannot be overstated. In addition, research visits to the party headquarters of the European Green Party (EGP), the European Free Alliance (EFA) and the EPP (all in Brussels) as well as visits to Dublin to interview national parties, about the nature of their relationships with their corresponding Europarty, were equally beneficial. This type of fieldwork enabled me to interview politicians/party officials from across the political spectrum and collect key documents (often documents not in the public domain). I also had the opportunity to engage with numerous academic experts, in the fields of EU studies and

party politics, which expounded my understanding of the situational environment/ context within which the events were unfolding. These meetings provided informal peer review of my ideas and assumptions and, ultimately, sharpened my awareness of what factors were instrumental in influencing the developments that I was interested in. Participation in conferences, workshops and the opportunity to give public lectures had the same effect in providing invaluable feedback. Given that the aim of the methodological approach was to garner a deeper understanding of the EU's political system, it should be considered a success.

#### 4 . 研究成果

(1) *The relevance of intra-party and inter-party voices* - Central to this story been the interjection of *realist, idealist and sceptic* voices emanating and operating from within and across the Europarties and the EPGs. How have those voices influenced developments either in terms of facilitating, or frustrating, efforts to consolidate representative democracy at the EU-level? One cardinal illustration of this remains the still unresolved question: what precisely is the role of the Europarties? Should they become entities in their own right (as idealist voices hope) or 'service providers' under the tutelage of their national member parties (as realist voices attest)? Many national party leaders tend to see them simply as 'support groups' or as an umbrella whose role is limited to reducing transaction costs and to coordinating gatherings of national leaders. From that perspective, formulating and directing policy is strictly off-limits. Europarty staff and MEPs, who tend to exist at the interface of the realist and idealist camps, recognize the limitations surrounding the Europarties while, in many cases, often hoping for more as they seek to act as a conduit and build tactical alignments between the two camps and the national and the transnational levels. Their effectiveness, though, has often been problematized as a result of poor intra-group relations. Numerous informants, during the course of the research alluded to their Europarty's struggle to be taken seriously by their corresponding EPG or, for that matter, their national member parties.

(2) *A battle between expectations and capacity* - Throughout this project it was apparent that a duality of 'capacity' (the empirical dimension) and 'expectation' (the normative dimension) constituted a major fault-line between the three tendencies. This duality also underpinned what I termed a 'dilemma of indifference'. This is a scenario where: a) advocates for enhancing the transnational and supranational qualities of Europarties/EPGs inadvertently stoke a sense of indifference because their aspirational desires find

it difficult to fit with national realities; while b) those who hold a general hesitance or dismissiveness towards the Europarties *start* from a premise of indifference that accepts the existence (often only for expediency) of the Europarties *sans* any emotional attachment to them. In its hardest form, the opportunity to establish a Europarty and receive EU-funding is seen as a stepping stone to bring about their own abolition. How might the Europarties/EPGs face up to this conundrum - remembering that it may well have to be embraced rather than solved - is a question worthy of future research.

(3) *The significance of events* - It is perhaps not a surprise to find that the 'developmental potential' of representative democracy at the EU-level, remains highly contested and contingent on events. One such identified event was the '*spitzenkandidaten*' procedure (i.e. the 'indirect' election of the President of the European Commission). Its existence proved to be a clear victory for its parliamentary and Europarty backers who were able to outmaneuver European Council resistance by essentially presenting the latter with a *fait accompli*. This was accomplished by ensuring a political atmosphere whereby the Lisbon Treaty's Article 17(7) 'Taking into account the elections to the European Parliament...' came to be seen as an 'obligation' and not a 'suggestion'. The execution of the '*spitzenkandidaten*' procedure, however, proved extremely underwhelming - even after allowances are made for acknowledgment of its novelty. On paper, it offered a golden opportunity for those Europarties which chose to participate in it to enhance their relevance by taking full-control of a pan-European campaign. But the initial 'idealist' chatter of open primaries, competitive elections, intensive debates and campaigns organized by the Europarties floundered alongside the hesitance, or total reluctance, of many of their national member parties to actively embrace the procedure. Such an episode provided a prime example of inter-party tendencies coming together to initiate the process but intra-party streams actively or passively seeking to undermine it. While it looks like the process will return in 2019 there are, as of yet, scant signs that things will be different second time around. 'Withering on the vine' seems an apt metaphor.

(4) *The significance of events (2)* - Another significant event to have explicit ramifications for this project was the outcome of the 2016 UK Brexit referendum. The result would go on to become a cause célèbre for eurosceptic and far-right parties across the continent who were already basking in the electoral success they had received in the 2014 European elections (*Brexit! Et Maintenant La France! Read a campaign poster of the National Front*). By 2018,

the continuing electoral growth of these parties was rapidly becoming yet, another, ‘existential crisis’ for the EU.

(5) *Changing dynamics, uncertainty and disappointment* - At the conclusion of this project, it would appear that the realist tendency is in the ascendency where it remains comfortable with things as they presently stand. This translates into a *general reluctance* to embrace measures aimed at facilitating the ‘developmental potential’ of the EU’s representative democracy. For idealists, such an approach has gifted an opportunity for the sceptics to advance their agenda of actively seeking to undermine on-going democracy building efforts. *Sceptics*, bolstered by electoral successes at the national level, continue to utilize transnational opportunities to frustrate or undermine transnational developments.

	Relative constellation (2018)
<i>Realists</i>	Dominant - Unconvinced by arguments surrounding transnational lists. ‘ <i>Allow</i> ’, but not fully embrace <i>Spitzenkandidaten</i> . Generally, content with the <i>status quo</i> .
<i>Idealists</i>	Languishing - Passionate about transnational lists and a fully functioning <i>Spitzenkandidaten</i> .
<i>Sceptics</i>	Rising - Increasing impact on the narrative. Any means necessary to dismantle the system

The idealists appear to be languishing after failing to secure key goals. At the top of that list was the Holy Grail of *transnational lists*. Here was an issue that appeared to have much going for it. It had a national champion in the Élysée Palace, French President Macron; the ‘lucky-break’ of the issue being tied to coming availability of UK’s 73 parliamentary seats; and was in-tune with the normative intention of the Treaty and Commission pronouncements. It also, according to proponents, had the potential to address many of the oft-cited deficiencies associated with EP elections by providing voters (via a second ballot) with a chance to vote for European-level candidates campaigning on European-level issues. On February 7, 2018, however, the Parliament voted 368 against to 274 for its introduction. Once again, the crosscutting nature and gravitational pull of the three tendencies would drive events.

## 5 . 主な発表論文等

( 研究代表者、研究分担者及び連携研究者には下線 )

[ 雑誌論文 ] ( 計 7 件 )

Day, Stephen (2018) ‘Global Party Internationals: “Tackling the Dilemma of Indifference”, in S. Van Hecke et al.,

*Reconnecting European Political Parties with EU Citizens*. Office of International IDEA, Brussels, pp.35-39. *In print*.

Day, Stephen (2018) ‘The surprising longevity of Kawasaki’s Representative Assembly for Foreign Residents: an institutionalist account’, *Social Science Japan Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp.27-43. 査定有.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ssjj/jyx031>

Day, Stephen (2016) ‘A Call for Eclecticism: Teaching European Union (EU) Studies in Japan via an ‘Active’ and ‘Blended-Learning’ Approach’, *Japanese Journal of European Studies*, Vol. 4. Organization for Regional and Inter-Regional Studies, Waseda University, pp.93-105. 査定有

Day, Stephen (2015) ‘The 2014 European Parliamentary Elections: Emerging signs of a shift from ‘solidarity’ to ‘politicization’ at the EU-level’, *EU Studies in Japan*, No. 35, pp.77-102. 査定有.

Day, Stephen (2015) 「ユーロ政党とEUの価値規範」白井陽一郎編『EUの規範政治：グローバルヨーロッパの理想と現実』ナカニシヤ出版、116-135頁。

Day, Stephen (2015) ‘The Europarties and the Grail of Sustained Recognition’, Academic Symposium, Normative Politics in the European Union’, EUJ-Kansai, pp.6-14, [http://www.kwansei.ac.jp/i\\_industrial/attached/0000078695.pdf](http://www.kwansei.ac.jp/i_industrial/attached/0000078695.pdf)

Day, Stephen (2014) ‘Between “Containment” and “Transnationalization”: Where Next for the Euro-parties?’ *Acta Politica*, Vol.49, No.1, pp.5-29. 査定有.

[ 学会発表 ] ( 計 12 件 )

Day, Stephen, 児玉昌己 (久留米大学法学部) 瀬能 繁 (日本経済新聞編集委員兼論説委員) (2018) プロジェクトシンポジウム大分市ホルトホールにて 1 月 20 日 16.00-19.00 「EU はさらに統合を深化させるのか、解体にむかうのか」EU 政治の現実と欧州合衆国の夢

Day, Stephen (2017) Brexit means Brexit? Or Does It? EU からの完全離脱 - 本当にそれでいいのか!? - EUJ-Kyushu, Extension Lecture Series 「EU の展望 / Europe in Prospect」 October 24<sup>th</sup>.

Day, Stephen (2017) Global Britain in a post-Brexit era- 脱 EU 後のイギリス : 「グローバルな国家」は維持できるのか

Lecture given at *United Nations University Summer School, 33<sup>rd</sup> Shonan Session*, Tokyo, September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Day, Stephen (2017) 'Crisis and Opportunity: European Integration and party politics at the national and EU-level 2016-2019', paper presented at *European Union Studies Association-Asia Pacific (EUSA-AP)*, Aoyama, Tokyo, July 1-2.

Day, Stephen (2016) 'The best-laid plans of mice and men often go askew': thinking about the electoral consequences of economic globalization', paper presented at 'Progress of Globalization and the Creation of New World Rules, International symposium, organized by the Organization for Regional and Inter-Regional Studies (ORIS) at Waseda University, November 24<sup>th</sup>.

Day, Stephen (2016) '歴史を変えた国民投票. イギリスと EU 離脱', 大分市大分 EU 協会にて講演 7 月 29 日.

Day, Stephen (2016) 'ブレグジット-イギリスの 6 月 23 日 EU 国民投票について考え直してみる', イギリス政治研究会、同志社大学、七月 23 日.

Day, Stephen and Simon Lightfoot (2016) 'Between Irrelevance and Romanticism – understanding the Global Party Internationals (GPIs)', paper presented at 'Transnational Partisanship Workshop, London School of Economics (LSE), May 23-24. *Presented by Simon Lightfoot*.

Day, Stephen (2015) 'The United Kingdom: To Be Or Not To Be a Member of the European Union', paper presented at EUJ-Kyushu 5th Annual International Conference "Whither Europe?: Views from Within and Beyond the Union", Kyushu University, Nishijin Plaza, December 6<sup>th</sup>.

Day, Stephen (2014) 'The 8<sup>th</sup> European Parliamentary Elections: A catalyst for Solidarity?', paper presented at the 35<sup>th</sup> EUSA-Japan annual conference, Risscho University, Tokyo, November 8-9.

Day, Stephen and Ian Neary (2014), 'Japan's Parliamentary Opposition: the possibilities of realignment', *European Association of Japanese Studies (EAJS) Congress*, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, August 27-30. *Presented by Ian Neary*.

Day, Stephen (2014) 'The 8<sup>th</sup> European Parliamentary Election: 'This time it will be different won't it?', EUJ-Waseda July 18<sup>th</sup>. [www.euij-waseda.jp/eng/whatsnew/20140805-1.html](http://www.euij-waseda.jp/eng/whatsnew/20140805-1.html)

〔図書〕(計 0 件)

〔産業財産権〕

出願状況 (計 0 件)

名称：  
発明者：  
権利者：  
種類：  
番号：  
出願年月日：  
国内外の別：

取得状況 (計 0 件)

名称：  
発明者：  
権利者：  
種類：  
番号：  
取得年月日：  
国内外の別：

〔その他〕  
ホームページ等  
<http://academicstudy.jugem.jp/>

#### 6. 研究組織

(1) 研究代表者  
デイ、スティーブン (Day, Stephen)  
大分大学・経済学部・教授

研究者番号：60404357

(2) 研究分担者 ( )

研究者番号：

(3) 連携研究者 ( )

研究者番号：

(4) 研究協力者 ( )