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2. Title of the application

3. Research proposal (3a + 3b = max 800 words)

3a. Problem statement and theoretical background

Compared to national political systems, the European Union is often found wanting as it lacks certain systemic properties that are generally included in established, nation-state based, models of democracy (Siedentop, 2000; Coultrap, 1999). At the same time, many have submitted that the EU’s ‘sui generis’ nature requires us to reconsider our models and standards of democracy (e.g. Weiler et al. 1995; Majone, 1998; Moravcsik, 2002; Follesdal and Hix, 2006). However, in the absence of an appropriate standard, this approach risks justifying any ad hoc revision of our models as befitting the distinctive nature of the EU. What is more, much of the debate on the EU’s democratic character has remained rather theoretical and stayed devoid of concrete empirical indicators that would allow us to identify when and where democratic deficits occur.

Nowhere has the EU’s democratic problematique been more painfully exposed than in the case of the making of the European Constitutional Treaty. Paradoxically, whereas the making of the EU Constitutional Treaty was set up as the most open and democratic process ever used for European treaty revisions, its end product eventually floundered on the negative verdict of the electorates in France and the Netherlands. What is particularly interesting about this process from the perspective of democratic theory is that the different phases of the process exemplified different mechanisms of democratic representation. Like previous Treaty-revision processes, the Heads of Government in the European Council played a crucial role in the initiation of the process and in the negotiations in the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC). However, much of the work of the IGC was prepared by the European Convention, which included delegates from the national and from the European level, and which sought to legitimise itself
through the public nature of its proceedings. Finally, in the ratification phase several member states involved citizens directly through referendums.

So far most political science analyses of the EU Constitutional process have only looked at particular stages, most notably the Convention (Magnette and Nicolaïdis, 2004; Pollak and Slominski, 2004; Risse and Kleine, 2007), or have remained mostly theoretical (Moravcsik, 2006; Fossum and Menéndez, 2005). Against this background this project has a double aim. First, it seeks to provide an integrated analysis of the representative quality of the whole Constitutional process from the famous Berlin speech of Joschka Fischer in May 2000 to the suspension of the ratification procedure in June 2005. Secondly, it is to review the repertoire of mechanisms for democratic representation for broader lessons regarding the challenges and viability of democratic representation in the multilevel polity of the EU.

3b. Method / Approach

Instead of departing from a comprehensive model of democracy, the analysis is premised on the sole standard of ‘the criterion of constituent-representative congruence’ (Mansbridge, 2003: 526) according to which democratic representation eventually requires the decisions taken by political representatives to be aligned with the views of their constituencies (cf. Pitkin, 1967). To ensure that politicians are aligned with their constituencies, a distinction is commonly made between upstream controls (manifestos, public pledges and mandates) and downstream controls (re-election, accountability) mechanisms (Przeworski, Stokes and Manin, 1999).

In an important recent article Jane Mansbridge (2003) has pointed out that thinking of political representation has traditionally tended to privilege upstream (or ‘promissory’) controls that are essentially static as they rely on the original preferences of the constituency. In contrast, downstream or deliberative controls allow for the representatives to communicate back to the constituency. The position where congruence is to occur is thus not given by the constituency’s original intentions but may be found anywhere where it can be convinced to go. Mansbridge concludes that, rather than excluding each other, the two kinds of controls ‘have complementary functions for different contexts and can, thus, be viewed as cumulative, not oppositional’ (Mansbridge, 2003: 526).

Building on Mansbridge’s conceptual framework, this project systematically reviews which mechanisms of representation were at work for each of the phases of the EU Constitutional process. In particular it will examine the extent to which politicians’ positions were actually constrained upstream in the IGC and the Convention, and to what extent politicians were successful in downstream deliberation with the public during the Convention and the referendum campaigns.

The analysis draws on the wealth of data that I have gathered on the Constitutional process, first as a direct observer of the Convention and the IGC (while working for CEPS in Brussels) and subsequently from the national ratification debates (back in the Netherlands at the VU and at the WRR). The information is mostly qualitative of nature (interviews, policy documents, personal observation notes, news coverage, secondary literature), but I also draw on quantitative data (public opinion). Most of this material I have already analysed in-depth for previous articles but, however much these publications share a similar orientation, they have not been integrated within a single, integrated theoretical framework yet.
4. Key publications relevant to the present proposal (3 - 5)


5. Time Plan (max ½ A4 or 100 words)

The primary objective is to develop the integrated theoretical framework. There is no need for additional data-collection, except for the odd detail that can be ascertained by document searches or phone calls. Once the theoretical framework is established, it can be applied to re-analyse the phases of the process and to distil conclusions. Planning is on the basis of 0.6 fte research time throughout 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Dec 2008</td>
<td>Developing and writing theoretical framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-April 2009</td>
<td>Re-analysing various phases: Laeken declaration (on basis of Crum 2003), Convention (Crum 2004), IGC (Crum 2007b), Ratification (Crum 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June 2009</td>
<td>Distilling conclusions and integrating analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-August 2009</td>
<td>Finalising manuscript</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Relevance (scientific, societal; max 300 words)

Whether and how democratic practices can be adjusted to the challenges of international decision-making in a globalising world is a matter of increasing political and academic concern. Arguably the EU Constitutional process has been the most ambitious effort ever to democratically open up international decision-making both in its scope as well as in the institutional means employed. Its failure should thus help to develop theories of whether and how international decision-making can be democratised. In particular, I believe the Constitutional process allows us to distil generalisable insights about whether and under what conditions democratic representation in international institutions is served by a) the superimposition of multiple principles of representation (national representatives, European representative, interest intermediaries and direct participation), and b) widespread efforts to ensure expertise, transparency and high quality deliberation per se.

From a societal perspective, it is clear that the EU Constitutional process has been the focus of much political attention in Europe from the Humboldt Universität speech of Joschka Fischer up to the failed referendums in France and the Netherlands. Even if a revised Treaty has now been drafted far outside of public view, politicians in Brussels and the member states (not least the Netherlands) are still trying to come to grips with what went wrong in the Constitutional process. Hence there is a need for a proper understanding of how and where politicians and their constituencies lost each other. This societal interest has also
been brought to evidence in my engagement in various projects for the Scientific
Council for Government Policy (WRR) and for the Centre for European Policy
Studies (CEPS) in Brussels.

7. Expected output and contributions (7a - 7d = max 500 words)

7a. Expected output

A research monograph ready for publication.
The envisaged publication outlet is the prestigious ‘Themes in European
Governance’-series of Cambridge University Press edited by Andreas Follesdal
(University of Oslo) who has responded very positively to the plan.

7b. Contribution to the research program of the Department

The research goes to the heart of the Department of Political Science’s research
programme ‘Multi-layered Governance in EUrope and Beyond’, and in particular of
the research cluster on ‘Multilevel Governance and Models of Democracy’. There
are obvious parallels with the work under the joint Chair in Multi-Level
Governance, but also with that of colleagues in the comparative politics and
international relations sections of the department.
Within this context, the project distinguishes itself by linking empirical research
on EU decision-making to current debates in democratic theory.

7c. Contribution to the research mission of the CCSS

By finalising the proposed monograph, the project is to conclude what has been a
very fruitful line of research, as evidenced by the stream of articles that have
come out of it. While these articles have already established my name as a
prominent author on the EU Constitutional process, the book should become an
unassailable reference for anyone touching on the topic, while at the same time
being an important contribution to the ongoing debate on the EU’s democratic
deficit.

Even if the main approach of the project is a normative one in which the
actual process is assessed against the norm expressed by ‘the criterion of
constituent-representative congruence’, there are important comparative aspects
to the project in the intra-case comparison between the various phases and in the
implied comparison of the Laeken constitutional process with previous Treaty
revisions and with the practice of day-to-day EU decision-making.

A further merit of the project is its inter-disciplinary orientation as it
engages in particular with the disciplines of constitutional law and political
philosophy.

7d. Additional value
- What is the additional value of the proposal? Why is it not possible / would it be possible to conduct the proposed project within regular work time?
- Has the content of the proposal (similar subject matter) been submitted elsewhere? If yes, where?

The intention to integrate my writings on the EU Constitutional process into a
monograph has been there for some time. However, a writing project of this size
has turned out to demand a much wider span of concentration than an article.
While the concept of the book has been developing in my mind, so far I have
been unable to find this time and concentration amidst my teaching obligations.
The fellowship would allow me to really focus on the book as a whole next
academic year.
Indeed, I would say that the fellowship will be crucial for the successful conclusion of the book.

The book also fits very well with my engagement in the EC sponsored RECON-project (www.reconproject.eu). Unfortunately, RECON money is limited to additional costs (e.g. workshops, postdoc) and it could thus not be used to buy me out of teaching obligations.

The proposal has not been submitted elsewhere

8. Replacement of applicant’s teaching obligations
Replacement of the applicant’s teaching obligations is stated in the attached letter by the Head of the Dept. of Political Science in Appendix A.
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