

EUROPEAN UNION AND GLOBALISATION

Ivana Mandysová

Ústav veřejné správy a práva, Fakulta ekonomicko-správní, Univerzita Pardubice

Abstrakt: Globalizace se odehrává v prostoru, ve kterém je nyní nové řízení moci a kde jsou nové struktury, které zaručují občanům jejich práva. Základní jev demokratické vlády není specificky evropský; je to všeobecný jev vztahující se ke globalizaci. Prohlubování ekonomické integrace omezilo jak obsahově tak formálně autonomii svrchovaných států v záležitostech ekonomické politiky. Nadstátní instituce, které nahrazují národní vlády, suverénním státům ve vzestupné míře odebírají základní nástroje ekonomické regulace v zájmu celého společenství. Globalizace se uskutečňuje v prostoru, ve kterém je nyní nová forma vlády a přicházejí nové struktury, které zajišťují občanská práva.

Abstract: Globalisation takes place in a space where there is now new control of power and there are new structures which guarantee the rights of citizens. The essential phenomenon of democratic governance is not specifically European; it is a general phenomenon relating to globalisation. Deepening economic integration has restricted, both substantively and formally, the autonomy of sovereign states in matters of economic policy. The supranational institutions which are replacing national governments increasingly take away the basis of economic regulation from sovereign states in name of interest of the Communities. Globalisation takes place in a space where there is now new control of power and there are new structures which guarantee the rights of citizens.

Klíčová slova: Globalizace, Evropská unie, občanská práva, demokratická vláda, prohlubování ekonomické integrace.

Key words: Globalisation, European Union, citizens rights, democratic governance, deepening economic integration.

The key features of globalisation today are the internationalisation of production and finance that link suppliers, producers and consumers both within and across national boundaries in novel ways. The prime movers in the process of globalisation are translational corporations and banks operating through global networks made possible by the new information technology. [5]

The EU is resolutely in favour of new and comprehensive trade liberalisation as evidenced by its proactive stance towards the Millennium Round.

Since the latter half of 1999 increasing signs of optimism for the European economy have emerged. With inflation and interest rates at a historic low point, and with good unemployment results in the periphery economies and less slowly falling unemployment in the larger centre countries, prospects for the future began to look bright.

The Scandinavian countries, as well as Austria and Holland, have been successful in bringing down their unemployment by adopting more flexible labour market arrangements which is the key to success when fiscal policy is constrained. The divergent unit labour costs in the fast-growing and slow growing economies, which are reflected in improving or declining

competitiveness, should with time bring about the convergence of labour market conditions throughout the entire EU by spurring labour market reforms in those countries where reform has been too slow.

Europe has a good record of basic research but it succeeds to a lesser extent in translating its scientific progress into commercial success.

Europe is now set to lead the world in mobile telephone technology. Based on its record of success in the field of digital radio technology and by gaining some first-mover advantages from standard selling, European firms are now leaders in the field and European consumers are leaders in the purchase of mobile phones. [1]

The next leap in technology will bring about widespread access of mobile phones to the Internet on a scale currently existing for personal computers. This implies expanding demand for new technologies and new services the provision of which could prove to be good for Europe.

The EU as a regional trading block gives preferential treatment to its own members over third countries, from the perspective of the WTO multilateral trade system the question concerning EU trade policy, and particularly since it has expanded from fifteen to twenty-five member countries, is the extent to which it contributes to trade diversion rather than trade creation and is, therein, effectively undermining the global multilateral system.[4]

Since the creation of the common market the EU has invested greater effort in internal trade liberalisation between its members than in external liberalisation. When the EU embarked on its most important internal liberalisation to date, which was the single market programme (SMP), fears concerning the external protectionist consequences of the programme gave rise to accusations of Fortress Europe. [2]

The SMP, which is the centrepiece of EU trade policy, came into effect on 1 January 1993 as the Uruguay Round in GATT was drawing to a close so that its external consequences could not be fully understood at that time. Now sufficient time has elapsed to provide enough data to analyse how it has affected the external market access regime of EU.

The SMP was initially conceived as a rather narrow trade liberalisation programme to complete the work already mandated under the Rome Treaty. But now the SMP is transformed into a major ongoing process which went far beyond the 1992 target of trade liberalisation. The SMP is a complex legislative programme of internal liberalisation, the effects on the market access regime of the EU can be analysed as follows:

- The removal of national quantitative restrictions (QRs). Prior to the SMP there was a perplexing array of formal and informal QRs by the individual member states including import quotas, tariff quotas, surcharges, import monitoring, licensing, voluntary export restraints (VERs), and orderly marketing arrangements (OMAs). In manufacturing, most of these restrictions were in the sector of textiles, clothing, footwear, steel and automobiles. These QRs were either eliminated completely or substituted by QRs at the EU level. In the case of elimination the effect on market access was clear, in the case of an EU QR the effect was complex.
- The removal of physical barriers, notably the elimination of customs controls at national borders, had a cost-reducing effect on suppliers and was therefore positive.
- In the areas of technical barriers to trade such as national regulations and standards there was policy change which took the form of either mutual recognition or

harmonisation. In the case of mutual recognition this improved market access and competition, where harmonisation took place there was complex change.

- Concerning barriers to the provision of services, there was liberalisation and freedom of establishment which improved the market access regime for external suppliers.
- Barriers in the business environment, for example, intellectual property rights, company law and taxation were reduced as the policy change towards approximation of laws made for simpler operating conditions.
- Barriers in regulated industries, especially in telecommunications, were liberalised which improved market access for external providers of services
- In public procurement there was some liberalisation and some discrimination.

The SMP has, on balance, improved market access for outside suppliers of goods and services. So the EU, which is keen to multilateralise its internal liberalisation to its trading partners in the context of the WTO, actively supports a new round of trade negotiations. Furthermore it proposes the SMP model as a blueprint for further trade liberalisation at the global level.

As the SMP which was strongly oriented towards the needs and demands of industry, gathered momentum, other important external stakeholders such as environmental organisations and labour unions seized the initiative and were able to sufficiently influence the policy process to get environmental and labour standards on the EU agenda and to get substantive new provisions in the treaties.

Concerning environmental protection, 'sustainable development' has been adopted as a treaty goal since the Amsterdam Treaty (which came into force in 1999) and environmental protection cuts across all areas of policy. The external stakeholders have played an important role in influencing public opinion. Public awareness has been heightened by the political action campaigns of environmental organisations across Europe.

Issues such as waste management, nuclear energy, the chemical industries and, more recently, genetically modified food, have been implemented. New legislation has been supported, highly organized and have been able to exert considerable influence over product development, product lifecycles, and packaging. The public enthusiasm for 'green products' has led to the EU eco label for high quality, environmentally superior products. Green political parties are strong in many European countries. The European Parliament also has a large green contingent.

The 'social dimension' of the single European market, although hotly contested, also evolved on the policy agenda. The concept of social rights was given, for the first time, a basis in law and the powers of the European institutions were expanded to regulate labour standards governing health and safety in the workplace. The Commission was also given responsibility for promoting a 'social dialogue' between management and labour at the EU level. And economic and social cohesion was strengthened by increased transfers to the low-income countries through the European Social Fund.

As the SMP went beyond the conventional trade liberalisation of eliminating border tariffs and quotas, it increasingly encroached upon long-established areas of national sovereignty. This resulted in a major shift of power away from the member states to the supranational institutions. The Commission, because of its power to initiate legislation, increasingly assumed the role of policy entrepreneur and of equal if not greater importance was the European Court of Justice (ECJ), on whose judgments the Commission heavily relied in formulating its policy proposals.

[3]

The response of the EU to fostering democratic governance and civil society cohesion has been ongoing constitutional review of the treaties through the process of inter-governmental conferences (IGCs), notably the treaty of Maastricht which entered into force in November 1993 and the Treaty of Amsterdam which came into effect in May 1999.

Substantive new provisions include the principle of subsidiary which is an ordering device for assigning regulatory power to diverse agencies at the local, national and international level. The constitutional protection of citizen's rights has also been incorporated into the treaties.

The classical political concepts of a confederation of states or a federal state are no longer considered to be adequate for purposes of analysis of the EU. The term 'multi-level governance', which draws attention to the existence of several coexisting levels of regulation and the interaction between them, is a unique system.

The advantage of this concept is that it has general application. An important distinction, which is implicit in the concept of multi-level governance is made between 'government' in the classical sense and the contemporary notion of 'governance', the constitutional evolution of the EU has, therefore, gone towards satisfying the demands of the external stakeholders and civil society. Demands for environmental and labour standards as well as protection of citizens' rights have been taken on board and are becoming more firmly anchored in European law. This EU model of dealing with civil society is far ahead of the world and could, therefore, provide some lessons.

References:

1. El-Agraa, M., The European Union Economics and Policies, Prentice Hall, Harlow, England, 2003
2. Hitiris, T., European Union Economics, Prentice Hall, Harlow, England, 2003
3. Hosli, M., Van Deemen A., Widgren M., Institutional Challenges in the European Union, Routledge, London, United Kingdom, 2002
4. Levy R., Implementing European Union Public Policy, Cheltenham, United Kingdom, 2003
5. Sandholtz W., European Integration and Supranational Governance, Oxford University Press, 1998

Kontaktní adresa:

Ing. Ivana Mandysová, Ph.D.

Univerzita Pardubice

Fakulta ekonomicko-správní

Ústav veřejné správy a práva

ivana.mandysova upce.cz

telefon: 46 603 6528