

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	<i>xix</i>
Introduction	1
I. The Emerging Debate on the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	4
II. How to Theorise on the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	5
A. Research Questions and the General Purpose of the Book: An 'Explanatory-Evaluative' Theory of the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	6
B. The Analytical Framework: A Combination of Criminalisation and Harmonisation Theories	7
C. What Indications are There from EU Constitutional Values and Principles for a Legitimate Use of EU Criminal Law?	7
D. How Does the EU Legitimise Resort to Criminal Law in Practice?	8
E. Are EU Criminalisation Choices Consistent with EU Constitutional Values and Principles?	10
F. Structure of the Book	13
III. The Practical Importance of (EU Criminal Law) Theory	13
IV. The Broader Reach of the Discussion on the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	15
A. EU Criminalisation and the Normative Foundations of the EU Criminal Justice Area	16
B. EU Criminalisation and the EU Constitutional Identity	17
1. Why Criminal Law? The Question of, and Models for, the Legitimacy of Criminal Law	21
I. Why is Criminal Law Special? A Consequence-Based Approach	22
A. The Impact on Individuals' Liberty as a Defining Feature of Criminal Law	23
B. The Impact on Individuals' Dignity as a Defining Feature of Criminal Law	25
C. Higher Procedural Safeguards as a Non-defining Feature of Criminal Law	27

II.	The Need to Legitimate Criminalisation Choices	28
III.	A (Liberal) Deontological Approach to the Legitimacy of Criminal Law	30
IV.	A (Liberal) Utilitarian Approach to the Legitimacy of Criminal Law	33
V.	A Joint Deontological-Utilitarian Approach to the Legitimacy of Criminal Law?	35
	A. Opposition and Reconciliation of Deontological and Utilitarian Approaches	35
	B. The Empirical and Normative Advantages of a Joint Approach	39
VI.	The Doctrinal Character of the Debate on the Legitimacy of Criminal Law	40
VII.	Conclusions	43
2.	Why EU Criminal Law? The Question of, and the Models for, the Legitimacy of Supranational Criminal Law	44
I.	Is the Debate on the Legitimacy of Criminal Law Relevant to the EU Legal Order?	45
	A. EU Definitions of Crimes and Member States' Limited Discretion	48
	B. Enforcement of EU Criminal Law Obligations: Infringement Proceedings and the Bar on Direct Effect	51
	C. <i>Taricco</i> and <i>MAS and MB</i> as a Challenge to the Bar on the Direct Effect?	53
	D. The Significant Impact of EU Criminalisation Choices and Their Ensuing Need for Legitimation	56
	E. The Repressive Potential of EU Criminal Law and its Accentuated Need for Legitimacy	58
II.	What Do EU Constitutional Values and Principles Tell Us about the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law?	62
	A. EU Values as a Foundation for a Deontological Approach to Criminalisation	62
	B. EU Proportionality as a Neutral Framework to Incorporate Deontological and Utilitarian Considerations	64
	C. Subsidiarity: A Utilitarian Approach to EU Criminalisation	69
III.	Conclusions	74
3.	Rationales for the Harmonisation and Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	76
I.	A Definition of Harmonisation as a Legal Process	76
II.	Does Harmonisation Have an Inherent, Values-Based Dimension?	78

A.	Normative v Instrumental Types of Harmonisation	78
B.	Rationales for Harmonisation and the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	80
III.	Harmonisation of National Criminal Law within the EU Legal Order.....	82
IV.	The 'Values-Based' Criminalisation Rationale for Harmonisation: Deontological EU Criminal Law.....	84
V.	The 'Justice', 'Free Movement' and 'Cooperation' Rationales for Harmonisation: Utilitarian EU Criminal Law	85
A.	Instrumental Rationales for Harmonisation	86
B.	... Implying a Utilitarian Legitimacy for EU Criminal Law	88
VI.	The Socialising Rationale for Harmonisation: Utilitarian EU Criminal Law	91
VII.	The 'Regulatory' Rationale for Harmonisation: Utilitarian EU Criminal Law	92
VIII.	Conclusions	93
4.	EU Competences on Securitised Criminalisation: From a Utilitarian to an Integrated Approach to EU Criminal Law	95
I.	EU Criminalisation Competences: Securitised v Functional Criminalisation.....	96
II.	A Utilitarian Legitimacy for EU Criminal Law under the Maastricht and Amsterdam Third Pillar	98
A.	The Position for Harmonisation in the Treaty: Evidence of a Cooperation Rationale.....	100
B.	The Objective of an Area of Freedom, Security and Justice: A Free Movement and Justice Rationale for Harmonisation?	101
III.	Integrated Legitimacy for EU Criminal Law under the Treaty of Lisbon	106
A.	EU Criminalisation Competence in the Treaty of Lisbon: An Overview	107
B.	Article 83(1) as an Example of Integrated Legitimacy for EU Criminal Law	113
IV.	Conclusions	119
5.	EU Competences on Functional Criminalisation: The Route to Utilitarian EU Criminal Law	121
I.	The Scope of EU Functional Criminalisation	122
II.	The Early Case Law: Sanctioning Obligations and an Integrated Approach to Criminal Law	123
III.	The Case Law in the 2000s: Criminalisation Obligations and an Integrated Approach to EU Criminal Law.....	126

A.	The 2005 <i>Environmental Crime</i> Case: The Utilitarian Dimension of EU Criminal Law.....	127
B.	The 2005 <i>Environmental Crime</i> Case: The Deontological Dimension of EU Criminal Law.....	128
C.	The Commission's and the Parliament's Diverging Interpretations of the <i>Environmental Crime</i> Judgment.....	131
D.	The 2007 <i>Ship Source Pollution</i> Case: A Confirmed Integrated Agenda for the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law?.....	133
IV.	The Treaty of Lisbon: The Final (Utilitarian) Word.....	135
A.	Article 83(2) TFEU: The Tension between Utilitarian EU Criminal Law and EU Values.....	136
B.	Article 83(2) TFEU: Utilitarian EU Criminal Law and Subsidiarity.....	138
V.	Conclusions.....	139
6.	From Tampere to Stockholm: The Path towards Integrated Legitimacy.....	141
I.	The Utilitarian Approach to Criminal Law in Pre-Lisbon Justice and Home Affairs Programmes.....	142
II.	The Integrated Approach in the 2009 Stockholm Justice and Home Affairs Programme.....	144
III.	The Silence in the 2014 Justice and Home Affairs Strategic Guidelines.....	147
IV.	The EU Criminalisation Policy Documents: The Core of the Discussion.....	148
A.	The 2009 Council's Conclusions: A Deontological, Harm-Based Approach to EU Criminal Law.....	151
B.	The 2011 Commission's Communication: Hinting at an Integrated Approach.....	154
C.	The 2012 Parliament Resolution: An Integrated, Damage-Based Approach.....	161
V.	The Shift from a Utilitarian to an Integrated Approach in Policy Documents.....	164
A.	The Growing Importance of the Deontological Approach to the Legitimacy of Criminal Law.....	165
B.	The EU Policy Documents and EU Treaty Norms: Synchronies and Ruptures.....	166
VI.	Conclusions.....	167
7.	Legitimizing EU Criminal Law in Practice: The Case of Racism and Xenophobia, Market Abuse and PIF Crimes.....	168
I.	The Patchwork Structure of EU Criminal Law and the Choice of Case Studies.....	169
II.	The 2008 Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia: Symbolic EU Criminal Law under Amsterdam.....	172

A.	The Values-Based Criminalisation Rationale of the Framework Decision: EU Values of Liberty, Democracy, and Individuals' Safety	174
B.	The Cooperation Rationale of the Framework Decision: Was Transnational Racist and Hate Speech Really the Problem?	177
C.	A Complementary Social Engineering Rationale for the Framework Decision?	179
D.	The Framework Decision as Symbolic EU Criminal Law in a Utilitarian Institutional and Policy Context?.....	180
III.	The 2014 Market Abuse Directive: Symbolic EU Criminal Law under Lisbon?.....	181
A.	The EU Fight against Market Abuse: The Road to Criminal Law	183
B.	The Offences in the Market Abuse Directive: Insider Dealing, Unlawful Disclosure of Information and Market Manipulation	184
C.	The Regulatory Rationale in the Market Abuse Directive: Three Arguments in Favour of the Effectiveness of Criminal Law	186
D.	The Weakness of the Empirical Data on the Regulatory Rationale	188
E.	The Normative Rationale of the Market Abuse Directive: The Seriousness Threshold	189
F.	The Market Abuse Directive and Article 83(2) TFEU: An Integrated/Symbolic Approach in a Utilitarian Institutional Context?.....	191
IV.	The 2017 PIF Directive: An Integrated Legitimacy for EU Criminal Law?	192
A.	Explicit Rationales for Criminal Law in the Field of PIF Offences: An Apparent Focus on Utilitarian Grounds	194
B.	Deontological, Values-Based Rationales Guiding Definitions of Offences.....	199
C.	Deontological and Utilitarian Rationales in the Definitions of Sanctions.....	205
D.	The PIF Directive as (Relatively) Soundly Legitimate EU Criminal Law	208
V.	Conclusions	208
8.	Conclusions.....	211
I.	The Long-Standing Doctrinal Debate on the Legitimacy of Criminal Law	211
II.	The Relevance and Legal Dimensions of the Debate on the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law.....	212

III. The EU Constitutional Values and Principles and the Legitimacy of EU Criminal Law	213
IV. The Specifics of the EU Criminalisation Process.....	214
V. The Main Argument of the Book: Symbolic EU Criminal Law in a Bureaucratic Criminal Law Institutional Framework.....	215
VI. The Dangers of an Expansion of Non-legitimate EU Criminal Law	218
<i>Bibliography</i>	221
<i>Index</i>	235