

Global Markets, European Constraints: The EU and the Programmatic Destabilization of Social Democracy in Historical Perspective

Gerassimos Moschonas

Introduction

The financial and economic crisis triggered in 2007–2008 struck at the heart of “Third Way” ideas, leaving a great void in the social democratic vision and social democratic policies. Today, torn between austerity policies, a mild anti-austerity discourse, rhetorical Euro-Keynesianism, and poor elaborations of “green growth” (cf. Escalona, Vieira, and De Waele 2013, 23–24) this great historical current lacks a convincing alternative. Wider transformations in modern capitalism, often conceptualized under the catch-all rubric of “neoliberal globalization”, together with choices made by social democratic leaderships themselves, have produced a system of influences and constraints within which social democracy – and the Left as a whole – find themselves trapped.

The undermining of social democracy’s historical pillars – a powerful working class, trade unions, a collectivist culture – and also the seismic shift in the economic and institutional landscape produced by globalization and the EU system are dismantling social democratic parties: they sap their organizational strength (Delwit 2015) and erode their implantation in society, their efficiency in government, and their capacity for programmatic innovation. The cumulative effects of the triangle defined by the *structural weakening of the working class, the EU, and globalization* are indeed infernal. And they have imperiled the historical vocation of social democracy as a moderate – but efficient – agency for social transformation. The operation and prestige of the “typical” social democratic brand has become *highly* blurred within “an increasingly deconstructed ... ‘center-left’ political space” (Ross 2013, 600–601). The great electoral contraction of social democracy – not a short-term tendency, as the term “electoral crisis” would suggest – is the best-known and most discussed manifestation of a vicious circle of defeats and political retreat characterized by absence of vision and lack of ideological novelty.

Social democracy between globalization and the EU

Are the constraints on social democracy a result primarily of globalization or of European integration? In general, the thesis that neoliberalism initially came to dominance as a result of the collapse of the post-war boom and the limitations of Keynesianism is fairly convincing (Lavelle 2008, 21–23). It was the crisis in the effectiveness of Keynesianism

In this short think-note citations are minimal

(and the consequent weakening of the material basis of egalitarian policies) that thrust hitherto marginal liberal ideas onto center stage. Policy liberalization and financialization predate the Single European Act and Maastricht. Likewise, the programmatic and identity uncertainty of social democracy predates the European Union and extends beyond the borders of Europe (Labourism in Australia and New Zealand is evidence enough; Lavelle 2008; Schulman 2015). The gradual adoption of liberal solutions at a *national* level – and especially their (relative) effectiveness – influenced and, in a subsequent phase, partly fashioned European integration. Thus, frontal attacks on ‘neoliberal’ Europe overlook the fact that the first leap forward in policy liberalization occurred at a national level, as attested by the financial big bang of the 1980s.¹ Even so, the Single European Market – “one of the most open internal markets in the world” (Ross 2013, 601) – and the implementation of the Maastricht Treaty converged to create a specific trend in Europe, an accelerated and focused adjustment that made the neoliberalization of European integration – and the de-social-democratization of European social democracy – deeper and more coherent. Through a snowball effect, the EU, since the beginning of the 1990s, has become the main driving force boosting economic liberalization and financialization. It led national governments “much further than they wanted to go at the outset” (Jabko 2009, 130–32. Also: Nölke 2017; Benhabib and Eich forthcoming). As Francis McGowan has written, “European integration involves member states committing themselves to a much more robust set of rules than those which might be regarded as framing globalization (WTO, IMF, etc.). Moreover, in the detail of reforms, the imprint of the EU is much clearer than that of global pressures” (2001, 98).

In particular, three key features of the EU have attenuated social democracy’s capacity for self-renewal and contributed to its ideological and programmatic destabilization.

Institutional conservatism and policy stability

Decisions within this “non-state polity” derive from negotiations between the three poles of the institutional triangle (Commission, Council, Parliament), on one hand, and from negotiations between the 27 member states, on the other. The independence of the ECB and the dynamic role of the European Court of Justice (whose decisions have provided a broad scope for the neoliberal content of European policies beyond what was desired by national governments) increase the polycentric character of the regime. Although the European Council has in the process become the center and key motor of integration (with the leading role assumed by Germany in recent years), the multiplicity of centers of power and the superimposition of decision-making levels make the EU a profoundly conservative system (Moschonas 2009), not in the sense of

1 For example, financial deregulation in three of the most influential European countries – Britain, Germany, and France – preceded the corresponding European strategy, albeit only in part (Cohen 2010, 143–46).

a Left/Right divide, but in the sense that it does not easily revisit a decision, once made. Taking a decision is difficult enough, and, when taken, it is even more difficult to change it, especially if it bears the signature of Germany. Compromises between institutions, between member states, and between party families are the rule. Transformative leadership and policy renewal do not easily come out of such a regime. As a result, the EU is characterized by a “very high level” of policy stability (Tsebelis 2002).

Governance at the center

Exactly because it is founded on the operation of many power centers, the European polity tends to be governed by informal (or formal) “grand coalitions.” Consequently, politics, in the sense of a clash between meaningful political alternatives, has greatly receded – especially as far as economic policy is concerned. Moreover, the convergence of national parties is much greater precisely on issues where the EU has strong competence – and greater than that observed in other non-EU member countries (Nanou and Dorussen 2013). This model of governance is not, of course, new. What is novel is the exercise of power only or mainly on the basis of this model. Can we imagine a national political system being ruled almost permanently by a kind of grand coalition, operating systematically on the basis of lackluster “centrist” politics? Apart from not serving the electoral interest of either the center-left or the center-right, this convergence has one crucial consequence: it is not conducive to the production of “creative political entrepreneurs.” Reducing as it does the repertoire of political parties and the “space” for *ideological novelty* it ultimately hinders the renewal of Europe itself and of the party families that govern it.

Weak dual power

Furthermore, European governance is distinguished by a *twofold* and *simultaneous* power deficit on the part of public authorities, at both the national level and the level of Europe proper (Moschonas 2012). The EU is now strong enough to impose decisive limitations on nation-state sovereignty, but it does not have enough strength itself to become an efficient federal power. The small size of the Community budget is a crucial aspect of the Brussels power deficit.² If globalization has everywhere weakened the core component of what might be called “government,” the dual deficit in question is *specifically* European (Moschonas 2012, 235–37).³ It reduces the problem-solving ca-

2 A surreal manifestation of this deficit is the non-implementation of the famous financial transaction tax – more than four years after being voted by the European Parliament and adopted by 11 governments, including Germany.

3 At international level, the EU is in a position of competitive inferiority by comparison with the

capacity of public powers, both European and national⁴. This framework of weak dual power deprives all parties in government of much of their influence and effectiveness and makes them much more vulnerable to electoral accidents and tactical errors. This applies even more in the case of the social democratic parties, which have traditionally made public (national) power the principal lever of their political action. In this “multi-level governance,” the national level is no longer pertinent for the adoption of a credible social democratic strategy, while the European level is neither sufficiently unified nor sufficiently flexible to facilitate the implementation of a European social democratic strategy. Thus, the reformist hypothesis (in the sense of ‘transformative’ reformism) has almost broken down, at the national and European levels alike. Social democratic parties matter less both as strategic “players” and as problem-solving structures and, because of this, they matter less as representative vehicles (Moschonas 2009, 170–73).

Institutional conservatism and policy stability (1), governance from the center (2), weak governance and limited problem-solving capacity (3) are structural characteristics. To these we must add the locking in of neoliberal economic policies and reinforcement of financialization (4), which we shall not, for reasons of space, analyze any further. These features are attributable (with the exception of the neoliberal policies) to the multi-state and polycentric nature of the EU. And they will not be easily modified, even if a “new great historical compromise” (Tsoukalis 2016) takes place in the near future. Europe poses a major problem for the left – and not simply because it is liberal. It poses a major problem because the European regime is complex, cumbersome, and institutionally inimical to change. Ironically, despite social democratic aspirations (political Europe as a counter-weight to the market), the politicization of integration through a dense, rigid, institutional apparatus – and through many political centers of influence – has consolidated and solidified the liberalization of EU policies. It was the building of a political Europe that gave liberal economic solutions a long-term advantage.

From strategic flexibility to flexible rigidity: The difficult renewal of social democracy

The whole history of social democracy, from the Erfurt Programme to the Stockholm School, from Austro-Keynesianism to some recent achievements of socialists in southern Europe, demonstrates that social democratic parties established themselves as central or majority forces when they took an ideological lead over their right-wing opponents; when they embraced ideas and implemented policies that the latter were not yet ready to accept or implement, such as universal suffrage and the political rights of the working class, inventive policies against unemployment, the welfare state, Keynes-

much more robust centralized power of the United States and China, though not only them.

4 The EU has “contributed to a reduction in the problem-solving capacities of its Member States but without the EU itself being able to substitute those capacities” (Kjaer 2017).

ianism, cultural liberalism or, more recently, the deepening of democracy and the cultural modernization in southern Europe (Moschonas 2009). Ideas count; this is clearly shown in the history of social democracy, whose capacity for programmatic change has been reinforced since the 1960s (by virtue of the strengthening of the personal power of the leader, the weakening of traditional bureaucracy, and the loosening of links with trade unions). Postwar social democracy has frequently proved very adept at producing or recuperating new themes and new ideas, even if, in the period 1946–2010, it was less flexible than right-wing parties (Krouwel 2012). The great historical parties of the Left (and the Right) have been characterized, since at least World War II, by a certain strategic flexibility and an important capacity for ideological adaptation and renewal. But not so much now as in the past. Today's big parties of government find it very difficult to respond to the changing preferences of the electorates, particularly if these preferences deviate from the "corridor of possibilities" whose boundaries are those of globalization and European integration. Big parties are organizationally and tactically flexible but, in the final analysis, owing to "external" constraints, politically and ideologically "rigid" (Moschonas 2013). The thesis of Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks that the "positional flexibility" of mainstream parties is heavily constrained by the cleavage structure of each country (2018, 126), though pertinent from a macro-historical point of view, underestimates the disciplinary influence of markets and, even more so, the ideological and policy impact of the EU's rules. Such external constraints today explain better than cleavage-related factors – *classe gardée*, the ideological profile of activists, the link with friendly interest groups, the party's self-image, and so on – why governments' responsiveness to citizens' preferences is frequently very limited. To paraphrase a very illustrative formulation by Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck,⁵ we could say that governments must satisfy three "electorates" today: their national electorate, the EU, and the international capital markets. The adjustment by mainstream parties to the preferences of voters has become much more difficult in the era of globalization and EU-ization (to use Hay's term; 2002).

As a result, a distinctive feature of the current operational specificity of social democratic parties is in fact a kind of *flexible rigidity*: they are capable of coming up with a host of new ideas of limited or non-economic significance and many innovative policy proposals (and in fact that's exactly what they have done in recent years); but they are not in a position to produce a distinct economic strategy and a new master narrative, even though such a perspective would probably be in their electoral interest.⁶ The important programmatic flexibility that once characterized social democratic parties is a thing of the past. This has weighty consequences for social democratic identity in general. In the current period – precisely because social democracy has greatly lost ground

5 "Governments must satisfy two electorates today: their national electorate and the international capital market" (Crouch and Streeck 1996, 19).

6 Following a data analysis by André Krouwel, social democrats show greater ideological flexibility on non-economic, cultural issues whilst inflexibility and centripetal tendencies on the economic left–right dimension dominate (Krouwel 2012).

as a cleavage-based political tradition – ideas (ideational factors), policy proposals (programmatic factors), and governmental records (policy outcome factors) are strengthened and enhanced as *focal points of identity*. Ironically, it is in an era of *diminished* programmatic autonomy that ideas and programs count far more in constructing social democratic identity. Correspondingly, the limits to the programmatic freedom of social democrats lead to a critical loss of overall identity. A “passionless” EU – characterized by severe “emotional poverty” (Benhabib and Eich, forthcoming) and the lack of a mobilizing narrative, both due to the multi-level, polycentric structure of the European regime – contributes to the establishment of a “modest,” passionless socialism, lacking in fighting spirit, and promoting a kind of political and ideological “minimalism”. Despite their flexibility on non-economic issues, social democratic parties as carriers of distinctive programs and ideology are under extreme pressure. And they will continue to be so for a considerable time into the future. All this, to some extent, reverses the logic of 150 years of social democratic history.

Social democratic ideas without social democracy?

The basic programmatic constituents and thematic configurations of the social democratic agenda were first crystallized during the Second International (1889–1914), just when the project of the Left as a general project of social transformation was shaping up. It was then that a comprehensive set of social and political changes was elaborated, albeit with important omissions concerning economic policy and the strategy for the state. This society-building project (Sejersted 2011) was based to a greater or lesser extent on the pursuit of five sets of changes:

- (1) democratization and expansion of the rule of law;
- (2) cultural radicalism (or cultural liberalism);
- (3) improving the immediate condition of labor, a welfare state *avant la lettre*;
- (4) social equality through redistribution; and
- (5) socialism.

This historic agenda represented *the first major – the foundational – wave* in the formulation of progressive politics (Moschonas 2018, 517–22). It served as a long-term repository of ideas for the parties of the Left (and not only of the Left), since the value and programmatic preferences it contained would return to the fore repeatedly in the years to come.

If the function of the first programmatic wave was institutive and foundational, the function of the second – which took place in the 1930s – was corrective and balancing. The central aspect of the social democratic programmatic reorientation in the 1930s

consisted of expanding the state's economic and social engagement (planning, socializations, deficit spending, more institutionalized industrial relations, welfare, and so on), and challenging automatic market triggers.

The pattern of foundation (1889–1914), partial refoundation (1930s), and the building of a new programmatic and ideological module with mixed features, is central for the shaping of the social democratic identity in the long *durée* (Moschonas 2018). As a matter of fact, the social democratic consensus of 1945–1975 is the partial fulfilment and extension of the historical project of social democracy as it took shape at the beginning of the twentieth century and during the 1930s (with the crucial exception of the goal of socialism, which was entirely abandoned). The European continent became a better place largely because of social democracy. It still is.

Today, measured in terms of its historical programmatic matrix, contemporary social democracy no longer seems able to effectively promote a distinctive democratic, egalitarian, or economic-social modernization agenda – except on issues of cultural liberalism (such as the gender question, the rights of minorities, same-sex marriage, ecology, and so on). History shows that a gain once achieved is not necessarily achieved forever.

The great irony of the present situation is that the “old” programmatic pillars of the historical Left progressivism have all – with the exception of the goal of socialism – re-emerged in our day, having acquired a new relevance. Social inequalities, redistribution, tax evasion and tax avoidance, the uncontrolled power of the markets, and the weakening of welfare mechanisms have returned to the center of the European debate. Moreover, the crisis of political representation has brought back anew the “democracy problem” that appeared to have been resolved in the aftermath of World War II. The “old” agenda of the Left has again become pertinent – but not dominant. Both in Europe and the United States, classic Left priorities (distrust of capitalism, statist attitudes, reduction of inequalities) are being reinforced within a culture that mixes social democratic preferences with neoliberal core values and ideas (Gonthier 2013).

But while its ideas have acquired anew a certain vitality, social democracy remains profoundly destabilized. The cunning of History? The dynamics of neoliberal globalization, and of the EU mostly, explain this “paradoxical” situation. Social democrats are no longer *one step ahead* of the right-wing parties on issues such as social policy, welfare, redistribution, and the controlled modernization of capitalist structures. A kind of “gradual disappearance of traditional economic left-wing politics from European party politics” (Krouwel 2012, 172) is indeed taking place. Social democracy's “ability to differ” has weakened, to a certain extent as a result of its own choices but to a greater extent due to macro-dynamics it could not easily control. In this complex web of choices and constraints, the conservative EU (in great part put in place by the social democrats themselves) functions as a great strategic barrier thwarting a left-wing programmatic renewal of social democracy. Although it is impossible to measure its

exact contribution, the EU is an autonomous cause in the process of social democratic ideological retreat and, as such, it is already an integral part of the national history of European social democracies.

Social democracy has entered a dark tunnel, with the effects of the emerging “transnational cleavage” (Hooghe and Marks 2018) making things worse. The medium-term ideological prospects for social democrats look bleak, and the programmatic recovery will not be easy.

References

- Benhabib, Seyla, and Stefan Eich, forthcoming. “Restructuring Democracy and the Idea of Europe.” In *The Cambridge History of Modern European Thought*, edited by Warren Breckman and Peter E. Gordon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Élie. 2010. *Penser la crise*. Paris: Fayard.
- Crouch, Colin and Wolfgang Streeck. 1996. “L’avenir du capitalisme diversifié.” In *Les Capitalismes en Europe*, edited by Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck, 11–25. Paris: La Découverte.
- Delwit, Pascal. 2015. “Adieu au modèle organisationnel social-démocrate”. *La revue socialiste* 60: 31–48.
- Escalona, Fabien, Mathieu Vieira, and Jean-Michel De Waele. 2013. “The Unfinished History of the Social Democratic Family.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Social Democracy in the European Union*, edited by Jean-Michel De Waele, Fabien Escalona, and Mathieu Vieira, 3–29. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gonthier, Frédéric. 2013. “Toward a Liberal Mood? A Multilevel Analysis of Public Support for State in the European Union between 1990 and 2008.” *Sciences Po Grenoble Working Paper* 11.
- Hay, Colin. 2002. “Globalisation, “EU-isation” and the Space for Social Democratic Alternatives: Pessimism of the Intellect: A Reply to Coates.” *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 4 (3): 452–64.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks. 2018. “Cleavage Theory Meets Europe’s Crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the Transnational Cleavage.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 25 (1): 109–35.
- Jabko, Nicolas. 2009. *L’Europe par le marché: Histoire d’une stratégie improbable*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Kjaer, Poul. 2017. “The EU’s Model of Regional Integration in a Functionally Differentiated World Society.” In *The Crisis of the European Union: Challenges, Analyses, Solutions*, edited by Andreas Grimm, 215–25. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Krouwel, André. 2012. *Party Transformations in European Democracies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lavelle, Ashley. 2008. *The Death of Social Democracy: Political Consequences in the Twenty-First Century*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- McGowan, Francis. 2001. “Social Democracy and the European Union: Who’s Changing Whom?” In *Social Democracy, Global and National Perspectives*, edited by Luke Martell, 74–106. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave.
- Moschonas, Gerassimos. 2009. “Reformism in a ‘Conservative’ System: The European Union and Social democratic Identity.” In *In Search of Social Democracy: Responses to Crisis and Modernisation*, edited by John Callaghan, Nina Fishman, Ben Jackson, and Martin McIvor, 168–92. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- . 2012. “La panne des voies réformistes en Europe. La social-démocratie à l’épreuve de la gouvernance européenne.” In *Le socialisme à l’épreuve du capitalisme*, edited by Daniel Cohen and Alain Bergounioux, 233-54. Paris : Fondation Jean-Jaurès / Fayard.
- . 2013. “The ‘Broken Equilibrium’ in European Politics: The Europe Factor and the Weakening of Mainstream Parties (with an emphasis on centre-left and radical left parties).” In *The Rise of Populism and Extremist Parties in Europe*, edited by The Spinelli Group, 20–27. Brussels.
- . 2018. “European Social Democracy, Communism and the Erfurtian Model.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by William Outhwaite and Stephen Turner, 516-47. London: Sage.
- Nölke, Andreas. 2017. “Financialization As the Core Problem for a ‘Social Europe.’” *Revista de Economía Mundial* 46: 27–48.
- Nanou, Kyriaki, and Han Dorussen. 2013. “European Integration and Electoral Democracy: How the European Union Constrains Party Competition in the Member States.” *European Journal of Political Research* 52 (1): 71–93.
- Ross, George. 2013. “Social Democrats Today: Tribe, Extended Family, or Club?” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Social Democracy in the European Union*, edited by Jean-Michel De Waele, Fabien Escalona, and Mathieu Vieira, 593–604. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schulman, Jason. 2015. *Neoliberal Labour Governments and the Union Response: The Politics of the End of Labourism*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sejersted, Francis. 2011. *The Age of Social Democracy, Norway and Sweden in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tsebelis, George. 2002. *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press and Russel Sage Foundation.
- Tsoukalis, Loukas. 2016. *In Defence of Europe: Can the European Project Be Saved?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.