



VOLUME 16 ISSUE 4 July 2019
BIMONTHLY ELECTRONIC NEWSLETTER
ISSN (online): 2421-8111

Shlomo AVINERI

“THE PEOPLE” AGAINST DEMOCRACY?

Chris ALEXANDER

**THE INMATES HAVE BEEN RUNNING THE
ASYLUM FOR WAY TOO LONG**

Victoria PISTIKOU

**CYPRUS EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE AND THE
TURKISH NON-PAPER CHALLENGE TO THE EU**

Antonia DIMOU

**CYPRUS: KEY STRATEGIC PARTNER AND PILLAR
OF STABILITY IN THE EAST MEDITERRANEAN**

Irene KATTOS

**BREXIT: BRITISH POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY VS
EU INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITARIANISM**

Stamatoula PANAGAKOU

**REFLECTIONS ON THE RECEPTION OF J. S.
MILL’S THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN**

Anthi ERMOGENOUS

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Menelaos MENELAOU

**YOUTH IN THE 21ST CENTURY: NEEDS FOR
REFORMS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM**



CYPRUS CENTER FOR EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
University of Nicosia

1993-2019 TWENTY SIX YEARS OF POLICY FORMULATION AND ANALYSIS

"THE PEOPLE" AGAINST DEMOCRACY?



Shlomo Avineri

Professor of political science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and member of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. He served as Director-General of Israel's Foreign Ministry in the cabinet of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin

A recent conference on democracy at the Central European University in Budapest – itself a target of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán authoritarian government – was held under the title “They, the People”, implying that the current challenges to liberal democracy came, at least in part, in the name of democracy itself. This, it was argued, was in stark difference from the 1920’s and 1930’s when the attack on democracy was legitimized explicitly by anti-democratic ideas anchored in theories of authoritarianism, racist exclusivism and the hegemonic ideas of the Fuehrer (“Leader”) principle.

Such a claim makes it necessary to look at the way Western liberal democracies functioned in the last few decades and ask whether it was their very way of operating that gave rise to such phenomena as exemplified in the election of Donald Trump, Brexit, the strengthening of extreme right-wing parties in many European countries, and the collapse of the multi-party post-1945 order in countries like Italy and France. That some of these phenomena were acutely visible in post-communist societies like Hungary and Poland also suggests that the almost messianic feeling of “The End of History” was far from being vindicated by actual historical developments.

The first crack appeared already in the late 80’s and early 90’s when the traditional parties, both of the center-left and the center-right, lost some of their appeal and were criticized for being distant from the real problems of many population sectors. Decades in power or in institutional parliamentary opposition tended to make these parties highly bureaucratized and not always sensitive to parts of their historical constituencies. The growing focus on identity politics which moved especially center-left parties (Labor in the UK and the Democrats in the US) to be concerned primarily with issues like women rights, minorities, immigrants and the gay community – justified as they were and in some cases long overdue – came at the expense of their advocacy for universal norms of equality as applied to the traditional working class and other economically weak groups in society.

Globalization contributed to exacerbate these developments, as it caused the exodus of many of the traditional production functions of the working class to third world countries this created wide swaths of unemployment (the “Rust Belt” in the US, the Midlands and the North in England). Even the terminological shift from dealing with the rights of the working class to dealing with “poverty” deprived many groups of their feeling of pride and self-esteem as crucial members of industrial society and made them feel as beggars asking for alms. It is these groups the brought Trumps to power, gave Brexit its popularity among traditional Labor Party supporters and are the backbone of the extreme-right in France and now also in united Germany, especially in areas of the former GDR.

While globalization was a fantastic boon to many upper middle class and intellectual groups of society, others were left behind and made it possible for populist leaders to speak in the name of “the people” as their authentic voice.

The success of the EU also moved many areas of decision making from the local national elected parliamentary level to a rather remote, unelected and sometimes faceless bureaucracy in Brussels and added to the feeling of alienation and powerlessness of many social group. Many people felt that they could continue to vote for their parliaments on the national level, but the real decision were made far away from their grasp and influence.

The massive waves of refugees and immigrants from Africa and the Middle East around 2015 were not the cause of populist nationalism, but they certainly helped to trigger it and were cynically exploited by what otherwise would be marginal right-wing politicians and groups. It added a sense of immediate political urgency to latent feelings of xenophobia which the traditional parties failed to address adequately/ Abstract ideas of universal solidarity, justified as they may be on a moral normative level, have little impact on people who feel that their country was being “taken away” from them”.

There is a further dimension to all this. The enormous spread of social networks had a complex, Janus-like impact on the political discourse. On the one hand it had the beneficial effect of greatly democratizing the access to an active political voice to wide groups of the public who until recently were effectively excluded from it. But it had another effect as well, as it made modern democracy much closer to classical, direct democracy in the Athenian or Roman sense.

One of the major differences between modern representative democracy and classical direct democracy was the emergence of mediating institutions between “the people” and the decision making process. As pointed out by liberal thinker like Mill and Tocqueville, it was these institutions – political parties, voluntary associations a free press, an independent judiciary trade

unions and professional associations of all kinds, which prevented democracy from being a mere tyranny of the majority. By giving legitimate institutional expression to a variety of interests and opinions, representative democracy created a balance between majoritarianism and human and civil rights and thus protected minorities of different kinds – economic, ethnic, religious, intellectual – from being suppressed or eliminated. One of the major roles of modern constitutions is to guarantee in a liberal democracy these rights and safeguard an internal balance by making it possible for minority opinions and interests to be heard – and occasionally also gain power.

The enormous proliferation of social media bright back, in a way, direct democracy and greatly weakened these mediating institutions – political parties, the traditional press, the judiciary. No longer does one have to stand in the sun or rain in the agora or the forum to be part of “the People”: a smartphone would do. We live in a virtual direct democracy. Brexit proved that a populist referendum campaign can practically destroy the cohesion – and relevance – of the traditional parties, and who needs a political party if you have 43 million followers on Twitter?

These are all serious challenges, and liberal democracies have to recognize them and try to adapt to the changing circumstances. Liberal democracies are usually resilient and powerful and if they develop adequate strategies they will overcome the current crisis. Until now, no functioning democracy has ever succumbed to dictatorship, and the Weimar example is misleading.

Under the traumatic impact of a humiliating defeat in 1918, a hastily elected assembly adopted a wonderful liberal constitution: but practically all the country’s elites – bureaucratic, military, economic, religious, academic, intellectual – never accepted it as legitimate, and hence it collapsed under the twin anti-democratic challenges from both Nazism and communism when the Great Depression hit the country in the early 1930’s.

This is not the case today in any Western democracy: now it is the liberal elites who defend democracy: but they have to address the concerns of many members of the demos if they wish to preserve the historical achievements of liberal, pluralistic democracy.

THE INMATES HAVE BEEN RUNNING THE ASYLUM FOR WAY TOO LONG



*Chris Alexander
Head of the Technology Enhanced Learning Centre,
University of Nicosia*

I would like to thank Professor Theophanous for inviting me to write another article for In Depth. The article itself is more than a 'tad' longer than the 750 words suggested. Bearing in mind the sombre topic area, the article is stylistically speaking, deliberately unconventional with some use of knee-jerking direct speech.

Ultimately, the key message in this article is (more) hopeful though.

You know, virtual reality [VR] headset technology is looking more impressive these days.

Consider, for example, developments in inside-out positional tracking, foveated rendering, improving field of vision [FOV] or adaptive focus display.

Yet, dare I say, by comparison, we're still living in the VR Stone Age when one ponders how the 100-billion-nerve-cell, 10-to-20-watt human brain actually recreates—and without any metaphysical discussion—what 'it' believes to be 'actual' reality by coalescing data from all available senses to boot in order, that is, to generate a very convincing user experience for us.

However, with regard to augmented reality [AR] and us using it, the 'silicon-based' and 'carbon-based' roads respectively might soon be crossing, and conceivably, in a most utilitarian way.

Therefore, I'd be wondering whether in the near future, for instance, it would be possible to go for a walk and get some (you know) 'prosthetic knowledge' real-time about anyone or anything you happened to stumble across using your AR device somehow.

What's more, assuming 'hypothetically' by then we'd, by some means, have been able to bin most of the privacy data-protection and GDPR policy stuff, you'd also be able to use your AR device to find out who'd have what debts on what things with which banks—and that might be really unethically interesting for more than a few of us I suppose.

So if all that AR stuff were really possible, I'd be guessing some people, during their AR 'walkabouts', might also start thinking about where all those banks actually got all that money from in the first place to lend out.

'But didn't the banks just conjure the money up out of thin air to lend out, thereby putting a legal claim on the hamster-on-the-wheel borrower and on any object being purchased by said borrower until, that is, said [fiat] debt were repaid?' some might ask (possibly smirkingly).

By the way, in the 'real' non-VR world, at this present moment in time, banks, which supposedly act as intermediaries between buyers and sellers, are generally looking frighteningly unstable or even zombieified.

Consider things like:

- The extremely low cash-to-deposit ratios (i.e. deposits that are covered with the actual cash the bank has on hand)—some banks even have under or near 1 percent (World Alternative Media 2018) [1]. This means that if a relatively small percentage of depositors came for their cash, the bank would likely go belly up;
- The 'true non-manipulated' status of numbers of non-performing loans. For instance, Schnabl & Stratmann (2019) maintain that the volume of bad loans in the euro area is estimated to be between 650 and 1,000 billion euros[2];
- The historically low, and in some cases negative, interest rates. Moneton (2019), by way of example, mentions that Nordea bank in Denmark is now offering a negative rate of interest to borrow money on a ten-year mortgage [3];
- The insane G20-approved Cyprus-style bail-in laws of unsecured depositors (aka you) [4];
- The dubious Deposit Guarantee Scheme reserve amounts. For example, Vanbergen (2018), citing a [Joint paper](#) issued by the U.S. Federal Deposit Scheme and the Bank of England dated 10th December 2012, presents an admission by the British government that the '*£85,000 deposit guarantee scheme is flawed and that the British depositors' protection promise is simply a sound bite and not financially supported*'[5];
- The terrifying levels of U.S. student debt. Moreover, Friedman (2019) [6] notes that there are more than 44 million borrowers who collectively owe \$1.5 trillion in student loan debt in the U.S. alone;

- The massive numbers of U.S. car buyers with risky subprime loans. Bliss (2019) [7] maintains that by summer 2018, Americans owed \$1.26 trillion on their cars, and a record 7 million Americans were at least three months behind on their car loan payments;
- Credit card debt at record-high \$870 billion levels at the end of 2018 (Ward 2019) [8];
- The \$9 trillion corporate debt bomb in the U.S. economy (Cox 2018) [9];
- The 2.2 million U.S. homes with negative equity (CoreLogic, 2019) [10];
- The misallocated New-Age oil sector capital. For instance, Mikulka (2018) [11] states that *'whether fracking companies are profitable or not doesn't really matter to Wall Street executives who are getting rich making the loans that the fracking industry struggles to repay'*.

Additionally, with regard to some of the above-mentioned stats, ironically, Trump might have been right, when he tweeted on ([15 June 2019](#)) *'The Trump Economy is setting records'*.

Then there is Deutsche Bank.

Its share price is currently getting to that 'Bear-Stearns cliff-point' moment and it's got 49 trillion dollars of nuclear derivatives [12] as well. However, *'don't worry, be happy'*, in the event of a collapse, its debts will likely be socialised with the 'usual' undemocratic *too-big-to-fail* ECB/government gabble about the need for a bailout—I presume allowing it to fail in this foolish banking world of bubble'omics would probably blow the entire fiat financial system to *Kingdom Come*.

Then there's all that government debt.

It's at record levels you know.

'These guys have borrowed more money than they ever borrowed in history'

In the U.S., for instance, there's the official over-\$22-trillion of living-beyond-your-means' Federal debt, and there's the other peskily unpayable \$200 trillion plus of contingent liabilities and future guarantees.

Most governments are likely 'way' beyond bankrupt.

And, how can creating more inflation-producing debt, by lowering interest rates to even saver-mugging bond-dumping negative levels, in the belief that it is possible to grow out of this insane mess, really help?

Then there's the U.S. Bond market inverted yield curve 'giving an ominous warning about the global economy' (Irwin 2019) [13].

Then there are those 'shadowy buyers of last resort': Mannarino (2018) holds the Fed and other central bankers have created enormous distortions in the financial markets [14].

This is not sustainable.

And anything unsustainable will come to an end [period].

'So what other crazy things have those inmates running the asylum being doing?' you might ask worryingly.

Other crazy thing [1]:

Out-sourcing so much production to China in the first place (possibly being attracted by short-sighted profits) must have seemed like such a great idea decades ago, but now Sino-American relations are at breaking point.

Klare (2019) [15] for instance warns that the Pentagon is 'increasingly obsessed' with preparations for a high-intensity conflict with China, possibly in the South China Sea'. Moreover, Lacalle (2019) [16] maintains that 'for many years China has been allowed to maintain a mercantilist dictatorship and protectionist model under the excuse that its high growth made it attractive'. Even though the Lacalle viewpoint may be over-simplified, there are now many high profile examples of corporate U-turns by American companies operating in the Chinese market (Routley 2019) [17].

And, of course, let's not forget President Trump has threatened to 'hit' China with tariffs on 'at least' another \$300 billion worth of Chinese goods (ZeroHedge 2019) [18].

Meanwhile, in China things might also be hotting up: 'a Chinese company recently notified all of its employees to boycott U.S. products and stop travelling to the United States, or face dismissal' (Li 2019) [19].

And (oh yeah) don't tariffs actually make Americans poorer [at least in the short-term, assuming the U.S. can actually re-industrialise quickly]?

Other crazy thing [2]:

Even though the numbers of American citizens living on the streets, often in appalling third-world conditions, is increasing colossally, the U.S. continues to spend likely over 1 trillion [and growing] dollars on something apparently much more important: its military.

Yet, Snyder (2019) [20] notes that there are possibly over 550000 homeless Americans in the US and many of them are likely living in vehicles. Moreover, of those living on the streets, Cowgill (2019) [21] maintains that apart from

the uptick in tuberculosis, hepatitis A, and staph, which are highly contagious, there is now a revival even of mediaeval diseases such as typhoid fever and typhus, which are borne by fleas, body lice, and faeces.

With regard to LA homelessness, which by the way has risen dramatically to 59000 (New York Times 2019 [22]), Pinsky (2018) [23] has even warned *'there's going to be an outbreak of something like the plague'* at some point.

Then there is the risk of an Ebola outbreak arising from the influx of over 7800 refugees in 2018 alone from the Congo (ZeroHedge 2019 [24], Luther 2019 [25]).

And, of course, then there are the 118,352 sightings in San Francisco of human 'poop' (euphemistic) or human faeces; Andrzejewski (2019) [26] mentions there's actually an interactive map [27] of where these 'poop' sightings were. Incidentally, sightings of where homeless people have been seen urinating in public, currently, are not included on the interactive map.

Parenthetically, homelessness, which is undoubtedly linked to city urban planning [McMaken, 2019 [28]), is also exacerbated by unaffordable housing, which is obviously an outcome of the historically low interest rate policy.

Also, what would U.S. homelessness be like, if the U.S. dollar were not the world reserve?

Other crazy thing [3]:

The U.S. military is acting in an increasingly bellicose manner presumably to ensure the petro-dollar remains the world reserve currency. But does it really deserve to be world reserve? And defending the status of this debt-promisory-note currency is increasing the risk of a major call-my-bluff regional or even World War.

For instance, Hall (2019) [29] states that 'Russian President Putin has said on the global stage twice that the Federal Reserve Note no longer deserves the status and privilege of "world reserve currency" that allows unlimited printing of the currency'. Moreover, there is a continued drive by Moscow and Beijing to conduct international trade in national currencies, obviating the U.S. dollar as a payment (Strategic Culture Foundation, 2019) [30].

Furthermore, with regard to tension rising between the U.S and Russia and China, note in particular:

- Russia has suspended its observance of the INF treaty (a key agreement in nuclear arms control), in response to the U.S. suspending its own participation in the deal (Kim 2019) [31];

- Russia and China have undertaken joint naval drills a day after two U.S. warships entered the Taiwan Strait (ZeroHedge 2019) [32];
- U.S. Indo-Pacific Command, which currently has more than 2000 aircraft, 200 ships and submarines, and more than 370,000 personnel at its disposal, has stated 'this is not enough' ['not enough' here implicitly meaning to curb China]—so the U.S. military therefore intends to 'actively engage partners from other countries' (Savin 2019) [33];
- Pieraccini (2019) [34] concludes bleakly that the U.S. remains on a collision course for Nuclear War with China and Russia.

In addition, Russia and China have likely been getting ready for the possibility of a war for some time now. For instance, Russia has already revealed a powerful arsenal of possibly game-changer hypersonic missiles about which, the U.S. apparently 'has been forced to admit it can't do anything' (Furlong 2018) [35].

Other Crazy thing [4]:

Political correctness, which seems to be being driven to the point of Orwellian madness in the West, is creating an annoying distraction from, in particular, the insanity of the fiat central banking systems, their obligatory military-enforcement arms, and the increasing annihilation of the middle-class.

Even though hate speech has no definition under international human rights law (ARTICLE 19, 2018 [36]), attempts are being made to define it and apply definitions (often very subjectively). For instance, consider Facebook's possibly deliberately ambiguous community standards for hate speech [37].

Furthermore, the unelected [by the people] EU commission (Fact Sheet, 2018) [38], for instance, states that Illegal hate speech is defined in EU law [39], and so IT companies (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Microsoft, Instagram) that signed the hate speech Code of Conduct, are committed to countering the spread of illegal hate speech online.

Hate speech laws appear to be increasingly politically motivated though.

Hanson (2018), for instance, [40] asserts '*it is more dangerous for a European citizen to publicly object to illegal immigration than for a foreigner to enter Europe illegally*'. In addition, Hunt (2018) [41] states that criticising migration could become a criminal offence under a new UN plan to classify migration as a human right.

Then there is all the banning and demonetising of hate speech and so-called 'fake news' on social media, for instance: (1) Paul Joseph Watson[42] was banned from Facebook and Twitter in May 2019; (2) Pinterest banned Zero Hedge adding it to its porn domain block list (ZeroHedge 2019) [43]; (3)

Facebook banned the word 'honk' for violating its community standards (ZeroHedge 2019) [44].

Then there are all those spurious definitions of anti-bullying, zero tolerance, hate crime, white supremacists, white privilege, safe spaces, free-speech zones, gender pronouns, gender identities that are non-binary, the 'far' right, climate-change deniers and the list sadly just *goes on and on and on*.

So what does this all mean?

Well, it means the euphemistically *too-big-to-jail* interconnected banking world has become much more fragile, and any number of individual events could have a cascading and devastating effect on it.

It also means, we need sane, intelligent, honest and caring leaders to deal with the aftermaths of an oncoming likely wealth-transferring axial monetary moment in human history, which also has increasing potential to lead to WW3.

As the fiat currency system has also allowed short-sighted and unscrupulous politicians to appease voters to the detriment of sound long-term policies, one might conclude democracy is particularly flawed in a fiat system.

There are no painless solutions now, as borrowing from the future to pay for the present cannot continue for much longer.

One might wonder whether it will really be possible to avoid an emerging two-tier system with most of the current inmates running the asylum being at the top of the new system.

However, personally, I don't think they'll be able to pull it off again—in any form—this time round.

The system-or enough of it to matter, will be righted one way or another.

Reference notes numbered according to order in text

1. World Alternative Media [You Tube]. (2018, July 7) [Video file] (Cyprus Faces ANOTHER Banking CRISIS! - The Story You're Not Being Told). Retrieved <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JH9pKzQ9uYc>
2. Schnabl, G, & Stratmann, T. (2019). Fed Policy vs. ECB Policy: A Comparison MISES WIRE. retrieved from <https://mises.org/wire/fed-policy-vs-ecb-policy-comparison>

3. Moneton, A. (2019). My bank in Denmark just offered me a NEGATIVE rate of interest to borrow money. Retrieved from <https://www.sovereignman.com/trends/my-bank-in-denmark-just-offered-me-a-negative-rate-of-interest-to-borrow-money-25233/>
4. Brown, E. (2017). New Rules: Cyprus-style Bail-ins to Take Deposits and Pensions. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/new-g20-bailin-rules-now_b_6244394?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAANx2XMwgff3bz-iUEQcq5IuAJYIgbWBBIM7R0Z4yWGEzZ-Vu7qPBLPooE4h7hpsl2qKI2-vi11YYpwiPAKZzU_33YMhtCf4OEVnAyhZl6WsddKXA6Qy0_0DSHjPlk7aSy-c2Y2BO3xhrqchXrYrpL8OwPd8JJNAV7pTooInuLRc-
5. Vanbergen, B. (2018). Financial Meltdown and the Confiscation of Bank Savings: The UK-EU Bank Depositor “Bail-In” Scheme. Retrieved from <https://www.globalresearch.ca/financial-meltdown-and-the-confiscation-of-bank-savings-the-uk-eu-bank-depositor-bail-in-scheme/5475934>
6. Friedman, Z. (2019). Student Loan Debt Statistics In 2019: A \$1.5 Trillion Crisis. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2019/02/25/student-loan-debt-statistics-2019/>
7. Bliss, L. (2019). If the Economy Is So Great, Why Are Car Loan Defaults at a Record High? Retrieved from <https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2019/02/subprime-car-loans-buy-automobile-lending-debt-trap/582652/>
8. Ward, P. (2019). Credit card debt hit record-high \$870 billion at the end of 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.creditkarma.com/insights/i/credit-card-debt-hit-record-high-end-2018/>
9. Cox, J. (2018). A \$9 trillion corporate debt bomb is ‘bubbling’ in the US economy. Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/11/21/theres-a-9-trillion-corporate-debt-bomb-bubbling-in-the-us-economy.html>
10. CoreLogic. (2019). Homeowner equity report. Retrieved from <https://www.corelogic.com/insights-download/homeowner-equity-report.aspx>
11. Mikulka, J. (2018). Fracking in 2018: Another Year of Pretending to Make Money. Retrieved from <https://www.desmogblog.com/2018/12/18/fracking-finances-record-oil-production-fuzzy-math>
12. Martens, P. (2019). After a \$354 Billion U.S. Bailout, Germany’s Deutsche Bank Still Has \$49 Trillion in Derivatives. Retrieved from <http://wallstreetonparade.com/2019/04/after-a-354-billion-u-s-bailout-germanys-deutsche-bank-still-has-49-trillion-in-derivatives/>

13. Irwin, N. (2019). The Bond Market Is Giving Ominous Warnings About the Global Economy. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/29/upshot/the-bond-market-is-giving-ominous-warnings-about-the-global-economy.html>
14. Mannarino, G. (2018). Bond and Stock Markets a Bomb Waiting to Go Off. Retrieved from <https://usawatchdog.com/bond-and-stock-markets-a-bomb-waiting-to-go-off-gregory-mannarino/>
15. Klare, M. (2019). The Pentagon's Spoiling For A Fight, But With China, Not Iran. Retrieved from <https://lobelog.com/the-pentagons-spoiling-for-a-fight-but-with-china-not-iran/>
16. Lacalle, D. (2019). Much More Than A Trade War. Retrieved from <https://www.dlacalle.com/en/much-more-than-a-trade-war/>
17. Routley, N. (2019). A Timeline of U-Turns from the Chinese Market. Retrieved from <https://www.visualcapitalist.com/timeline-of-u-turns-from-china/>
18. Zerohedge (2019). Trump Threatens China With Tariffs On "At Least" Another \$300 Billion Of Goods. Retrieved from <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-06-06/trump-threatens-china-tariffs-least-another-300-billion-goods>
19. Li, O. (2019). Chinese Company Tells Employees to Boycott U.S. Products, as Trade War Propaganda Heats Up. Retrieved from https://www.theepochtimes.com/as-trade-war-propaganda-ramps-up-chinese-company-tells-employees-to-boycott-us-products_2931464.html
20. Snyder, M. (2019). For Countless Americans, Living In Their Vehicles Has Become "The New Normal". Retrieved from <http://endoftheamericandream.com/archives/for-countless-americans-living-in-their-vehicles-has-become-the-new-normal>
21. Cowgill, S. (2019). As the homeless population in Los Angeles grows, so does the unfortunate revival of many third world diseases. Retrieved from <https://www.libertynation.com/the-los-angeles-disease-renaissance-typhoid-and-typhus-make-a-comeback/>
22. New York Times. (2019). Homelessness Rises 12% in Los Angeles County. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2019/06/04/us/ap-us-los-angeles-homeless.html>
23. Pinsky, D. (2018). Will LA get the Plague from homeless people living in squalid encampments the city is unable, or unwilling, to remove? Retrieved from <http://www.kabc.com/2018/02/09/dr-drew-pinsky-warns-of-plague-threat-from-la-homeless/>
24. Zerohedge. (2019). Ebola Jumps Borders As Epidemic Rages On. Retrieved from <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-06-12/ebola-jumps-borders-drc-epidemic-rages>

25. Luther, D. (2019). 5 Alarming Reasons Americans Need to Pay Attention to Ebola RIGHT NOW. Retrieved from <https://www.theorganicprepper.com/5-reasons-ebola/>
26. Andrzejewski, A. (2019). Mapping San Francisco's Human Waste Challenge - 132,562 Cases Reported In The Public Way Since 2008. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adamandrzejewski/2019/04/15/mapping-san-franciscos->
27. Open the books (2019). San Francisco's human waste challenge 2011-2019: an interactive map with 118,352 cases. Retrieved from <https://www.openthebooks.com/map/?Map=32504&MapType=Pin&Zip=94103>
28. McMaken, R. (2019). Homelessness and the Failure of Urban Renewal. <https://mises.org/wire/homelessness-and-failure-urban-renewal>
29. Hall, R. (2019). This is twice. Putin Sets The Table To Leave The Dollar Behind. Retrieved from <https://thedailycoin.org/2019/06/09/putin-sets-the-table-to-leave-the-dollar-behind/>
30. Strategic Culture Foundation (2019). Russia-China: a Strategic Alliance for the 21st Century. Retrieved from <https://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2019/06/07/russia-china-a-strategic-alliance-for-the-21st-century/>
31. Kim, L. (2019). Russia Pulls Out OF INF Treaty In Response To U.S. Move. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2019/02/05/691521600/russia-pulls-out-of-inf-treaty-in-response-to-u-s-move?t=1560602254258>
32. Zerohedge (2019). Joint Russia-China Naval Drills Kick Off After 2 U.S. Warships Enter Taiwan Strait. Retrieved from <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-04-30/joint-russia-china-naval-drills-kick-day-after-2-us-warships-enter-taiwan-strait>
33. Savin, L. (2019). The Pentagon's New Strategy For The Indo-Pacific Region. Retrieved from <https://orientalreview.org/2019/06/05/the-pentagons-new-strategy-for-the-indo-pacific-region/>
34. Pieraccini, F. (2019). What Comes After Trump – World War III? Retrieved from <https://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2019/06/11/what-comes-after-trump-world-war-iii/>
35. Furlong, R. (2018). Putin's 'Invincible' New Weapons. Retrieved from <https://www.rferl.org/a/russia-putin-weapons/29071567.html>
36. ARTICLE 19 (2019). Retrieved from https://www.article19.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ECA-hate-speech-compilation-report_March-2018.pdf
37. Facebook hate speech community standards. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/hate_speech

38. European Commission - Fact Sheet (2018). Countering illegal hate speech online. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-18-262_en.htm
39. EU Law: A Framework Decision on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:l33178>
40. Hanson, V. (2018). Europe's decline fueled by political correctness. Retrieved from <https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/06/08/hanson-europes-decline-fueled-by-absence-of-political-correctness-christianity-military-deterrence-democracy/>
41. Hunt, T. (2018). PC GONE MAD: Criticising migration could become CRIMINAL offence under new plan. Retrieved from <https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1052923/UN-migration-agreement-Angela-Merkel-EU-criticise-migration-hate-crime>
42. Paul Joseph Watson [You Tube]. (2019, May 7) [Video file]. BANNED BY FACEBOOK & INSTAGRAM. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aMqlfwV4BA8>
43. Zerohedge. (2019). Pinterest Bans Zero Hedge By Adding To "Porn Domain Block List" Used To Target Conservatives. Retrieved from <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-06-11/pinterest-bans-zero-hedge-adding-porn-domain-block-list-used-target-conservatives>
44. Zerohedge (2019). Facebook Has Banned The Word "Honk" For Violating Their Community Standards. Retrieved from <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-06-10/facebook-has-banned-word-honk-violating-their-community-standards>

CYPRUS EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE AND THE TURKISH NON-PAPER CHALLENGE TO THE EU



*Dr Victoria Pistikou
Adjunct Lecturer, Democritus University of Thrace,
Department of Economics*

On 16 June 2019, Turkey warned the EU through a non-paper (Phileleftheros, 2019) not to intervene in the Cyprus Exclusive Economic Zone issue since that would negatively affect the Greek-Turkish relations and the resolution of the Cyprus Problem. The reaction of Cyprus' government in line with the Greek government was immediate within the institutional framework of the EU. The decisions taken by the European Council on 20 June satisfied the Greek-Cypriot side, since the EU declared that it will impose sanctions if Turkey continue the illegal activities in the Cyprus EEZ. The question is how much should the Greek-Cypriot side count on the EU? In order to answer this question, I focus on three key issues of the non-paper which reveal the weaknesses of the EU.

- *"We are of the opinion that it would be wise if the EU refrains from taking sides in overlapping maritime jurisdiction area claims and acting as a court in deciding on maritime boundaries".*

At the diplomatic level the EU backs the Republic of Cyprus declaring that the European Council asks Turkey to show restraint (Euronews, 2019). However, the internal power balance structure has also to be taken into consideration; this is related with the main weakness of Common Foreign and Security Policy, which is the harmonization of 28 different national interests. More precisely, although Germany shares the view of the EU, at the same time it does not intervene in bilateral disputes concerning the Law of the Sea (AMNA news, 2019) and the UK, still a member of the EU, mentioned that the sovereignty is under dispute (Cyprus Mail, 2019).

- *"[...] we are also determined to protect Turkish Cypriots' rights on the offshore resources in the region".*

The EU, apart from the challenges of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, has weak operational capacity in defense and security since it is defined by relative power within the EU and the international system itself. More specifically, most of the EU member-states belong to NATO and the later

shaped the concept of the Common Security and Defense Policy. However, CSDP has a secondary role compared to NATO, for example, EU weakness in peacekeeping in the Balkans led to the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999. Nevertheless, in this case, Turkey is a NATO member outside the EU and Cyprus is an EU member outside NATO, due to Turkey's opposition with a veto power. In case of military conflict in the area, the EU will have to face the dilemma of supporting its member-state in the EU, that is Cyprus, or an ally in NATO, that is Turkey. Therefore, at the military level, the EU will probably remain neutral, however, member states may act individually according to their interests.

- *"Far from being impartial, the EU's positions exclusively reflect the position of the Greek Cypriots".*

The EU, as an entity, considers imposing economic sanctions to Turkey in protest to the Turkish disputes over Cyprus EEZ violations. Such measures include cutting of the flow of funds and aid, limitations of the European Investment Bank's lending in Turkey, that is a cut of 146 million euros in aid for next year, suspending ministerial and leaders' meetings on aviation agreement as well as freezing negotiations regarding Turkey's accessions in the EU (EKATHIMERINI, 2019). However, the question remains: are these measures enough in order to deter Turkey from escalating conflict in the area? In 2016, the EIB agreed with Turkey a loan of 800 million euro for infrastructure and support of small and medium enterprises while in 2015 the lending increased by 12% reaching 2,3 billion euro (European Investment Bank, 2019). These amounts compared to the sanctions do not seem to have a serious impact so to make Turkey reconsider its actions. For example, as far as trade relations is concerned, *"Turkey is the EU's 5th largest trading partner, both in exports and imports"* while *"The EU is by far Turkey's number one import and export partner, as well as source of foreign direct investment (FDI)."* (European Commission, 2019). In numbers, in 2018 the value of EU exports to Turkey reached 77,3 billion euro, imports from Turkey reached 76,1 billion euro and the overall trade in goods amounted to 153,4 billion euro (European Commission, 2019). There is also a customs union between Turkey and the EU however, the upcoming economic sanctions, if they come into force, do not concern these fields.

Concluding, all the above show that Turkish losses in economic level won't be big enough in order to stop it from its claims and at the same time the EU seems unable to correspond to a crisis with military means, if it occurs. Thus, the EU should reexamine the impact of the economic sanctions to Turkey and further promote European integration in the field of defense and security. If the intervention of the International Monetary Fund in supporting financially a member-state of EMU considered as a weakness of the EU mechanisms to deal with the financial crisis, then the inability of the EU to support a member

state in a potential military conflict will be considered as a failure of the EU itself.

References

- AMNA news (2019) (in Greek) “Γερμανικό ΥΠΕΞ στο ΑΠΕ-ΜΠΕ: Η Άγκυρα να αποστεί από ενέργειες που εντείνουν την διένεξη”, 18/6/2019 <https://www.amna.gr/home/article/370152/Germaniko-YPEX-sto-APE-MPE-I-Agkura-na-apostei-apo-energeies-pou-enteinoun-tin-dienexi-> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- Cyprus Mail (2019). “Cyprus protests to UK over ‘disputed’ EEZ comments”, 15/5/2019, available at <https://cyprus-mail.com/2019/05/15/cyprus-protests-to-uk-over-disputed-eez-comments-updated/> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- EKATHIMERINI (2019) “EU to cut aid to Turkey over Cyprus EEZ violations, report says” 10/7/2019 , available at <http://www.ekathimerini.com/242415/article/ekathimerini/news/eu-to-cut-aid-to-turkey-over-cyprus-eez-violations-report-says> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- Euronews (2019) “Turkey-Cyprus dispute: Why are the two countries arguing over drilling rights?” 25/6/2019, available at <https://www.euronews.com/2019/06/24/turkey-cyprus-dispute-why-are-the-two-countries-arguing-over-drilling-rights> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- European Commission (2019) “Turkey-Trade picture”, 17/4/2019, available at <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/turkey/> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- European Investment Bank (2019) “Turkey: EIB supports SMEs and infrastructure with over EUR 800 million”, 5/5/2016, available at <https://www.eib.org/en/press/all/2016-109-eib-supports-turkish-smes-and-infrastructure-with-over-eur-800-million> (accessed 11/7/2019)
- Phileleftheros (2019) (in Greek) “Τουρκικό non paper Vs κυρώσεων και «νομική αρωγή» από Βρετανία”, 23/6/2019

CYPRUS: KEY STRATEGIC PARTNER AND PILLAR OF STABILITY IN THE EAST MEDITERRANEAN



*Antonia Dimou
Director of the Middle East and Persian Gulf Unit at the
Institute for Security and Defense Analyses based in
Athens, Greece*

Cyprus is assessed to gain significant geopolitical benefits from its commercially viable levels of hydrocarbon resources. The discovery of substantial gas resources by American energy company Exxon Mobil and Qatar Petroleum in block 10 that lies within Cyprus Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) is expected to not only boost the European energy security, but also advance American energy interests in the East Mediterranean.

The importance that Washington attributes to the development of Cyprus energy program is evidenced by consistent legislative activity in American Congress. The Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act of 2019, also known as East Med Act, has been approved by the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee and acknowledges that the recent discovery of what may be the region's largest natural gas field off the Egyptian coast and the newest discoveries of natural gas off the coast of Cyprus could represent a significant and positive development for the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East, enhancing the region's strategic energy significance.

The East Med Act is an important step toward a comprehensive American strategy in the wider region highlighting that the energy exploration in the Republic of Cyprus's EEZ and territorial waters not only furthers United States interests by providing a potential alternative to Russian gas for United States allies and partners but also should not be impeded by other sovereign states. It is in this context that the Act specifies that the United States along with Israel, Greece, and Cyprus oppose any action in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea that could challenge stability, violate international law, or undermine good neighborly relations, and in a joint declaration on March 21, 2019, agreed to "defend against external malign influences in the Eastern Mediterranean and the broader Middle East".

On a parallel level, an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act lifting the American arms embargo on Cyprus passed the US House of Representatives. It is the sense of the US House that allowing for the export, re-export or transfer of arms subject to the United States Munitions List (part

121 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Republic of Cyprus would advance United States security interests in Europe by helping to reduce the dependence of the government of Cyprus on other countries, including those that pose challenges to United States interests around the world, for defense-related materiel. Evidently, US congress activity falls within the realization that the security of partners and allies in the Eastern Mediterranean region is critical to the security of the United States and Europe.

That said, the recent Turkish intrusion into EU-member Cyprus's EEZ with the Fateh and Yavuz ships is prompted by the energy cooperation between Cyprus, Greece, Israel and Egypt and aims to counter what Ankara perceives as increasing encroachment by Cyprus and regional rivals. By violating Cyprus's EEZ, Turkey seems to take a calculated risk in order to repeat claims that the offshore area in the northern part of Cyprus where its ships explore for gas is part of its own continental shelf; at the same time Ankara envisions to solidify influence over East Mediterranean energy resources. Turkey takes these steps at a time when it views possible European sanctions as less of a risk, while relations with the United States are strained over a number of issues with most prevailing the acquisition of the Russian S-400 air defense system.

In reality, however, the EU appears ready to take measured steps against Turkey due to its continued escalation and challenge to the sovereignty of member state Cyprus. On parallel level, Washington has warned over the imposition of sanctions in case Ankara deploys the Russian S-400 system on its soil. It seems that in light of Turkey's continued and new illegal drilling activities, the EU will conclude a joint decision to reduce the pre-accession assistance to Turkey for 2020; suspend negotiations on the Comprehensive Air Transport Agreement; not hold further meetings of the high-level dialogues; and, invite the European Investment Bank to review its lending activities in Turkey with regard to sovereign-backed lending. Should Ankara continue drilling, the EU appears determined to introduce more restrictive measures against Turkey.

Regarding American sanctions on Turkey, they are expected to be outcome of the latter's decision to accept the delivery of the S-400 system on the basis of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act that foresees the sanctioning of any country that does business with prohibited Russian companies like the MKB Fakel that produces the S-400. American sanctions, the termination of Turkish F-35 pilot training and the expulsion of Turkey from the F-35 program will have dire effects on the fragile Turkish economy. Ankara's decision to proceed with the acquisition of the S-400 despite strong opposition and repeated warnings signals that the country gradually drifts away from the West and the transatlantic alliance in particular.

In this geopolitical setting, Cyprus should continue to proceed with its energy program and improve cooperation on energy and security issues with Israel, Greece and Egypt. With the prospect of Turkey being a permanent troublemaker, Cyprus is offered the opportunity to highlight its value as a key strategic partner of the United States and a pillar of stability in the East Mediterranean.

BREXIT: BRITISH POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY VS EU INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITARIANISM



Irene Kattos
1st year Law student, School Of Law, The University of Sheffield, UK

Defining a constitution and recognising its regulation and powers often seems like a tough process, this is why in my opinion each constitution should be examined on its own merits, as the historical and socio-political contexts of each country differ and directly shape its constitution.

In the context of the UK, one can identify that an uncodified constitution is due to its historical (traditional) development and thus in its 'broad' sense it could be defined as 'the set of laws, rules and practices that create the basic institutions of the state and its component and related parts, and stipulate the powers of those institutions and the relationship between the different institutions and between those institutions and the individual'.¹

As Aileen Kavanagh elaborates 'all constitutional democracies rest on some form of division between three distinct branches of government—the legislature, executive, and judiciary.'² Indeed, it can be viewed that the UK constitution does not aspire to acquire clear separation of powers, as it is deeply political, but in one sense also this enabled it to be flexible and evolutionary. In fact, one can argue that the UK constitution is a case where the idea of democratic process and the rule of law are valued above everything else, as opposed to the view that "strong judicial review occurs when judges are allocated the authority to overrule the legislature and they conclude that statutory provisions violate constitutionally protected rights. This allocation of authority to judges is illegitimate in the eyes of political constitutionalists since in their view, in a well-functioning democracy, only our elected representatives in the legislature have the legitimacy and the competence to settle—to have 'the last word' about—deep societal disagreements about rights."³

¹ House of Lords Select Committee on the Constitution.

² The Constitutional Separation of Powers Aileen Kavanagh (2015).

³ David Dyzenhaus, 'The Idea of A Constitution: A plea for Staatsrechtslehre', [2016], 'Philosophical Foundations of Constitutional Law', 9.

This set of characteristics of the UK constitution and its order on separation of powers is clearly shaped by Dicey's perception of parliamentary sovereignty, which states that parliament can enact or abolish any law it sees fit, except bind itself. Furthermore, 'no person or body of persons' can question an Act of Parliament and no parliament (whether from a different country or a past one) can question it or bind the UK parliament.⁴ As Nguyen-Duy points out 'the concept of sovereignty is far more complex than what one can imagine... parliamentary sovereignty remains the "keystone" of the whole British legal system'.⁵

This idea in my opinion is present in the case of *Cheney v Conn* (1968) where it is explicitly stated that "what the statute itself enacts cannot be unlawful, because what the statute says and provides is itself the law, and the highest form of law that is known in this country. It is the law that prevails over every other form of law".⁶

From this statement we can derive that courts in the UK lack any substantial legal leverage over the rulings of Parliament and that critique of any Act of Parliament is suggestive at best.

Further, one can argue that the UK Parliament had almost always the most power and exercised that power based on 'its own continuing sovereignty' to control each branch of the government.

Historically though, in 1972 by the s2(4) European Communities Act, for the first time Parliament bound itself as, "passed or to be passed, other than one contained in this part of this Act, shall be construed and have effect subject to the foregoing provisions of this section [2(1) and 2(2)]".⁷

This is because the EU through its European Court of Justice (ECJ) functions with a European legal supremacy and that is one of the fundamental differences between the constitutional operation of the UK and the EU. As Lord Bridge explains in the 1991 Factortame case, 'it has always been clear that it was the duty of a UK court, when delivering final judgment, to override any rule of national law found to be in conflict with any directly enforceable rule of Community law'.⁸

⁴ Albert Venn Dicey, *An Introduction to the Study of Law of the Constitution*, http://files.libertyfund.org/files/1714/Dicey_0125_EBk_v6.0.pdf p.87.

⁵ Essentially this could be attributed to the absence of a codified constitution. Ian Harden quoted by Nguyen-Duy (2013) regarding the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty states that "the British Parliament possesses sovereign -legally unlimited - legislative authority. [it is the] expression of both the 'nation' and of the idea that government should be accountable to the representatives of the nation." Nguyen-Duy, *Iris* (2013), *Sovereignty and Europe - The British Perspective*, *L'Europe en formation*, number 368, Summer, pp.79-96.

⁶ *Cheney v Conn* [1968].

⁷ European Communities Act 1972.

⁸ *Factortame*.

For the first time the UK Courts appeared to have more power than ever before and make decisions by having precedent an outside court and its decisions. This is contra to the status quo of Continuous Parliamentary Sovereignty. Moreover, the UK Supreme Court within its discretion can make a declaration of incompatibility. Although this may seem as giving the branch of Judiciary finally enough balance of power in relation to the Parliament, often declarations of incompatibility are not a powerful enough tool to do that. These declarations do not give the opportunity to the Court to strike down legislation like the USA Supreme Court which constitutionally exercises judicial review. It just notifies Parliament that something is not compatible with legislation. This allows the Parliament to deal with it at any time, if they want to, because Parliament can lawfully defend its decisions and choose to not take any action.

In fact as Nguyen-Duy argues 'in the case of the UK, treaties have no special status... The status of EU law in the UK thus depends on one initial, single Act of Parliament, the European Communities Act of 1972, and on other Acts or subordinate legislation'.⁹

Although the European Communities Act 1972 made for the first time the Parliament to bind itself, it can be appealed like any other legislation and does not have a specific status in the uncodified constitution of the UK. Thus, the fundamental rule of recognition is not accepted at the moment by the UK Supreme Courts, as 'consistently with the principle of parliamentary sovereignty, this unprecedented state of affairs will only last so long as Parliament wishes: the 1972 Act can be repealed like any other statute'.¹⁰

From all the above, it is clear that the UK does not have a clear delimitation regarding the separation of powers, which in my view is not necessarily a negative thing. In actuality, it should be the ideal constitutional order as Aileen Kavanagh argues, 'we should think of the separation of powers as requiring a division of labour where each branch plays a distinct role in the constitutional scheme. Though the labour is divided, functions may be shared.'¹¹ In fact, having a 'pure' separation of powers seems more a dream than something attainable. What is also clear though is that the UK constitution favors and gives more discretion than necessary to the legislature branch.

Similarly, but for different reasons the EU functions with a model that does not adhere to the traditional view of the separation of powers. In particular, the Commission has both executive and legislative functions. The EU possesses no single body that is identifiably the legislature, rather, three

⁹ Nguyen-Duy, Iris (2013), *Sovereignty and Europe – The British Perspective*, L' Europe en formation, number 368, Summer, p.87

¹⁰ *Miller v Secretary of State for Exiting the EU*

¹¹ Aileen Kavanagh (2015)

institutions- the Commission, the Council and the Parliament are involved in the enactment of legislation. Once the Commission has initiated the process, its proposal is considered by the Parliament and the Council. The Council is the hardest of the EU institutions to place within a traditional tripartite separation-of-powers model. It carries out policy-making and coordinating functions and plays a central role in the enactment of legislation. It consists of representatives of each Member state at ministerial level, who may commit the government of the Member State in question and cast vote.

The 'constitution' of the EU is codified in two different documents, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Treaty of European Union. These documents are treated with legal supremacy and outline the function and power distribution within the EU and its member states. However, the EU should not be considered as a federal entity with different states, like the US for example, as the crucial difference between the two documents (US Constitution and EU treaties) is that they represent different stages and characteristics of political and legal models of governance. The US Constitution is by far more advanced than the EU treaties. More democracy at the European level is possible, but is currently lacking. Thus, the EU is a supranational legal entity that falls short of being described as a substantive or ipso facto federation. That is why still the intergovernmental conferences (IGs) continue, that is the member states, to play a decisive role in the EU decision making process. Whereas in the UK national (parliamentary and popular) sovereignty reigns. They are two different legal frameworks. These frameworks affect and condition the extent of the separation of powers. But most importantly their core difference is sovereignty. In the UK, Parliament enjoys undisputed sovereignty as the representative of popular will, whereas according to Coman, the European Parliament, despite all the relevant provisions of the Lisbon Treaty and despite its unique democratic character in the EU, its role is essentially consultative.¹² Conway cites Case 302/87, *European Parliament v Council* [1988] ECR 5615, to expose the institutional and legal prejudice by the ECJ towards the European Parliament.¹³ Compare this with the British political system where Parliament as the representative of popular will, is sovereign. What it comes down to is the issue of sovereignty and its respective treatment. The ECJ, an EU institution that lacks democratic legitimization reigns supreme over a democratically elected Institution.¹⁴

¹² Coman Ramona, (2017), *Intergovernmental Method, Community Method and Open Method of Coordination: The Resilience, Efficiency and Legitimacy of the EU's Modes of Governance*, retrieved on 8/5/2019, from: <https://www.academia.edu/37053059>

¹³ Conway, Gerard, (2011), *Recovering a Separation of Powers in the European Union*, *European Law Journal*, Vol.17, No.3, May 2011, pp. 304-322.

¹⁴ This bodes well with articles 2-6 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union-TFEU, which institutionalize the differentiation of competences. It ranges from exclusive, the member state cannot intervene, eg among other things, the economic and monetary union, customs union, fisheries and commerce, up to shared and coordination competences. National security according to the Treaties 'remains the sole responsibility of each Member State' (Article 3a). Juxtapose this with the decision of the House of Commons which 'voted

Further examining the European Parliament's procedure, there are changes in order to enhance its legislative powers. Candidates for the Commission are appointed by the European Council subject to the European Parliament's approval. The European Council is the EU institution with the 'impetus necessary for its development'¹⁵ and for defining its 'general political directions and priorities'¹⁶, it has no legislative functions. It is the executive organ of the EU. Interestingly, a long-term presidency replaces the previous system of six-month rotation. The President is appointed by the European Council every 30 months. The changes seem to increase bureaucracy and still lack democratic credibility.

Moving on the Council, Lisbon maintains the principle of double majority voting (citizens and Member States). When 55% of members of the Council, (representing 65% of the population), is secured a proposal is supported.¹⁷ When the Council is not acting on a proposal from the Commission or the VP/HR a qualifying majority of 72% of Member States is required.¹⁸ To block legislation, at least four Member States must vote against a proposal. The Council Presidency is based on a six-month basis, but there are 18-month group presidencies of three Member States, for better continuity of work. Lastly, the president of the Commission is now chosen and elected considering the outcome of the European elections. This is to ensure the political legitimacy of the office. Interestingly, this is a step towards incorporating more political and democratic credibility and public accountability.

The EU has a different historical origin and it lacks a political constitution. Rather, it is an international legal entity. The legal foundation of the EU is deeply political and influenced by ideology, disguised behind a model that specifically protects and promotes specific neo-liberal economic narratives.¹⁹

The EU dream has transcended to institutional authoritarianism that lacks the democratic foundation of sovereignty. This can be examined in the case of Greece in 2015 when as Zizek observed, 'Greeks are now being asked to pay the price, but not for a realist perspective of growth. The price they pay is

against military action in Syria defeating the then Prime Minister Cameron' on August 29, 2013. (<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-23892783>)

¹⁵ Lisbon Treaty.

¹⁶ Lisbon Treaty.

¹⁷ (Article 16(4) TEU).

¹⁸ (Article 238(2) TFEU).

¹⁹ See Treaty of Maastricht 1992. The treaty just intends to re-establish a balance of politico-economic power on a global scale within the context of a global austerity regime. Although the Treaty of Lisbon professed of being 'more democratic, more transparent and more efficient' ... this is far from being the case based on what I have stated so far.

for the continuation of the “extend and pretend” fantasy. They are asked to extend their suffering in order to sustain another’s (the Eurocrats’) dream.’²⁰

Unlike the EU, in the UK there is democratic transparency and accountability. In the UK there is a distinctive fusion of power between Parliament and the executive. Thus, the UK is a unique constitutional paradigm where the House of Commons is supreme to all other institutions because it represents the people.²¹

As Nguyen-Duy prophetically predicted ‘It is difficult to deny that there is an ever growing gap between the de jure sovereignty of Parliament and the de facto supremacy of EU law in British law, which might eventually result in a more radical step taken by the UK out of the EU ... section 18 of the European Union Act 2011 reaffirm[s] that the status of EU law in British law depends on continuing statutory basis... also known as the *sovereignty clause*’.²²

As Cogliandro points out ‘the main actor for the enforcement of the rule of law in the EU is in fact the Court of Justice with the peculiarity that this Court is given the power also to define what the rule of law is’.²³

Brexit could be described as a rational democratic response to an undemocratic authoritarianism, as the EU paradigm exemplifies, by institutions like ECJ, the European Central Bank and the European Commission, all of which lack democratic accountability²⁴. The constitutionality of the EU has succumbed to the influence of vested economic

²⁰ Trapped in another’s dream Slavoj Žižek. The EU project started with the impression that in order to avoid conflict and disaster again (like W2) countries should come together through a common market and economic integration.

²¹ Nevertheless The Constitutional Reform Act 2005 established The Supreme Court which took effect in October 2009 and replaced the Appellate Committee of the House of Lords as the highest court in the UK. This has led to a gradual enhancement of the separation of powers between the legislative and executive powers and the judiciary. The establishment of the Supreme Court in my view emanated from the growing institutional pressure from the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and its powers for judicial review regarding the supremacy of EU law over national law.

²² Nguyen-Duy, Iris (2013), *Sovereignty and Europe – The British Perspective*, L’ Europe en formation, number 368, Summer, p.95. But even before that as Duy states ‘In June 2008 the Parliament enacted the European Union (Amendment) Act 2008 in order to incorporate...the Lisbon Treaty into UK law while preventing the...Treaty from further undermining the sovereignty of Parliament’ p.88.

²³ Cogliandro, Giovanni, (2015), *The Rule of Law and Separation of Powers in European Union*, Paper presented at the MANCEPT Workshop on Political Theory and the European Union, Manchester University, 1-3 September 2015, retrieved on 15/5/2019 from: https://www.academia.edu/19786941/The_Rule_of_Law_and_Separation_of_Powers_in_European_Union?

²⁴ The Lisbon Treaty - brief overview of the key changes. It is a known fact that ‘Protocol on the Internal Market and Competition, which states that ‘the internal market as set out in Article 3 of the TEU includes a system ensuring that competition is not distorted’. Not even Samuel Becket could constitute such an absurdity. How can unregulated capitalism which feeds on inequality and disparities achieve the EU objectives of equality, welfare and growth?

interests, and it is far from a democratic constitutional means to check such a catastrophe.

The goal should not be should we leave or not, but how do we make the EU more democratic. In fact, I firmly believe that how the European Union and its power structure rule and operate, should fundamentally change. Yanis Varoufakis, has been one of the few advocates insisting on the threat that austerity and the euro pose to liberal democracy, as 'a clueless, inefficient bureaucracy complete with its own mystical beliefs... Democracy is too fragile a flower to survive such sadness.'²⁵

Inevitably the big question arises. Who should hold the most constitutional power? Who should be the one who has the responsibility of deciding the legislative changes? The sovereign people, who nonetheless, suffer from the neoliberal project, the selected few representing Parliament, which will indirectly have their party's agenda in mind, or the selected few in the constitutional courts, where although they are independent from biases of the Parliament, they most probably do not represent the majority? Democratic practice relies on the notion of popular sovereignty, something which the EU lacks. And it is a precondition for checks and balances among the various branches of government.

In conclusion, the EU 'constitution' framework needs deep radical change. The UK constitutional separation of powers with all its criticism, reflects what Cogliandro emphasizes '[that] the rule of law has to be implemented by a new understanding of legislative power, because this power only ... has the dignity of representing the general will, and the argument of competence which guaranteed bare majorities decisions in Courts has no more philosophical standing'.²⁶

EU constitutionality relies heavily on judicial review and it is far from being a functional body of democratic validity. Popular sovereignty has been replaced by what Conway describes as institutional balance.²⁷ What is at risk, is not only the UK's national (parliamentary and popular) sovereignty and its democratic traditions, but western liberal democracy in general.

²⁵ Yanis Varoufakis, *And The Weak Suffer What They Must?* First edition, Vintage, 2017.

²⁶ Cogliandro, Giovanni, (2015), *The Rule of Law and Separation of Powers in European Union*, Paper presented at the MANCEPT Workshop on Political Theory and the European Union, Manchester University, 1-3 September 2015, retrieved on 15/5/2019 from: https://www.academia.edu/19786941/The_Rule_of_Law_and_Separation_of_Powers_in_European_Union?

²⁷ Conway, Gerard, (2011), *Recovering a Separation of Powers in the European Union*, *European Law Journal*, Vol.17, No.3, May 2011, p. 322.

**REFLECTIONS ON THE RECEPTION OF J. S. MILL'S
*THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN***



*Dr Stamatoula Panagakou
Department of Social and Political Sciences,
University of Cyprus*

The Subjection of Women “is one of the landmarks of British feminism” (Pyle, 1995a: ix), a classic text in the history of liberal feminism, and “a fine specimen of J. S. Mill’s political philosophy and social critique” (Panagakou, 2017: 18). The book had an enthusiastic reception among the circles of women’s rights advocates (Shanley, 1998: 396), got “approving comments from respected personalities” in North America, Europe and Britain, and stimulated discussion attracting both “high praise and vehement hostility” (Kornberg, 1974: 37). Mill became the object of both admiration and opposition from different groups, for his feminist treatise challenged established ways of thinking about the nature of women and the relation between the sexes. There were soon requests for permission to translate the book into French, German and other languages (Kornberg, 1974: 37; Packe, 1954: 496). Mill’s vision of women’s emancipation and his call for “perfect equality” shocked and unsettled the minds of many Victorians. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen (1829-1894) considered Mill’s doctrine of equality “unsound in every respect” and believed “that its practical application would be as injurious as its theory is false” (Stephen, 1995: 246). The coming of a new era of justice and freedom for all “threatened” the supporters of the existing pattern of sexual relations that not only justified inequalities of power in the domestic sphere, but also reproduced a harmful command and obedience ethic. Mill spoke of a change in attitudes that was long overdue, since he regarded the social subordination of women as a relic of the past, unfit for the institutions of the modern world (Mill, 1991: 488-491). He defended the right of women to equality, respect and recognition and set out to replace oppression and misery with a social ethic of rational freedom and true happiness. Mill’s brave critique of the ills of his society conveys a vision of moral reform that challenges unexamined beliefs and practices, and reveals the injustice of an obsolete legal system which hindered social development. Women’s empowerment is indispensable to the improvement of humankind and to social progress (Panagakou, 2017: 22).

Andrew Pyle (1995b) has edited a selection of Victorian responses to *The Subjection of Women*. It is worth reading this anthology. Articles published in *The Athenaeum*, *Blackwood's Magazine*, *The Christian Observer*, *The Contemporary Review*, *The Edinburgh Review*, *Frazer's Magazine*, *The Theological Review*, and *The Westminster Review* give us a taste of the reaction that "uncomfortable" texts, like Mill's treatise, were bound to generate. The second half of the English nineteenth century was a complex era of assurance and doubt, of tradition and transformation, as well as of continuity and change.¹ In this context, *The Subjection of Women* is an important book for at least two main reasons. First, it reflects aspects of the ideological fragmentation of the epoch and, second, it contributes to the crystallisation of a modern view of politics which champions the ideals of freedom, equality and justice for all, men and women. This is an approach to politics, power and the state that drives society forward and opens up new horizons of empowerment and affirmation of liberal values.

How did Mill's contemporaries receive his feminist vision? In reading Pyle's collection of articles, I identified two groups of responses with representative exponents. The first group comprises those who question the naturalness of gender equality and thus oppose Mill's theory. William Hepworth Dixon (1821-1879), Anne Mozley (1809-1891), Margaret Oliphant (1828-1897), and Sir Henry Taylor (1800-1886) are among those who criticised Mill. W. H. Dixon argues that male superiority and female subordination represent the natural order of things. Women do not want equality but love: "A woman who has won her husband's heart has gained the only prize on earth for which she cares" (Dixon, 1995: 47). Although he agrees with Mill about the abominable state of married Englishwomen and recognises the need for changes in the common law, he is against gender equality and women's right to vote. Anne Mozley's emphatic endorsement of an array of sexist views against Mill's theory of the rights and emancipation of women is really astonishing. Female subordination is natural, according to Mozley. Women retain their sense of liberty through men and have power over men so far as they are still young and attractive. We are reminded that even women of vigorous intellect need men's support in their efforts. It is claimed that Mill disregards the realities of female nature and he "clearly aspires to eradicate the feminine element out of woman's nature" (Mozley, 1995: 90). For Oliphant, there cannot be equality of the sexes because men are superior to women in terms of natural constitution and women are not indisputably superior to men in any other respect (Oliphant, 1995: 119-120). She also refers to a primordial law that governs the relation of the sexes allotting to man the external toil and labour for the wellbeing of his bride and to the woman the duty of service at home and the voluntary acceptance of her subordination. Marital union thus has "a dignity and harmony which exists in no other partnership" (Oliphant, 1995: 125). Sir Henry Taylor opposes

¹ For the social and intellectual character of the Victorian period, see Ensor (1960), Hewitt (2006), Searle (1998), and Wilson (2003).

equality of the sexes as an unnatural condition and thinks that women's suffrage lacks adequate justification. He acknowledges, however, the need for more effective laws to protect married women from domestic violence, and accepts, not unreservedly, the opening of some professions, such as medicine, to women.

Sheldon Amos (1835-1886) and Frances Power Cobbe (1822-1904) are on Mill's side and stress the thoroughness, rigour and justice of his analysis. For Amos (a barrister, Chair of Jurisprudence at University College London and later a judge), *The Subjection of Women* "is emphatically a great work" which reveals the cruelty and irrationality that had traditionally characterised the treatment of women, especially the legal position of married ladies (Amos, 1995: 172). Mill's reasoning is "completely conclusive and utterly unanswerable" (Amos, 1995: 169). He suggests, however, that Mill should have also included in his discussion the issue of divorce. Frances Power Cobbe salutes Mill's courage to step forward and develop a "daring" thesis for women's emancipation. The radicalism of his discourse was bound to provoke "an avalanche of sarcasms and rebukes and jokes" from the self-appointed guardians of morals. Mill showed courage and determination: "The philosopher has gone forth to encounter the fierce simoom of prejudice, and if he be not blown upon with a vengeance, it will be a miracle indeed" (Cobbe, 1995: 56). Cobbe too is a shrewd and fearless critic who unmasks the hypocrisy and entrenched sexism of her society.

The above brief review of a selection of Mill's contemporaries' responses to *The Subjection of Women* shows that the book sent shockwaves through the conservative world, while, at the same time, it excited and inspired the supporters of social reform (Panagakou, 2017: 18). For some scholars and social commentators in Victorian Britain, traditional conceptions of the nature and role of women were authoritative and valuable and must be preserved and safeguarded. Others, however, held that obsolete views concerning women's abilities and natural roles, as well as systems of thought harbouring hypocrisy, injustice, and corruption had to be decisively addressed and their evil exposed.

Mill's feminist theory continues to stimulate discussion and research. Current responses, however, do not focus on the validity of Mill's views on gender equality² or on the justification of women's suffrage. Contemporary commentators tend to explore topics such as the type of Mill's feminism, his analysis of power, his views on the role of friendship in marriage, as well as the style and methodology of his narrative. These analyses reflect concerns of current schools of feminist philosophy, assess aspects of Mill's feminism, and contextualise his discourse. Susan Mendus (1989, 2000), Maria Morales

² Stove's hostile critique is a notable exception. For Stove, *The Subjection of Women*, apart from being plagued with inconsistencies and groundless assumptions, is an ill-conceived book containing a vast amount of "just plain comical" arguments (Stove, 1993: 12-13).

(1996, 2005, 2007), Martha Nussbaum (2010), M. L. Shanley (1981, 1998) and Nadia Urbinati (1991) are among those scholars who engaged with Mill's feminist thought and provided useful expositions and interpretations. More recently, Gregory Claeys (2013) and Frederick Rosen (2013) stressed the significance of the profound critique of despotism and gender inequality that Mill develops in *The Subjection of Women* for the proper understanding and evaluation of his social and political philosophy. I hope to discuss more substantially the current reception of Mill's feminism in another article.

This year, we celebrate the 150th anniversary of the publication of Mill's feminist masterpiece. Anniversaries offer an opportunity for reflection, reconsideration and reassessment. Revisiting *The Subjection of Women* prompts us to think about the importance of the struggle for women's emancipation and rights and to remember the activists and intellectuals who fought for gender equality and for the creation of a more inclusive and free society. My students are impressed by the rigour and relevance of Mill's arguments and enjoy his insightful narrative. The passion and courage of his discourse and the contribution of his writings to human development and social progress make Mill one of the most important philosophers and public intellectuals of our times. Although published in 1869, *The Subjection of Women* retains its sparkle and the power to inspire and instruct. The scholarly interest that this book continues to generate is a testimony to the enduring legacy of J. S. Mill feminist political thought.³

REFERENCES

- Amos, S. (1995), "The Subjection of Women," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. 141-172.
- Claeys, G. (2013), *Mill and Paternalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cobbe, F. P. (1995), "The Subjection of Women," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. 54-74.
- Dixon, W. H. (1995), "The Subjection of Women," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. 46-53.
- Ensor, R. C. K. (1960), *England. 1870 – 1914* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

³ I would like to thank Peter P. Nicholson and James Connelly for their comments.

- Hewitt, M. (2006), "Why the Notion of Victorian Britain Does Make Sense," *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 395-438.
- Kornberg, J. (1974), "Feminism and the Liberal Dialect: John Stuart Mill on Women's Rights," *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 37-63.
- Mendus, S. (1989), "The Marriage of True Minds: The Ideal of Marriage in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill," in S. Mendus and J. Rendall (eds.), *Sexuality and Subordination: Interdisciplinary Studies of Gender in the Nineteenth Century* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 171-191.
- Mendus, S. (2000), *Feminism and Emotions: Readings in Moral and Political Philosophy* (London: Macmillan).
- Mill, J. S. (1991), "The Subjection of Women," in J. S. Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. J. Gray (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 471-582.
- Morales, M. H. (1996), *Perfect Equality: John Stuart Mill on Well-Constituted Communities* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).
- Morales, M. H. (2005), "The Corrupting Influence of Power," in M. H. Morales (ed.), *Mill's The Subjection of Women* (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield), pp. 98-113.
- Morales, M. (2007), "Rational Freedom in John Stuart Mill's Feminism," in N. Urbinati and A. Zakaras (eds.), *J. S. Mill's Political Thought: A Bicentennial Reassessment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 43-65.
- Mozley, A. (1995), "Mr Mill on the Subjection of Women," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Pres), pp. 89-108.
- Nussbaum, M. (2010), "Mill's Feminism: Liberal, Radical and Queer," in G. Varouxakis and P. Kelly (eds.), *John Stuart Mill – Thought and Influence: The Saint of Rationalism* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 130-145.
- Oliphant, M. (1995), "Mill on the Subjection of Women," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. 109-140.
- Packe, M. St. John (1954), *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (London: Secker and Warburg).

- Panagakou, S. (2017), "J. S. Mill on Women's Empowerment and the Improvement of Humankind," *In Depth*, Vol. 14, Issue 6, pp. 18-24.
- Pyle, A. (1995a), "Introduction," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. ix-xxxiii.
- Pyle, A. (1995b) (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press).
- Rosen, F. (2013), *Mill* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Searle, G. R. (1998), *Morality and the Market in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Shanley, M. L. (1981), "Marital Slavery and Friendship: John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women*," *Political Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 229-247.
- Shanley, M. L. (1998), "The Subjection of Women," in J. Skorupski (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Mill* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 396-422.
- Stephen, J. F. (1995), "Equality," in A. Pyle (ed.), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press), pp. 243-265.
- Stove, D. (1993), "The Subjection of John Stuart Mill," *Philosophy*, Vol. 68, pp. 5-13.
- Urbinati, N. (1991), "John Stuart Mill on Androgyny and Ideal Friendship," *Political Theory*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 626-648.
- Wilson, A. N. (2003), *The Victorians* (London: Arrow Books).

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN



*Anthi Ermogenous
Lawyer / Journalist / Member of Board at Single parent's
association, Stigma, Hypatia / PhD (Candidate) at Political
Marketing/Patronage – CUT University*

The Istanbul Convention is the first international treaty that covers areas of prevention, victim protection and prosecution of perpetrators for all forms of violence against women, including physical, psychological, sexual, and economic, within family, harassment stoking, forced marriage, female genital mutilation and forced abortion/sterilization.

It aims in designing an integrated framework of practices to protect female victims, promote international co-operation to combat the problem, provide support and assistance to law enforcement services for effective co-operation, creating international mechanism to monitor implementation.

In June 2015, Cyprus signed, after a decision of Council of Ministers, with reservations; in other words, some Articles were excluded. The reservations concern state compensation to victims, jurisdiction and residence. Cyprus ratified in March 2017 with maintenance of these exceptions. The Minister of Justice and Public Order was authorized to prepare a bill which was approved in May 2017. The exceptions relate to cost, which shouldn't be barrier to such a serious issue. The Parliament estimated full implementation and measures that were perceived at €8.000.000 while the exceptions (i.e. excluding civil liability and possible compensation of victims) costs €300.000.

The need to protect women is imperative as in Cyprus the incidents are rising rapidly. The exception-based implementation is insufficient to combat the phenomenon. Violence against women is a patch of patriarchal perceptions. The culture of the "owned" woman by a man, who is entitled to do so, has created many victims. A state which is a member of the EU should not allow it. Just before European elections, it is a sad realization that no substantive practice was applied to suppress the phenomenon in its true dimension.

Most striking examples are, the reduced sentence to a rapist, stating that the victim was not a virgin. In another case the perpetrator was granted a limited sentence because when he raped, he was 15 years old. Another example, who for years, complaints were made to the Police regarding threats from the ex-husband who was violent and invaded the house continuously. The police

did not file a deposition and sent her back home. The eventual outcome was her murder.

Whether we talk about institutional sexism or lack of policies, those must be addressed without institutional tolerance, with immediate amendments to the Law. In the patriarchal model, a whole system of coping with violence was built, in both, Police and Welfare Office, which only acts superficially, with lack of mechanisms to support victims. It is worth mentioning that there is only one women's shelter in Cyprus, permanently full of incapacity to accommodate a large number and provides hospitality up to a month. The shelter works without solving all areas, such as post-integration, children's school, psychological rehabilitation, legal assumption of victims' issues.

Even if we ignore police's condemnation solving other crimes, issuing warrants to clear a crime, from whiplash to having in possession hashish, it's worthwhile reflecting on what the alleged "refusal" of the victim to give testimony to enable the Police's investigation. The "refusal", in order for the perpetrator to be arrested and brought to trial, is the complete lack of State protection to the victim. It also coincides that, if the perpetrator is arrested, he will only be hold for 24hours and then he will be angrier. In addition, questions e.g. «what were you wearing», «what did you do to him». The process, the victim has to suffer is a new set of violence, with no counseling or other support provided by State.

Discussions with state bodies concluded that: The lack of protection begins with the absence of any practical support for finding residence with state financial support, absence of psychosocial support to disengage from victimization process, absence of political support for the single parent family and especially children who are also victims.

Undercurrent sexism runs through the entire investigation/complaint (or non-complaint) process. While the offense of violence (in any form) is considered a felony against any concept of moral and legal order and violates the legitimate good of physical integrity and personal security, even the right to life and should not leave room for institutional negotiation. Police officers, who receive complaints and are called to investigate incidents, are unaware of the provisions of the Law, which is sufficiently protective. In spite of the fact that the law states that an edict is to be issued to remove the perpetrator and to prohibit him to approach the residence and the victim in certain radius, it's not put in affect. In the 30years in which the Law was in force, it was applied only in two cases, having as a result that the victims were exposed to the refusal of perpetrators to move away, or even to his subsequent raids. So it's not just the updating and the amendments to the Law that have lapsed, but even where there are Laws, training is needed in order for the laws to become applicable. Additionally, legal aid should be provided so that victims

can financially go to court. Legal assistance with State's financial costs is given in rare cases.

It is noteworthy that during the period 1990-2019 there have been recorded 39 missing women in Cyprus whose fate has not been established. The figure is much higher considering that, recent immigrant women's murders, revealed that some were not on the police list of missing women. These murders seal the lack of protection for women.

Noting the hard work that needs to be done in police education and training, we state: A State that wants to persuade that it won't tolerate violence against women, as an offensive rigor of democracy must impose the correct mechanisms for implementing the Law and adding other Laws, to be called European. It must proceed with the non-deductible strategic plan, as defined by the Istanbul Convention. Without any negotiations, without reservations, in a full implementation, with no exceptions. European elections are reminiscent of this, especially now that above murders have eroded institutional failure.

YOUTH IN THE 21ST CENTURY: NEEDS FOR REFORMS IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM



Menelaos Menelaou
Executive Director, Youth Board of Cyprus

In the 21st century, mankind faces a multidimensional range of challenges. The exponential growth of technology transforms the world of work, new social redeployments take place, and the need for more coherent and responsible economic models emerge. However, the way in which students are trained, through formal education, to manage the challenges and complexity of the world remains the same as the one that has been in place for the past 100 years. In this context, it is necessary to lay the foundations for a system that helps students think creatively, critically and freely, to have faith in and cultivate their talents, to encourage them to be innovative and responsible citizens. It is thus necessary to re-examine the heart of our education, namely what knowledge we want the educational system to offer to our young people and in what ways, which skills and values of character should be cultivated through the learning process.

The role of the Youth Board of Cyprus

The Youth Board of Cyprus aims to engage in a dialogue with all relevant stakeholders, as well as in the framework of a public dialogue with the wider society, in order to present our concerns and our positions on this major issue.

This effort is part of a multi-month methodical work aimed at capturing the voice of the younger generation on the issue of education, methods and learning content and the acquisition of skills necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Structured consultation with young people

The Youth Board of Cyprus dedicated the National Youth Summit in 2018, to the challenges, trends and opportunities of the future. Young people had the opportunity to submit their own views and concerns. At least 500 young people took part, of whom 300 were engaged in interactive meetings and subsequently in workshops. The result of this assisted the Youth Board to

come to a better understanding of what young people think and what they are looking for. Moreover, during the Summit, participants had the opportunity to listen to experts from the OECD and discuss best practices applied abroad.

Research and documentation

Based on this consultation, we then conducted three surveys to document the positions of young people with significant findings on the wider society. The topics of the surveys focused on young people's skills, the positive development of young people and on project-based learning.

Policy Proposal - STEAM Schools

Taking all this into account, we have shaped our integrated positions and put forward a policy proposal on what we believe can be done by the state to meet the expectations of the new generation.

The policy proposal is about introducing STEAM themed schools in both primary and secondary education.

What are STEAM Schools?

STEAM Schools (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics) are an educational approach that uses science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics as a reference point for guiding student research, collaboration, dialogue and critical thinking. STEAM schools are based on the notion that innovation is often encountered at the crossroads of academic issues. By being educated in these subjects at the same time, students look at a wider range of perspectives when solving a particular problem. The STEAM framework has a beneficial impact across a wide range of learning, because it contributes to the development of horizontal skills.

Learning objectives and interdisciplinary approach

The implementation of the STEAM school curriculum focuses on the subjects of science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics and the skills developed around them. The interdisciplinary approach of the above courses is ensured by integrating a multifaceted exploration and study of a subject that ensures that transferable / horizontal knowledge takes place.

Way of learning

The STEAM school needs to be based on personalized/ individualized learning. By addressing different learning needs, including personal interests and understanding of the social background of each student. The learning process actively engages pupils in the process of solving real problems and endorses

problem-building and project based learning. Furthermore, students participate in designing and conducting their own scientific research (Inquiry Based Science Education). This educational approach enables children to think critically, creatively and productively about a problem, while at the same time cultivating cooperative and teaming skills.

Implement a curriculum

The association of the learning procedure with the real world is necessary. Bridging lessons and reality helps students understand the world, its complexity and its challenges while the Humanitarian dimension encourages children to develop initiatives, become responsible and active members of society.

Evaluation

Student assessment should be continuous. An appraisal of a student's progress is done throughout the course and not only at the end. It also needs to be personalized and interdisciplinary. This means that it is based on and takes into account to predetermined individual educational objectives, as well as interdisciplinary, just like teaching.

Appropriate infrastructure

The appropriate STEAM school infrastructure is necessary to achieve the desired results. The creation of a Makerspace within the STEAM School gives students the opportunity to create, discover, learn, accessing high-end and state-of-the-art equipment.

Connections

It is necessary to link school units with all relevant stakeholders, namely businesses, universities, research centers, the local community, parents / guardians and other schools.

Staffing

STEAM's training staff needs to be made up of highly qualified professionals in the relevant educational subjects who also embrace the philosophy of the STEAM framework and are ready to offer the best possible educational environment for students. Interdisciplinary work groups will be organized, which can be co-ordinated in order to tailor the program according to individual educational objectives and carry out assessment according to the pupils' needs. A high level of cooperation and a culture of respect among staff should be ensured under an effective school administration that, with vision and dedication, ensures the progress of all children.

Collective responsibility considering the best interest of the youth

What is clear is that the current educational system prepares our children for a world that we know it will not exist in 10 or 20 years from now. At the same time, we need to find a way to prepare them for a world that still does not exist. We are in a transitional period regarding our education system thus, the decisions that will be taken require collective action and responsibility, so that our youth are empowered with the knowledge, skills and character elements necessary for them to reach their full potential.

It is our firm belief that young people's voice and opinions need to be heard, and that public debate should be enriched by them. Youth are not only the citizens and leaders of the future. They are present now as well, and they have their own needs and challenges to face on one hand, but they also have their own ideas and resources on the other.

Reforms always need resources. Access to quality education is a right and not a privilege, so we need to prove that Youth are a priority. Investments need to be made to bring the educational system to the level our youth demand and deserve.

Editorial Team: Andreas Theophanous (Editor)
 Michalis Kontos
 Andreas Kirlappos
 Christoforos Christoforou
 Styliana Petrou



IN DEPTH
Bimonthly Electronic Newsletter

Cyprus Center for European and International Affairs (CCEIA)
University of Nicosia

Makedonitissis 46, CY-2417, Engomi, Cyprus

P.O. Box 2405, CY-1700 Nicosia, Cyprus

T: +357 22841600 F: +357 22357964

E: cceia@unic.ac.cy

W: <http://cceia.unic.ac.cy> www.emgr.unic.ac.cy

ISSN (online) 2421-8111



9 772421 811107