

The book ends with an interesting vision of three possible scenarios for Europe. The author, Renaud Thillaye, sees three alternatives: integration/disintegration, a two-pillar Europe (of a eurozone core and a non-euro periphery) and a third scenario of ‘the EU as a platform’. In this scenario, the EU is a bit like Facebook – a user-friendly interface that allows to its members the flexibility to set up and join some groups while staying away from others. As with Facebook, individual members ‘animate the application by sending messages, sharing best practices, commenting on each other’s activities and proposing common projects’. It would be interesting for the author to elaborate this scenario in light of growing public scepticism towards social platforms like Facebook. People appear to be equally averse to artificial intelligence algorithms and Brussels institutions if they do not have an essential sense of ownership and democracy. In this regard, a quest for a ‘post-teleological narrative of a plural Europe’ remains open.

VADIM KONONENKO

*European Parliamentary Research Service*

*The Eurosceptic Challenge: National Implementation and Interpretation of EU Law*, edited by C. Rauegger and A. Wallerman (Oxford: Hart, 2019, ISBN 9781509927654); 280pp., £70.00 hb.

This edited volume valuably combines doctrinal, political science and socio-legal research. Going well beyond its title, in this book the diverse and highly qualified pool of authors demonstrates that there is no single eurosceptic challenge to EU law. In the summary that follows the 11 preceding chapters (many of which offer single or comparative country case studies) as well as a prologue and an introduction, the editors admit that their initial focus on the challenges to EU law and governance by ‘legislative, administrative and judicial practices’ driven by ‘eurosceptic attitudes’ (p. 229) led them to broaden their exploration of the problems of implementing EU law. These may result not only from principled challenges to European integration but also from the lack of capacity or from deeply embedded features of domestic legal cultures.

The editors refer to Falkner’s classification of ‘worlds of compliance’ (pp. 236–239) (though they do not introduce the classification until Part III, which offers case studies on free movement and migration). They argue that traditions at the member state level affect their decisions to comply with EU law in several sectors. The explanations based on the attitudes of political elites and deeply embedded governance practices are partly overlapping but can conflict as well. Hungary’s historically pro-European position contrasted with its current approach towards EU law, discussed by Papp and Varju, is a case in point.

Courts merit being the focal point of the volume. As the chapters addressing the preliminary reference procedure in Part IV indicate, judiciaries can help overcome some of the odds to the implementation of EU law in the member states, but they face their own practical challenges (see Glavina’s chapter). Yet the volume focuses less on pluralist responses to the EU law’s claim to supremacy. These would amplify the advance of EU law via disagreement, with some member state actors committed to the core EU values protecting fundamental rights beyond the requirements set by the Court of Justice. Though such a position can hardly be considered as ‘anti-EU’, even the judicial role

faithful to EU law envisioned in Wallerman's chapter seems to be more of a 'top-down loyalist' than a 'critical bottom-up Europeanist' one.

While a comment on the selection of the specific cases under study would have been useful for understanding the editors' choices, their brief overview in the Introduction can help the reader navigate to what she is most interested in. Substantively, the analysis reveals that euroscepticism has largely been studied by political scientists (as demonstrated by the explicit focus on euroscepticism in Part I). Given its breadth, this volume prompts further study on the relationship between euroscepticism and other concepts used more frequently in legal scholarship. Indeed, some chapters offer thorough analysis without mentioning 'euroscepticism' (Papp and Varju, Thalmann), referring to 'populism' instead (Mayoral, Tacik) or using both terms synonymously (Gianniti and Guastaferrero).

If we accept Michal Bobek's assertion in the prologue that the EU 'appears to be [in] an overall crisis of (integrationist) faith' (p. xiv), the present volume's relevance will be amplified if anti-EU actors capitalize on the economic and social hardships after the Covid-19 pandemic.

MAX STEUER

*O.P. Jindal Global University*