

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. A PRELIMINARY WORD ABOUT COMPARISON	7
3. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND AND GENERAL OVERVIEW	8
3.1. Preventive Treaty Reviews: France and the Czech Republic.....	9
3.1.1. France – Necessity of a Prior Constitutional Amendment	9
3.1.2. Czech Republic – Two Decisions, No Amendments.....	10
3.2. Ex post Treaty Reviews: Hungary and Poland	11
3.2.1. Hungary – ‘The Use of the Ex Ante Review Would Be Desirable’.....	11
3.2.2. Poland – Protest During the Oral Hearing	12
3.3. Individual Complaints and Petitions: Germany, Austria and Latvia.....	12
3.3.1. Germany – The Right To Vote As Catalyst To A Full-Scale Review	13
3.3.2. Austria – Total Inadmissibility.....	15
3.3.3. Latvia – A Middle Way.....	15
3.4. Differences of Institutional Self-Conception?.....	16
4. LEGITIMIZING THE EU: A CASE OF MULTI-LEVEL DEMOCRACY?	17
4.1. Parliamentary Assent to the Future Application of ‘Dynamic Treaty Provisions’	17
4.1.1. Similarities and Peculiarities.....	18
4.1.2. National v. Multi-Levelled Democracy	18
4.1.3. Who Demands Prior Parliamentary Assent: Division of Powers I.....	21
4.2. Popular Vote as a Requirement for Ratification?.....	21
5. CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS AND JUDICIAL RESERVATIONS	23
5.1. Substantive Constitutional Limits to Future Developments of EU law.....	23
5.1.1. Two Categories of Constitutional Limits.....	23
5.1.2. Who Determines Constitutional Limits: Division of Powers II	25
5.2. Challenges to the Applicability of EU law.....	27
5.2.1. Ultra Vires Review	27
5.2.2. Identity Review.....	29
6. CONCLUSION: A NEW QUALITY OF COMPARATIVE DIALECTICS	32