

THE EL-RAKHAWI DOCTRINE: DISSECTING EUROPEAN LAW - 100 LOOPHOLES

THREATENING STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi

Independent Researcher

Date: September 2026

Foundational Digital Record: 10.5281/zenodo.22649195

PART ONE: FOUNDING THE DOCTRINE

Chapter 1: Defining the Elrakhawi Doctrine of Critical Comparative Law

The Elrakhawi Doctrine of Critical Comparative Law represents a paradigmatic rupture in the methodology of legal analysis, transcending the traditional descriptive and normative approaches that have dominated comparative legal scholarship since the nineteenth century. Traditional comparative law operated within an epistemological framework that presumed the neutrality of legal systems and the universal applicability of Western legal categories. The Elrakhawi Doctrine challenges this presumption by positing that all legal systems, particularly supranational constructs like European Union law, are embedded within power relations that systematically privilege certain actors while subordinating others. The doctrine is explicitly grounded in Critical Legal Studies (CLS), which deconstructs the myth of legal neutrality, and Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL), as articulated by scholars such as Makau Mutua and Obiora Okafor. By integrating TWAIL, the doctrine exposes how European legal frameworks often function as instruments of neo-colonial extraction, imposing normative hegemony on developing nations under the guise of universal human rights or environmental standards. The doctrine employs a tripartite analytical framework: first, the archaeological excavation of legal texts to uncover historical power relations; second, the genealogical tracing of legal concepts to reveal their transformation from instruments of liberation to mechanisms of domination; and third, the strategic deconstruction of legal loopholes that enable the systematic erosion of state sovereignty. The Elrakhawi Sovereignty Erosion Index and the Elrakhawi Democratic Deficit Coefficient provide quantitative methodologies for measuring these dynamics. This doctrine does not seek to reject European integration outright but rather to expose the structural asymmetries that render it a mechanism of hierarchical domination rather than horizontal cooperation.

Chapter 2: From State Sovereignty to Supranational Technocracy

The transformation from Westphalian state sovereignty to what this doctrine critically terms Commission Sovereignty, or more precisely, Supranational Technocracy and Executive Dominance, represents one of the most profound constitutional mutations in modern legal history. The classical conception of sovereignty, as articulated by Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes, posited the state as the ultimate locus of indivisible and inalienable authority. The European integration project systematically transferred sovereign competencies from member states to supranational institutions. The European Court of Justice, in *Costa v ENEL* (Case 6/64, 1964), established the principle of primacy of European law. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies

this jurisprudential development as the foundational moment of Executive Dominance, wherein the European Commission acquired de facto legislative supremacy without possessing the democratic legitimacy traditionally associated with sovereign authority. It is crucial to note that Commission Sovereignty is utilized here as a critical term to describe the de facto reality of power concentration, contrasting with the de jure classical definition of sovereignty which does not accept division. The Commission's monopoly on legislative initiative, enshrined in Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union, combined with its expansive interpretation of competencies under the flexibility clause of Article 352 TFEU, has created a situation where the executive arm of the Union exercises legislative power that in national systems would be constitutionally reserved to elected parliaments.

Chapter 3: European Law Between Idealism and Reality

The European legal order presents itself as the realization of a Kantian perpetual peace, a supranational legal framework that transcends the anarchic international system through the rule of law. This idealistic self-presentation masks a reality characterized by structural inequalities, democratic deficits, and the systematic subordination of peripheral economies to the interests of core member states. The Elrakhawi Doctrine employs a critical realist methodology that juxtaposes the normative claims of European law against its empirical effects. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union exemplifies this gap. While it enumerates an impressive catalogue of rights, its enforcement mechanism remains weak. The doctrine further critiques the European Semester, established in 2010, as a mechanism through which the Commission exercises soft power over national budgets, imposing fiscal discipline without democratic accountability. The gap between idealism and reality is structural, reflecting the fundamental tension between the supranational ambition of European integration and the democratic legitimacy that can only be derived from national political communities.

Chapter 4: The Methodology of Dissection: How We Expose Defects

The Elrakhawi Doctrine employs a rigorous methodological framework for the systematic dissection of European law, combining doctrinal analysis, critical legal theory, political economy, and quantitative assessment. The methodology proceeds through four distinct phases. The first phase, Textual Archaeology, involves the close reading of legal texts to identify ambiguities and gaps that enable expansive interpretation. The second phase, Genealogical Tracing, reconstructs the historical development of legal concepts to demonstrate how originally limited competencies have been progressively expanded. The third phase, Structural Analysis, maps the institutional architecture of European law to identify the decision-making processes through which sovereignty is transferred, employing network analysis and game theory. The fourth phase, Impact Assessment, quantifies the effects of European law on state sovereignty across multiple domains, employing the Elrakhawi Sovereignty Erosion Index and the Elrakhawi Democratic Deficit Coefficient. The methodology is designed to be replicable and transparent, enabling other scholars to apply it to different legal domains and to verify the findings through independent analysis.

PART TWO: DEFECTS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

Chapter 5: Incomplete Democracy: A Parliament Without Legislative Power

The European Parliament, despite its evolution to a co-legislator, remains fundamentally incomplete as a democratic institution. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple structural defects. First, the Parliament lacks the right of legislative initiative, which is monopolized by the Commission. Second, the Parliament's budgetary powers remain constrained by the multiannual financial framework. Third, the Parliament cannot dismiss individual Commissioners but can only vote to censure the entire Commission, a mechanism that has never been successfully employed. Fourth, the electoral system remains fragmented along national lines, with no genuine European political parties. The Spitzenkandidat process failed to establish a genuine link between electoral outcomes and executive selection, as demonstrated by the European Council's nomination of Ursula von der Leyen in 2019. The doctrine calculates that the European Parliament exercises effective legislative power over only a fraction of policy areas, while in the remaining areas it has only consultative or consent powers.

Chapter 6: The Inability of the European Court to Hold the Commission Accountable

The European Court of Justice exhibits a structural inability to hold the Commission accountable for its actions. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple legal and institutional mechanisms that insulate the Commission from judicial review. First, the Court's jurisdiction over Commission action is limited to actions for annulment under Article 263 TFEU, which requires applicants to demonstrate direct and individual concern, a standing requirement that the Court has interpreted restrictively since the Plaumann judgment (Case 25/62, 1963). Second, the Court exercises deference to the Commission's discretion in areas involving complex economic and technical assessments. Third, the Court has no jurisdiction to review the Commission's decisions not to act under Article 265 TFEU. Fourth, the preliminary ruling procedure under Article 267 TFEU enables the Court to expand its jurisdiction incrementally without explicit treaty amendment. The doctrine demonstrates that the Court's jurisprudence has systematically favored the expansion of Commission powers.

Chapter 7: Conflicts Between Member State Laws and Union Laws

The relationship between European Union law and national law remains one of the most contested issues in European constitutional law. The European Court of Justice has asserted the absolute primacy of European law over all forms of national law, including constitutional provisions. However, national constitutional courts have resisted this claim. The German Federal Constitutional Court, in its Solange I and Solange II decisions, and later in its Lisbon Treaty judgment (2009), asserted its authority to review whether European institutions act ultra vires and to protect the constitutional identity of the Federal Republic. The definitive nail in the coffin of unconditional national constitutional identity was driven by the Melloni judgment (Case C-399/11, 2013). In Melloni, the Court ruled that a member state cannot invoke its national constitutional standards to refuse the execution of a European Arrest Warrant if doing so would compromise the primacy, unity, and effectiveness of EU law. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies Melloni as the apex of normative hegemony, where the abstract efficiency of the supranational legal order is explicitly prioritized over the foundational constitutional rights guaranteed by sovereign member states. The doctrine argues that these conflicts can only be resolved through a constitutional settlement that explicitly recognizes shared sovereignty.

Chapter 8: The Crisis of Legitimacy: Who Elected Whom?

The European Union suffers from a fundamental crisis of legitimacy, characterized by the gap between the scope of its decision-making authority and the democratic mechanisms through which that authority is exercised. The Commission does not derive its authority from a direct electoral mandate. The European Council operates largely outside the scrutiny of national parliaments. The doctrine calculates that only a minority of European citizens feel that their vote in European Parliament elections matters for the direction of European policy. This legitimacy crisis is exacerbated by the asymmetry between the scope of European authority and the mechanisms of accountability, as European law increasingly regulates domains that were traditionally within the exclusive competence of member states, including social policy, criminal justice, and fiscal policy.

Chapter 9: The Principle of Blank Delegation

The principle of conferral, enshrined in Article 5 TEU, provides that the Union shall act only within the limits of the competencies conferred upon it. However, the Elrakhawi Doctrine demonstrates that this principle has been systematically undermined, creating what the doctrine terms the principle of blank delegation. The most significant example is Article 114 TFEU, which empowers the Union to adopt measures for the approximation of national laws for the establishment of the internal market. The European Court of Justice has interpreted this provision broadly, enabling the Union to regulate virtually any economic activity. Similarly, Article 352 TFEU, the flexibility clause, has been used to expand Union competencies in domains ranging from environmental protection to human rights. The doctrine argues that these open-ended competencies have created a situation where the principle of conferral operates as a blank delegation of authority.

PART THREE: DEFECTS OF ECONOMIC LAW

Chapter 10: The Euro: A Double-Edged Sword That Kills Weak Industries

The adoption of the euro represents an ambitious monetary experiment that has proven to be a double-edged sword, systematically disadvantaging peripheral economies while benefiting core industrial powers. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple structural defects. First, the euro eliminates the possibility of independent monetary policy for member states, transferring this competence to the European Central Bank, which prioritizes price stability over full employment. Second, the eurozone lacks a fiscal union that would enable risk-sharing across member states. Third, the Stability and Growth Pact constrains the fiscal space available to member states, forcing pro-cyclical austerity. Fourth, the TARGET2 payment system has generated massive claims and liabilities that create implicit transfers without democratic accountability. The doctrine demonstrates that the euro has contributed to the deindustrialization of peripheral economies.

Chapter 11: Greek Debt: A Model of New Financial Colonialism

The Greek debt crisis represents the paradigmatic case of new financial colonialism, wherein supranational institutions impose structural adjustment programs on sovereign states as a condition for financial assistance. The doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this colonial

dynamic. First, the bailout programs were negotiated by the Troika without meaningful involvement of the Greek Parliament. Second, the conditionality attached to the Memoranda of Understanding required Greece to implement sweeping structural reforms that were rejected by the Greek electorate in the July 2015 referendum but were nonetheless imposed. Third, the majority of bailout funds were used to repay private creditors, primarily French and German banks. Fourth, the debt sustainability of Greece was repeatedly overstated by the Troika, as later acknowledged by the IMF itself. The doctrine argues that the Greek case demonstrates the need for a fundamental reform of European economic governance.

Chapter 12: Austerity Policy Kills Social Sovereignty

The policy of fiscal austerity represents a systematic assault on social sovereignty, transferring decisions about the allocation of public resources from democratic governments to supranational technocrats. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this assault. First, austerity policies require reductions in public spending on social protection, healthcare, and education. Second, austerity policies are imposed through the European Semester, creating a system of soft law that constrains national fiscal sovereignty. Third, the Fiscal Compact requires the incorporation into national law of a balanced budget rule, effectively constitutionalizing austerity. Fourth, austerity policies have been demonstrated to be self-defeating, as fiscal multipliers in recessionary conditions are greater than one. The doctrine demonstrates that austerity has contributed to the rise of populist and extremist parties across Europe.

Chapter 13: Brussels' Monopoly on Foreign Trade

The European Union's exclusive competence over common commercial policy grants the Commission a monopoly on the negotiation and implementation of international trade agreements. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple defects in this arrangement. First, trade agreements increasingly cover domains that extend beyond traditional trade to include services, investment, and regulatory cooperation. Second, the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism enables foreign investors to challenge domestic regulations before international arbitration tribunals. Third, the Commission's negotiation mandate is not subject to meaningful parliamentary scrutiny. Fourth, trade agreements are often negotiated in secret. The doctrine demonstrates that trade agreements impose significant constraints on member states' ability to regulate in the public interest.

Chapter 14: Competition Standards and the Brussels Effect

The European Union's competition policy has been deployed in ways that systematically disadvantage European companies relative to their global competitors. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this problem, explicitly integrating the concept of the Brussels Effect, as articulated by Anu Bradford (2020). The Brussels Effect describes the phenomenon whereby the EU unilaterally regulates global markets, not through coercion, but through the structural power of its market size. Multinational corporations voluntarily adopt EU standards globally to maintain access to the European market, thereby transforming European law into de facto global law. While Bradford frames this as a benign export of high standards, the Elrakhawi Doctrine critiques this as a form of normative hegemony. The Commission's merger control

practice has blocked the creation of European champions, as demonstrated by the prohibition of the Alstom-Siemens merger in 2019. Furthermore, the Commission's state aid control constrains the ability of member states to support strategic industries, while competitor states provide massive subsidies without facing equivalent constraints. The doctrine argues that European competition policy must be reformed to take into account global competitive dynamics.

PART FOUR: DEFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY LAW

Chapter 15: The European Climate Agreement Kills Wind Energy in Developing Countries

The European Union's climate policy, while presented as a global leadership initiative, has significant negative implications for developing countries' ability to develop their own wind energy industries. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple mechanisms through which European climate policy undermines wind energy development in developing countries. First, the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism imposes carbon costs on imports from countries that do not have equivalent carbon pricing, effectively penalizing developing countries. Second, the European Union's stringent environmental standards for wind energy projects increase the cost and complexity of wind energy development, making it difficult for developing countries to replicate the European model. Third, the European Union's dominance in wind energy technology creates a dependency relationship wherein developing countries must import expensive European technology. The doctrine argues that European climate policy must be reformed to enable technology transfer and financial support for wind energy development in the Global South.

Chapter 16: Carbon Standards as a Protectionist Tool Against Arab Countries

The European Union's carbon pricing mechanisms function as de facto protectionist instruments that disproportionately affect exports from Arab countries. The Elrakhawi Doctrine demonstrates that these mechanisms have significant economic implications that undermine the development prospects of Arab countries. First, the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism directly affects Arab countries that are major exporters of cement, iron, steel, and aluminum. Second, the European Union's stringent sustainability criteria for renewable energy disadvantage Arab countries that are investing in renewable energy but cannot meet European standards without significant additional investment. Third, the European Union's requirements for environmental due diligence in supply chains create additional compliance costs for Arab exporters. The doctrine argues that these mechanisms constitute a form of green protectionism that violates the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Chapter 17: Monopoly on Clean Energy Technology

The European Union's dominance in clean energy technology creates a dependency relationship that undermines the energy sovereignty of developing countries. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this technological monopoly. First, European companies control a significant portion of the global wind turbine market, enabling them to set prices and terms that favor their interests. Second, the European Union's research and innovation funding concentrates clean energy research in European institutions, creating a

knowledge gap. Third, the European Union's intellectual property regime creates barriers to technology transfer. Fourth, the European Union's export credit agencies provide financing for clean energy projects in developing countries, but this financing is often tied to the procurement of European technology. The doctrine argues that clean energy technology monopoly can only be addressed through international agreements that facilitate technology transfer.

Chapter 18: The Elrakhawi Law for Energy Sovereignty

The Elrakhawi Law for Energy Sovereignty establishes the principle that every state has the inalienable right to determine its own energy mix, to develop its own energy resources, and to control its own energy infrastructure without external interference. The law is founded on five core principles: national control, technology sovereignty, resource sovereignty, energy justice, and democratic control. The law proposes the establishment of an International Energy Sovereignty Tribunal, empowered to adjudicate disputes between states and foreign investors over energy policy, and to issue advisory opinions on the compatibility of international agreements with the principle of energy sovereignty.

Chapter 19: The Contradiction Between Energy Security and Environmental Protection

The European Union's energy policy faces a fundamental contradiction between the imperative of energy security and the imperative of environmental protection. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this contradiction. First, the European Union's dependence on imported natural gas creates a vulnerability that forces compromises on environmental policy. Second, the phase-out of nuclear energy in several member states has increased dependence on fossil fuels. Third, carbon pricing mechanisms increase energy costs, creating political pressure to suspend them during energy crises. Fourth, renewable energy targets are insufficient to replace fossil fuels in the short term. The doctrine argues that this contradiction can only be resolved through a realistic energy policy that pursues a diversified energy mix.

PART FIVE: DEFECTS OF DIGITAL LAW AND SECURITY

Chapter 20: GDPR: Data Protection or Data Monopoly?

The General Data Protection Regulation is presented as the global gold standard for data protection, but the Elrakhawi Doctrine demonstrates that it functions in practice as a mechanism that reinforces the dominance of large American technology companies. The doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this paradox. First, the GDPR's compliance costs disproportionately affect small and medium-sized enterprises. Second, the GDPR's extraterritorial application creates a regulatory burden on non-European companies. Third, the GDPR's enforcement practice has not resulted in meaningful changes to large technology companies' business models. Fourth, the GDPR does not address the structural power of large technology companies to control data flows. The doctrine argues that the GDPR must be supplemented by a data sovereignty framework.

Chapter 21: The Digital Services Act Kills Freedom of Expression

The Digital Services Act establishes a comprehensive framework for the regulation of digital services. The Elrakhawi Doctrine argues that while the DSA addresses legitimate concerns

about online harm, its provisions create significant risks to freedom of expression. First, the DSA's requirement that platforms remove illegal content upon notice creates incentives for over-removal of content, a phenomenon known as collateral censorship. Second, the DSA's requirement that very large online platforms conduct risk assessments creates incentives to restrict content that could be characterized as contributing to systemic risks. Third, the DSA's enforcement mechanism is subject to political influence. Fourth, the DSA's requirements for platforms to provide statements of reasons for content moderation decisions create a bureaucratic system that is inaccessible to ordinary users.

Chapter 22: Europe's Dependence on American Servers

The European Union's digital infrastructure is overwhelmingly dependent on American cloud service providers. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies this dependency as a fundamental threat to European digital sovereignty. First, the US CLOUD Act enables United States law enforcement agencies to compel American technology companies to provide data stored on servers anywhere in the world. Second, the dependence on American cloud providers means that European public sector data is stored on servers controlled by foreign companies. Third, European attempts to develop alternative cloud infrastructure have been unsuccessful. Fourth, the dependence on American cloud providers extends to software, creating a lock-in effect. The doctrine argues that European digital sovereignty can only be achieved through a coordinated industrial policy.

Chapter 23: European Cybersecurity Is an Illusion

The European Union's cybersecurity framework presents itself as a comprehensive approach to protecting European digital infrastructure. The Elrakhawi Doctrine argues that this framework fails to address the fundamental vulnerabilities that render European digital infrastructure susceptible to cyberattack. First, the framework relies on certification and standardization, which do not address fundamental vulnerabilities. Second, European dependence on foreign technology means that infrastructure includes components that may contain vulnerabilities. Third, the framework does not address the geopolitical dimensions of cybersecurity. Fourth, the framework is fragmented across multiple directives and regulations. The doctrine argues that European cybersecurity can only be achieved through a fundamental restructuring.

Chapter 24: The Elrakhawi Doctrine for Sovereign Cybersecurity

The Elrakhawi Doctrine for Sovereign Cybersecurity establishes the principle that cybersecurity is a dimension of national sovereignty that cannot be delegated to supranational institutions. The doctrine is founded on five core principles: technological sovereignty, data sovereignty, operational sovereignty, defensive sovereignty, and cooperative sovereignty. The doctrine proposes the establishment of a Sovereign Cybersecurity Index that measures the degree to which states have achieved these forms of sovereignty.

PART SIX: DEFECTS OF SOCIAL LAW

Chapter 25: The Refugee Crisis: Law Without Humanity

The European Union's response to the refugee crisis demonstrates the failure of European law to balance the imperative of border control with the obligations of international human rights law. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this failure. First, the Dublin Regulation places a disproportionate burden on border states. Second, the EU-Turkey Statement has been criticized for violating the principle of non-refoulement. Third, the externalization of border control exposes asylum seekers to human rights abuses. Fourth, the New Pact on Migration and Asylum maintains the fundamental structure of the Dublin system. The doctrine argues that European migration law must be reformed to establish a genuine system of responsibility-sharing.

Chapter 26: Labor Law Discrimination Against Migrants

The European Union's labor market exhibits structural discrimination against migrants. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this discrimination. First, the Posted Workers Directive has been interpreted in ways that enable social dumping, as demonstrated by the Viking and Laval judgments. Second, the seasonal workers directive ties workers to specific employers, creating vulnerabilities to exploitation. Third, the informal economy employs large numbers of irregular migrants without legal protection. Fourth, the Work-Life Balance Directive, while well-intentioned, is frequently weaponized as a tool of regulatory overreach. Its complex bureaucratic reporting and compliance requirements disproportionately burden small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), inadvertently harming the national economy and reducing overall employment capacity more than it benefits the targeted workers. The doctrine argues that European labor law must be reformed to ensure equal treatment for all workers.

Chapter 27: Double Standards on Human Rights

The European Union presents itself as a global champion of human rights, but its practice reveals significant double standards. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this hypocrisy. First, human rights dialogues are selective, focusing on countries that are geopolitically distant. Second, human rights clauses in trade agreements are rarely enforced. Third, external action prioritizes stability and migration control over human rights. Fourth, the internal human rights record has been undermined by the unwillingness of member states to enforce European values. The doctrine argues that the European Union can only regain credibility on human rights by applying consistent standards.

Chapter 28: The Death of National Identity Under the Slogan of European Citizenship

The concept of European citizenship has been deployed in ways that undermine national identity and democratic self-determination. The Elrakhawi Doctrine identifies multiple dimensions of this problem. First, European citizenship is derivative of national citizenship. Second, the European Court of Justice has interpreted European citizenship broadly, creating tensions with national welfare systems. Third, the rhetoric of European citizenship ignores the fact that most citizens continue to identify primarily with their nation. Fourth, the attempt to construct a European identity through symbols has been unsuccessful. The doctrine argues that European citizenship must be reformed to acknowledge the primacy of national identity.

PART SEVEN: SOLUTIONS - THE ALTERNATIVE ELRAKHAWI DOCTRINE

Chapter 29: The Principle of Flexible Sovereignty and Constructive Non-Compliance

The Elrakhawi Doctrine proposes the principle of flexible sovereignty as an alternative to the current European legal architecture. The principle proposes a differentiated integration model where member states can choose the depth of their integration. However, recognizing the enforcement mechanisms of the European Court of Justice, the doctrine introduces a vital corollary: the Principle of Constructive Non-Compliance. This principle asserts that member states possess the legal and political right to engage in strategic delay or selective transposition of European directives that fundamentally infringe upon their core national sovereignty. This is not mere lawlessness, but a recognized political realism tool. By leveraging the implicit threat of activating Article 50 TEU (the withdrawal clause) as a bargaining chip, member states can force the Commission to retreat from ultra vires demands, exactly as demonstrated by the United Kingdom's pre-Brexit renegotiation dynamics. Constructive non-compliance serves as a necessary democratic circuit breaker against supranational overreach, ensuring that the threat of daily infringement fines is balanced by the existential threat of the Union's fragmentation.

Chapter 30: Fair Energy Law for Developing Countries

The Elrakhawi Doctrine proposes a fair energy law for developing countries, recognizing that the global energy transition must be equitable. The fair energy law is founded on five core principles: common but differentiated responsibilities, energy justice, technology sovereignty, policy space, and just transition. The doctrine proposes the establishment of a Global Energy Justice Fund, financed by developed countries, that provides grants and concessional financing for renewable energy projects in developing countries.

Chapter 31: The Elrakhawi Protocol for Digital Security

The Elrakhawi Protocol for Digital Security establishes a comprehensive approach to digital security. The protocol is structured around five layers: the technological layer, the organizational layer, the human layer, the cooperative layer, and the defensive layer. The protocol proposes the establishment of a Digital Security Certification Authority, independent of government and industry.

Chapter 32: The International Tribunal for Soft Law Overreach and De Facto Bindingness

The Elrakhawi Doctrine proposes the establishment of an International Tribunal for Soft Law Overreach and De Facto Bindingness. This precise terminology corrects the semantic trap of "crimes," as soft law is by definition non-binding. The tribunal would be empowered to adjudicate disputes arising from the application of soft law instruments, including European Union recommendations, guidelines, and opinions, which, while not formally binding, have significant practical effects on states, organizations, and individuals. The tribunal would address the democratic deficit and lack of accountability that characterizes soft law governance, providing a mechanism for challenging soft law instruments that exceed the authority of the issuing body or that violate fundamental rights. The tribunal would have the authority to annul soft law instruments that are ultra vires or that create de facto binding obligations without democratic ratification.

Chapter 33: 2030: A World After European Law

The Elrakhawi Doctrine envisions a world in 2030 where the European legal order has been fundamentally reformed. The vision includes a constitutional dimension with a genuine parliamentary democracy, an economic dimension with a reformed eurozone, an environmental dimension with reformed climate policy, a digital dimension with achieved digital sovereignty, and a social dimension with reformed migration law. The doctrine argues that this vision is achievable through political will and democratic mobilization.

CONCLUSION: Who Owns the Law Owns the World

The Elrakhawi Doctrine demonstrates that law is not a neutral framework for resolving disputes but a mechanism of power that structures social relations and distributes resources. The European legal order functions in practice as a mechanism for the transfer of sovereignty from member states to supranational institutions, for the concentration of economic power, and for the subordination of social and environmental values to market imperatives. The doctrine has identified one hundred specific loopholes in European law that enable this transfer of sovereignty and concentration of power. The doctrine proposes a comprehensive alternative based on the principles of flexible sovereignty, energy justice, digital security, soft law accountability, and democratic legitimacy. The doctrine concludes that the question of who owns the law is ultimately the question of who owns the world, and that the struggle for democratic sovereignty and social justice is ultimately a struggle over the content and application of law.

APPENDIX: 100 DETAILED LOOPHOLES, CASE MODELS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Loophole 1: The Commission's monopoly on legislative initiative under Article 17 TEU enables the executive to control the legislative agenda without democratic mandate. Case model: Commission withdrawal of legislative proposals contrary to member state interests. Recommendation: Grant the European Parliament and Council the right of legislative initiative.

Loophole 2: The European Court of Justice's restrictive interpretation of standing under Article 263 TFEU, established in Plaumann (Case 25/62, 1963), prevents individuals and organizations from challenging Commission decisions. Case model: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami v Parliament and Council (Case C-583/11 P, 2013). Recommendation: Reform standing rules to enable broader access to justice.

Loophole 3: The principle of primacy of European law, established in Costa v ENEL (Case 6/64, 1964), overrides national constitutional provisions without democratic ratification. Case model: German Federal Constitutional Court Lisbon Treaty judgment (2009). Recommendation: Establish explicit constitutional settlement recognizing shared sovereignty.

Loophole 4: Article 352 TFEU, the flexibility clause, enables the Union to act without explicit treaty authorization, creating blank delegation of competencies. Case model: Commission use

of Article 352 for environmental protection before explicit competence was granted.
Recommendation: Require explicit treaty amendment for new competencies.

Loophole 5: Article 114 TFEU, the internal market legal basis, has been interpreted broadly to enable regulation of virtually any economic activity. Case model: Tobacco Advertising I (Case C-376/98, 2000). Recommendation: Limit Article 114 to measures genuinely aimed at eliminating obstacles to trade.

Loophole 6: The European Parliament's lack of legislative initiative creates a democratic deficit where elected representatives cannot propose legislation. Case model: Parliament's inability to initiate legislation on tax harmonization. Recommendation: Grant Parliament the right of legislative initiative.

Loophole 7: The Spitzenkandidat process failed to establish a genuine link between European elections and Commission presidency selection. Case model: European Council nomination of Ursula von der Leyen in 2019. Recommendation: Make Spitzenkandidat process legally binding or establish direct election of Commission president.

Loophole 8: The European Semester enables Commission oversight of national budgets without democratic accountability. Case model: Commission country-specific recommendations to Italy in 2018-2019. Recommendation: Require parliamentary approval for country-specific recommendations.

Loophole 9: The Fiscal Compact constitutionalizes austerity by requiring balanced budget rules in national law. Case model: Incorporation of Fiscal Compact into German Basic Law. Recommendation: Repeal the Fiscal Compact and reform the Stability and Growth Pact.

Loophole 10: The Stability and Growth Pact's 3 percent deficit and 60 percent debt limits constrain fiscal space for counter-cyclical policy. Case model: Enforcement of SGP during the 2008 financial crisis. Recommendation: Reform SGP to allow counter-cyclical fiscal policy.

Loophole 11: The European Central Bank's mandate prioritizes price stability over full employment. Case model: ECB's limited response to the sovereign debt crisis. Recommendation: Reform ECB mandate to include full employment objective.

Loophole 12: The TARGET2 payment system creates implicit transfers between member states without democratic accountability. Case model: Accumulation of TARGET2 imbalances during the sovereign debt crisis. Recommendation: Establish mechanism for settling TARGET2 imbalances with democratic oversight.

Loophole 13: The eurozone lacks a fiscal union enabling risk-sharing across member states. Case model: Asymmetric impact of the 2008 financial crisis on peripheral economies. Recommendation: Establish eurozone budget and common debt issuance.

Loophole 14: The bailout programs imposed on Greece were negotiated without meaningful parliamentary involvement. Case model: Greek referendum of July 2015. Recommendation: Require parliamentary approval for bailout conditionality.

Loophole 15: The majority of bailout funds were used to repay private creditors rather than support the Greek economy. Case model: First Greek bailout program (2010). Recommendation: Establish mechanism for sovereign debt restructuring without democratic suspension.

Loophole 16: The Troika's economic projections for Greece were systematically overstated. Case model: IMF acknowledgment of errors in Greek program projections. Recommendation: Establish independent fiscal institution to verify program projections.

Loophole 17: The Memoranda of Understanding imposed on Greece required structural reforms rejected by the electorate. Case model: Greek pension reforms and labor market deregulation. Recommendation: Require democratic ratification of structural reform conditions.

Loophole 18: The European Union's exclusive competence over common commercial policy removes trade policy from member state control. Case model: Commission negotiation of TTIP. Recommendation: Require national parliamentary approval for trade agreement negotiating mandates.

Loophole 19: Investor-State Dispute Settlement in trade agreements creates a parallel legal system privileging foreign investors. Case model: Vattenfall v Germany (ICSID Case ARB/12/12). Recommendation: Exclude ISDS from trade agreements and establish multilateral investment court.

Loophole 20: Trade agreement negotiations are conducted in secret, preventing democratic debate. Case model: Non-disclosure of TTIP negotiating texts. Recommendation: Make negotiating texts public throughout the negotiation process.

Loophole 21: The Commission's merger control blocks creation of European champions. Case model: Prohibition of Alstom-Siemens merger (Case M.8677, 2019). Recommendation: Reform merger control to consider global competitive dynamics.

Loophole 22: The Commission's state aid control constrains member states' ability to support strategic industries. Case model: Commission investigation into German renewable energy support schemes. Recommendation: Reform state aid rules to allow support for strategic industries.

Loophole 23: The Digital Markets Act imposes obligations on gatekeeper platforms without addressing their fundamental market power. Case model: DMA designation of major tech companies. Recommendation: Strengthen DMA to enable emergence of European alternatives.

Loophole 24: The Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism penalizes developing countries that cannot afford carbon pricing. Case model: CBAM impact on Egyptian steel exports. Recommendation: Exempt least developed countries from CBAM and provide technical assistance.

Loophole 25: The EU Emissions Trading System increases energy costs, creating incentives for carbon leakage. Case model: Relocation of energy-intensive industries outside the EU. Recommendation: Strengthen free allocation of allowances to prevent carbon leakage.

Loophole 26: European environmental standards increase the cost of wind energy development in developing countries. Case model: Stringent bird protection requirements for wind farms in Morocco. Recommendation: Provide technical assistance for environmental impact assessment.

Loophole 27: The European Union's dominance in wind energy technology creates dependency for developing countries. Case model: Dependence of Egyptian wind energy sector on European turbine manufacturers. Recommendation: Facilitate technology transfer and indigenous technology development.

Loophole 28: European research funding concentrates clean energy research in European institutions. Case model: Horizon Europe funding allocation. Recommendation: Establish joint research programs with developing countries.

Loophole 29: European intellectual property rules create barriers to technology transfer. Case model: Patent protection for wind turbine technologies. Recommendation: Establish compulsory licensing mechanism for essential climate technologies.

Loophole 30: European development finance ties clean energy financing to procurement of European technology. Case model: European Investment Bank financing conditions. Recommendation: Untie development finance from technology procurement.

Loophole 31: The GDPR's compliance costs disproportionately affect small and medium-sized enterprises. Case model: GDPR compliance costs for European SMEs. Recommendation: Simplify GDPR requirements for SMEs.

Loophole 32: The GDPR's extraterritorial application creates regulatory burden on non-European companies. Case model: GDPR enforcement against non-European companies. Recommendation: Limit GDPR application to processing activities with substantial connection to the EU.

Loophole 33: The GDPR's enforcement has not resulted in meaningful changes to large technology companies' business models. Case model: Repeated fines against Google and Meta. Recommendation: Strengthen GDPR enforcement with structural remedies.

Loophole 34: The GDPR does not address the structural power of large technology companies to control data flows. Case model: Dominance of Google and Meta in digital advertising. Recommendation: Supplement GDPR with data sovereignty framework.

Loophole 35: The Digital Services Act's content moderation requirements create incentives for over-removal of lawful content. Case model: Platform removal of political content under DSA obligations. Recommendation: Strengthen protections for lawful expression in DSA.

Loophole 36: The DSA's risk assessment requirements for very large platforms create incentives to restrict content. Case model: Platform restrictions on content related to public debates. Recommendation: Exclude lawful content from scope of platform risk assessments.

Loophole 37: The DSA's enforcement mechanism is subject to political influence. Case model: National digital services coordinators' supervision of platforms. Recommendation: Establish independent digital rights authority with judicial oversight.

Loophole 38: The DSA's content moderation appeals mechanism is bureaucratic and inaccessible. Case model: Platform appeals procedures for content removal. Recommendation: Require platforms to provide accessible and timely appeals mechanisms.

Loophole 39: European digital infrastructure is dependent on American cloud providers. Case model: Market share of AWS, Azure, and Google Cloud in Europe. Recommendation: Invest in European cloud infrastructure through Gaia-X.

Loophole 40: The US CLOUD Act enables United States law enforcement to access European data. Case model: US law enforcement requests for data stored in Europe. Recommendation: Negotiate international agreement limiting CLOUD Act application in Europe.

Loophole 41: European public sector data is stored on servers controlled by foreign companies. Case model: Storage of health records on American cloud servers. Recommendation: Establish data localization requirements for sensitive public sector data.

Loophole 42: European attempts to develop alternative cloud infrastructure have been unsuccessful. Case model: Gaia-X progress and limitations. Recommendation: Increase investment in European cloud infrastructure and open-source alternatives.

Loophole 43: European dependence on American software creates lock-in effects. Case model: Dependence on Microsoft Windows in European public administrations. Recommendation: Promote open-source software in public sector procurement.

Loophole 44: The EU Cybersecurity Act's certification does not address fundamental vulnerabilities. Case model: Certified products found to contain vulnerabilities. Recommendation: Strengthen certification requirements to include security testing.

Loophole 45: European dependence on foreign technology creates vulnerabilities that cannot be addressed through certification. Case model: Use of foreign hardware in European critical infrastructure. Recommendation: Establish requirements for European-developed technology in critical infrastructure.

Loophole 46: The EU cybersecurity framework does not address state-sponsored cyberattacks. Case model: Russian cyberattacks on European critical infrastructure. Recommendation: Establish European cyber defense capability with offensive capabilities for deterrence.

Loophole 47: The EU cybersecurity framework is fragmented across multiple directives and regulations. Case model: Overlap between NIS2, Cybersecurity Act, and Cyber Resilience Act. Recommendation: Consolidate EU cybersecurity framework into single regulation.

Loophole 48: The Dublin Regulation places disproportionate burden on border states. Case model: Greece and Italy's responsibility for asylum applications. Recommendation: Reform Dublin system to establish responsibility-sharing mechanism.

Loophole 49: The EU-Turkey Statement violates the principle of non-refoulement. Case model: Return of asylum seekers from Greece to Turkey. Recommendation: Suspend EU-Turkey Statement and establish lawful asylum procedures.

Loophole 50: The externalization of border control exposes asylum seekers to human rights abuses. Case model: Treatment of migrants in Libyan detention centers. Recommendation: Establish monitoring mechanism for externalized border control.

Loophole 51: The New Pact on Migration and Asylum does not establish meaningful responsibility-sharing. Case model: Limited solidarity mechanism in New Pact. Recommendation: Establish mandatory relocation mechanism for asylum seekers.

Loophole 52: The Posted Workers Directive enables social dumping. Case model: Viking (Case C-438/05, 2007) and Laval (Case C-341/05, 2007) judgments. Recommendation: Reform Posted Workers Directive to prioritize collective bargaining rights.

Loophole 53: The seasonal workers directive ties workers to specific employers, creating vulnerabilities. Case model: Exploitation of seasonal agricultural workers in Spain. Recommendation: Reform seasonal workers directive to enable job mobility.

Loophole 54: The informal economy employs large numbers of irregular migrants without legal protection. Case model: Irregular migrants in Italian agriculture. Recommendation: Establish pathways to regular status for integrated irregular migrants.

Loophole 55: Migrants from newer member states face discrimination in older member states. Case model: Discrimination against Eastern European workers. Recommendation: Strengthen enforcement of equal treatment principle.

Loophole 56: The EU's human rights dialogues are selective, focusing on geopolitically distant countries. Case model: Limited criticism of Saudi Arabia compared to Iran. Recommendation: Apply consistent human rights standards to all countries.

Loophole 57: Human rights clauses in trade agreements are rarely enforced. Case model: Continued application of EU-Morocco Association Agreement. Recommendation: Enforce human rights clauses through suspension of trade preferences.

Loophole 58: The EU prioritizes stability and migration control over human rights in external action. Case model: EU cooperation with Sudan despite human rights abuses. Recommendation: Prioritize human rights in all aspects of external action.

Loophole 59: The EU's internal human rights record is undermined by unwillingness to enforce European values. Case model: Limited effectiveness of rule of law framework in Hungary and Poland. Recommendation: Strengthen rule of law conditionality mechanism.

Loophole 60: European citizenship lacks democratic legitimacy as it is derivative of national citizenship. Case model: Limited identification with European citizenship in Eurobarometer surveys. Recommendation: Establish genuine European political sphere.

Loophole 61: The European Court of Justice has interpreted European citizenship broadly, creating tensions with national welfare systems. Case model: Dano (Case C-333/13, 2014) and Alimanovic (Case C-67/14, 2015) judgments. Recommendation: Clarify scope of European citizenship rights through treaty amendment.

Loophole 62: The attempt to construct European identity through symbols has been unsuccessful. Case model: Low levels of identification with Europe compared to national identity. Recommendation: Focus on building European political sphere rather than symbolic identity.

Loophole 63: The principle of conferral has been undermined by expansive interpretation of treaty provisions. Case model: Broad interpretation of Article 114 TFEU. Recommendation: Establish explicit enumeration of Union competencies.

Loophole 64: The subsidiarity review mechanism lacks binding force. Case model: Limited effectiveness of early warning system for subsidiarity. Recommendation: Establish subsidiarity review with binding force.

Loophole 65: Significant transfers of sovereignty do not require explicit democratic ratification. Case model: Transfer of competencies through treaty interpretation. Recommendation: Require referendum or parliamentary supermajority for sovereignty transfers.

Loophole 66: The European Union's climate policy does not enable technology transfer to developing countries. Case model: Limited technology transfer under Paris Agreement. Recommendation: Establish mandatory technology transfer mechanism.

Loophole 67: European climate policy does not provide adequate financial support for renewable energy in the Global South. Case model: Insufficient climate finance from developed countries. Recommendation: Increase climate finance and establish Global Energy Justice Fund.

Loophole 68: European climate policy does not recognize the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Case model: Equal application of carbon pricing to developed and developing countries. Recommendation: Differentiate carbon pricing requirements based on development level.

Loophole 69: European energy policy constrains member states' ability to determine their energy mix. Case model: Commission pressure on member states to phase out coal. Recommendation: Respect member states' right to determine their energy mix.

Loophole 70: European energy policy does not address the contradiction between energy security and environmental protection. Case model: German Energiewende and increased dependence on Russian gas. Recommendation: Pursue diversified energy mix including nuclear, renewable, and fossil fuels with carbon capture.

Loophole 71: The European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) overreach infringes on national criminal sovereignty. Case model: EPPO investigations bypassing national prosecutorial discretion in member states. Recommendation: Establish strict subsidiarity checks and national parliamentary veto mechanisms for EPPO investigations.

Loophole 72: Misuse of Article 214 TFEU (Humanitarian Aid) to bypass foreign policy unanimity. Case model: Channeling geopolitical conditionalities through humanitarian aid frameworks to avoid Council veto. Recommendation: Strictly separate humanitarian aid from geopolitical conditionality and require unanimous Council approval for politically sensitive aid allocations.

Loophole 73: European data sovereignty is undermined by the US CLOUD Act. Case model: US law enforcement access to European data. Recommendation: Negotiate international agreement limiting CLOUD Act application.

Loophole 74: European cybersecurity is undermined by dependence on foreign hardware. Case model: Use of foreign hardware in European critical infrastructure. Recommendation: Establish requirements for European-developed hardware in critical infrastructure.

Loophole 75: European migration policy does not address the root causes of displacement. Case model: Continued displacement from conflict zones. Recommendation: Increase development cooperation and conflict resolution efforts.

Loophole 76: European labor policy does not ensure equal treatment for all workers regardless of origin. Case model: Discrimination against third-country nationals in labor markets. Recommendation: Strengthen enforcement of equal treatment principle.

Loophole 77: European human rights policy is undermined by double standards. Case model: Selective application of human rights conditionality. Recommendation: Apply consistent human rights standards internally and externally.

Loophole 78: European identity policy is undermined by the primacy of national identity. Case model: Low levels of European identification. Recommendation: Focus on building European political sphere rather than symbolic identity.

Loophole 79: European constitutional law is undermined by the lack of explicit constitutional settlement. Case model: Conflicts between European Court of Justice and national constitutional courts. Recommendation: Establish explicit constitutional settlement recognizing shared sovereignty.

Loophole 80: European economic law is undermined by the asymmetries of the euro architecture. Case model: Divergence between core and peripheral economies. Recommendation: Reform euro architecture to include fiscal union and banking union.

Loophole 81: European environmental law is undermined by the contradiction between climate targets and industrial competitiveness. Case model: Carbon leakage and deindustrialization. Recommendation: Strengthen carbon leakage prevention and support for industrial decarbonization.

Loophole 82: European digital law is undermined by the dominance of American technology companies. Case model: Market dominance of Google, Meta, and Amazon. Recommendation: Strengthen enforcement of competition law and digital regulation.

Loophole 83: European social law is undermined by the lack of meaningful social union. Case model: Divergence in social protection levels across member states. Recommendation: Establish European social union with minimum standards.

Loophole 84: European foreign policy is undermined by the lack of genuine common foreign and security policy. Case model: Divergent positions on Russia and China among member states. Recommendation: Establish genuine common foreign and security policy with qualified majority voting.

Loophole 85: European defense policy is undermined by dependence on NATO and the United States. Case model: Limited European defense capabilities. Recommendation: Establish genuine European defense union.

Loophole 86: European fiscal policy is undermined by the lack of fiscal union. Case model: Inability to respond to asymmetric shocks. Recommendation: Establish eurozone budget and common debt issuance.

Loophole 87: European monetary policy is undermined by the one-size-fits-all approach. Case model: Inappropriate monetary policy for peripheral economies. Recommendation: Reform ECB mandate and establish fiscal stabilizers.

Loophole 88: European trade policy is undermined by the lack of democratic oversight. Case model: Secret negotiation of trade agreements. Recommendation: Require parliamentary approval for negotiating mandates and make texts public.

Loophole 89: European competition policy is undermined by the focus on consumer welfare rather than industrial competitiveness. Case model: Prohibition of Alstom-Siemens merger. Recommendation: Reform competition policy to consider global competitive dynamics.

Loophole 90: European energy policy is undermined by the lack of energy union. Case model: Divergent energy policies among member states. Recommendation: Establish genuine energy union with common energy policy.

Loophole 91: European digital policy is undermined by the lack of digital union. Case model: Fragmented digital single market. Recommendation: Establish genuine digital union with common digital infrastructure.

Loophole 92: European social policy is undermined by the lack of social dialogue. Case model: Limited involvement of social partners in policy-making. Recommendation: Strengthen social dialogue and tripartite decision-making.

Loophole 93: European environmental policy is undermined by the lack of environmental democracy. Case model: Limited public participation in environmental decision-making. Recommendation: Strengthen public participation and access to environmental justice.

Loophole 94: European foreign policy is undermined by the lack of democratic oversight. Case model: Limited parliamentary scrutiny of foreign policy decisions. Recommendation: Strengthen parliamentary oversight of foreign policy.

Loophole 95: European defense policy is undermined by the lack of democratic control. Case model: Limited parliamentary oversight of defense spending and operations. Recommendation: Strengthen parliamentary oversight of defense policy.

Loophole 96: European fiscal policy is undermined by the lack of democratic accountability. Case model: Commission oversight of national budgets through European Semester. Recommendation: Require parliamentary approval for European Semester recommendations.

Loophole 97: European monetary policy is undermined by the lack of democratic accountability. Case model: ECB independence from democratic oversight. Recommendation: Establish democratic oversight of ECB while maintaining operational independence.

Loophole 98: European trade policy is undermined by the lack of transparency. Case model: Non-disclosure of trade agreement negotiating texts. Recommendation: Make negotiating texts public throughout the negotiation process.

Loophole 99: European competition policy is undermined by the lack of transparency. Case model: Limited transparency in state aid decisions. Recommendation: Increase transparency in competition policy decision-making.

Loophole 100: European digital policy is undermined by the lack of transparency. Case model: Limited transparency in digital infrastructure procurement. Recommendation: Increase transparency in digital policy decision-making.

MATHEMATICAL FORMALIZATION OF INDICES

The Elrakhawi Sovereignty Erosion Index (SEI):

$$SEI = \text{Sum} [W_i * (C_{\text{transferred}_i} / C_{\text{retained}_i})]$$

Where:

SEI represents the total Sovereignty Erosion Index for a member state.

W_i is the strategic weight assigned to policy domain i (e.g., fiscal policy, digital governance, environmental regulation), normalized such that the sum of all W_i equals 1.

$C_{\text{transferred}_i}$ is the quantifiable measure of competencies and decision-making authority transferred to supranational institutions in domain i .

C_{retained_i} is the quantifiable measure of competencies and decision-making authority retained by the member state in domain i .

A higher SEI value indicates a greater degree of sovereignty erosion, signaling domains where urgent constitutional rebalancing is required.

The Elrakhawi Democratic Deficit Coefficient (DDC):

$$DDC = (P_{\text{decision}} / P_{\text{accountability}}) - 1$$

Where:

DDC represents the Democratic Deficit Coefficient.

P_{decision} is the proportion of binding regulatory and legislative decisions affecting the member state that are initiated or finalized at the supranational level.

$P_{\text{accountability}}$ is the proportion of those decisions that are subject to direct, meaningful democratic accountability mechanisms (e.g., direct electoral mandate, parliamentary recall, transparent public debate).

A DDC value greater than zero indicates a democratic deficit, where the volume of supranational decision-making exceeds the available mechanisms for democratic accountability.

A value of zero represents perfect equilibrium, while negative values indicate robust democratic oversight.

REFERENCES

- Treaty on European Union (Consolidated version 2016). Official Journal of the European Union C 202.
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Consolidated version 2016). Official Journal of the European Union C 202.
- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2012). Official Journal of the European Union C 326.
- Costa v ENEL (Case 6/64, 1964). European Court of Justice.
- Internationale Handelsgesellschaft (Case 11/70, 1970). European Court of Justice.
- Plaumann v Commission (Case 25/62, 1963). European Court of Justice.
- Melloni (Case C-399/11, 2013). European Court of Justice.
- Van Gend en Loos (Case 26/62, 1963). European Court of Justice.
- Viking Line (Case C-438/05, 2007). European Court of Justice.
- Laval un Partneri (Case C-341/05, 2007). European Court of Justice.
- Tobacco Advertising I (Case C-376/98, 2000). European Court of Justice.
- Dano (Case C-333/13, 2014). European Court of Justice.
- Alimanovic (Case C-67/14, 2015). European Court of Justice.
- German Federal Constitutional Court. Lisbon Treaty judgment (2 BvE 2/08, 2009).
- German Federal Constitutional Court. Solange I judgment (1974).
- German Federal Constitutional Court. Solange II judgment (1986).
- Italian Constitutional Court. Frontini judgment (1974).
- Polish Constitutional Tribunal. Judgment on primacy of European law (2021).
- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).
- Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 (Digital Services Act).
- Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 (Digital Markets Act).
- Directive (EU) 2022/2555 (NIS2 Directive).
- Regulation (EU) 2023/956 (Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism).
- Directive (EU) 2018/2001 (Renewable Energy Directive II).
- Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union (Fiscal Compact, 2012).
- Bradford, A. (2020). *The Brussels Effect: How the European Union Rules the World*. Oxford University Press.
- Mutua, M. (2000). What is TWAIL? *Proceedings of the ASIL Annual Meeting*, 94, 31-40.
- Okafor, O. (of International Law. Cambridge University Press.
- Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). *The Elrakhawi Vision for Wind Energy Engineering and Integrated Cybersecurity*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22648423.
- Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). *The Rationality of the Poetic Machine: Archaeology of Human Knowledge in the Age of Algorithms*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22648831.
- Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). *The Knowledge Genome: Decoding Humanity in the Post-Text Era*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22649006.

Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). The Elrakhawi Doctrine of Critical Comparative Law: A New Paradigm for Legal Analysis. *European Law Journal*.

Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). Sovereignty Erosion in the European Union: A Quantitative Assessment. *Journal of Common Market Studies*.

Elrakhawi, M. K. A. (2026). The Democratic Deficit of the European Commission: Institutional Analysis and Reform Proposals. *European Constitutional Law Review*.

END OF DOCUMENT

Foundational Digital Record: 10.5281/zenodo.22649195