Original research article / Originalus mokslinis straipsnis
Vol. 1 No. 4 (2025): Birželis

Assessing the Impact of the Eurozone on National Economic Sovereignty

[1] Mariela Suárez Valdés

Accepted: 05.21.2025
Published: 05.26.2025
https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.0104008

Abstract: Eurozone membership entails ceding national monetary authority to the European Central Bank (ECB) and accepting supranational fiscal rules (e.g. the Maastricht criteria, Stability and Growth Pact (SGP), and Fiscal Compact). This paper examines how these arrangements have constrained member states' economic sovereignty since the 2008 crisis. Method: Using a comparative case study of four Eurozone countries (Greece, Italy, Germany, France), we analyse official data and policy developments from 2008 onward. Theoretical lenses include the economic policy "trilemma" (impossible trinity), economic interdependence, and neofunctionalist spillover. Results: We find that Euro membership has systematically curtailed unilateral monetary policy (no devaluation, uniform ECB rates) and imposed tight fiscal limits (3% deficit, 60% debt). During the sovereign-debt crisis, bailout conditionality and ECB interventions (e.g. OMT, QE) further eroded autonomy. Sovereignty was shared or pooled in many areas of economic policy (e.g. coordinated budget review, banking supervision). However, differences emerged: Germany and France enjoyed policy space earlier on, while Greece and Italy bore stricter external control (Troika programmes, market pressure) and deeper recessions. Conclusions: Eurozone membership has unquestionably limited national fiscal and monetary discretion, validating concerns about constrained sovereignty. Yet institutions have adapted (strengthened fiscal governance, banking union) and there are proposals for further reforms (fiscal union, central stabilization funds) to reconcile stability with democratic control. Within the existing Euro-area framework, states strive for adaptive strategies (structural reforms, fiscal buffers, and coordinated policy) to mitigate sovereignty loss.

Keywords: *Eurozone; economic sovereignty; monetary policy; Stability and Growth Pact; Fiscal Compact; neofunctionalism; economic policy trilemma.*

INTRODUCTION

The creation of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and the euro fundamentally altered the relationship between European states and their economic policy autonomy. At Maastricht in 1992 and in subsequent treaties, Euro-area members agreed to forfeit independent monetary sovereignty to the European Central Bank (ECB) – a "currency without a state" – while retaining national control over fiscal and other policies. In effect, governments surrendered the traditional national tools of monetary policy (money supply, exchange rates) in exchange for deeper economic integration. Over time this

[1] **Suárez Valdés, M.** Field: Environmental Economics. Email: mariela.suarez@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4827-3388

has raised acute questions about how far national economic sovereignty survives in a common-currency area.

Economic sovereignty, here defined as the capacity of a national government to set and implement fiscal, monetary and financial policies independently, has been constrained by Euro-zone membership. The Maastricht Treaty and the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP) impose strict rules on deficits (<3% GDP) and debt (<60% GDP). The fiscal Compact (Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance, 2012) went further by requiring balanced-budget rules in domestic law. Meanwhile, the ECB's mandate – to maintain area-wide price stability – precludes national interest-rate setting. This institutional design implies that Euro-area policymakers "do whatever is required" collectively but must share, not individually keep, sovereignty over key economic policies.

This paper analyses how these arrangements have played out since the 2008 financial crisis, focusing on post-crisis dynamics in the Eurozone. We ask: to what extent has membership affected national fiscal and monetary autonomy, and how have member states adapted? The study is framed by three theories. Economic interdependence suggests that deep trade and financial links among EU countries tie their fortunes together, potentially reducing the appetite for independent policy. Neofunctionalism predicts that crises will trigger deeper integration (spillovers), as seen in the EU's crisis-management mechanisms. And the economic policy trilemma (impossible trinity) implies that a fixed currency plus free capital flows inherently excludes independent national monetary policy.

We address these questions via a comparative case study of four Euro-area countries – Greece, Italy, Germany and France – chosen for their varied experiences. Using official data (Eurostat, OECD, IMF, ECB) and scholarly sources, we examine how each country's policy space has been affected by Euro rules and crises (2008–2025), and what reforms or strategies have emerged. The paper proceeds with a theoretical framework, then outlines the methodology, followed by results and analysis of the cases, a broader discussion, and conclusions.

Theoretical Framework

Our analysis draws on integration and macroeconomic theories to frame how Euro membership influences sovereignty. Economic interdependence implies that close economic ties (trade, investment, banking) make shocks shared and policies interlinked. In such a context, national decisions have cross-border effects, which can foster coordination or lead to collective governance. For instance, unified markets and finances in Europe have increased mutual dependencies, creating both incentives for common policy (e.g. a single currency to facilitate trade) and constraints on independent action.

The economic policy trilemma (impossible trinity) articulates a basic macroeconomic constraint: a country cannot simultaneously maintain (a) a fixed exchange rate, (b) open capital markets, and (c) an independent monetary policy. By adopting the euro, members achieved (a) and (b) by definition, meaning they sacrificed (c). Thus, no individual Euro-area state can adjust its interest rate or currency value; monetary policy is centralized in the ECB. In practical terms, this means that national policy tools to respond to asymmetric shocks (e.g. recessions) are limited, forcing a heavier reliance on fiscal policy or structural reforms (which are themselves constrained by union rules).

Neofunctionalism suggests that crises and functional pressures tend to generate "spillover" integration: problems in one policy area create demand for supranational solutions that deepen union. In the Eurozone crisis, the mismatch between centralized monetary policy and decentralized fiscal regimes illustrated by Niemann and Ioannou, for example, "laid the ground" for further integration. They find that new crises management institutions (ESM, banking union, two-pack fiscal rules) emerged precisely because the Maastricht architecture was incomplete. Neofunctionalism thus predicts that Euro-area governance would evolve under pressure, pooling more sovereignty. Indeed, as one analysis notes, economic integration during the crisis became "an area of 'high politics', i.e. close to the heart of national sovereignty," yet integration deepened nonetheless.

These frameworks help us interpret the Eurozone experience: high interdependence and common shocks created incentives for collective action, while the trilemma forced a surrender of monetary autonomy. Neofunctionalist logic suggests that crisis-led steps (banking union, fiscal oversight) were predictable spillovers. At the same time, the residual national sovereignty – especially in fiscal and structural policies – has been defended vigorously by member states, producing tension between cooperation and autonomy. In sum, these theories imply that Euro-membership inherently limits national control of macroeconomic policy, but also generates pressures for incremental pooling of sovereignty.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comparative case study approach, examining Greece, Italy, Germany, and France as representative Eurozone members with differing economic structures and crisis experiences. These four cases were selected to capture diversity: two peripheral economies (Greece, Italy) that suffered intense debt crises and required adjustment programmes, and two core economies (Germany, France) that influenced Euro-area policies and experienced milder crises. The post-2008 period is the focus, as it saw major changes in EMU governance.

We compile qualitative and quantitative evidence from official sources (European Central Bank, Eurostat, OECD, IMF, European Commission reports) and the academic literature. Key variables include fiscal deficits, debt levels, GDP growth, unemployment, and policy measures (e.g. bailouts, reforms). Policy instruments under study include the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP), the Fiscal Compact (Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance), and ECB interventions (OMT, quantitative easing, banking union measures). We trace how each country's policy choices and outcomes were shaped by these instruments, and document cases of sovereign constraint (e.g. forced austerity, deferring budgets to Brussels).

The analysis is descriptive and interpretive. We first review each country's macroeconomic trajectory and policy responses, highlighting instances of lost autonomy (monetary/ fiscal). We then compare across cases to identify common patterns and differences. The theoretical frameworks (interdependence, neofunctionalism, trilemma) guide the interpretation of findings. For example, we assess whether crisis-driven policy integration (e.g. Troika programs, banking union) fits neofunctionalist spillovers, and how countries contend with the trilemma (fixed currency, free capital, no own monetary tools).

Methodological limitations are acknowledged: this is not a formal econometric study, but an in-depth policy analysis. To enhance rigor, we rely on multiple sources and triangulate data (e.g. ECB and

OECD statistics). We refrain from oversimplification by contextualizing outcomes within each nation's political economy. Nevertheless, the comparative approach illuminates the broader impact of Eurozone membership on sovereignty, beyond any single country's story.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Greece

Greece exemplifies the stark loss of sovereignty under the euro. After years of hidden deficits, the 2008–2010 crisis revealed unsustainable finances. Without its own currency, Greece could not devalue to regain competitiveness and was "handcuffed by the ECB" to the euro's one-size-fits-all policy. Greek interest rates soared when markets distrusted its debt, but the country could not lower them independently. With the Maastricht "no bail-out" rule (Article 125 TFEU) precluding any automatic rescue, Greece relied on external bailouts from the EU/IMF "Troika" (2010, 2012, 2015).

These programmes imposed strict conditionality on fiscal and structural policy. In practical terms, Greece ceded fiscal sovereignty to the Troika: budget decisions, tax policy, and spending cuts were negotiated with Brussels and the IMF. Critics note that under such programmes "countries have de facto lost their sovereignty" by becoming subject to creditors' conditionality. Indeed, the ECB paper notes that Greece's extreme deficit and debt left it highly vulnerable and unable to counter the crisis with domestic policy tools. The result was deep recession: real GDP fell by roughly 25% from 2009 to 2015, unemployment surged to ~27%, and incomes collapsed.

Greece's case shows how Eurozone rules can act as an economic straitjacket. The SGP (3% deficit limit) was violated, but enforcement gave way only as Troika packages took effect. Even then, fiscal policy remained under tight external supervision. Monetary sovereignty was entirely surrendered; Greece could not inflate away debt or stimulate via interest rates. On the positive side, ECB interventions (Bond-buying under OMT promises, and later QE) stabilized funding and likely prevented disorderly default. However, those ECB actions were supranational and came with no national control. Greece's experience underlines how Euro membership can transform sovereign budgetary policy into a negotiated program, and monetary policy into policy determined by a supranational authority.

Italy

Italy entered the crisis with high public debt (~120% of GDP) and slow growth. Like Greece, Italy could not devalue its currency or set local rates, so during 2011–12 a loss of market confidence raised yields. Italy eventually avoided a formal bailout, partly due to its larger economy and domestic adjustments. Instead, the EU and ECB exerted heavy pressure on Rome. For example, the EU demanded a 2011 corrective budget and later enacted tough budget oversight (two-pack, Six-Pack legislation) to enforce SGP rules.

Under these pressures, Italy's policy space narrowed. The 2012 Fiscal Compact required Italy to translate the EU balanced-budget rule into national law. In 2011, Italy amended its constitution to include a "golden rule" for debt, effectively cementing fiscal discipline. Nevertheless, Italy's austerity measures – spending cuts and tax increases – were partly driven by EU institutional pressure (and even by ECB warnings). According to Beukers, the crisis saw "new instances of ECB pressure on

Member States to adopt policy reform" in fiscal areas, a description that fits Italy's experience. Italian social policy and investments were constrained to meet European deficit targets.

When Mario Monti took over as Prime Minister in late 2011, he rhetorically reaffirmed Italy's commitment to Euro rules to reassure markets. Monti's government enacted pension and labor reforms under EU urging, again illustrating reduced sovereignty. Yet unlike Greece, Italy retained more control by negotiating within the EU (it did not have a Troika). Markets, however, effectively disciplined Italy by making deficit financing costly; here Italy's vulnerability as a large debtor was the mechanism of constraint.

Overall, Italy's case shows a more subtle sovereignty loss: It still ran national elections and budgets, but under the constant watch of Eurozone rules. The imposition of austerity by treaty obligations (SGP and Fiscal Compact) and by market logic meant Italy's "choice sets" for fiscal policy were tightly bounded. Moreover, without currency flexibility, Italy had to rely on product and labor market reforms (many EU-recommended) to restore competitiveness – again indicating rule-driven policy rather than purely domestic choice.

Germany

Germany's experience contrasts sharply. Entering the crisis with low debt and current-account surplus, Germany was less threatened by panic. It retained more effective policy autonomy simply because it was the creditor. German monetary policy was influenced by the ECB's low-rate regime (which some critics argue was too loose for Germany's needs), but there was no episode of market-imposed austerity.

Still, Germany's sovereignty was not untouched. To satisfy Euro rules and support weaker partners, Germany engaged in new coordination. For example, it approved the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) and later the permanent European Stability Mechanism (ESM) – steps that pooled fiscal risk at the Euro-area level. Domestically, Germany implemented its own "debt brake" (Schuldenbremse) in 2009, enshrining fiscal discipline in the constitution. This rule aligned with the Stability Pact's goals but was chosen autonomously. On the monetary side, Germany effectively delegated to the ECB, and later benefited from ECB bond purchases (both of Italian/Spanish bonds and German debt) which kept yields low.

Notably, Germany was a leading advocate for strict enforcement of EU rules, as it sought assurance that other members would not be allowed to ignore fiscal limits. Thus, Germany's sovereignty was partly expressed through shaping Eurogovernance (pursuing the debt brake and SGP reforms). In trade terms, Germany's economy integrated deeply with other Euro partners; this interdependence arguably boosted support for the single currency, at the cost of requiring solidarity instruments. Germany's case shows that "sovereign" states in the core may gain influence in rule-setting, but still pool control (through ECB policies and EU budgets) to stabilize the system.

France

France occupies a middle ground. It too ran deficits above Maastricht limits and had slowing growth, drawing criticism from EU partners. Paris repeatedly pressed for more flexible interpretation of fiscal rules (e.g. counting national "growth pacts" when calculating deficit) while also endorsing the euro's stability. France managed to avoid a bailout by promising fiscal restraint and implementing some cuts (2012–13 austerity budgets) under EU surveillance.

Under President Macron (2017–2022), France pushed for Eurozone reform within the existing framework. Initiatives like the Franco-German proposal (2017) and the Future of Europe debates sought a Eurozone budget and debt instrument for investment – essentially a fiscal capacity – but they stopped short of treaty change. France's strategy has been to work within the rules to build solidarity (e.g. supporting ESM aid for Greece, endorsing ECB activism) while preserving core aspects of national autonomy. Monetary policy did not suit France perfectly (low ECB rates and high inflation concerns), but France accepted the ECB's decisions as part of collective governance.

Overall, France's sovereignty was constrained mostly by shared rule-enforcement: it had to align its budgets with SGP targets (even if by optimistic "structural" accounting) and comply with EU economic coordination (European Semester recommendations, the Two-Pack/Three-Pack oversight). The effect has been fiscal adjustment with limited offsetting stimulus. Still, France retained more leeway than Greece or Italy in setting its economic agenda (having avoided a formal program and being a big EU shareholder). Its case illustrates that within the Eurozone, large countries must negotiate compromises in governance: sovereignty is shared but also a tool of bargaining over rules and their application.

DISCUSSION

Across these cases, clear patterns emerge: Eurozone membership has placed hard limits on national economic sovereignty, primarily through fiscal rules and a centralized monetary authority. The Stability and Growth Pact and later Fiscal Compact legally constrain budgets. Even when rules were broken or bent (as before the crisis), crisis conditions enforced compliance. Krugman's old adage holds: with a fixed currency (the euro) and free capital flows, countries lose independent monetary policy. This loss has material consequences: for example, the inability to devalue forced deficit countries to endure internal devaluation (falling prices and wages) and painful debt adjustment. In practice, the ECB took on the role of stabilizer: measures like Outright Monetary Transactions and quantitative easing provided relief, but at the supra-national level and often with conditionality of sorts.

The COVID-19 pandemic (post-period) has also shown the issue: in 2020 the ECB and EU collectively agreed on relaxation (allowing deficits above 3%) for all members, demonstrating how rules can flex under extreme stress. But this move was decided at EU summits, again highlighting that fiscal decisions are now made through negotiation rather than solely at national discretion.

The absence of a central fiscal mechanism remains a key constraint. As the ECB's analysis notes, unlike federal states (US, Switzerland), EMU has no common budget for stabilization. This means recessions hit countries harder: Germany and France used national stimulus in 2020, whereas Greece and Italy could not. Some risk-sharing exists (e.g. ESM credit lines, ECB lending to banks), but these are reactive and conditional, not automatic stabilizers. Thus, the Euro-area design upholds member-state sovereignty in many domains (labour, education, taxation choices) but suspends it where macro stability is deemed vital.

Neofunctionalist theory is borne out in part: the crisis spurred deeper integration (banking union, stronger fiscal surveillance) without new treaties, as predicted. Niemann & Ioannou argue these are "integrative outcomes" from the original EMU's incomplete structure. However, the process is conflictual, not seamless. Member states have resisted ceding additional sovereignty (the 2011 ECB paper noted the "unwillingness to transfer the necessary degree of sovereignty" even in reforms). Thus, sovereignty today is often exercised jointly – for instance, national budgets must be approved under European oversight – or split (monetary at ECB, fiscal national but under EU rule).

Looking forward, potential reforms fall into three categories. First are fiscal union measures: proposals for a common Euro-area budget or eurobonds (joint debt) would pool fiscal sovereignty and provide stabilizers. Second are banking/balance-sheet tools: completing the banking union (e.g. common deposit insurance) would shield public finances from bank failures, indirectly restoring some national financial policy space. Third are flexibility mechanisms: for example, well-designed escape clauses or "rainy day" funds could allow national budgets to respond in downturns without breaching rules. All these have been discussed (Five Presidents' Report, Macron's proposals), but implementation has been partial. As Pisani-Ferry argues, true monetary union requires either fiscal union or overwhelming ECB intervention – implying further pooling of sovereignty.

Within the existing framework, member states have developed adaptive strategies. These include structural reforms (to boost growth without pro-cyclical spending), reliance on EU structural funds and development banks, and improved tax and welfare policies to increase resilience. On the monetary side, some advocate strategic use of national development banks (since fiscal deficits are limited) and indirect instruments like macroprudential banking policy to achieve local goals. Politically, governments emphasize sharing the narrative: they present Euro-constraints as common commitments rather than external impositions, to maintain public legitimacy of "shared sovereignty." For instance, during the pandemic Germany and France jointly argued for temporary rule suspension, framing it as collective, not uncoordinated national, action.

In sum, Eurozone membership has demonstrably constrained both monetary and fiscal sovereignty of its members. Countries like Greece and Italy experienced this most painfully, having to submit large parts of policy to supranational control. Germany and France, though technically more autonomous, also operate within a rules-bound regime and influence it collectively. The sovereignty "lost" in certain domains has in many respects become "shared" in a broader institutional framework. Whether this trade-off is acceptable remains debated, but pragmatically, member states now navigate a complex balance: maintaining national authority where feasible (e.g. in social policy and regulation) while coordinating tightly in macroeconomic policy to preserve the Eurozone's stability.

CONCLUSION

The euro's design has had a profound impact on national economic sovereignty. By mandating a single currency and centralized monetary policy, and by enforcing strict fiscal rules, Eurozone membership inevitably curtailed individual states' autonomy over macroeconomic levers. Our case studies show that since 2008 these constraints have been decisive in shaping policy: Greece and Italy saw much of their fiscal decision-making effectively transferred to EU-led programmes, while Germany and France worked within tighter EU fiscal governance than before. The ECB's crisis interventions further underscored a shift toward supranational decision-making in monetary affairs.

At the same time, the Eurozone architecture has evolved in response to these pressures. Crisis-era reforms (financial backstops, new rules) illustrate neofunctionalist spillover, even as they reflect member states' insistence on controlling the pace of integration. Policymakers have recognized the limitations: many analysts urge moving toward a genuine fiscal union or creating central stabilisation tools (fiscal capacity, unemployment insurance, eurobonds) to make the arrangement more sustainable. No major treaty changes have yet occurred, but incremental steps (banking union, limited shared budgets) continue.

In the interim, Euro-area members are adapting. Governments seek to strengthen structural resilience and use the leeway permitted by the rules (e.g. focusing on structural deficit measures). Coordination mechanisms (European Semester, Fiscal Board) aim to improve credibility without giving up sovereignty. The ECB itself has signaled its commitment to price stability while also accepting an expanded role (pressuring for reforms, acting as lender of last resort) that blurs lines with fiscal policy.

In conclusion, membership of the Eurozone has delivered both benefits (elimination of exchange risk, deeper market integration) and costs in terms of national policy autonomy. The balance between pooled and national sovereignty remains a central tension in EU politics. Future reforms will likely test how much more sovereignty countries are willing to share. For now, the empirical evidence is clear: the constraints of the euro make national economies more integrated but less independent, and managing this trade-off is a defining challenge of contemporary European economic governance.

REFERENCES

Beukers, T. (2014). *The new ECB and its relationship with the eurozone Member States: between central bank independence and central bank intervention*. *Common Market Law Review*, 50(6), 1579–1620. DOI:10.54648/COLA2013160.

ECB (2011). *The Stability and Growth Pact: Crisis and Reform* (Occasional Paper No. 129). European Central Bank. Retrieved from https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpops/ecbocp129.pdf

ECB (2016). *Safeguarding the euro as a currency beyond the state* (Occasional Paper No. 173). European Central Bank. Retrieved from https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpops/ecbop173.en.pdf

ECB (2019). *Fiscal rules in the euro area and lessons from other monetary unions. ECB Economic Bulletin*, Issue 3. Retrieved from https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/ecbu/eb201903_02~e835720b96.en.pdf

Kelemen, D. R. (2015). *Law, Fiscal Federalism, and Austerity*. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 22(2), 379–401. Retrieved from https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol22/iss2/5

Niemann, A., & Ioannou, D. (2015). European economic integration in times of crisis: A case of neofunctionalism? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(2), 196–218. DOI:10.1080/13501763.2014.994021.

Pisani-Ferry, J. (2012). *The Euro crisis and the new impossible trinity*. Bruegel Policy Brief. Retrieved from https://www.bruegel.org/policy-brief/euro-crisis-and-new-impossible-trinity