

Propositions accompanying the thesis

“The regulation of household debt levels in the EU and three of its member states: evaluating the legal preconditions for effectiveness”

by Arie van 't Hof

1. European rules for consumer credit are unable to effectively protect consumers, due to their lack of determinacy and completeness.
2. Despite harmonisation, regimes for enforcing prudential regulation and consumer law differ substantially across the examined jurisdictions, especially with respect to the nature of enforcement – private, public or criminal.
3. The advantages of principle-based and rule-based regulations can be combined by creating overarching open norms, which are further detailed by specific rules.
4. The increase of powers of financial supervisors in EU member states has not been accompanied by sufficient governance arrangements to ensure independence and accountability.
5. Creating more well-designed guided discretion mechanisms for macroprudential instruments will decrease the inaction bias and increase accountability possibilities.
6. Interdisciplinary research in law and economics offers important added value for analysing regulation, as legal details matter for the effectiveness of instruments.
7. Understanding EU law is impossible without understanding the political motives of the actors involved in creating and applying EU law.
8. The *post*-crisis reforms of EU law have increased technocracy more than they have increased transparency.
9. The strong effect of financial and economic cycles on the tides of regulation has not fundamentally changed since the financial crisis.
10. As predicting and preventing crises is difficult, increasing resilience is the best policy option.
11. As a PhD researcher, your friends and family do not understand what you are doing as a job; as an interdisciplinary PhD researcher, even your colleagues don't understand.